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**ABSTRACT**

The adoption of the minority reading ἐκδυσάμενοι (2 Cor 5:3) in Nestle-Aland is unwarranted because the copyist assumed Paul knew the open tomb tradition and had taken a disappearance of Jesus’ dead body literally. To him Paul would have feared to die before the parousia and thus enter a state of a ‘naked’, disembodied soul (ἐκδυσάμενοι). Paul rather reckoned with appearing before Christ’s judgment seat (10) when mortals might appear ‘naked’ in shame. He nowhere shows a knowledge of the open tomb tradition. Moreover, the majority reading ἐνδυσάμενοι fits hand in glove with Paul’s imagery in 2 Cor 4:16-5:10 and his soteriology elsewhere. The open tomb story should be read as a midrashic aggadah.

It is somewhat of a surprise to note that the minority reading ἐκδυσάμενοι [D* a f(c) Tert Spec.] in 2 Cor 5:3 has been adopted in the latest 26th edition of Nestle-Aland (cf GNT 4). The majority reading ἐνδυσάμενοι which stood in previous editions of Nestle’s text has now been degraded to a note in the apparatus, marked as such with a tiny dagger. This sudden shift in judgment reflects, in my opinion, a serious misunderstanding of what Paul intended to say. An analysis of this unexpected change may serve to illustrate the importance of upholding a majority reading unless overriding arguments necessitate a different course.

The text itself is important enough. Some scholars, opting for ἐκδυσάμενοι, believe it to be the only instance in which Paul would offer the reader a closer look into the afterlife; Paul would here assume that there is an *interim state* of the dead before the resurrection at the Last Day: an existence of the naked soul without a body.

Margaret Thrall, who exhaustively assesses the text of 2 Cor 5:3 in her ICC commentary on 2 Corinthians, rightly rejects this variant ἐκ and retains the majority reading of ἐνδυσάμενοι (Thrall 1995:373 n 1278). Metzger also discards the variant with the following appraisal: ‘In view of its superior external support the reading ἐνδυσάμενοι should be adopted, the reading ἐκδυσάμενοι being an early alteration to avoid apparent tautology’ (Metzger 1975:511).
I would suggest, however, that a more weighty consideration than ‘apparent tautology’ motivated the scribe to alter the text. He took, I think, the Gospel’s open tomb story literally as historical fact. This led him to misconstrue what I believe to be the original meaning of Paul’s words.

By the time the scribe altered ἐνδυσάμενοι to ἐκδυσάμενοι, the canon had already, unlike in Paul’s days, been formed. The scribe was, of course, familiar with the mysterious ending of Mark’s Gospel and its open tomb story. We may assume that to this scribe it referred to an event that literally took place on the Sunday after Jesus’ death. Many Christians after him have likewise believed that Jesus’ grave was miraculously opened on that day by an invisible hand. In the scribe’s perception this momentous event had therefore occurred years before Paul wrote the creedal formula on Jesus’ resurrection to the Corinthian ecclesia. Three years after his call (33–35 CE) Paul conversed with Peter and James in Jerusalem (Gl 1:18). Thus the scribe may well have reasoned that the three had discussed the assumed awesome event of Jesus’ empty grave. A modern interpreter, such as Craig, also argues that the empty grave must have been a known fact soon after the crucifixion. But Craig does not only conjecture an exchange between Peter and Paul concerning the ‘empty’ tomb he also postulates that it would have been impossible to proclaim the resurrection had the disciples not known about it, ‘...a Jew could not think otherwise’ of resurrection (1985:50). So the scribe too may have thought that when Paul handed on the tradition [Christ]...was buried and was raised on the third day according to the scriptures’ (1 Cor 15:4), he must have presumed Jesus’ grave had literally been opened as a kind of divine proof that his resurrection had already taken place before the general resurrection at the Last Day (1 Thess 4:16, 1 Cor 15:52).

However, many accept that Mark implied a symbolic meaning of his open tomb story. It is better understood as a midrashic aggadah, written in the wake of the war of 66–70, as noted below. But the ancient scribe must have concluded from the open tomb story that Jesus’ own body had been taken away by heavenly means. For if Jesus’ actual grave had been found empty, the conclusion lies at hand that something had happened to Jesus’ body. It would have been difficult to understand the message of the resurrection any other way. And with special interest, therefore, he would have analysed 2 Cor 5:1–10 where Paul writes about the Christian’s hope when facing his or her own death (2 Cor 1:8, 5:4).

The above scenario offers a more cogent reason why the copyist would have substituted ἐκδυσάμενοι for the ‘inappropriate’ ἐνδυσάμενοι. To him Paul was expressing his fear of dying ‘prematurely’, before the parousia and the general resurrection. The participle ἐκδυσάμενοι would express Paul’s anxiety of being stripped of the body and of entering a state of nakedness.
(γυμνοὶ), namely ‘the condition of the inner man who has no body’, as Cullmann puts it (1964:52). In his highly influential article Cullmann places the Platonic concept of the immortality of the soul in opposition to the biblical concept of resurrection. In the last half of this century biblical scholars have frequently contrasted Greek thinking to Hebraic thinking (Ellis 1960:220, 224). Paul, it is argued, could not, as a Jew, envisage life in the hereafter without a body. Hence Paul’s speculation in 2 Cor 5 on the metaphysical aspects of the afterlife. However, while the distinction between biblical and Greek philosophical thought may be helpful for certain passages, one may not narrow it down to a supposed opposition of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body, as if Greeks were able to envision life without a body and the Jews could not. That argument is a false one. No one can envisage an afterlife without a body; one need not be a Jew for that. Human imagination assumes a kind of existence with spiritual bodies as a matter of course: ‘like the angels’ (Lk 20:36). The question is whether Paul was concerned about the material aspect of the afterlife. He evidently was not, in view of his exclamation ‘you fool’; he was confident that ‘God gives it a body as he has chosen’ (1 Cor 15:36, 38).

The scribe’s understanding of 2 Cor 5:3 would have logically followed one of three lines of argument developed by later commentators (Thrall 1995:356-400). (1) Paul believed that after death he would enter an interim state of nakedness before the parousia (2 Cor 5:3, 4); (2) he still clung to the hope that he and his readers would survive till the parousia and then be clothed with a spiritual body (ἐπενδόσασθαι, 2 Cor 5:2, 4) in order to avoid this interim state; (3) Paul must have radically changed his views expressed in 1 Cor 15, now teaching that he would receive a σῶμα πνευματικὸν at death (cf 1 Cor 15:44, 2 Cor 5:1); he would be consoling the Corinthians that a bodiless existence need not await them (Thrall 1995:363).

In other words, no matter which line the copyist may have followed, to him the word γυμνὸς referred to the soul without a body. In that case the reading ἐνδυσάμενοι in the manuscript he was copying would indeed constitute a meaningless tautology. So he ‘improved’ the manuscript by changing the offensive participle ἐνδυσάμενοι to its very opposite ἐκδυσάμενοι, in the belief that Paul was preoccupied with an anthropological puzzle about the afterlife and feared that his soul at death would be ‘stripped’ of the body like a worn coat.

But weighty arguments can be arrayed against this position.

(1) Paul evidently did not know an ‘empty grave’ tradition, as many have pointed out (Schnell 1989:177-194, Botha 1989:195-219). Had he known it, he would have certainly mentioned it as astounding proof of Jesus’ resurrection in order to convince his doubting Corinthian readers. But he is not
appealing to a discovery of an empty grave for his assertion that Jesus was raised on the third day: he is appealing to 'the scriptures'.

Here I may insert a possible reason for this appeal to the Torah. The scripture reference is here to Lev 23:11, 15, as Clement of Alexandria notes (Eusebius, Chronicon Paschale, Van Goudoever 1961:168). Paul was probably contesting the official introduction under Herod Agrippa (40-44 CE) of the Pharisaic dating (Nisan 16) of the wave-offering of the sheaf of barley on the first of the fifty days of the Pentecostal harvest (συμπαχή 1 Cor 15:20, cf 16:2, 8). That the calendar was officially changed some time before 70 CE and that the farmers were instructed to observe the new dating of the harvest by emissaries of the bet din (Menachot 10:3) has been widely acknowledged. The dispute is known as the Boethusian controversy. The question is when the change of date took place. Matthias, who succeeded a Boethusian high priest under Herod Agrippa, is the most likely candidate for introducing this new Pharisaic dating of the harvest. If so, it would help to explain the crux interpretum why Mark charges Herodians and Pharisees (otherwise 'unlikely bedfellows') of conspiring 'to kill Jesus' (3:6). Moreover, since altering the scriptural date for the offering of the first fruits (no light matter) would undoubtedly have met resistance, this scenario provides a good reason why James was killed by the sword and Peter was put in prison—had he not proclaimed the resurrection of Jesus Messiah on Pentecost Sunday? —and why Herod initiated a bloody persecution of Christians (Acts 12:1). For the Christians continued to observe the ancient priestly calendar date 'on the day after the sabbath' (Lev 23:11, 15). The angel's message that the risen Christ would go before his own into the 'Galil of the Gentiles' (Mk 16:7, cf Mt 4:15), was dated on the third day after the crucifixion, that is our Easter Sunday, hence not on the second day (Nisan 16!), that is the day a 'member of the council' asked permission of the Roman overlord (Schreiber 1981) to bury the 'body of Jesus' (Hanhart 1996:302-33).

The debate about the formula: 'he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures' (1 Cor 15:4) has not ended, of course. But for our subject, it suffices to note that Paul here and elsewhere does not show any knowledge of the open tomb story so that he would have been plagued by an anthropological riddle about 'what exactly happens when I die'. His concern was rather of a theological and a christological nature, not an anthropological one. A puzzle about the fate of a bodiless soul would have been forced on him only by the knowledge and a literal interpretation of the open tomb aggadah.

(2) Besides this argument from silence, there are also reasons of idiom and grammar for rejecting the scribal 'improvement' of the text. Paul never uses the metaphor of clothing for receiving or being stripped of the body.
(a) ἐκδύσεσθαι and ἀποτίθεσθαι refer to the putting off of the works of darkness or falsehood, anger and wrath or the 'old nature' or even to disarming the principalities and powers, but never of putting off the body (Rm 13:12; Col 2:11, 12; 3:8; cf Eph 4:22, 25). (b) ἐνδυέσθαι stands for the putting on the 'new self' or the armour of light and of God (1 Thess 5:8; Gl 3:27; Rm 12:12; cf Eph 6:11). The cause of the confusion is that in verse 3 Paul adds a negative proviso to his fervent hope of a glorious afterlife (2 Cor 5:1, 2 and 4): at death he may be found 'naked'. But this proviso is expressed in the positive context of hope, and not in a negative context of fear. Paul assures his readers that they need not be afraid: they will not be found naked (οὐ γυμνοὶ ἐνεπεθησόμεθα). The participle ἐνδυσάμενοι forms the basis for their confidence and refers to the present situation of his readers, as we will see under (4), below.

Some believe, however, the participle ἐνδυσάμενοι refers to the future life. The compound verb ἐπενδύσασθαι is then simply 'taken up by' this aorist participle (Throll 1981:237). From the viewpoint of grammar this is a possibility but is it plausible? The arresting prefix ἐπ- signifies something in addition to ἐνδυσάμενοι. The participle, therefore, refers to a condition in this present life protecting the believer against the later risk of being found 'naked'. Paul writes that because the believer has already 'put on' some kind of cover, he or she will not be found naked. The question is, to what cover does Paul refer and what is given to believers in addition (ἐπ-) to that cover in the after-life?

(3) The reason behind the negative proviso, as well as the positive hopeful assertion, is a soteriological one. (a) The term εἰ γε καί (2 Cor 5:3) introduces a stern prerequisite far more serious than the somewhat banal puzzle of becoming a soul without a body. This proviso is clearly stated at the end of the pericope: ‘We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ’ (2 Cor 5:10). In the End all humans will be judged. The reality of this judgment casts a shadow over Paul’s hope of ἐπενδύσασθαι for the life to come. In biblical terminology the adjective ‘naked’ invariably conveys a sense of shame under divine judgment (Gen 3:10; Isa 32:11; Ezek 16:39; 23:29; Hos 2:5). So the word γυμνὸς surely does not signify the loss of the body.

(4) In 2 Cor 5:6–8 Paul rather hopes to be ‘away from the body and at home with the Lord’, a life far superior to anything one can imagine (4:17, 5:2, 4). With the arresting ἐπενδύσασθαι Paul indicates the continuity between the present life of the believer who has put on the new being and the life to come. The agent guaranteeing this continuity is the Spirit who is preparing the believers for it (2 Cor 5:5). This present life in the Spirit is marked by ‘groaning under a burden’ (2 Cor 5:4) and by ‘momentary affliction’ (4:17) but it is of such a nature that it evokes at the same time the longing for the
glorious life to come 'beyond all measure' (4:17, 5:4); hence the prefix ἐπι- in ἐπενθύσασθοι in verses 2 and 4. So on the one hand, the proviso of future judgment has not lost its force, but on the other hand, Paul assures his addressees that they may foster hope of that superior existence because they have been baptised and have already put on the new self (ἐνυδύσαμενοι, cf 2 Cor 4:16–18). In other words, the aorist participle ἐνυδύσαμενοι, like the parallel present participle βαρούμενοι (2 Cor 5:4) refers to occurrences in the present life of the apostle (conversion, baptism, conflicts), and not to the moment of his death. Βαρούμενοι reflects the burden of Paul's own ministry of reconciliation, as it is carried out under the signature of suffering and death (4:7–12). But ἐνυδύσαμενοι mirrors the new being ἐν χριστῷ, clothed with the 'transcendent power' of God at work through him in the daily renewal of the 'inner nature' (4:17, 16; 5:5, cf 4:7).

So throughout this section Paul is expressing his hope in the face of death. He is not preoccupied with fear of a so-called state of nakedness in the hereafter. It is this preoccupation with the literal interpretation of the Gospel's open tomb story that contributed to the exegetical impasse of 2 Cor 5:3. It has led our scribe to produce the variant ἐκδυσάμενοι, now adopted in Nestle-Aland.

The above arguments also affect the interpretation of 2 Cor 5:1. Some believe, as noted above, that the 'house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens' refers to a σῶμα πνευματικόν. As they see it, Paul had radically changed his views expressed in 1 Cor 15. For, as they rightly observe, the temporal clause 'when the earthly tabernacle is destroyed' refers to the moment of death. Paul must have abandoned his views on the resurrection of the dead at the Last Day and is now expecting to receive life in a spiritual body as soon as he dies. Others think the present tense of ἔχωμεν indicates an 'eventual possession' of it, to wit, at the parousia (Thrall 1995:368). Whatever position is taken, the present tense in 'we have a building from God' (2 Cor 5:1, ἔχουμεν) makes it highly unlikely that Paul believed that the physical body will be changed into a spiritual body at death. He writes, we have an eternal home in heaven from God.

Moreover, the contrast between a collapsible tabernacle and an eternal abode (οἰκία ἐκείριστοις αἰώνας, 2 Cor 5:1) is paralleled by the verbs ἐκδημεῖ (to be in a foreign country) and ἐνδημεῖ (in his home country) in 2 Cor 5:8. In Paul's eschatology both spatial and temporal metaphors are used. They have a necessarily ambivalent dual orientation as they point to what exceeds the spatio-temporal. So we may distinguish between an eschatology (a) of Heaven and (b) of the Last Day (Pilcher 1940), corresponding to faith in the God who IS (in Heaven) and who COMES (at the Last Day). In the apocalyptic imagery of the End, the dead, as a corporate entity, are described
from the perspective of the living (οἱ περὶλειπὸμενοὶ, 1 Thess 4:17) as those who have gone before and have fallen asleep but will rise at the Last Day. ‘Sleep’ is here not an objective description of an interim state of the dead, but a common euphemism of death; it is the first part of a word pair: sleep—being awakened (ἠγείρομαι). Here the temporal term ‘at the Last Day’ applies. But hope expressed in the face of death—the last event in the life of the individual—requires spatial metaphors to express the inexpressible: the entrance into an eternal home (2 Cor 5:1), a being away (ἐκδημέω) from the body and at home (ἐνδημέω) with the Lord (2 Cor 5:8).

The eschatology of ‘Heaven’ and the eschatology of the ‘Last Day’ are both theological in nature and form two sides of one coin. As I put it earlier, ‘It is a hope inspired by the Christ who is and the Christ who comes...’ ‘In death the believer enters the hidden life with the Lord and the revelation of this hidden life is the resurrection in which the transformation to the new form manifests itself’ (Hanhart 1969:452–53). Or in the words of Col 3:3, 4, ‘For you have died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life appears, then you also will appear with him in glory.’

In fact, even the term resurrection may occur when hope for a single martyr meeting his death is expressed in an eschatology of Heaven, as in the story of the seven brothers (2 Macc 7:1–38). Here ‘resurrection’ (2 Macc 7:14) takes place in heaven where God takes the righteous martyrs (cf 2 Macc 15:12–16, Wisd 4:7, 10, 5:4, 5, 1 Thess 1:10, Lk 23:43, Hb 5:8–10, 12:2, 3, 9:11, 12. See de Jonge 1991:47–61).

It is highly unlikely that the elaborate phrase ‘a house not made with hands’ refers to a body. Ἐκηνος, it is true, may serve at times as a metaphor for ‘body’ as in Wisdom 9 (Thrall 1995:357–60 nn 1152, 1175). However, Paul’s terminology in our case is at most an echo of Wisdom 9:15, ‘for a perishable body presses down the soul, and this earthly tent burdens the thoughtful mind.’ For a formal similarity in wording in 2 Cor 5:1 is not matched by a similarity in content of thought. The author of Wisdom is dealing with human imperfection and not with death and the afterlife. He has the ‘worthless’ reasoning in mind of mortals without Wisdom who only ‘guess what is on earth’ (Wisdom 9:15). Paul, however, is thinking of the coming judgment versus ‘being clothed with Christ’ and of the eternal dwelling in which believers may live with Christ. So Paul’s teaching in 2 Cor 5:3 is hardly derived from ideas in Wisdom 9:15.

The contrast in 2 Cor 4:16–5:1 is not an anthropological one, namely, between the physical and the ‘spiritual’ body of an individual. It deals rather with the vast difference between the divine and the human, between the earthly and the heavenly, the temporal and the eternal. In 2 Cor 5:1 Paul uses the metaphors of Israel’s collapsible tabernacle in the desert and the
permanent temple in Jerusalem to illustrate this vast difference (Ellis 1960:217). Both terms refer to the 'house of God'; they are symbolic of God's presence on earth as well as in heaven. The 'house not made with hands' refers to the heavenly temple. For (a) in the Septuagint oikodomē often refers to Jerusalem’s temple (1 Chron 26:27, 29:1; 2 Chron 3:2; 1 Esd 2:20, 4:51, 5:64, 73; 6:6) and (kata)oxēptērion likewise is primarily used for God’s dwelling place in Jerusalem. Elsewhere, Paul also uses the analogy for the body as the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 6:19), quite similar to that of 2 Cor 5:1 (cf 2 Cor 5:5). In these cases the emphasis is not on the body as such but on a mode of a life guided by the Spirit yet lived in mortal flesh. Even in 1 Cor 15:53 the object with which one is 'clothed' is not exactly a body, but ἄφθαρσία and ἀθανασία. (b) The adjective ἀχειροποίητος (2 Cor 5:1), moreover, is an apocalyptic commonplace for heavenly, eternal realities. So Paul’s metaphors of 'collapsible tent' and 'building of God' do not signify our physical body versus a 'spiritual' body in the afterlife, but our existence in a temporal fragile body as temple of the Spirit versus our eternal abode in the heavenly temple of God (cf 2 Cor 4:17-18). The word oikodomē, as expressed by Paul elsewhere, never means a human body. The noun refers to the process of building something or of building up a community in a spiritual sense. So Paul calls the ecclesia a temple of God (2 Cor 6:16 (!), 1 Cor 3:9, cf Eph 2:21; 4:12, 16).

Immortal life, of course, implies a bodily existence. But Paul is not concerned with the question of how corporal life in the hereafter is possible. As we saw above, his first reaction to the question 'with what body do they come?' was 'you fool' (1 Cor 15:36). So in 2 Cor 5:1 Paul is not preoccupied with an anthropological puzzle of the afterlife. He believes an eternal abode from God awaits him in the heavens in which humans may dwell (ἐξομεν—ἐκ θεοῦ). Finally, Thrall, having explored nine possible options, also concludes that Paul would hardly have mixed such diverse metaphors as a 'building' and 'putting on' in 2 Cor 5:2 and 4 to refer to a body (1995:357–70).

We may conclude that the verb ἐνδυόμεθα in Paul and the usages of γυμνός and oikodomē in the Bible as a whole prohibit applying these terms to the putting on or stripping of the physical body. But that was precisely the reason for rejecting the majority reading ἐνδυσάμεθα as a meaningless tautology in Nestle-Aland26. Using an anachronism, I suspect that the copyist, preferred in Nestle’s latest edition, was a fundamentalist who understood the open tomb story literally. The scribe was ‘proving’ what he presupposed in the first place: that Jesus’ resurrection implies that something actually happened to his dead body in the grave with certain anthropological consequences for the future life of the Christian.

The faith that God raised Jesus from the dead is foundational for Christian belief. But, as I see it, in the forty years prior to the fall of
Jerusalem, Christians believed in his resurrection without ever having heard a tale that Jesus’ grave was found empty, simply because such a ‘divine proof of his resurrection never took place. This conclusion is inescapable if one takes Claude Montefiore seriously who suggested as early as 1927 that Mark’s description of the tomb is a midrash on LXX Isa 22:16; 33:16. If one follows this trail (cf also tIsa 22:16) the conclusion lies at hand that Mark in the wake of the destruction of the temple, expressed his faith in Jesus’ resurrection by means of a midrash. The striking phrase a ‘tomb hewn from the rock’ is an ironic reference to the doomed temple. The term is a *hapax* in the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, the secular context of LXX Isa 22 and 33 is quite similar to that of Mark and his compatriots. In the Septuagint the arresting expression refers to the holy city under threat by a powerful enemy without and by corruption within (Van der Kooij 1981:44, 45, 56, 57). The temple was destroyed in 586 BCE by the Babylonians. Just as in LXX Isa 32:9–33:24, Mark told how three women, true daughters of Zion, saw the catastrophe to come, which in reality befell Jerusalem some forty years later. They received this frightening vision of the future about forty hours after Jesus’ death (ἀναβάλλεσθαι in Mk 16:4 cf 6:41; 7:34; 8:24; 10:51, 52). The temple would this time be utterly destroyed by the Romans. The women flee the holy place (ἐφυγόν, Mk 16:8, τόπος, Mk 16:6) and do not tell anyone (Mk 16:8). In other words, the vision is part of the messianic secret. In spite of the catastrophe to come, which they see in the vision, the promise will hold true that the risen Christ will go before his disciples into exile, that is, the Galilee of the nations (16:7).

In a recent study of this pivotal aggadah I concluded that the open tomb story is the climax of a redaction of an earlier gospel. It is, in fact, a new edition which needed to be written in view of the delay of the parousia (Hanhart 1996).

It would be going too far to outline this cryptic meaning of Mark’s climactic post-70 ending further. However, I would mention here that Mark, in his new post-70 version, also introduced Paul as the naked youth (γυμνός) in Gethsemane (Mk 14:51). In view of Paul’s exceedingly important role in the formation of the Christian ecclesia Mark retrojected the apostle (Paul called himself ‘untimely born’) into the Gethsemane scene as the ‘thirteenth’ disciple (*συνηκολούθησεν*). In a sense, Paul should have a role in Gethsemane, next to Judas Iscariot, when Jesus was ‘handed over’. The verb παραδίδομι does not normally mean to betray (προδίδομι) but to hand over. For Paul would indeed hand over the *νίκη τοῦ ἄνθρωπον* to the Gentiles, but in a positive way, unto ‘life’, whereas Iscariot had handed him over to the Gentiles in a negative way, unto death (cf Mk 10:33). Paul, or rather his angel (Paul had died before 70) appears again in the open tomb midrash as this same young man, now *clothed* in baptismal white (Mk 16:5, cf Col 2:12).
The literal understanding of Jesus' resurrection—an empty grave as historical fact—came only to the fore when the tension between synagogue and ecclesia had hardened resulting in the definitive separation of the two. Gentiles who gradually gained the upper hand in the ecclesia no longer understood Mark's cryptic message. Hence some of the more subtle, midrashic codes in the gospel story were lost for future generations and need to be recovered once again.

This approach is a far safer avenue to understand Paul's hope in the face of death than altering his written text because a lone scribe or scribes had misunderstood Mark's opened tomb story. For in 2 Cor 5:3 the majority reading ἐκθέσατον makes far better Pauline sense than the meagerly attested reading of ἐκθέσαμεν.
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