

DISCUSSION ON 2 CORINTHIANS 5 - Sam Frost, Martin Asare And William Bell

Sam Frost

More on 2 Co 5. Before commenting further on verse 3, we should first define some terms. In verse 2, Paul uses yet another word for “dwelling”, but this time, oiketerion. He has used oikia, and oikodome (you might notice the word, ‘dome’, there on the end). Oike-terion is a compound word. With oikia (home, house), and oikedome (building), oike-terion is a dwelling place, or ‘the place where a home sits.’ Compound terms provide emphasis. In keeping with our interpretation, one may suggest that “home” and “body” can be seen as a metaphor, but oikodome (building) and oiketerion (place of building) is surely a stretch (and this would be the single instance!). The “body” is a “place” where a building “dwells”? Absurd. If the building itself is the body, then the body/dwells in the body/building dwelling place! Absurd. I dwell in my house, which dwells on a place. The house and the place are not the same things anymore than the land on which my house sits are not the same. However, if Paul is talking about heaven, and God’s Building out of/in heaven – the place – then our absurdity goes away.

When our spirit/selves is without our body, our body does not cease being “ours”. It’s still mine. It’s still very much tied to who I am. Always will be. This is where the idea of “getting a wholly other body” devalues the body you currently are/have. Hebrew theology doesn’t do that. In fact, we can see this in Paul’s choice of words in verse 6 (at home in the body). But, that’s later. For now, for in this tent we are groaning for the dwelling-place-of-ours-the-one-of heaven. That’s Greek.

I have made much clamor about the present form of “we have” in verse 1, insisting on its base function: present action. That is, Paul is not saying we will have, or simply expressing a certain hope of having. Rather, he sees ‘the dwelling place’ and the ‘building of God’ as something he now has while writing. Further analysis demonstrates my point in verse 2: we long for (present form) the dwelling place of ours, where “of ours” is possessive; something we have; ours. The dwelling place of God’s (heaven), his home, is something that is, now, ours – we have access. I don’t have to resort to explaining some other ‘aspect’ of the present form. I let it be. We have a building from God when this earthy tent of ours is temporarily taken

down. Ours is the heavenly dwelling place of God when such occurs. Paul is not talking about “getting a new body when you die”. Silly. You get your old tent back, when he raises it from the ‘earthy’ dust, making it new.

Now, one last thing in verse 2. The verb, en-duo, is further compounded by Paul with epi. Epi-en-duo. Rare, rare word. In fact, Paul seems to have coined this one himself. In Greek, you can add suffixes and prepositions to words, making “new” words. German is the same. In English, for example, we have ‘grain’ and ‘in-grained.’ ‘Side’ and ‘out-side.’ Bitter, em-bitter. You get the point. Here, we have epi-en-duo. Upon-in-dwelling. The verb itself does not mean “to be clothed upon”. Duo does not mean ‘clothe’; the many words for clothes (shirt, pants, robe, shoes) can be used with this verb and thus the translation would be, ‘put on a shirt’ or what have you. The verb itself means ‘putting’ ‘dwelling’ ‘entering’ or ‘going in’ or ‘going on.’ You can ‘put on’ righteousness, salvation, or a hat. You can ‘dwell in’ your misery, a store, or a shirt. Take your pick. But, here, Paul has spoken of a place and a building IN heaven. The verb, ependuo, is in the Infinitive form, aorist, middle. ‘We long to dwell upon in’ the dwelling place of God of heaven, in the heavens. How one dwells upon-in a body, I have no idea. However, how a person can dwell in a building, upon a place...I am doing that right now in my house, upon my land. Thus, We have long known that when this earthly tent is taken down, we know we have entrance into God’s Building, the eternal Home of God himself, in the heavens. For we now feel this groaning in this earthy tent, longing to enter upon the dwelling place that is of heaven (as opposed to earth).

Thus, to make the point again, Paul is NOT comparing his body/tent on earth with a "house/building" in heaven body. He is saying that his house on earth (a tent) will fail, but that he, as a spirit, enters into God's own House, in the heavens UNTIL the tent (his body) is raised again. This is saying the same EXACT thing as in Hebrews 12, "you have come to Mount Zion....to the SPIRITS of the just made perfect..." And, in the context of Hebrews 11-12 ("these all died"), their SPIRITS are in heaven as "great cloud of WITNESSES", in the HOUSE OF GOD, awaiting resurrection when TOGETHER WITH ALL THE SAINTS, they shall be raised in the last day. Paul's message is consistent throughout....

Martin Asare's Question:

Sam Frost, so is the heavenly tent his resurrected heavenly body or heaven itself? That's the question to you .

Sam Frost's Reply

again....Paul is NOT comparing his body (tent) with a "body" he will get "in heaven." All that he is saying is that when he leaves this body, he will enter into - not ANOTHER BODY - but into God's House "in the heavenlies" wherein he will AWAIT to receive back his body when he 'stands before the Judgment Seat of Christ for things done through the body' (5.10). The things he done "through the body" (his tent), will be accounted for IN THE BODY (his tent) when God RAISES that body (his tent) again. MEANWHILE, apart from the body (his tent), his DWELLING PLACE will be "with the Lord" in Heaven, in his FATHER'S HOUSE.

Martin Asare's Second Question

so u are saying paul's hope is the intermediate state? Really? How is the heavenly tent a clothing and not similar to the Earthly tent which is also a clothing as he says? Your analysis don't add up. Notice he says mortality will be swallowed up when he puts off the Earthly tent and puts on the heavenly tent? The phrase, mortality swallowed up is right from 1 Cor 15:50-54, and Isa 25:1-10.

Paul explains this as what happens when he receives his immortal body which is also the heavenly body. So clearly the heavenly tent which he puts on to swallow up mortality is not the place he goes when he does, [sic] but rather the resurrected body given to him as his heavenly body. .

That is why I think if u are being consistent with the analogy , and see a reality being spoken of, in his death, u may have to posit some form of clothing given to the soul in heaven. Yet this clothing though not the resurrected body is a clothing in likeness of the spiritual body given [sic] to those who dwell [sic] in heaven whjch [sic] is a place for spiritual bodies. So that angels have the ability to appear in bodies though never created with a physical body because they posses a spiritual body. So that even the soul at death like Moses in glory has a glorified body given to it when he appeared to Jesus at the MT of transfiguration. .

However this body is simply an inaugural manifestation of the Christian hope to be realized at the resirrection. [sic] However At The resurrection, when the body is raised, the soul will be clothed with the spiritual body which pertains to the dead body to show mortality has been swallowed up . Same like christ [sic] he appeared in OT prior to his incarnation with a body

and was called the son of God in the furnace. He also came as a man to Abraham and as an angel shining in God's glory .

These bodily appearances were manifested in a permanent way when he was incarnate and glorified in his resurrection. Thus what was to become permanent was manifested ahead of time . This perhaps is the same with the souls of believers. So that in heaven they are not naked. AND AS heaven itself is a present manifestation of what the NHNE will be,so they dwell there in a spiritual body. And this when revealed at the 2nd coming is seen in both the renewed creation and resurrected body. Thus Christian hope is inaugurated in death and consummated at the 2nd coming. Perhaps this is the position to adopt. But to say heaven is the tent and clothing to be put on, I find that jarring to the text and inconsistent in the analogy of a tent as a clothing which is put on .

Sam Frost's Reply

Martin Asare, you are not understanding what i am saying, that is evident.

Martin Asare's Reply:

I do, u are saying the heavenly tent is heaven and not the heavenly body. I disagree with that based on the text speaking of the 2 tents as a clothing to be put on .

Sam Frost,

Martin Asare, where does he call the heavenly dwelling a tent?

Martin Asare

Sam Frost, it's right there in verse 1-3, the Earthly house = building =tent in which we dwell= clothing of mortality, then he contrasts this with a heavenly house= building = clothing =DWELLING = clothing of immortality .

So that Earth vs heaven is not thw dwelling but that which houses the soul is the dwelling. One is Earthly tent , or dwelling or clothing vs the heavenly tent or clothing or dwelling . In both cases the dwelling or house, or tent is a PLACE . However it's a clothing to be put off or put on to cover nakedness. This nakedness refer to the soul, and the clothing it's embodiment which expresses a character of mortality or immortality . So the idea of Place as Earth vs heaven lurks in the text but that is not the focus of the hope which paul engages as a clothing . So that we can say in this body tied to each we groan being burdened for deliverance as Rom 8:17-24, shows the groaning of the beleiver for deliverance in his body is equal to that of the creation which is Earth. Likewise the heaven is where the body redeemed

will be delivered from its groans and pains which is mortality and corruption . This also means the creation is delivered and made the heaven without tge corruption ie the NHNE. Hence the idea of heaven vs Earth is also carried bit the focus is the type of body associated with each realm.

Sam Frost

no, it's not "right there." There is Paul's "tent", and GOD'S House/building/dwelling place - you know, "I shall dwell in the HOUSE of the LORD forever" - not, "I shall dwell in the BODY IN HEAVEN of the LORD forever"

Martin Asare

the text shows, the tent or cloth8ng to be put on is what will swallow up mortality. If u don't see this as lcor 15:35-54, 50-54, I don't know what to tell u. . 2 Cor 5 tells you this cloth9ng, and house IN THE Heavens and its ETernal.. meaning it's an heavenly eternal dweling and clothing. This is why i sepak of an heavenly tent and clothing. 1 Peter 1:4, Phil 3:20-21, all say our inhertance is IN HEAVEN, and our glorified body will come when Christ comes from Heaven. Rev 21 shows the bride is heavenly and thus her glory given to her when the heavens and earth pass away is from heaven. That's the point. So hope u will understand this. This is why Paul in 1 Cor 15 speaks of the 2nd man from above who brings the heavenly body is Christ.

Sam Frost

Martin Asare, there is no "clothing" mentioned here. Again, the verb "ekduo" or "enduo" does not mean "put clothing on." It simply means "enter in" "go into", "put on" whatever (you can put on righteousness; you can enter in a garage; I can have put over me a banner of truth, or a flag).

Sam Frost

Martin, Asare, Heck, we can even "put on" Jesus himself...or be "over covered" with Jesus...

Martin Asare

Sam Frost, see how u are struggling, paul is making the sane comparison. , the semantic range u gave includes PUT ON , yet you want to tell me the idea of clothing is foreign . Meanwhile ,He has told us the present body in which he groans is a house, a tent and clothing. So what's the heavenly tent in which mortality is swallowed up? It's the resurrected

body as 1 Cor 15:23,50-54 says. This is also when we are redeemed from our groaning in this body as Rom 8:17-24, says. Enough said .

Martin Asare

Sam Frost, yet in the text the clothing is also the building which prevents Nakedness. So tell me what is this Nakedness?

William Bell's First Reply:

Sam Frost, in the first epistle to the Corinthians Paul says, "For we are God's fellow workers, YOU are God's FIELD, YOU are God's BUILDING (oikodome). 3:9. Later he said they were the TEMPLE of God, v. 16, and again they were the BODY, 1 Cor. 12. All these terms are later used in the second epistle. Which of them in the first epistle refers to the human body?

Sam's Reply:

William Bell, this is a really great example of how NOT to do exegesis. Instead of CONTEXT allowing words to function in different ways, you, instead, define a term in the exact same way in different contexts, which is known as a "word fallacy". I guess "door" in "they opened the door", and "I am the door" are both used for Jesus....right?

William's 2nd Reply:

That is a great example of how to dodge and add senseless confusion to a straight-forward question.

1. 2 Cor. 5 is an eschatological context which I'm sure you agree and will not deny.
2. So is 1 Cor. 3:8-18 because it speaks of "receiving the reward", taking heed in view of the "Day of judgment" to declare one's work, "destruction for defiling the temple", all in "this age" v. 18, of which end was coming upon that generation, 1 Cor. 10:11.
3. Since Christ is the "foundation of the temple" 3:9, and no other foundation could any man lay, (v. 10) that means he is the foundation of the heavenly house of 2 Cor. 5:1, Eph. 2 and 1 Pet. 2, unless of course you want cracks in the foundation so you can build three tabernacles like Peter suggested!

4. The house of God is the temple, (Isa. 2:2, 3), which is also the church, (1 Tim. 3:15), and the church is the body of Christ, also called the habitation OIKODOME (building) that grows into a holy temple in the Lord, (Eph. 2:21) in whom the saints were being built together for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit, who was the earnest of their "inheritance" (the heavenly house) until the redemption of the purchased possession (the church, Eph. 1:13, 14, Acts 20:28, Eph. 4:30) or is that too much context for you?

5. This was certainly the "last days temple" as Isa. 2:2, 1 Pet. 1:20, 2:5-9
Now try it again, without the smokescreen or do we have two end times paradigms in scripture with two foundations, temples, fields, bodies, houses, etc.
Now that the scriptures have opened the correct door for you, which one are you going to walk through?

Sam's Reply

William Bell, there are so many smuggled in assumptions in your attempt to be "overbearing" (as if that somehow means something). Your word salad is not impressive.

No one said anything about these not being "eschatological texts". What you did, and you know it, is take the word "oikedomos" in 1 Co 3, and make it the same meaning in 2 Co 5. Thus, in 1 Co 3.9, "you are God's building" - and in 2 Co 5.1, "we have a building" - same word, clearly two different applications. So, I asked you, "is the church (building) to enter into the church (building)"? You dodged this, and offered instead a blustering of yet even more questions and assumptions.

So, from your FIRST response (stay on subject, William), are you saying that the meaning of "building" in 3.9, is the same, exact meaning in 2 Co 5.1

William's 3rd Reply

it wasn't a dodge. You have dodged the issue. But thanks, I take your statement about, "...these not being eschatological texts" as agreement. Now, we have a place to start. So we have both 1 Cor 3 and 2 Cor 5 dealing with eschatology. Thanks for that admission.

Now, you claim, there are two different applications of the terms. You want me to do your work? You're suggesting they are different. Where's your proof? But, since you like mind games, here are a few questions for you.

1. Is the field of 1 Cor. 3:9 made with men's hands or cultivated like earthly fields? Was it watered with H2O or planted with natural seed? Is it geo-centric?
2. Is the building made with man's hands? Did man lay the foundation with brick and mortar?
3. Is the temple of verse 16-17 a "house made with hands"? Is this the same temple of 2 Cor. 6:16, where God said he would dwell with them, walk in them, be their God and they be His people, as he also said in Rev. 21:3?
4. Were the Ephesians in a "heavenly" or earthly temple, 1:3, 2:6, 19-22? Were they in the same temple as the Corinthians?
5. Are the garments of Rev. 3:18 that Christ counseled the impenitent church of Laodicea to buy so the shame of their nakedness would not be revealed, the same garments of 2 Cor. 5? And why does Christ admonish the churches to "keep" their garments, lest they walk naked and their shame appear? Rev. 16:15. How many ways, and end times and garments do they need to not be found naked?

Sam Frost On 2 Corinthians 4

In our little series, we have watched some Hyper Prets in desperation use "word studies" and such to distract away from the actual context of what Paul has explicitly stated. "The LIFE of Jesus" will be made manifest "in THE MORTAL FLESH" which is the body (2Co 4.11). Just before this, verse 10, Paul wrote, "so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies." The hypers won't touch these verses. They can't. And, it is clear that "jars of clay" (4.7) is the "body", "mortal flesh" and "tent" (5.1).

To continue the death hammer of Hyper Preterism, Paul THEN says, "knowing that he who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us also with Jesus and bring us with you into his presence" (4.14). Now...WHAT is RAISED? WHAT is the LIFE to be MANIFESTED in? The body, the mortal flesh. So clear, so plain, so evident. The 'original audience' understood it, as well as the second century fathers: our BODIES that have died because they are MORTAL BODIES, shall be RAISED from the dead. The language is simple so that even critical scholars, who do not believe in the NT (but certainly know Greek), overwhelmingly state this to be the case. Yet,

the Hyper Pret is desperate here; desperate to force Paul's words into a 70 AD straightjacket. It just doesn't work.

Now, as for my view that Paul is not contemplating "getting a new body in heaven" in 2Co 5.1-10, I am not alone. There is Charles Hodge, H. Odeberg, G. Wagner, R.V.G. Tasker, F. Prat, F.W. Grosheide - to name a few. Several scholars have noted that Paul's "mixed metaphors" here are meant to convey his conception of an "intermediate state" prior to resurrection (this would have been essentially Jewish, noted in the Book of Wisdom, in the Apocrypha). In other words, "going to heaven" as a spirit, prior to resurrection, was not an invented view by Paul.

Several "interpretations" have been given of this passage. Mine is simply one of them. By noting that Paul is not comparing "earthly body" with "heavenly body" (a mistake many make, but not all), we relieve the other mistake many scholars state: that Paul is simply "contradictory" here. I, for one, cannot settle for "contradictions" in the divine text. However, their point is to be understood. That is, if Paul has already stated that the "mortal flesh" is the object of which "the life" is to be made "manifest" (i.e., raised from its mortal stature and made immortal), then, clearly, 'the body' that one will 'receive' in the resurrection is not in heaven, but is on earth, in the dust of the earth. The mortal body is on earth, in the dust, dead. It is the object to be raised. Nothing is raised in heaven! Therefore, since these same scholars think that Paul suddenly 'switches' his ideas in 5.1-8, offering the picture that a person "get a heavenly body when he dies and goes to heaven" totally destroys the image of a resurrected body.

Hyper Prets have a hard time digesting this. They claim to get a 'raised body' - yet, a body in heaven in waiting that never died cannot be said to be a 'raised' body, and neither a 'mortal body made immortal'!

As stated, Paul has plainly stated that "the life" will be manifested "in the mortal flesh" - and then speaks of being "raised from the dead". The context is plain. No attempts of 70 AD redefining will help.

Therefore, we find the same syntactical phrasing in 4.11 "For we who live are always being given over to death for Jesus' sake, SO THAT the life of Jesus also may be manifested in the mortal flesh", with, "we have no wish to go out of this tent by our own hand, but we do wish

to go in upon his House, SO THAT the mortal tent be swallowed up in the life of Jesus" (5.4). 5.4 is making the SAME POINT in 4.11. Paul is not "switching" meaning, or definitions.

Therefore, the mortal body that dies, and is in "the dust of the earth" - ON EARTH, is the very MORTAL body/flesh that "shall be raised", and this means that it is NOT IN HEAVEN, but ON EARTH, waiting to be RAISED ("swallowed up in THE LIFE"). Paul does not speak of "mortal spirits" or "mortal souls". He speaks of MORTAL FLESH and BODIES.

The point that the Hyper Pret cannot get (the elephant in the room) is that the only object concerning the death of the believer that literally DIES is the body of their flesh, not their spirits.

due to the number of points you've made above, I think it best to slice and dice it up a bit to address some key points. So, they won't be in the order you've presented them.

William's Fourth Reply:

1. If I am following you correctly, you are arguing for a physical life/death motif in 2 Cor. 4:10-14. Did I get that right? You are stressing "mortal flesh," "jars of clay," and "bodies in the dust," physically dead, etc.

1. So, my first question is per vv. 11-12: What is the "life of Jesus" and secondly, why is "death" (physical???) working in "us", while "simultaneously" i.e. at the very same time, "life" is working in "you?" Can you tell us who the "us" is and why death only works in them, and who the "you" are in whom "life" is working but not "death", per the context all as concurrent or simultaneous actions?
2. . If these are antithetical states of physical life and death, how was it possible that some Corinthians/believers were not experiencing death/dying or would not do so, while others (Paul, & company) were? Where is such a scenario occurring with believers today that some experience physical death while others do not? Can you show us some living saints today in whom physical death is working and others in whom it is not, but life is working? Which group are you in?

3. How could physical death be working in Paul and company, (the us) while they were still PHYSICALLY ALIVE, i.e. before their bodies were buried in physical dust? Were they both physically dead and physically alive at the same time? And what of the "you" in whom life worked? How are they experiencing the "life of Jesus" by escaping physical death and dust burial out of which they were to be raised in your paradigm? Or, had they already been raised from physical death? Further, are they not in their "mortal flesh" (even per your construct) while the "life of Jesus" was working in them? If this is not the "life of Jesus", i.e. (resurrection life) working in them, what life is it, and why wasn't it working in the "us" group?
4. Wasn't it Paul's desire that they (the us) would also be "raised up" with Jesus, i.e. in the "life of Jesus" so they [the "us" group] could be presented with the "you" group in whom life was already working? And doesn't that demonstrate that the "life of Jesus" is resurrection life per the context?

2. You have acknowledged and admitted that 2 Cor. 4:11 is the same context of 2 Cor. 5:4. That must also mean that 2 Cor. 5:5, i.e. the earnest of the Spirit (the miraculous) is also implied in the resurrection of 2 Cor. 4:14. You can't have the Spirit operative in 2 Cor. 5:5 and inoperative in 2 Cor. 4:14 if they are speaking of the same resurrection. Sam, are we under the miraculous power of the Spirit today? Can you speak in tongues, heal the sick or raise the dead? Can anyone today? Are you charismatic now?

1. You acknowledged in the previous writing your agreement that 1 Cor. 3:9-17 and 2 Cor. 5:1f were both eschatological and speak of the same events, using the same terms. What then of 1 Cor. 6:14, "And God both raised up the Lord and will also raise "us" up by His "POWER?" (emp. mine). Is this verse not the exact parallel to 2 Cor. 4:14, almost identical in wording? However, it tells us how the raising would occur, i.e. through or by the POWER of the Spirit, i.e. the same earnest of the Spirit found in 2 Cor. 5:5, therefore confirming the Spirit's work in 2 Cor. 4:14.
2. In 4:10, Paul makes a statement about "the" body in the first part, versus the second part of the verse. "Always carrying about in "THE" body [sing.] the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life of Jesus also may be manifested in [the] "OUR" body. [literally, the body [sing.] of us]. This is not Paul's individual body. Rather, it is the Old Covenant body.
3. Since you have made this the physical body, how is death and life working in it simultaneously, even while it is yet alive?
4. Note that the only dying mentioned in verse 10 is the "dying of the Lord Jesus". This "dying of the Lord Jesus" stands over against the "life of Jesus." Were they literally carrying around Jesus literal death in their physical body? What about his physical life?

Sam's Reply

Paul's statement, "death in us, life in you" is explained by the fact that death was quite visible due to the long list of "hardships" the apostles endured, "even death." The idea that Paul is denying that death (the same death) is not working also in them (in all believers) is a logical non-sequitor. X works in me, but Y in you does not logically convert to X "never" works in you, only Y does. Paul's congregations were the RESULT of his sufferings, thus, their coming to life (being started, or founded).

This is made plain in the opening of the letter: "If we are afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation; and if we are comforted, it is for your comfort, which you experience when you patiently endure the same sufferings that we suffer...as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so also are ye of the comfort" (1.6-ff.).

Thus, both death and life work in all believers - there is no "Jew/Gentile" distinction here (your view, which most have long debunked in commentary after commentary).

"Indeed, we felt that we had received the sentence of death. But that was to make us rely not on ourselves but on God who raises the dead." Now, here, EVERY commentary understands that Paul's mission involved actual, physical "death" - capital punishment in some cases (stoning). Is this "spiritual corporate death" here, William? And, since this "sentence of death" is on them, what is it to hope for a resurrection of the dead (those who have been sentenced to death)? Spiritual resurrection? Does Paul "flip flop" meanings in one sentence?

"who out of so great a death did deliver us, and doth deliver, in whom we have hoped that even yet He will deliver" - again, here, it is clearly Paul's life being threatened with actual death (he lived a very dangerous life). Like the Psalmists, "delivered from death" means "the sword didn't get my throat today". I could have died! But didn't! He delivered me from death. EVERY commentary understands this.

These are just some of the first points I would make that demolish your "Jew/Gentile" distinction here, and "spiritualizing" of death.

William's Fifth Reply

Sam says death in 2 Cor. 4:11, 12, is explained by a "long list of hardships" the apostles endured "even DEATH." If they suffered hardships, they were delivered from them. If they suffered death, they were delivered from it. Sam says true, they suffered even death.

First, that's makes the death physical doesn't it? Surely can't say the apostles suffered "sin-death" or the "second death" can you? A long list of hardships, even physical death works in

the apostles, but not in the rest of the church? Hmmm

Secondly, you write that in 1:10, they were delivered from so great a death in the past (aorist) and from which they will be (future) delivered which was their hope that he would yet deliver them from it. Now if delivering them from physical death means they **did not die** in the past, how can the meaning change for their **future deliverance**? Does Paul "flip flop" meanings and do a double twist backward somersault in one sentence when discussing the same death and deliverance?

How can delivered from physical death mean they did not die physically in the past, but not also mean they would not die physically in the future? Is the future deliverance less powerful than the past one? How did that work out for the apostles and the entire body of believers in the first century? Can you point us to one single Corinthian or congregant who was delivered from physical death?

And yet, SOME OF THEM were NOT delivered even in the "past deliverance" according to Sam's demolition doctrine. But if some were not delivered from physical death and if that is the meaning of the salvation/consolation, then it means some were LOST! Oops! You can't have physical resurrection as the hope of the saints and have some falling short of it, then claim they receive it. Another flip flop!

Moreover, if physical death is the meaning of the text, then the Holy Spirit was given as a guarantee to prevent them from dying physically, i.e. becoming naked/unclothed with a physical body. Guess they didn't "keep those garments" and thus exposed their shame, Rev. 3:16.

Further, that has to be the meaning of establish "us" with "you" in your paradigm. It's the same concept of "raising us up with you" (which you say is from physical death) and both are done by the sealing/earnest of the Spirit.

But if they were to be delivered in the future from the death they were delivered from in the past, then they weren't supposed to die physically at all! Now run and tell that to "EVERY one of your commentary buddies. Be sure to address the charismata in your physical resurrection motif.

By citing 2 Cor. 1:10, you have admitted an "already but not yet" deliverance from physical death. Therefore, you cannot deny the principle of the "already but not yet" in soteriology and eschatology.

Will you have "believers" being delivered from "sin death" then die in sin and call that salvation from sin? How then can you have them delivered from physical death, then die physically and call that deliverance from physical death? Must one die in sin after being delivered from it to be ultimately saved from sin? If the physical body is under the power of death through sin, (which must be the only reason it dies, according to your paradigm, and since the "sting of death is sin"), then how can that not be an already but not yet release from the power of "SIN"? So you can't get sin-death out of the equation even on your physical death motif, now can you?

Those are just some of the first points that demolish your physical death paradigm for resurrection. Now would you address the other points, questions I raised that you completely ignored to tell me about your infatuation with the commentaries?

Martin Asare/Sam Frost

Martin Asare How do you get a "split salvation by making the outward man the physical body and the inward man the non-physical body or spirit?

If your inward man is being renewed "day by day" isn't that the opposite of your "outward man dying," and thus, the gospel was able to save your inward man, but not your outward man from death?

But, if your inward man is saved (renewed daily) so that it does not die, then has it put on immortality, and if so, how can you become naked, even if your physical body dies?

Are immortality and nakedness soteriological equivalents?

Further, doesn't that mean you put on immortality without "physically dying" and even before the parousia in your futurist paradigm? Thus, physical death was not necessary for your inner man to become immortal?

Or are you mortally immortal (whatever that means?) Do you need more immortality to be immortal, in spite of an inward man that does not die?

If the inward man cannot die because it is "renewed day by day" as a result of the gospel, doesn't that mean that it was not being renewed before one was saved? What kept it alive without the gospel or was it being un or non-renewed day by day, yet it never died?

If it did not die before the gospel, why was the gospel needed to renew it so it would not die?

Further, doesn't that also mean that "immortality" does not refer to the physical body, (unless your inward man has flesh and blood also, like your dying outward man?

Why would you need a body to cover the immortality of your inward man that has no nakedness or shame, since it is being renewed day by day?

Where does the scripture say one must put on immortality of the physical body and immortality of the inward man as two separate salvific motifs? Why can't it operate on the physical man while operating on the spiritual man?

Is the physical body willing but the spirit is weak so that the gospel is strong enough to renew the spirit at salvation but not the physical body?

But, if you're looking for another body to replace the one you have, will it be "seen" or "unseen?" If it is seen, how can you not be looking at and for that which is seen, and yet say you are/it is not?

If it is an "unseen" body, then how does it differ from the "inward man" which is not seen, and why do you need two unseen bodies or spirits?

And why would the body have to become a corpse before it could be renewed if the gospel was able to save the soul? Which is stronger, the body or the soul? Did not Jesus say the spirit is willing and the flesh is weak? So, you can save the stronger with the gospel but not the weaker flesh? How does that work?

The last two questions should be answered by you. Paul was not speaking of all people when he spoke of the "outward" man anymore than he was speaking of all people when he spoke

of the inward man.

Tell me, over whose eyes was the veil of chapter 3 in their reading of Moses, i.e. the O.C.? Was it everyone's or just Israel?

Also tell me, are there two men referred to in chapter 3? Can you say Moses and Christ? (3:15, 16).

Which of the two covenant or federal heads do you believe have immortality, Moses or Christ?

Which represents the "flesh" and which represents the "Spirit", (3:17).

Also, did not Moses and Christ respectively represent two "houses" (Heb. 3:5, 6)?

Which of the two was an "earthly house" and which was a "heavenly house"?

Which one was made by hands and which one was not?

Now the other day Sam Frost, wrote:

"The idea that Paul is denying that death (the same death) is not working also in them (in all believers) is a logical non-sequitor. X works in me, but Y in you does not logically convert to X "never" works in you, only Y does. Paul's congregations were the RESULT of his sufferings, thus, their coming to life (being started, or founded)."

That's true if we allow Sam to define the dying and rising which he apparently believes had the same meaning for the Jew and for the Gentile. The problem with that argument is this. The Gentiles, in dying to sin, were not dying to a system or world to which "laws were added that made sin abound." Nor were they commanded or required to keep the Torah laws during the transition from 30-70AD.

But the JEWS WERE!!!. That's the difference, and that is what the Jews were dying to that the Gentiles were not. So, life was working in the Gentiles separate and apart from Torah, hence they were not dying to IT. That added baggage of bondage the Jews had to carry was the focus of Paul and the rest of the apostles' gospel message. See Acts 15:1-11, 21:20-28.

That nuance was so important that (1) Peter, James and the Apostles forbade the law to be imposed on the Gentiles in order to show the Jews what true life in Christ was all about, i.e. without observance of Torah. The Apostles were emphatically insistent that that gospel message was not violated. Hence, death [to Torah] was working in us [Jews] but life [without Torah] in the you [Gentiles].

Holger Neubauer, Raymond Nana-Wusu Yeboah, Roy Runyon, Julie Hand, Larry Siegle, Don K. Preston

SAM'S Reply

We can even see here that Neal Jessup does indeed know what I mean by the statement he finds blasphemous. To repeat, I wrote, "If God leaves the bodies of Death's claim and hold in the grave, then God is an ultimate failure, and Christ died for nothing." He KNOWS what that means, and so does Julianne Chambers, who also denies it. It's the MAIN CONTENTION that we find in Hyper Preterism, as noted by Howard Denham, William Vincent, Scott Russell, Stephen N Whitsett, Faye Rod, and several others. To AVOID this, some even go so far as Steve Baisden, or Holger Neubauer, or William Bell - making up "spiritual blood" for a "spiritual death" of Jesus, totally minimizing any aspect of his PHYSICAL death, and, subsequently, PHYSICAL resurrection and EMPTY TOMB. THIS IS THE ISSUE.

William Bell's Sixth Reply

Sam Frost, what a strawman and underhanded tactic especially attributing it to me, but I would venture to say to preterists in general. I know of none who deny the bodily resurrection of Christ. We simply focus on the theological meaning of it. I spent over a year presenting studies on 1 Cor. 15, and not once did I deny the bodily resurrection. You engaged me early on in those studies then dropped out when you couldn't successfully deny that Christ died "for our SINS". I have copies of those posts.

If Christ dies for sins, that means 1 Cor. 15 is focused on His Priesthood (which it quotes Ps. 110 in the chapter). Where was any high priest in the O.T. involved in raising dead bodies from the literal grave? You will agree that 1 Cor. 15 is about Jubilee and the Day of Atonement or do you deny that also? Their work was totally focused on sin, (Heb. 1-10). See especially ch. 5 and Lev. 8, 9, 16.

What happened to your physical body responses on 2 Cor. 4-5? Haven't seen any more posts on it as well.

What garments are you wearing now that are hiding the shame of nakedness prior to this alleged future return of the Lord you are advocating? Rev. 16:15