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Abstract

The study of theological anthropology significantly depends on the resource of the biblical tradition, including relevant material in the Pauline epistles. A solid understanding of Paul’s anthropology inevitably requires an analysis of the key anthropological terms used in the Pauline epistles.

However, the task of understanding Paul, with a view to using his thought as the basis for reflection on theological anthropology, is difficult. Although James Barr’s *The Semantics of Biblical Language* has provided ground-breaking insights by highlighting the importance of applying linguistic principles in conducting biblical semantic study and various scholars have been attentive to Barr’s comments for the last forty years in studying Paul’s anthropological terms, many of these works fail to follow Barr’s comments adequately. In particular, they fail to pay sufficient attention to the textual context of the specific terms. Thus, this thesis adopts the method of discourse analysis to overcome some of the deficiencies in previous scholarship.

Following a survey of scholarship and consideration of an appropriate methodology, the thesis studies four key terms: σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα, and καρδία, as these occur in different Pauline letters. We argue that there are social and corporate dimensions, the focus of community or communal unity in particular, connoted by some occurrences of Paul’s anthropological terms. Although not every single occurrence carries a corporate and relational reference, many occurrences, which together form a coherent thematic meaning, point in that direction. Our study indicates that Paul’s anthropology shows less concern for the ontological nature of a
human person. Instead, the apostle uses anthropological terms to focus on the place of the human person within the ecclesial community, a theme which is, ultimately, inseparable from his Christology.

The thesis therefore proposes that reflection on the nature and identity of the human person should take the notions of communal relationship and social identity into serious consideration.
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1.1 The Rationale Behind the Study

Christian accounts of the nature of the human person—theological anthropology—significantly depend on the resources of the biblical tradition. Central to that tradition is the relevant material found in the Pauline epistles. A solid understanding of Paul’s anthropology inevitably requires an analysis of the apostle’s key anthropological terms, including σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα, σάρξ, καρδία, νοῦς, σύνειδησίας, and ἔσω ἄνθρωπος. Throughout church history, various New Testament (NT) scholars have sought to better understand the semantic value, and theological and anthropological connotations of these terms, from John Chrysostom in the fourth century, who provided an early analysis of the anthropological use of πνεῦμα,1 to two recent studies of σῶμα and σάρξ by Emma Wasserman and Lorenzo Scornaienchi.2 However,


the task of understanding Paul, and using his thought as the basis for reflection on theological anthropology, is difficult. Werner Georg Kümmel argues that it is “a priori impossible” to provide accurate definitions for different anthropological terms, due to their arbitrary use in description of a human being. Nevertheless, through careful study of several key anthropological terms, this study intends to identify and describe one aspect of Paul’s anthropology.

Several NT interpreters maintain that some anthropological terms are occasionally used in a metaphorical sense by Paul, with a corporate and social connotations. For instance, ψυχή in Phil 1:27 highlights community sharing or sharing among friends, καρδία in 2 Cor 1:22 points to the “messianic community,” and πνεῦμα in Gal 6:18 denotes the spiritual fellowship of the faith community. Although this communal understanding is not particularly popular amongst NT scholars, the corporate and social connotations of Paul’s anthropological terms must not be overlooked. This study seeks to revisit and investigate Paul’s anthropological terms with particular focus on their corporate, relational, and thus ecclesiological connotations. In this study, the term ‘corporate dimension’ denotes the unity of a community (corporate unity), or a community acting as a single entity sharing the same identity (corporate entity). The term ‘social dimension’ denotes the relationship

---


4 Hansen, 8; O’Brien, Philippians, 152.

5 Thrall, 1:158.

6 Burton, 362.
amongst different members in a community (communal relation), or the relationship between Paul and a community.

1.2 The Problems of Previous Studies

James Barr, in *The Semantics of Biblical Language* published in 1961, changed the landscape of biblical semantic study by exposing problematic approaches in previous scholarship. According to Barr, earlier work suffered from a gross negligence of linguistic principles in conducting biblical semantic study. Barr’s insights were in part a response to the Biblical Theological Movement (BTM), which sought to uncover the theological connotations of key biblical terms. The BTM approached biblical language as a special “divine language,” and criticised previous scholarship for undermining this uniqueness. Many NT words were perceived as closely related to their so-called Hebrew roots. Paul was perceived as thinking “more consciously along OT lines,” rather than employing a Hellenistic understanding of anthropological terms. Therefore, scholarship in the BTM largely investigated the meanings of the Hebrew equivalents of key biblical words. According to Barr, such previous scholarship tended to adopt two flawed approaches to the NT data. First, theological

---


8 According to Barr, the term ‘linguistics’ denotes “the science of linguistics and the material it handles: phonology, grammar and lexicography of various languages and the semantic value of the various form observed and classified in these processes.” Barr, *Semantics*, 2.


12 This quote by Schweizer, a BTM scholar, concerns the meaning of σῶμα in Paul’s work. E. Schweizer, “Σῶμα,” *TDNT* 7:1060.
presuppositions were superimposed onto a word whilst ignoring its textual context.\textsuperscript{13} Second, these semantic studies were overly diachronic.

Semantics became a distinct field of enquiry in 1883 when Michel Bréal demarcated the term ‘sémantique’ as the study of “the laws which govern the transformation of sense, the choice of new expressions, and the birth and death of locutions.”\textsuperscript{14} Within this field, Ferdinand de Saussure defined two different dimensions of semantic study, the diachronic and the synchronic.\textsuperscript{15} The diachronic is the study of the historical development of a word, and the synchronic is the study of a word’s meaning in light of its contemporary literary context. The diachronic and the synchronic loosely represent the temporal and the spatial dimensions of semantic meaning respectively. Thus, Saussure argues that every word “is at the crossroads between the diachronic and the synchronic viewpoint.”\textsuperscript{16} These two terms were thereafter used to describe the two different foci of semantic study.\textsuperscript{17}

In commenting the problematic method adopted in previous scholarship, Barr mentions several essentials in conducting biblical semantic study. Barr first contends that biblical semantic study must take into account the modern science of linguistics.

\textsuperscript{13} The term ‘textual context’ is equivalent to Barr’s term ‘literary context.’

\textsuperscript{14} Neal R. Norrick, “Discourse and Semantics,” in The Handbook of Discourse Analysis (eds. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tanner, and Heidi E. Hamilton; Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2003), 76.


\textsuperscript{16} At the beginning of his work, Saussure sets forth that duality is the ‘first and last’ principle in terms of linguistic points of view. The duality of ‘time and space’ is also prominent in his analysis. Ferdinand de Saussure, Writing in General Linguistics (trans. Carol Sanders and Matthew Pires; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 3–4, 6–7, 80, 112–3.

\textsuperscript{17} Burton, a NT grammarian in the same era as Saussure, similarly identified two dimensions in the study of syntax. However, he names them differently, as ‘historical grammar’ and ‘exegetical grammar.’ Ernest De Witt Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898), 2–3.
and apply the general linguistic rules that are applied in studying other languages. Based on this, Barr then emphasises the importance of adopting a synchronic approach by seriously attending to the context of a word. Barr identifies two different notions of context: the textual context and the wider context. The textual context refers to the place of a word in the whole discourse, and the wider context refers to how a word is employed in contemporary usage. An examination of the wider context should be a much higher priority than an examination of its historical development.

Over the last 40 years, scholars investigating Paul’s anthropological terms have been attentive to Barr’s criticism and have adopted a more synchronic approach, attending to the textual context and the wider context in their work. Nonetheless, much of this scholarship arguably fails to follow Barr’s comments adequately. Some scholars examining the textual context are either overly speculative about or rely heavily on presuppositions about the likely situation behind the text. Others scholars focus on the place of a word in a sentence or paragraph, and undertake little analysis at the discourse level. On the other hand, scholars examining the wider context for Paul’s anthropological terms either do not sufficiently attend to the textual context or fail to include any textual analysis.  

1.3 The Proposed Approach of the Study

One way to address Barr’s criticism is to employ discourse analysis, which originates from the field of linguistics and focuses on textual context. This method explicates the semantic value of key words in light of their usage in the whole discourse. Linguists use this method to examine written and oral forms, namely discourse. The term

---

18 See Chapter 2 for a detailed explanation of Barr’s criticism and his proposals for conducting biblical semantic study, and for a critical analysis of subsequent scholarship.
discourse refers to “the entirety of the author’s communication to his or her audience … [it] represents the largest linguistic level of communication.” A written discourse usually comprises a combination of various levels, including grapheme, word, clause, sentence, and paragraph. A narrative containing many paragraphs and segments is a single discourse, as is a letter comprising many segments.

The application of discourse analysis in NT scholarship is relatively new. Some well-known NT scholars who apply this method include Stanley Porter, Moisés Silva, Jeffrey Reed, and J. P. Louw. Discourse analysis can provide a new perspective regarding the function and significance of Pauline anthropological terms. By adopting this method some of the deficiencies in previous scholarship as identified by Barr are overcome. Discourse analysis does not rely on investigating the historical development of words, nor does it speculate about the situation behind a text. Instead, it focuses on the textual context, enabling exegetical and semantic analysis at both the discourse level and paragraphic-sentential-clausal level. The highest priority of this method is examining how a term is used within the discourse, instead of focusing on the diachronic aspects of semantic meaning. Discourse analysis offers a more secure approach to these terms than has been provided thus far in the scholarship.

19 Jeffrey T. Reed, A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity (JSNTSup 136; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 45.

20 Reed, Discourse, 43–5.

1.4 The Aims and Hypotheses of the Study

The following chapters investigate Paul’s anthropological terms with particular focus on their corporate, relational, and thus ecclesiological connotations. Primarily, this study seeks to ascertain whether some of Paul’s anthropological terms connote social and corporate dimensions in some instances, using the method of discourse analysis. This study does not presuppose that all of Paul’s anthropological terms *always* denote a social and corporate dimension. Instead, this study undertakes the more modest task of ascertaining whether some of the terms, on some occasions, are used by the apostle to highlight or denote for the audience the corporate and relational dimensions of human identity. This study argues that the corporate and relational dimensions of Paul’s terms are increasingly perceptible, when applying the tools of discourse analysis.

The corporate and relational dimensions of Pauline anthropology are deeply connected to his ecclesiology. Paul’s audiences are united, and are a single communal entity due to the work and faithfulness of Christ. This united entity operates under the new dispensation of grace, in which Christ is at the centre. Amidst various tribulations and distresses, they are waiting for the eschatological realisation that brings forth the perfection of their community through the redemption of Christ. Hence, Christian practice should not be understood as an individualistic endeavour. Rather, it must be accomplished in and through community.

Accordingly, this study explores the following questions. First, what are the social and corporate dimensions of the key anthropological terms, and what are the implications of this for understanding Paul’s anthropology? Second, how are the key anthropological terms understood given Paul’s wider thought about the person of Christ and the identity of the church? Third, how might a better understanding of the
key anthropological terms assist Christian reflection on the nature of the human person?

These questions will be addressed as follows. In Chapter 2, a literature review will identify key methodological flaws in previous scholarship and will investigate the validity of the concept ‘distributive singular’ in the Pauline epistles. Subsequently, a method for semantic study based on discourse analysis will be established, leading to an investigation of the key anthropological terms in four stages.

Stage I will analyse a single anthropological term within a single discourse: σῶμα in 1 Corinthians (see Chapter 3). Given that τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ in 1 Corinthians is widely accepted by scholars as denoting the church, the corporate and relational dimensions of σῶμα are already well-established. The purpose of this stage is two-fold. It intends to prove the value of discourse analysis for the investigation of such terms, and to provide further insights regarding σῶμα in 1 Corinthians.

Stage II will analyse multiple anthropological terms within a single discourse: πνεῦμα, ψυχή, καρδία, and σῶμα in Philippians (see Chapter 4).

Stage III will analyse a single anthropological term within multiple discourses: καρδία in all of the Pauline epistles, particularly focusing on Romans and 2 Corinthians (see Chapter 5).

Stage IV will analyse multiple anthropological terms within multiple discourses: πνεῦμα, σῶμα, and ψυχή in the benediction in 1 Thessalonians, and πνεῦμα in the benedictions in Galatians, Philippians, and Philemon (see Chapter 6).

In Chapter 7, the findings will be summarised and broader implications will be suggested.
1.5 The Scope and Limitations of the Study

It is beyond the scope of this study to analyse all of Paul’s anthropological terms as they occur in all of the Pauline epistles, both authentic and disputed. The definition of the Pauline corpus is broadly contested, with mainstream scholars widely upholding the authenticity of some letters, and disputing the authenticity of other letters. This study focuses on analysing seven epistles that are commonly considered authentic: Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon.

Paul’s key anthropological terms are: σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα (τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), καρδία, σάρξ, νοῦς, σύνειδησις, and ἔσω ἀνθρώπος. This study particularly focuses on examining σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα (τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), and καρδία. Rather than examining every occurrence of these terms, this study intends to provide a more adequate understanding of the possible connotations of Paul’s anthropological terms through discourse analysis.

---

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH APPROACH

This chapter aims to establish a research method that can be used to investigate and accurately ascertain the semantic values and the theological implications of Paul’s anthropological terms. First, modern scholarship addressing Paul’s anthropological terms will be reviewed. Second, a particular grammatical construct that is commonly overlooked by scholars, namely the occurrence of an anthropological term in the abnormal singular construct, will be elucidated. Third, the linguistic method called discourse analysis, and how this overcomes the limitations and problems in previous scholarship will be explained. Fourth, the research method will be formulated based on the principles of discourse analysis. Finally, an overview of the usage of the keys terms in the first century Koiné Greek literature will be provided.

2.1 Semantic Study According to Barr

The publication of *The Semantics of Biblical Language* in 1961, by James Barr, was arguably a watershed moment in the field of biblical semantic study. This monograph included valuable insights and exposed the problematic methodologies in previous
scholarship. Barr’s criticisms and recommendations have been widely adopted by modern scholars, including those investigating Paul’s anthropological terms. The following parts initially explicate Barr’s criticisms and proposals, and then examine the strengths and weaknesses of recent work addressing Paul’s anthropological terms. The proposed research method in this study draws on Barr’s proposals and seeks to resolve the identified weaknesses in recent work.

2.1.1 Barr’s Critique of Previous Scholarship

The fundamental criticism by Barr is the gross negligence of linguistic principles in conducting biblical semantic study. This criticism contains two main points, which are explained further below. First, some semantic research ignores the textual context and wrongfully superimposes particular theological presuppositions onto a word. Second, some semantic research is overly diachronic.

2.1.1.1 Theological Presuppositions

Barr heavily criticises the method in which presuppositions, usually theological, are superimposed onto a word to determine its meaning without considering its textual context. There are three fundamental issues: “the inability to keep to linguistic method strictly and the tendency to replace it by theological and philosophical argument; the blindness to any idea of the social conditioned nature of language as an arbitrary system of semantic markers; [and] the inability to see and present linguistic evidence
except where it appears to follow the lines of a thought-structure of metaphysical-theological type.”

A prominent example of this flawed method is Gerhard Kittel’s *Wörterbuch*, translated into English as *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (TDNT).*

Although Barr acknowledges that Kittel’s work is enormously influential in the study of the NT, he expresses grave concerns:

The great weakness [of Kittel’s *TDNT*] is a failure to get to grips with the semantic value of words in their contexts, and a strong tendency to assume that this value will on its own agree with and illuminate the contours of a theological structure which is felt to be characteristic of the NT and distinctively contrasting with its environment. The belief that the distribution of the lexical stock of the NT may be directly correlated with the theological realities of God and his acts is both assumed in the method and fostered in the product … the attempt to relate the individual word directly to the theological thought leads to the distortion of the semantic contribution made by words in context; the value of context comes to be seen as something contributed by the word, and then it is read into the word as its contribution where the context is in fact different.

A further example concerns the hermeneutics of Rudolf Bultmann and Karl Barth. Barr contends that the hermeneutic method advocated by these scholars primarily focuses on and overly emphasises the “philosophical-theological problems” instead of the linguistics. Barr calls this “theological hermeneutics,” and explains that its inadequacy is “a result of its neglect of linguistics as a science” since both Bultmann

---

1 These three inabilities comprise Barr’s criticism of Hebert and Torrance, who examine the two Pauline terms, faith and truth. This statement pinpoints the fundamental problems of this method. Barr, *Semantics*, 204–5.

2 Barr devotes one chapter to discussing the problem of the *TDNT*. Barr, *Semantics*, 206–62.


5 Barr, *Semantics*, 275.

6 Barr, *Semantics*, 277
and Barth “seem not to see semantics as a part of linguistics and semantic functioning as an immediate effect of any dealing with language.”

In summary, Barr contends that linguistic principles, especially textual context, should be afforded priority in biblical semantic study. Instead, in previous scholarship, particular theological presuppositions have been superimposed onto a word to determine its meaning.

### 2.1.1.2 Overly Diachronic Approach

Barr also heavily criticises the adoption of an overly diachronic approach. A belief underlying this approach concerns the “unity of the Bible,” and the Hebrew language as “the language that fits the ultimate theological realities.” The “extraordinary peculiarity of the Hebrew language” is highlighted and presupposed, which leads to

---

7 Barr, *Semantics,* 277. Furthermore, Barr criticises the semantic study of ἐκκλησία conducted by Torrance. Barr, *Semantics,* 119–29. According to Barr, Torrance wrongly imposes the OT concept of the synagogue onto the NT term. Barr states that there is a common practice in “reading the maximum possible theological content into a linguistic choice.” Barr, *Semantics,* 129.

8 Various modern scholars support Barr’s criticisms and argue that in some biblical semantic study a NT word is simply taken of its textual or wider context. For example, Meeks states that this flawed method is widely adopted in the entries of the *TDNT* “sacred lexicography.” He argues that many NT words are treated as though “absorbed by the exclusiveness of their new content,” and carry certain theological meanings not shared by other Koine Greek literature. Wayne A. Meeks, “A Nazi New Testament Professor Reads His Bible: The Strange Case of Gerhard Kittel,” in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (eds. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman; Boston: Brill, 2004), 513–44. Furthermore, Berding indicates that this flawed method is commonly practiced by those who do not realise that any meaning of a word can only be “defined more narrowly if the context suggests it.” Kenneth Berding, “Confusing Word and Concept in ‘Spiritual Gifts’: Have We Forgotten James Barr’s Exhortation,” *JETS* 43 (2000): 51. For Balentine, the fundamental problem is that scholars and students often wrongly bring “certain general theological convictions” to the exegetical task, and use a word to “describe” a certain theological concept that they have already embraced. Samuel E. Balentine, “James Barr’s Quest for Sound and Adequate Biblical Interpretation” in *Language Theology and the Bible: Essays in Honour of James Barr* (eds. Samuel E. Balentine and John Barton; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 13.


10 Barr, *Semantics,* 44.
an overemphasis on the Hebraic linguistic heritage of the NT,\textsuperscript{11} whereby a NT word is always traced back to its Hebrew equivalent. The fundamental flaw is “starting from the theoretical end, from the assurance of understanding the Hebrew mind, and working from there to its linguistic form.”\textsuperscript{12} This facilitates two problematic practices in biblical semantic study.

First, some semantic research overly emphasises the historicity of a word. It is supposed that a NT Greek word always stems from a Hebrew theological concept. As a result, the research fails to investigate how the Greek word functions in the Greek non-biblical system.\textsuperscript{13} Second, some semantic research commits the “root fallacy.”\textsuperscript{14} A word is etymologised, “giving excessive weight to the origin of a word as against its actual semantic value.”\textsuperscript{15} Barr pinpoints the flaw, stating that “the etymology of a word is not a statement about its meaning but about its history; it is only as a historical statement that it can be responsibly asserted, and it is quite wrong to suppose that the etymology of a word is necessarily a guide either to its ‘proper’

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{11} Barr directs this criticism at Boman’s method of contrasting Greek and Hebrew thought. Barr, \textit{Semantics}, 47–8.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{12} Barr, \textit{Semantics}, 23.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{13} Barr discusses the problematic approach of Robinson’s study of σάρξ and σῶμα. Barr, \textit{Semantics}, 34–7. Osborne echoes Barr’s concern, and contends that, in determining the semantic range of a word, a much higher priority should be given to its usage in contemporary literature, rather than focusing on its historical usage. Osborne also expresses caution towards Kittel’s approach, and states that the TDNT is certainly a tool, but is not exhaustive in identifying semantic range because of its emphasis on ‘theological usage.’ Grant R. Osborne, \textit{The Hermeneutical Spiral} (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006), 102.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{14} Barr, \textit{Semantics}, 100.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{15} Barr, \textit{Semantics}, 101.
\end{flushright}
meaning in a later period or to its actual meaning in that period.” However, Barr does not diminish etymology, and recognises the value in tracing the “Hebraic root” of a NT word. For example, in discussing Old Testament (OT) semantic study, Barr states that “the etymological recognition may be used in conjunction with the context of the Hebrew word to give a good semantic indication for its occurrence.”

Barr provides various examples to illustrate these two problematic practices. An example of the “root fallacy” is Schlier’s analysis of \(\alpha\nu\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\iota\omicron\alpha\omicron\) in the TDNT. Barr stipulates that the word is interpreted with a “particular theological importance” by incorrectly relating the word to its assumed root \(\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\iota\omicron\). Importantly, this illustrates a failure to investigate how the semantics of a word functions given its context. An example of the diachronic approach is John Robinson’s analysis of \(\sigma\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\) and \(\sigma\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\). Barr states that John Robinson contrasts these two Greek terms with their supposed Hebrew equivalent \(\tau\varepsilon\varsigma\), but fails to address “synchronic semantics” and investigate how these Greek terms function in “the Greek non-biblical system.”

---

16 Barr, *Semantics*, 109. Various modern scholars echo this problematic practice. For example, Carson contends that the root fallacy is common in biblical semantic study, because some people are drawn to etymology and the search for a “hidden meaning bound up with etymologies.” D. A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies* (2d ed., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book, 1998), 28, 30. Green stipulates that the meaning of a word cannot be determined by etymology, because when biblical authors composed their work new concepts represented by a word were “being modified and constructed.” Gene L. Green, “Lexical Pragmatics and Biblical Interpretation,” *JETS* 50 (2007): 809. For Osborne, even though a past meaning might consciously be in an author’s mind at the time of writing, etymology must not be abused and only has limited value. Osborne, *Meaning*, 112.

17 Barr, *Semantics*, 158.


20 Barr, *Semantics*, 37. The following statement by Robinson illustrates this flawed mentality: “\(\tau\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\ \tau\omicron\eta\ \varsigma\rho\alpha\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\)—another impossible combination for the Greek mind. Though the actual word \(\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\) may be taken from Hellenistic terminology, we have here a good example of how, like every other term, it is drawn by Paul into his typical Hebrew usage.” John A. T. Robinson, *The Body* (London: SCM, 1952), 25.
The *TDNT* is a prominent example of this problematic diachronic approach. An overindulgence of “the realm of concept history” leads to a diachronic analysis of NT words, by correlating the NT Greek words with their so-called related theological concepts in the OT Hebrew and the LXX.\(^{21}\) In other words, there is a clear emphasis on how the historicity of a theological concept is transmitted from a particular OT Hebrew word to a NT Greek word.\(^{22}\) According to Barr, a sole emphasis on concept history and a failure to understand a word in its textual context leads to “illegitimate totality transfer.”\(^{23}\) This occurs when word is isolated from its context and “the ‘meaning’ of a word (understood as the total series of relations in which it is used in the literature) is read into a particular case as it sense and implication.”\(^{24}\)

In summary, Barr criticises the adoption of an overly diachronic approach, which leads to two problematic practices in biblical semantic study. First, an overemphasis on concept history leading to “illegitimate totality transfer,” and second, the “root fallacy” emphasising the etymology of a word.

---

\(^{21}\) Barr, *Semantics*, 207.


\(^{23}\) Barr, *Semantics*, 218.

\(^{24}\) To illustrate “illegitimate totality transfer,” Barr cites Schmidt’s lexical entry of ἐκκλησία in the TDNT. Barr, *Semantics*, 218. Various modern scholars maintain Barr’s criticism, including Meeks, Louw, and Silva. Meeks repudiates the claim that NT Greek words “often take on a Hebrew content” because there is “a fundamental difference in mentality between Semitic and Greek consciousness.” Meeks, “Kittel,” 536–7; J. P. Louw, *Semantics of New Testament Greek* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982), 41–2; Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meanings: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1983), 25. Green warns against an overreliance on lexicons, given the danger of illegitimate transfer. Although lexicons can be helpful, he argues that “a simple survey of the semantic range” using lexicons, does not guarantee successful identification of the specific conceptual schema represented by a word in its specific context. Green, “Lexical,” 799–812.
2.1.2 Barr’s Comments on Semantic Studies

Alongside heavy criticism of previous scholarship, Barr provides insightful comments on conducting biblical semantic study. The key comment is that any biblical semantic study must follow the modern science of linguistics. Barr succinctly sums up his comment: “It is probable that a greater awareness of general semantics, of general linguistic method in all its aspects, and an application of such awareness in biblical interpretation, would have valuable and important results for theology.” In other words, the semantic study of biblical Hebrew or Greek words cannot be excluded from the general linguistic rules that are applied in studying all other languages.

In addition, Barr emphasises the importance of a synchronic approach, instead of a diachronic approach, and makes two clear suggestions. First, the textual context of a word must be prioritised in semantic study. Second, the wider context, including the particular writer and contemporary Greek thought, must be consulted. These two proposals are examined in greater detail below.

2.1.2.1 Textual Context

According to Barr, textual context is crucial in biblical semantic study. He argues that the theological connotation “of the type found in the NT has its characteristic

25 Barr, Semantics, 296. At the beginning of his work, Barr similarly argues that “by studying language linguistically one is making a genuine and valid contribution to the understanding of it.” Barr, Semantics, 2. As previously mentioned, according to Barr, the problem of previous scholarship rests on the failure to “relate what is said about either Hebrew or Greek to a general semantic method related to general linguistics.” Barr, Semantics, 24.

26 Porter echoes this key proposal, and acknowledges Barr’s “ground-clearing” work and notes that various scholars in the Greek field are “explicitly utilizing the principles of modern linguistics.” Stanley E. Porter, “Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies: An Introductory Survey,” in Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek (JSNTSup 113; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 14–35. Louw states that semantic study involves “several dimensions: linguistic, logical, psychological, anthropological.” However, linguistics “must be the dominating dimension with others supporting it, since language is a linguistic entity in the first place.” Louw, Semantics, 16.
linguistic expression not in the word individually but in the word-combination or sentence.”

Barr markedly contends that “the sentence (and of course the still larger literary complex such as the complete speech or poem) which is the linguistic bearer of the usual theological statement, and not the word (the lexical unit).” Therefore, “the real communication of religious and theological patterns is by the larger word-combinations and not by the lexical units or words.” Using Paul’s letters as an illustration, Barr suggests that:

the impress of the Jewish tradition in the Pauline letters and speeches was borne mainly by the things that he said, his sentences, his complex word-combinations, his themes and subject-matter; and that this impress remained even where the individual semantic value of many words was not changed from the average Hellenistic, and was not greatly deepened where words were technically overprinted with a Jewish reference.

Notably, as well as analysing a word in its sentence, Barr clearly asserts that any investigation must also consider “the still larger literary complex,” pointing to a complete written or oral form. This “larger literary complex” is equivalent to

---


28 Barr, *Semantics*, 263.

29 Barr, *Semantics*, 264.

30 Barr, *Semantics*, 250.

31 Barr defines “literary” as both oral tradition and written literature. Barr, *Semantics*, 269.
discourse, as discussed in Chapter 1.\textsuperscript{32} In other words, a thorough investigation of a word involves analysing its sentential context and its discourse context.\textsuperscript{33}

\subsection*{2.1.2.2 Wider Context}

In addition to textual context, according to Barr, it is also important to investigate the wider context. According to Barr, the semantic value of a word should be understood through a systematic examination of the language: how a word is employed in literature that is contemporary to the biblical text. In criticizing the abuse of etymology, Barr points out a malpractice in which there is a general disregard of “the social nature of language as a means of communication” by ignoring a word’s “current usage and current understanding.”\textsuperscript{34} In other words, to ascertain the current usage and understanding of a biblical word one must examine how the same word is used in its contemporary literature.

On the other hand, solely relying on the assumption that a NT word is directly associated with a particular Greek thought is unreliable. For example, Barr argues that many contemporary scholars wrongly perceive the Pythagorean-Platonic tradition,

\textsuperscript{32} See pages 5–6 in Chapter 1.

\textsuperscript{33} Modern scholars affirm the importance of textual context. For example, modern linguists who deal primarily with non-biblical texts express the importance of referring to the sentence where a word is found. Finn Collin and Finn Guldmann, \textit{Meaning, Use and Truth: Introducing the Philosophy of Language} (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2005), 41. Carson, in discussing various fallacies in word study, provides a headline “The Heart of the Matter: Coping with Context.” He elaborates that “the heart of the issue is that semantics, meaning, is more than the meaning of words.” Carson, \textit{Fallacies}, 64. Osborne maintains that the textual context of a word must be carefully considered, in order to avoid reading preconceived theological concepts into the word. Osborne, \textit{Hermeneutical}, 110–1. Porter discusses the relevancy of considering discourse in biblical studies. Porter, “Discourse,” 21–35.

\textsuperscript{34} Barr, \textit{Semantics}, 113.
which sees an immortal soul imprisoned in a mortal body, as the typical Greek tradition.\textsuperscript{35}

As such, rather than blindly assuming a theological concept governs the meaning of a NT word, Barr purports the value of investigating the wider context by examining how the word is used in other contemporary Greek literature.

\textbf{2.2 Recent Work on Paul’s Anthropological Terms}

After the publication of Barr’s work, there was a major shift within the field of biblical semantic study, with Barr’s criticisms and comments drawing much attention.\textsuperscript{36} In the post-Barr era, dozens of significant studies addressing Paul’s anthropological terms basically follow Barr’s recommendations. They adopt a synchronic approach, with some focusing on the textual context and others attending to the wider context.

\textbf{2.2.1 Textual Context}

Robert Jewett, James Dunn, Gordon Zerbe, Lorenzo Scornaienchi, Robert Gundry, E. Earle Ellis, and Sang-Won (Aaron) Son analyse Paul’s anthropological terms by examining different aspects of the textual context. The most comprehensive studies are by Jewett, Dunn, Zerbe, and Gundry, as they consider all of the Pauline epistles. Jewett and Dunn analyse all of the key terms, Zerbe examines several key terms, and Gundry focuses only on $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$. By comparison, most studies concentrate on a single

\textsuperscript{35} Barr, \textit{Semantics}, 12.

\textsuperscript{36} For example, in his semantic study of NT soteriological terms published in 1967, Hill cautions against the danger of “illegitimate totality transfer” and provided a thorough investigation of the historical context of the chosen terms. Although Hill focuses on their usage in the LXX and their Hebrew equivalents in the OT, he is wholly aware of the value of attending to the immediate textual context. David Hill, \textit{Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms} (SNTSMS 5; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 18–9.
term within a particular Pauline epistle. However, despite their efforts, much of this work fails to adopt the synchronic approach in full.

2.2.1.1 Multiple Terms

Jewett, Dunn, and Zerbe investigate multiple anthropological terms, and Scornaienchi investigates two anthropological terms.

2.2.1.1.1 Robert Jewett

Jewett’s work is undoubtedly the most comprehensive study post Barr. He analyses all of the authentic Pauline epistles, and examines all the key anthropological terms. Importantly, Jewett was the first to explicitly address Barr’s criticisms and insights. In describing his methodology, Jewett writes: “First of all, the approach will be to take account of the literary context of the sentence, the paragraph and the letter as a whole. We shall attempt to start with J. Barr’s dictum that the basic semantic unit is not the word but the sentence, taking account of the grammatical structure in which a term is used.”

Jewett employs a synchronic approach throughout his work. He focuses on the immediate context of a passage (sentence and paragraph) where a term occurs, and examines in detail the larger context by referring to the historical setting of the epistle. Jewett argues that historical reconstruction is important, despite its risk, in order to

37 Jewett analyses the following epistles: 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Philemon, and Romans; and examines the following terms: καρδία, φυσή, νοῦς, πνεῦμα (τοῦ ἄνθρωπος), σάρξ, σῶμα, σύνειδησία, and ἐσοφ ἄνθρωπος. Robert Jewett, Paul’s Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings (Leiden: Brill, 1971), vii.

38 Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 3.

39 Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 7.
ascertain the usage of the key terms. For example, before conducting a semantic analysis of σάρξ and πνευμα in Galatians, Jewett initially examines the circumstances of the audience, the Galatians, and establishes a chronological framework of Paul’s ministry and epistles to properly situate the anthropological terms. This examination of the context is even extended to an investigation of the linguistic horizon of the first century. As such, Jewett’s semantic analysis employs a three-fold approach, examining the immediate context of a term, the historical setting of an epistle, and the linguistic usage in other contemporary Greek literature. Nonetheless, Jewett largely focuses on investigating how a term is used in light of its historical context, in particular, the polemical usage of an anthropological term.

Jewett’s approach can be demonstrated by his examination of σώμα. Jewett initially considers the purpose of each Pauline epistle. He then argues that Paul faces different “opponents” throughout his ministry, and that the “extra personal, corporate dimensions” of σώμα are absent in the earlier epistles. For example, when Paul wrote 1 Thessalonians, Galatians and Philippians, he was tackling the “Libertinists” (who believed they were not bounded by the Law) and the “Enthusiasts” (who held the superiority of spirit over body and soul).

40 Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 7.
43 Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 8.
44 Jewett attempts to ascertain how the anthropological terms are used by the “conversational partners” (largely Paul’s opponents), and how Paul redefines the terms to “fit to the needs of particular controversies.” Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 10.
45 Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 250.
However, despite his thorough historical construction and examination of the textual context, overall, Jewett’s methodology exhibits two major problems. First, Jewett’s approach is overly speculative. Second, his attention to the textual context is limited.

Jewett reconstructs the chronological framework by producing a date for each Pauline epistle, then identifies Paul’s opponents by interpreting the situation faced by the church, and then explains the polemical use of the anthropological terms.\footnote{Jewett, \textit{Anthropological Terms}, 12–48.} For example, in his examination of \(\sigma\alpha\rho\xi\) Jewett first establishes the date of Galatians as AD 52–53 by adopting the North Galatia theory.\footnote{Jewett, \textit{Anthropological Terms}, 18–9.} He then identifies the “Judaizers” and the “Libertinists” as Paul’s opponents by examining the apostle’s response. Then, he uses the identified opponents to understand the meaning of \(\sigma\alpha\rho\xi\) in Galatians.\footnote{Jewett, \textit{Anthropological Terms}, 95–114.}

The adoption of the North Galatia theory, to establish the date of Galatians, is initially problematic.\footnote{For a detailed analysis of this theory, see Fung, 1–9; Guthrie, 17–27.} Hence, Jewett’s chronological reconstruction is not without risk. Furthermore, an examination of Paul’s response to extrapolate his opponents and their thoughts is called mirror-reading. Despite its value, this method requires prudent treatment. As stipulated by Barclay, mirror-reading can lead to a biased selection of texts and wrong assumptions.\footnote{John M. G. Barclay, “Mirror-Reading a Polemic Letter: Galatians as a Test Case,” \textit{JSNT} 10 (1987): 73–93.} Barclay refers to Jewett’s work as an illustration of this method, and repudiates Jewett’s identification of the opponents in Galatians as a
shaky assumption. In summary, Jewett’s methodology is problematic given that the reconstructed timeline and his conjecture of Paul’s opponents are questionable. Thus, his deduced polemical use of the anthropological terms is a product of speculation.

Given that Jewett focuses on the polemical use of the anthropological terms in Paul’s epistles by examining the historical situation, the attention to textual context is limited. For example, in his study of σῶμα in Philippians, Jewett’s textual analysis is mainly confined to sentential level by analysing σῶμα in 3:21 given its immediate context in 3:19. His analysis is also fixated on how the term is used in relation to the Libertinists. As a result, Jewett fails to examine the linguistic evidence in the whole epistle, and ascertain how this evidence informs the use of σῶμα. His approach fails to attend to the “larger literary complex” as suggested by Barr.

2.2.1.1.2 James Dunn

In The Theology of Paul the Apostle, Dunn discusses Paul’s anthropological terms. In responding to the enduring debate about the Hebrew over against Greek influence on Paul’s work, Dunn contends that there is a better approach than one that merely seeks “particular parallels in Greek or Hebrew thought which could fully explain Paul’s anthropology.” He suggests that it is more fruitful to “look for the coherence of

---

51 In Gal 5:3, Paul explicitly tells the Galatians that those who get circumcised would be obliged to keep the whole law. Barclay criticises Jewett’s assumption that the opponents “had craftily refrained from passing on this information,” and argues that the opponents “may have made very clear” the obligation, but Paul “may nevertheless feel it is necessary to hammer home their full unpalatable implication.” Barclay, “Mirror-Reading,” 74–5. As well as the Judaizers and the Libertinists, Jewett identifies other opponents, including the Gnostics, the Enthusiasts, and the Divine-Man-Missionaries. Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 119–30, 250–1.

Paul’s thought in itself and only to draw attention to the points of possible influence where they are relevant to our better understanding of Paul.”

For instance, in discussing σάρξ, Dunn agrees with Jewett’s criticism of pure semantic study without reference to context. He argues that σάρξ has a spectrum of meaning, which is coherent with Paul’s theology. For example, the immediate context of κατὰ σάρκα in Phil 3:3–4 suggests that the people placed their confidence in the national identity of being Israelites, which was marked by circumcision. Dunn argues that the phrase alone is neutral (for example, 1 Cor 10:18; Rom 4:1), and is even something to be treasured (for example, Rom 9:3–5). However, due to this physical kinship the people misplaced their confidence and refused to have faith in Christ, a negative connotation (for example, Gal 4). In other words, Dunn contends that Paul’s thought is coherent, and this spectrum of meaning reflects such a coherency.

According to Dunn, Paul is not fixated on adopting Hebraic or Greek thoughts, and instead sometimes creates a new usage that modifies the original Hebraic mindset or Greek philosophy. In contrasting σῶμα and σάρξ, Dunn concludes that Paul synthesises elements of Hebrew and Greek anthropology, concurrently affirming a holistic Hebrew concept of human embodiment and a “negative Greek attitude to existence in the flesh.” For Dunn, this synthesis is largely due to Paul’s apologetic and missionary strategy, and the need to persuade audiences with both Jewish and Greek backgrounds. However, Paul’s usage is coherent with his anthropology.

---

53 Dunn, Perspectives, 55.
54 Dunn, Perspectives, 64.
55 Dunn, Perspectives, 72.
56 Dunn, Perspectives, 72.
Dunn astutely surmises that Paul’s concept of the human person comprises several dimensions, wherein each reflects one or more anthropological terms, and each anthropological term imbues a spectrum of meaning. Nonetheless, Paul’s anthropology is coherent. A human person can be understood as a living being (\(\psi\nu\chi\eta\)) existing in a social and relational dimension (\(\sigma\delta\mu\alpha\)) with weakness and frailty (\(\sigma\alpha\rho\xi\)), yet capable of deep emotions (\(\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\)) and being “touched by the profoundest reality within and behind the universe” (\(\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\)).\(^57\)

However, Dunn’s analysis of Paul’s anthropology and argument of coherency is problematic. Given that Paul developed his theology over a period of time as he composed the epistles, whether Paul always had a coherent and “neat” anthropology is questionable. Of most importance, Dunn gives less attention to the textual context by focusing on analysis at the discourse level and by examining the linguistic evidence of a discourse to ascertain the usage of a term. Therefore, the rhetorical and contextual circumstances surrounding the composition of an epistle are flattened out in favour of Pauline coherence. As specified by Barr, the preconceived theological concept (in this case Paul’s coherence) is imposed on an anthropological term in semantic study.

2.2.1.1.3 Gordon Zerbe

Zerbe’s analysis focuses on three key terms, \(\sigma\delta\mu\alpha\), \(\psi\nu\chi\eta\), and \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\), and contends that these terms do not have narrow semantic precision because some of them can be

\(^{57}\) Dunn, Perspectives, 78.
used interchangeably with an overlap in meaning.\footnote{Gordon Zerbe, “Paul on the Human Being as ‘Psychic Body’: Neither Dualist Nor Monist,” \textit{Direction Journal} 37 (2008): 168–84. Cited 24 September 2012. Online: http://www.directionjournal.org/article/11527.} Sometimes these terms are used colloquially by Paul, and other times they are used in a technical sense to elucidate a key theological argument. Zerbe argues that $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ in the Corinthian epistles denotes the sacramental-spiritual-social being of the church, $\pi\nu\epsilon\delta\mu\alpha$ indicates the capacity of a person to relate directly to God, and $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ means the vitality of a living being, which relates to the “Hebrew notion of nepesh.”

Of interest, Zerbe contends that both the “essentialist anthropological dualism” and purely “monist understanding” cannot be established as the apostle’s view, given that Paul is not interested in an ontological exposition of the human person. Paul’s teaching is not “monist” in nature:

Paul is certainly a dualist, although of a certain kind—an apocalyptic dualist… For Paul the human being is faced with imperatives (modalities of living) that are God-ward (theological-spiritual), ethical (behavioral), and socio-political (having to do with allegiance, dominions, and identity). Paul’s dualism has multiple dimensions.\footnote{Zerbe, “Paul,” 168.}

Zerbe concludes that Paul does not portray a “dualist anthropology with a distinct and separable soul.” Paul is an apocalyptic dualist who emphasises social-ethical-political-spiritual “human living,” rather than the ontology of “human being.” Therefore, the resurrected body can be elucidated and understood as transformation into newness.

Zerbe’s work primarily focuses on the textual context of the anthropological terms. In discussing $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ in 1 Corinthians, Zerbe investigates how this term is used throughout the epistle. His attempt to address the textual context at the discourse level is commendable. However, his analysis does not demonstrate an attention to detailed contextual evidence. For example, Zerbe simply cites a biblical source without giving
any detailed exegetical analysis. Nonetheless, his most important finding is the social-ethical connotations of Paul’s anthropological terms, rather than ontological. This study, drawing on a better formulated methodology, will endorse this finding.

2.2.1.1.4 Lorenzo Scornaienchi

Scornaienchi investigates the terms σωμα and σάρξ, and describes his methodology as a “neue Systematik.” Scornaienchi demonstrates how Paul uses these terms to denote “Konstruktivität” and “Destruktivität” communities respectively, and primarily argues that this meaning stems from Paul’s environment. For Scornaienchi, σάρξ denotes a destructive community. This community is characterised by hierarchical domination, and is full of differences. Moreover, σωμα denotes togetherness and a constructive community. This community is characterised by constructive action that amalgamates a community and eliminates hierarchy, wherein believers come together despite their differences (gender, social group, and nationality).

Scornaienchi bases this argument on an analysis of various Pauline passages (Rom 7:7–25; 12:3–8; 1 Cor 6:12–20; 11:17–34; 12:1–31; 2 Cor 5:1–10; Gal 5:13–23). Scornaienchi concludes that while a person lives ἐν σαρκί, the power of σάρξ cannot be fully eliminated. Consequently, the person experiences a struggle between

---

60 For example, “Paul can use the term [σωμα] … to denote the very sacramental-spiritual-social being of the church (“you are the body of Christ and individually members of it,” 1 Cor. 12:27; “the body is one,” 1 Cor. 12:12, 13; cf. 10:16–17; 1 Cor. 11:24–29).” Zerbe does not provide a further analysis of these cited passages. Zerbe, “Paul,” 168.

61 Scornaienchi, Sarx und Soma, 13.

62 Scornaienchi, Sarx und Soma, 67. Scornaienchi argues that σάρξ does not merely indicate a material substance. This term points to the living flesh and those people who actively pursue their own desires contributing to this destructiveness.

63 Scornaienchi, Sarx und Soma, 62.

64 Scornaienchi, Sarx und Soma, 62, 67.
the consuming power of this destructiveness and the constructive life realised in
Christ.\textsuperscript{65}

However, despite Scornaienchi’s insights, his argument is limited to select
Pauline passages and does not sufficiently investigate how the anthropological terms
within chosen passages relate to the whole discourse. For example, in an analysis of
\(\sigma\rho\xi\) in Rom 7, Scornaienchi discusses various understandings of the human person
held by ancient Greek philosophers, including Plato, Aristotle, Stoic, and Epicurus.\textsuperscript{66}
However, a consideration of the wider discourse is limited.\textsuperscript{67} Therefore, the semantics
of these key terms are not examined through the “lenses” of the whole discourse, as
suggested by Barr.

2.2.1.2 Single Term

Gundry, Ellis, and Son investigate a single anthropological term, focusing only on
\(\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\).

2.2.1.2.1 Robert Gundry

Gundry’s analysis focuses on \(\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\). First, Gundry examines the usage of \(\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\) in
contemporaneous extra-biblical literature, and concludes that the term always denotes
a physical essence. Hence, the holistic definition of \(\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\) proposed by Bultmann and
Robinson is not supported by extra-biblical literature.\textsuperscript{68} Gundry then examines the

\textsuperscript{65} Scornaienchi, \textit{Sax und Soma}, 353.

\textsuperscript{66} Scornaienchi, \textit{Sax und Soma}, 308–16.

\textsuperscript{67} Scornaienchi only devotes a small portion of his analysis in discussing the wider discourse

\textsuperscript{68} Robert H. Gundry, \textit{Sôma in Biblical Theology: with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology}
(SNTSMS 29; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 15.
usage of σῶμα in the LXX by reviewing its Hebrew equivalent, וּפָד. He shares Barr’s concern about “illegitimate identity transfer,” and concludes that “the LXX offers no convincing support” for interpreting σῶμα as the whole human person. Gundry maintains that “whatever the underlying Hebrew, תָּפֶד or another word – σῶμα refers to the physical body alone.” Gundry also examines the usage of σῶμα in the Pauline epistles, especially focusing on 1 Cor 6:12–20. Gundry concludes that σῶμα usually “denotes the physical body, roughly synonymous with ‘flesh’ in the neutral sense.” Hence, similarly, the holistic definition of σῶμα is not supported by biblical literature, including the LXX, the NT, and the Pauline epistles.

Second, Gundry discusses various understandings of anthropological duality, including human identity in Greek thought. He examines σῶμα as the body of Christ, and heavily criticises Bultmann who demerits the communal connotation of the term to suit, according to Gundry, his theological framework.

Gundry adopts a synchronic approach and focuses on the context of σῶμα. He analyses the wider context by reviewing contemporary philosophical thought, such as the concept of anthropological duality, but prioritises the textual analysis of various biblical and extra-biblical literature, particularly focusing on Pauline passages. While Gundry examines the historical development of the term, for example in the LXX, it does not dominate his investigation. His exegetical work provides a solid criticism of prior scholarship, specifically Bultmann and Robinson who attempt to place the term within their theological frameworks.

69 Gundry, Sōma, 25.
70 Gundry, Sōma, 50.
71 Gundry, Sōma, 79.
72 Gundry, Sōma, 223.
However, apart from his specific examination of 1 Cor 6 and 12, his exegetical analysis is arguably truncated. For example, various Pauline passages are quoted to support an idea without a detailed textual analysis. In addition, the examination of 1 Cor 6 and 12 are limited to sentential and paragraphic levels. Hence, his exegetical analysis fails to review the place of the term within the whole epistle. Therefore, Gundry’s synchronic approach is limited as it does not attend to the “larger literary complex,” the whole discourse, as suggested by Barr.

2.2.1.2.2 E. Earle Ellis

Ellis specifically focuses on the term σῶμα in 1 Corinthians. First, he compares σῶμα with other Pauline anthropological terms. He repudiates the Platonic dualistic notion of the human person, and argues that various anthropological terms, including spirit, heart, conscience, and flesh, depict either the “outward self” or “inward self,” which resembles the OT “distinction between the person outwardly and the person inwardly.” Ellis then focuses on and examines the “corporate body” in 1 Corinthians, particularly the contrast between the body of Christ and “the body of Adam.” Ellis cites various Pauline passages in his analysis, but does not provide any detailed textual analysis. In most cases, he simply refers to the passage in a statement.

---

73 For example, in explaining the phrase “absent in body” in 1 Cor 5:3, Gundry argues that σῶμα is “a reference to the external absence of the whole man,” and refers to Col 2:5 and 1 Thess 2:17. However, he does not provide any contextual analysis of these passages. Gundry, Sôma, 48. Gundry’s conclusion may be correct, but citing various Pauline passages without proper analysis can lead to the malpractice of taking a passage out of context.


2.2.1.2.3 Sang-Won (Aaron) Son

Son examines σώμα in 1 Corinthians, and contributes two studies. In one study, Son demonstrates how various Pauline expressions, involving σώμα, convey the corporate dimension of human existence. For example, ἐν Χριστῷ (and its synonyms), the Adam-Christ typology, and σώμα (in particular, ἐν σώμα and σώμα Χριστοῦ in 1 Corinthians) are used by Paul to convey corporate personality. In the other study, Son focuses on ἐν σώμα in 1 Corinthians, demarcating the comparison between sexual union (between a man and a woman) and spiritual union (between Christ and his church). In both studies, he argues that a corporate solidarity is denoted by the usage of σώμα. Paul employs this anthropological term and related expressions to highlight “the significance of the individual existence of believers in the light of their corporate reality in Christ.”

Son draws on particular passages from 1 Corinthians, Romans, Colossians, and Ephesians, to illustrate how σώμα refers to the church as the body of Christ and denotes “primarily the unity of believers with Christ.”

Although Son examines some contemporary philosophy, including the Stoic metaphor, the Gnostic myth, and the rabbinic tradition, he predominantly focuses on exegetical analysis.


79 Son, Corporate Elements, 183.


81 Son, Corporate Elements, 102.
However, this analysis is limited to σῶμα, and the explanation of ἐν σῶμα only considers 1 Cor 6 and 12. 83 Thus, this study is far from exhaustive. In addition, the textual analysis is mostly limited to sentential and paragraphic levels, and accordingly Son’s study fails to attend to “the complete speech,” as suggested by Barr.

Many modern commentaries critically elucidate the Pauline anthropological terms through exegetical analyses. 84 However, many of these are limited to sentential and paragraphic levels, and do not examine the terms in light of the textual context at the discourse level.

2.2.2 Wider Context

In addition to the textual context, various studies focus on the wider context, or the cultural and the philosophical context of Paul’s anthropological terms. Some examine how the human person is understood in contemporaneous philosophical thought, and others examine how a particular term is employed in contemporary Greek literature.

Although an investigation of the wider context is valuable, as suggested by Barr, and informs the meaning of key terms, many of these studies fail to apply the synchronic approach, and attend to the textual context. The key findings of various studies are discussed below.

82 Son, Corporate Elements, 112–6.

83 Son, “One Flesh,” 107–22

84 For example, Hawthorne studies πνεῦμα and ψυχή in Phil 1:27 (Hawthorne, 57), Thiselton examines σῶμα in 1 Cor 6 (Thiselton, 316, 474), and Furnish analyses καρδία in 2 Cor 6–7 (Furnish, 2 Corinthians, 360). This research explores and understands these terms in light of their immediate sentential context.
2.2.2.1 Multiple Terms

Emma Wasserman, Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, and Brian Edgar investigate multiple anthropological terms, with most focusing on two terms.

2.2.2.1.1 Emma Wasserman

Wasserman’s discussion of the terms σῶμα and ἀρχὴ in Rom 7 rejects the notion that a dualistic anthropology is being conveyed. Despite the probability that a Platonic logic is adopted in Rom 7, Wasserman contends that Paul does not need to agree with “Platonic metaphysics and epistemology to conceptualize the body or flesh as an ally of passion.”\(^8^5\) Wasserman’s focus on Platonic logic, delimits an analysis of the textual context.\(^8^6\) Thus, the level of synchronic analysis in this study is considerably limited.

2.2.2.1.2 Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce

Destro and Pesce briefly analyse the usage of ἐσω ἀνθρωπος and σῶμα in the Pauline epistles, and surmise that “the redefinition of spatial categories allows the conceptual elimination of the pre-existing boundaries between social group.”\(^8^7\) Their approach is

---


largely based on investigating the contemporary philosophical background. However, an exegetical analysis and attention to the textual context is nearly nonexistent. 88

2.2.2.1.3 Brian Edgar

Similar to Wasserman, Edgar also repudiates the dualistic view by investigating how Paul’s anthropological terms are employed in his soteriology. For example, Edgar argues that “Paul is more concerned with anthropological themes which develop and validate his central soteriological concerns than with the formulation of an all-encompassing anthropological ontology.” 89 Edgar cites some Pauline passages, but does not provide any exegetical analysis of these.

2.2.2 Single Term

Troy Martin, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, David Brakke, and Timo Laato investigate a single anthropological term, with Martin and Engberg-Pedersen focusing on πνεῦμα, Brakke focusing on σῶμα, and Laato focusing on σάρξ.

2.2.2.1 Troy Martin

Martin examines the usage of πνεῦμα, by comparing ancient medical texts and the Pauline epistles. 90 He concludes that the pneumatological statements found in the

88 For example, passages are only cited in the discussion of the relation between “inner man” and “outer man,” and there is little textual analysis. Destro and Pesce, “Self,” 188.


Pauline epistles are in accordance with those found in the medical texts. In these medical texts, πνεῦμα is portrayed as entering a person through oro-nasal channels, causing movement and providing health. Martin observes that this understanding is also found in the Corinthian correspondence, in which the Spirit enters the body and imparts life. However, Martin’s examination includes little exegetical analysis.

2.2.2.2 Troels Engberg-Pedersen

Engberg-Pedersen studies the usage of πνεῦμα in the Pauline epistles by examining contemporary Greco-Roman philosophy. Engberg-Pedersen identifies and explains how Stoic philosophy influences the meaning of πνεῦμα in 1 Cor 15 regarding the resurrected body. He maintains that Paul’s account of “the pneumatic resurrection body presupposes Stoic cosmology… [Paul’s] idea of a substantive change belongs within an Aristotelian tradition of physics.” As such, Engberg-Pedersen argues that πνεῦμα does not reveal an immaterial understanding, and rather is employed to emphasise materiality in an apocalyptic framework, with a Stoic view of a bodily...

---

91 Martin, “Pneumatological,” 106.


93 For example, Martin briefly describes the notion of Spirit in 1 Cor 2:8–16 without providing any in-depth textual analysis. Martin, “Pneumatological,” 121.

Although Engberg-Pedersen incorporates various Pauline passage in his argument, there is minimal textual analysis.

2.2.2.2.3 David Brakke

Brakke investigates the notion of σῶμα in the ancient world. Whilst acknowledging the complexity of Paul’s usage of σῶμα, Brakke illustrates the relationship between Platonic teaching and Paul’s anthropology. According to Brakke, certain elements of Platonic teaching are adopted by Paul to portray σῶμα as a “tent,” but other elements describing God’s glory as manifested in human σῶμα are rejected. However, Brakke does not undertake any textual and exegetical analysis of the term.

2.2.2.2.4 Timo Laato

Laato examines the usage of ἄρξ by contrasting Pauline and Jewish philosophical frameworks. Laato focuses on and discusses the connection between Galatians and

---


96 For example, Engberg-Pedersen provides a brief textual analysis of 1 Cor 15:35–50 in one paragraph, without addressing detailed textual evidence both within and beyond the passage. Engberg-Pedersen, “Spirit,” 185.


98 Brakke, “Body,” 120.

99 For example, Brakke cites 2 Cor 5:2 to illustrate the “tent” language without analysing the context at sentential or paragraphic levels. Brakke, “Body,” 120.

the Jewish pattern of religion. However, this predominantly relies on a reconstruction of events that occurred in Galatia, rather than attending to the textual context.\(^{101}\)

As established above, many studies investigating the wider context fail to attend to the textual context.

2.2.3 Textual Context and Wider Context

Some scholars investigate both the textual context and the wider context, including Hans Dieter Betz, Michelle Lee, and Dale Martin. However, all of these studies are limited in their scope by only focusing on a single anthropological term.

2.2.3.1 Single Term

Betz examines \(\varepsilon\sigma\omega\ \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\zeta\), and both Lee and Martin explore \(\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\). In particular, both Lee and Martin carefully analyse the contemporary philosophical backgrounds of some key passages, and provide a thorough exegetical analysis.

2.2.3.1.1 Hans Dieter Betz

Betz examines the usage of \(\varepsilon\sigma\omega\ \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\zeta\). He considers some philosophical thought and provides a comparatively detailed analysis of the context. Betz argues that Paul rejects the Middle-Platonic dualism of an immortal soul imprisoned in a material body.\(^{102}\) He suggests that \(\varepsilon\sigma\omega\ \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\zeta\) is employed by Paul to denote


\(^{102}\) Betz, “Inner Human,” 315–41.
“eschatological redemption through the Christ-ἀνθρωπος.” In another work, Betz also articulates Paul’s struggle to teach the Christian faith to the Corinthians, among whom there is a “perceived conflict between Paul’s preaching and conventional anthropological assumptions held by people educated in Greek culture,” especially “with regard to the dualism of body and soul.” In both studies, Betz considers the immediate textual context and the wider context of the term, within the whole letter.

2.2.3.1.2 Michelle Lee

Lee’s analysis of σώμα suggests that Stoic philosophy influences Paul’s usage of this term, and specifically informs the concept of bodily unity in the apostle’s work. She claims that comprehending “how the Stoics saw the universe and society as a “body” may help us comprehend what lies behind Paul’s statements that the believers are not “like” a body, but also “are” the body of Christ.” The Stoics consider the universe a living being, which resembles the human body as an organism, and that people are unified bodies under the presence of a “persuasive πνευμα.” The concept of bodily unity, between humanity and the gods, is at the heart of Stoic philosophy, and forms the foundation of their ethical system and moral.


105 For example, the immediate textual context of ἰδέα ἀνθρωπος in 2 Cor 4:16 is analysed while the wider issues are addressed. Betz, “Inner Human,” 329–35; Betz, “Antagonisms,” 565–8.


107 Lee, Stoics, 46.

108 Lee, Stoics, 50.
expectations. Lee contends that Paul adopts a similar concept to convey his ideas to the Corinthians, and also uses “a similar method to train the Corinthians” to respond to the moral expectations within the church. Detailed exegetical analysis is provided throughout Lee’s study; however, the analysis is limited to a single anthropological term within one Pauline epistle.

2.2.3.1.3 Dale Martin

Martin considers the term σῶμα, and broadly examines contemporary philosophical thought and Greek literature. He argues that Greco-Roman philosophy is commonly assumed by modern biblical scholars “to share our modern notions of the body,” and is portrayed as “more unified and more homogeneous than it actually was.” As a result, a form of Platonism that holds the radical separation of a mortal body and an immortal soul is considered “the Greek view.” In particular, Martin argues that the philosophy of René Descartes adversely influenced modern scholarship. Unlike the ancient dualism of the body and the soul, Descartes created an ontological dualism in which “on one side were body, matter, nature, and the physical; on the other were soul or mind, nonmatter, the supernatural, and the spiritual or psychological.”

111 For example, an analysis of 1 Cor 12 attends to both the paragraphic and sentential levels while discussing the relevance of Stoic thought to the interpretation. Lee, Stoics, 105–52.
113 Martin, Body, 7.
114 Martin, Body, 6.
contends that this dualism “still influences many modern minds, this was a system of which the ancients knew nothing.”

Following a brief analysis of various Greek philosophical schools of thought, Martin asserts that first-century Platonism is more complex than perceived by many modern scholars and students. He argues that the influence of popular philosophy on the early Christian communities, within which Paul ministered, was “more related to Stoic than Platonic concepts.” Martin examines the concept of “microcosmic body,” which states that human bodies are part of the universe, the boundary between inner body and outer body is blurred, and the whole body is constantly influenced by and interacting with the universe. This concept was widely embraced during Paul’s era. Martin provides a succinct explanation:

In most of the Greco-Roman culture a human being was a confused commingling of substances. A few philosophers, Platonists perhaps, may have emphasized a dualism between the body and the soul. But such theorists represented a small minority. In the absence of such an ontological dualism, for most people of Greco-Roman culture the human body was of a piece with its environment. The self was a precarious, temporary state of affairs, constituted by forces surrounding and pervading the body… In such a maelstrom of cosmological forces, the individualism of modern conceptions disappears.

Employing these findings, Martin provides a detailed exegetical analysis of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians, examining the immediate textual context and the structure of the whole epistle. He argues that Paul assumes the microcosm of the body, whereby, the human body is an analogy for human society and “unity can exist in diversity

115 Martin, Body, 6.
116 Martin, Body, 14.
117 Martin, Body, 17–21.
118 Martin, Body, 25.
within the macrocosm of society.” In addition, Martin considers the “opponents” who confronted Paul, namely a group of people who believed they were “stronger” in faith than the rest. By adopting a rhetorical strategy, Paul identifies himself “with the position of the Strong and then calling on them to give up their own interests for the sake of the Weak.”

However, despite these insightful findings, Martin’s study is limited to a single anthropological term, σῶμα in 1 Corinthians.

2.2.4 The Limitations of Recent Work

As demonstrated in this discussion, many recent studies of Paul’s anthropological terms attend to Barr comments and adopt a synchronic approach, focusing on the textual context and/or the wider context. However, many of these studies fail to fully apply Barr’s recommendations. Those that focus on the textual context are either overly speculative (Jewett), rely heavily on presuppositions (Dunn), or undertake limited textual analysis at the sentential level (Zerbe, Ellis) and the discourse level (Gundry, Son). Those that focus on the wider context either insufficiently address the textual context (Wasserman, Engberg-Pedersen, Laato) or do not include any textual analysis (Destro and Pesce, Edgar, Troy Martin, Brakke). Conversely, Betz, Lee, and Dale Martin provide detailed textual analysis while investigating the wider context. Yet, their work is limited to a single anthropological term within either multiple Pauline epistles (Betz) or a single epistle (Lee, Dale Martin).

---

119 Martin, Body, 92.

120 Martin, Body, 103.
Given these limitations, there is a need to formulate a research approach that principally attends to the modern science of linguistics. In other words, this must be a linguistic method that can be applied in the semantic study of different languages, both modern and ancient. In addition, this research approach must attend to Barr’s comments and adopt the synchronic approach in full, providing textual analysis at clausal-sentential-paragraphic levels, and in turn a wider analysis of the larger literary context, the whole discourse. Furthermore, this research approach should be broader in scope and applicable for multiple anthropological terms within multiple Pauline epistles. The need for this research is also suggested by the failure of scholarship to adequately explain a peculiar grammatical feature of Paul’s rhetoric.

2.3 The Abnormal Singular Construct and Distributive Singular

Previous scholarship has either overlooked or been unable to satisfactorily explain a particular grammatical construct in the Pauline epistles, namely the combination of a singular anthropological noun and plural personal possessive pronoun. This ‘abnormal’ grammatical construct is carefully explicated in the following parts, since this will re-emerge in later chapters, in the analysis of particular Pauline passages.

2.3.1 Abnormal Singular Construct

In Koine Greek grammar, the combination of a singular noun and singular personal possessive pronoun (normal singular construct), and the combination of a plural noun and plural personal possessive pronoun (normal plural construct) follow the basic rule

---

121 In examining the phrase μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν (Gal 6:18), Fee notes that scholarship has been unable to provide a satisfactory explanation for this abnormal grammatical construct. Gordon D. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), 469.
of agreement, and as such are expected constructions. Unless the noun is abstract in nature, wherein it takes a singular form (for example, ἐλπίς), the combination of a singular noun and a plural personal possessive pronoun is abnormal since it violates the rule of agreement. In this study, this peculiar construct is called the “abnormal singular construct.” In the Pauline epistles, there are 15 phrases with anthropological terms that appear in the abnormal singular construct: η ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία (Rom 1:21); τῷ θυτῷ υμῶν σώματι (Rom 6:12); τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν (Rom 6:19); τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν (Rom 8:16); τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν (Rom 8:23); τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν (1 Cor 6:19); τῷ σώματι υμῶν (1 Cor 6:20); τίνι καρδιαίν αὐτῶν (2 Cor 3:15); τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν (2 Cor 4:10); τῇ θυτῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν (2 Cor 4:11); η καρδία ἡμῶν (2 Cor 6:11); η σάρξ ἡμῶν (2 Cor 7:5); τοῦ πνεύματος υμῶν (Gal 6:18); τοῦ πνεύματος υμῶν (Phil 4:23); and τοῦ πνεύματος υμῶν (Phlm 1:25).

In explaining this peculiar construct some modern scholars define the singular anthropological term as the distributive singular. Therefore, it is important to initially delineate this concept to ascertain whether the distributive singular is a satisfactory solution to the grammatical problem of the abnormal singular construct.

---


123 For example, in the NT, ἐλπίς and πίστις always appear in the singular form, and as such appear in the abnormal singular construct, such as τῇ πίστιν ἡμῶν (Matt 9:29), ἦ πίστες υμῶν (Rom 1:8), and ἐλπίς ἡμῶν (2 Cor 1:7). The abnormal singular construct with abstract nouns in the Pauline epistles will be further discussed later.

124 Some scholars cite Turner’s work as supporting evidence. For example, Gundry argues that σῶμα in these phrases, τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν (2 Cor 4:10) and τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν (Rom 8:23), is a distributive singular. Gundry, Sōma, 76–7. Both Fee and Hawthorne also argue that πνεύμα in the phrase τοῦ πνεύματος υμῶν (Phil 4:23) is a distributive singular. Fee, Philippians, 461; Hawthorne, 215.
2.3.2 Distributive Singular

The distributive singular is defined as “the use of singular in reference to a plurality of objects.”\(^{125}\) As such, the singular is employed when a noun representing something belonging to each person in a group of people is expressed in the singular form, even though the object is plural in number. Although the distributive singular with concrete nouns is extremely rare in classical Greek literature, according to both Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve and Hebert Weir Smyth,\(^{126}\) this peculiar construct is found in the LXX and the NT.\(^{127}\) For example, a phrase like “they shook their head” can be found in ancient Hebrew literature. Here the plural object (heads) is constructed in the singular form (head).\(^{128}\) Conversely, the Greeks would simply write “they shook their heads.”\(^{129}\) F. Blass and A. Debrunner explain that the distributive singular is an

---


\(^{127}\) For example, in the LXX, the combination of σῶμα and personal possessive pronoun is as follows: seven abnormal singular constructs (σώματα ημῶν in Lev 19:28; Sir 7:24; σῶμα αὐτῶν in Num 8:7; Bar 6:21; σώματος αὐτῶν in Neh 9:26; Ezek 1:11; Dan 3:94); seven normal plural constructs (σώματα αὐτῶν in Gen 34:29; Sir 44:14; Ezek 1:23; Dan 3:95; σώματα ημῶν in Neh 9:37; σώματος αὐτῶν in Sir 41:11; Nah 3:3). Conybeare and Stock state that the singular is used in the sense of the plural in imitation of Hebrew idiom. F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1980), section 48.

\(^{128}\) Gesenius states that “the plural of persons is sometimes construed with the singular of the predicate, when instead of the whole class of individuals.” Some clear examples include Gen 27:29 (אֶת אֶלְהָאַבֶּרֶךְ יִשְׂמָךְ וֹאִירָךְ אַיְרַרְךְ וֹאִירָךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְ�), Exod 31:14 (אֶת אֶלְהָאַבֶּרֶךְ יִשְׂמָךְ וֹאִירָךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַрְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְ�), Lev 17:14 (אֶת אֶלְהָאַבֶּרֶךְ יִשְׂמָךְ וֹאִירָךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְךְ אַיְרַרְ�). Wilhem Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar: As Edited and Enlarged by the Late E. Kautzsch* (ed. A. E. Cowley; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 464. Although Waltke and O’Connor do not discuss the distributive singular, they provide a comprehensive explanation of the usage of singular in biblical Hebrew language. Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 111–6.

\(^{129}\) BDF, 77. For example, drawing on the previous example, in the LXX, the Hebrew for σώματι ημῶν (Lev 19:28 in the LXX) is פֶּסֶת (in the BHS), which combines a masculine plural suffixed pronoun, פֶּסֶת, and singular noun, פֶּסֶת. As a result, the Hebrew is probably translated into σώματι ημῶν in the LXX, which combines a singular σώμα and a plural ημῶν.
Aramaic concept, and Nigel Turner similarly suggests that the usage is mainly due to Aramaic and Hebrew influence, since it departs from the basic Greek grammatical rule. A. T. Robertson calls this concept the idiomatic singular, and suggests that “the N. T. writers merely follow in the beaten track of Greek usage with proper freedom and individuality.” Samuel Green observes that in the NT some words, like καρδία and σώμα, are in singular form “when predicated of several individuals,” but that the plural is more common on these occasions.

From the literature reviewed regarding Greek grammar and syntax, only the above-mentioned studies discuss the distributive singular. Of those that mention the

---

131 Robertson, Grammar, 409.
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distributive singular, only Turner provides a comprehensive analysis and cites copious examples, including a number of Pauline passages.\textsuperscript{134} Given the adoption of Turner’s analysis by various subsequent scholars, it deserves further elucidation.

2.3.2.1 Nigel Turner’s Analysis

Turner uses καρδία, κεφαλὴ, ὀδφύς, σῶμα, and χείρ as examples of the distributive singular in the NT. καρδία, ὀδφύς, and σῶμα appear in the Pauline epistles,\textsuperscript{135} and of these καρδία and σῶμα are anthropological terms. According to Turner, these two terms appear in both distributive singular and normal plural forms.\textsuperscript{136}

2.3.2.1.1 Καρδία

Turner’s findings indicate that the occurrences of καρδία in the Pauline epistles are prominent examples of the distributive singular, which is viewed as a popular Pauline construct. However, further analysis shows that these examples are less clear.

Moreover, the existence of both the normal plural construct and the abnormal singular construct indicate a degree of lexical choice. In other words, Paul does not randomly

\textsuperscript{134} Robertson identifies several examples from non-Pauline works, including the four Gospels, Hebrews, 1 John, and Acts, and one example from the authentic Pauline epistle (1 Cor 1:27) and two examples from suspected pseudopigrapha (2 Thess 2:6; Eph 6:14). Blass and Debrunner also identify several examples from Acts and Luke, and one example from the Pauline tradition (Eph 6:14). Green does not provide any examples of the distributive singular of σῶμα and καρδία. Robertson, Grammar, 409; BDF, 77; Green, Grammar, 202.

\textsuperscript{135} Turner, Syntax, 3:23–4.

\textsuperscript{136} For example, καρδία appears as a distributive singular (Rom 1:21; 2 Cor 3:15; 6:11; Eph 1:18; 4:18; 5:19; 6:5; Phil 1:7; Col 3:16) and a normal plural (Rom 1:24; 2:15; 5:5; 16:18; 2 Cor 1:22; 3:2; 6:22; Phil 4:7; Col 2:2; 3:15; 3:16; 4:8; 1 Thess 2:4; 3:13; 2 Thess 2:17; 3:5). σῶμα also appears as a distributive singular (Rom 8:23; 1 Cor 6:19; 6:20; 2 Cor 4:10) and a normal plural (1 Cor 6:15; Eph 5:28). Notably, the singular form and the plural form of σῶμα appear in a close proximity (1 Cor 6:15 and 6:19 respectively). A further example is ὀδφύς, although this only appears once (Eph 6:14). Turner, Syntax, 3:23–4.
or without reason choose one expression over another. As such, differentiating the two constructs is significant in understanding Paul’s work, and requires attention.

According to Turner, καρδία appears as a distributive singular noun in Col 3:16 and Phil 1:7. In Col 3:16, καρδία appears in the plural form, ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμᾶς. The singular form is a textual variant with only the support from D², I, and the Majority Text. The plural form, however, receives overwhelming support from various manuscripts, including but not limited to, φ⁴⁶, K, A, B, C, D*, F, G, Ψ, 33, 1739, and 1881. Hence, Col 3:16 is not a good example of the abnormal singular construct, nor the distributive singular. Regarding καρδία in Phil 1:7, careful scrutiny reveals that this is most likely an invalid example. The phrase διὰ τὸ ἐξευν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς can be interpreted as either “I have you in [my] heart” or “you have me in [your] heart.” Both are grammatically probable. However, με is placed in closer proximity with the infinitive ἐξευν than ὑμᾶς. Given this word order, “I” as the subject of the infinitive is more likely since με precedes ὑμᾶς. In other words, in Phil 1:7, καρδία portrays the heart of Paul instead of the Philippians. The singular καρδία, in Col 3:16 and Phil 1:7, is excluded from subsequent analysis.

In Ephesians, based on Turner’s study, καρδία occurs in the abnormal singular construct as a distributive singular (Eph 1:18; 4:18; 5:19; 6:5), and in the normal

---

137 The Greek text of the NA27 shows the plural form in the main text, and the singular form appears as a textual variant in the apparatus. Although this study is aware of the most recent publication of 26th edition of the Nestle-Aland editions, it adheres to the NA27 because most of its textual analyses were conducted before the new edition was available.

138 Various scholars adopt the plural form in their commentaries. See Dunn, Colossians, 235; O’Brien, Colossians, 210; Lohse, 151; Sumney, 226–7; and Hay, 134.

139 καρδία only occurs in the normal plural construct in Colossians. καρδία does not occur in either the normal singular construct or the abnormal singular construct in the epistle.

140 In addition, various commentators support this view, which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, in a further examination of the usage.
plural construct (Eph 3:17; 6:22). Notably, the meaning of καρδία in these constructs is different. καρδία in the abnormal singular construct refers to mind or thought, and denotes an attitude towards God. While καρδία in the normal plural construct connotes “inner being,” depicting the whole person.

The first occurrence of καρδία in the abnormal singular construct is Eph 1:18, in the phrase τοὺς ὠφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας [ἡμῶν]. There are several observations. First, it is disputable whether the plural pronoun is in the original text or an early insertion, given the substantial support for both variants. Second, καρδία likely denotes mind, since the surrounding clauses point to knowledge. In 1:17, the author prays that the Ephesians be given the πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύφεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ. Then, in 1:18, opening of the eyes of the heart leads: εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ. As suggested by Turner, it is possible to interpret καρδία as a distributive singular. Hence, καρδία denotes the mind of each member of the Ephesian community. However, it is also possible to understand καρδία as an abstract noun, pointing to the corporate mindset of the believing community. This explanation is further illustrated in the immediate context.

In 1:15, the author gives thanks to God for the community, for the following reason:

141 A parenthesis is used for the plural pronoun in the text NA27. The omission of ὑμῶν is supported by Í, B, 33, 1175, 1739, and 1881, while the insertion is supported by א, ה, ו, ג, י, and the Majority Text. However, the omission of the pronoun is a harder reading. Thus, the absence of ὑμῶν would more likely be the original reading.

142 For O’Brien, καρδία draws on the OT usage, pointing to the centre and source of physical life and the whole inner life. O’Brien, Ephesians, 134. Conversely, Perkins argues that the term does not carry the OT usage. Instead, the phrase τοὺς ὠφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν is “associated with change in conduct,” an expression of contemporary Greek moralists. Perkins, 48.

143 Best, MacDonald, Muddiman, and Barth do not mention the abnormal construct of the phrase. Best, Ephesians, 165; MacDonald, 217, Muddiman, 85; Barth, 1–3, 149–50.

144 Hoehner defines the singular καρδία as a distributive singular, citing Turner, and interprets this as denoting the thought and understanding (mind-related) that belongs to each person in a group. Hoehner, 261.
The plural ὑμᾶς, referring to the community, is reported as having faith in the Lord. Thus, it is natural to interpret the singular καρδία as connoting corporate entity, when combined with the plural ὑμῶν.\footnote{MacDonald argues that “eyes” and “heart” in 1:18 are closely associated with the OT, and also suggests that the phrase “eyes of your heart” is “closely tied to expressions of fundamental commitment by believers.” MacDonald, 217. MacDonald’s view subtly highlights the focus of “believers” as a communal group in this context.}

According to Turner, a second distributive singular occurs in Eph 4:18, in the phrase διὰ τὴν πίστιν καθ’ ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἡσυχ. The plural ὑμᾶς, referring to the community, is reported as having faith in the Lord. Thus, it is natural to interpret the singular καρδία as connoting corporate entity, when combined with the plural ὑμῶν.\footnote{Best interprets this as denoting the “Gentile world out of which the readers were converted remained in a state of blindness.” Best, Ephesians, 419. MacDonald also understands this verse as the “depiction of the Gentile world.” MacDonald, 302.}

A third occurrence of καρδία as the distributive singular, based on Turner’s study, is Eph 5:19.\footnote{Best, Ephesians, 421.} An imperative main verb in ἀλλὰ πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι (5:18), precedes the participle clause ψάλλοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ (5:19b). Similarly, for Turner, the singular in this abnormal singular construct can be understood as a distributive singular. However, this can also be interpreted differently.\footnote{The plural form of καρδία is a secondary reading, supported by some ancient manuscripts including 𝔃, A, D, F, and G. Hoehner again defines the singular form as a distributive singular, citing Turner. Hoehner, 588.}
The context of the phrase is exhortation, in which the community is encouraged.\(^{149}\) This is indicated by the preceding participle clause, λαλούντες ἐαυτοῖς ἐν ψαλμοῖς, in 5:19a. The setting is communal, possibly a worship assembly, and the author encourages the singing and making melody to be done to ἐαυτοῖς.\(^{150}\) Therefore, καρδία can be interpreted as singular, pointing to the corporate attitude in the communal worship of God, whilst the plural ὑμῶν denotes the various community members. Hence, καρδία is not employed as the distributive singular.

Turner’s final example of the distributive singular occurs in Eph 6:5. This is an exhortation to the slaves, Oi δούλοι ... τρόμου ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδιάς ὑμῶν ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ. The feminine noun, ἀπλοτης, means sincere,\(^{151}\) and the term relating to this noun, ἀπλοῦς and ἀπολῶ, notably connote “singleness.”\(^{152}\) Therefore, ἀπλοτης possibly connotes “singled heart.”\(^{153}\) The usage of καρδία seems to denote the attitude of Christian slaves towards their masters, which should be the same ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ. In other words, their “singled heart” towards their masters should resemble that to Christ. Hence, the singular καρδία can be used to illustrate the corporate attitude of Christian slaves towards their masters and the Lord.

\(^{149}\) For MacDonald, the context of 5:18 relates to the “manifestations of the Spirit in the midst of the community.” MacDonald, 318. According to Muddiman, the context “implies corporate worship and interaction with other Christians.” Muddiman, 248.

\(^{150}\) MacDonald argues that this verse centres on the community, with “psalms” pointing to the “Jewish liturgical materials.” MacDonald, 318. Best understands this as the Ephesians worshipping together. Best, Ephesians, 510–1. Barth describes the Ephesians as the “celebrating community.” Barth, 4–6, 604.

\(^{151}\) BDAG, 85–6.

\(^{152}\) BDAG, 86.

\(^{153}\) According to Barth, the noun literally means “singleness.” Barth, 4–6, 757. Hoehner shares a similar view, suggesting that the prepositional phrase should be rendered as “in singleness of your heart.” Hoehner, 807.
Overall, this analysis indicates that the occurrence of καρδία in the abnormal singular construct is not necessarily a distributive singular, as suggested by Turner’s examples. Instead, καρδία can denote a corporate mindset or attitude towards God. This shows that καρδία in the abnormal singular construct occurs in a specific pattern to depict the corporate attitude of the Ephesian believers towards God, the unbelieving Gentiles towards God, or slaves towards master. In Chapter 5, an analysis of καρδία in Romans also reveals in a similar pattern.

Moreover, καρδία appears in the normal plural construct in Eph 3:17 and 6:22. Regarding 3:17, καρδία occurs in a prayer (3:16–19): κατοικήσας τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ύμῶν. Here, καρδία denotes the inner being, depicting the whole person rather than merely the mind. This is suggested in 3:16, with the strengthening of the τὸν ἐσω ἀνθρώποι. Thus, καρδία connotes the inner being in which Christ dwells. In this normal plural construct, the focus is on the heart of each individual. Best notes that the dwelling of Christ, depicted in 3:17, refers to the individual aspect rather than the corporate aspect as in 2:22. In 6:22, Tychicus is sent to the Ephesians so that παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ύμῶν. The usage of καρδία should not be narrowly understood as denoting the mind. Instead, καρδία denotes the inner being, depicting the whole person being encouraged by Tychicus. Thus, the meaning of καρδία in Eph 3:15 and 6:22 is different from that in Eph 1:18;

154 For Hoehner, καρδία in 3:17 denotes “inner person.” Hoehner, 481. In addition, Barth argues that the meaning of καρδία is not limited to “reason, will, and decision, but also the hidden quality of a Christian’s existence. Barth, 1–3, 370.

155 O’Brien and Mittonhis view, and argue that the inner person in 3:16 is equivalent to the heart in 3:17. O’Brien, Ephesians, 258; Mitton, 132.

156 Best, Ephesians, 341.

157 MacDonald also argues that καρδία in 6:22 does not merely denote emotion, and instead, καρδία denotes the centre of thought and emotion, pointing to believers “as a whole.” MacDonald, 351. Conversely, Hoehner argues that καρδία connotes “feelings and emotions.” Hoehner, 871.
4:18; 5:19; 6:5. *καρδία* in the abnormal singular construct appears to be a normal singular noun instead of a distributive singular noun. This study understands the term as deliberately employed in the abnormal construct to depict the corporate attitude of different groups regarding their attitude towards God.

In Turner’s study, the remaining examples of the abnormal construct in the authentic Pauline epistles are either the normal plural construct or the normal singular construct. Out of the 21 examples given by Turner regarding the occurrence of *καρδία* with a personal plural possessive pronoun, only three occur in the abnormal singular construct (Rom 1:21; 2 Cor 3:15; 2 Cor 6:11). A thorough analysis of these three abnormal singular constructs, to verify whether they are distributive singular, will be presented in Chapter 5.

### 2.3.2.1.2 Σωμα

Turner also presents *σώμα* as an example. The singular *σώμα* in the abnormal singular construct occurs only four times in the Pauline epistles: σώματος ἴμων (Rom 8:23; 2 Cor 4:10) and σώμα ἴμων (1 Cor 6:19, 20). Turner also gives two examples of *σώμα* with the normal plural construct (1 Cor 6:15; Eph 5:28). A brief examination of the four abnormal singular constructs, which Turner interprets as the distributive singular, is provided below.

In 2 Cor 4, Paul deliberately contrasts ἴματι and ἴμείς as exemplified in 4:12:

\[ \textit{ώστε ὁ θάνατος ἐν ἴματι ἐνεργεῖται, ἢ δὲ ζωή ἐν ἴμείς.} \]

The repeated use of first person plural verbs in 4:1–15, however, likely denotes the apostle himself. Describing

---

Nonetheless, the total occurrence of this combination should be five: σώματα ἀυτῶν (Rom 1:24) and σώματα ἴμων (Rom 8:11; 12:1; 1 Cor 6:15; Eph 5:28). The combination of a singular σώμα and a singular personal possessive pronoun occurs three times in the Pauline epistles: σώμα μου (1 Cor 13:3) and σώματί μου (Gal 6:1; Phil 1:20).
his ministry, Paul lists his various sufferings and distresses including the description in 4:10: πάντοτε τήν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφεροντες, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν φανερωθῇ. Within this context, the abnormal singular construct occurs, τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν. Paul concludes his description in 4:15, stating that the ministry is for the sake of the Corinthians, τὰ γὰρ πάντα ὑμᾶς. The inclusion of “we” and first person plural verbs throughout seemingly function as an epistolary plural. While the plural can refer to a group of people, it can also denote the apostle. Some major scholars do not mention the epistolary plural, and commonly regard this passage, including 4:12, as a portrayal of the apostle’s sole experience. 159

In summary, τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν in 4:10 can be explained by the distributive singular, pointing to each of the bodies belonging to a group of ministers. However, the plural ἡμῶν can also be an epistolary plural given the context, wherein the singular σώμα refers to Paul.

In Rom 8:18–25, Paul discusses the future eschatological glory and virtue of patience. In 8:23, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν, depicts the eventual hope for believers. The singular form of σώμα is likely to be a distributive singular, denoting the physical body, which is also a common argument among scholars. 160

159 For example, while Harris argues that 4:1 is a depiction of Paul and his “fellow ministers,” he explains that 4:1–15 wholly concerns the experience of Paul not his “fellow ministers.” Harris, 322–57. Martin also suggests that 4:7–18, 4:12 in particular, refers to Paul’s “apostolic labor” and “missionary service.” Martin, Corinthians, 87. Lambrecht also regards 4:12 as the experience of Paul who “speaks only of himself.” Lambrecht, 74. Many other commentators, including Barnett, Bruce, Barrett, Thrall, and Roetzel, similarly interpret this passage as concerning Paul’s own apostolic ministry. Barnett, 229–32; Bruce, Corinthians, 198; Barrett, Second Corinthians, 141; Thrall, 1:321; Roetzel, 71–2. However, contrary to the majority of scholars, Furnish argues that the portrayal in 4:7–18 concerns Paul and his associates. The problem with this is that the passage specifically focuses on Paul’s apostolic ministry, and therefore the experience portrayed in 4:7–15 is uniquely Paul’s. Furnish, Corinthians, 279.

160 Byrne links Rom 8:23 back to 8:11, suggesting that σώμα denotes the “mortal bodies” or physical bodies. Dunn and Moo understand 8:23 as elucidating the future resurrected bodies and the transformed bodies respectively. Byrne, 246, 265; Dunn, Romans 1:491; Moo, Romans, 521.
The singular use of σῶμα in 1 Cor 6:19–20 is not the distributive singular. Instead, the singular usage points to the corporate dimension of the Corinthian community. A careful analysis of σῶμα ὑμῶν in 1 Cor 6:19–20 will be presented in Chapter 3.

Overall, Turner’s examples of καρδία and σῶμα cannot conclusively demonstrate the distributive singular in the Pauline epistles, and the abnormal singular construct can be alternatively understood. Although Paul uses the distributive singular, he uses it sparingly as demonstrated by the examples of καρδία and σῶμα. Since the abnormal construct is not a regular Pauline usage, this study proposes that Paul employs it purposefully to convey a particular point, rather using these randomly and arbitrarily. This will be further explored in this study.

2.3.2.2 Nouns Depicting Body Parts

Given that all the examples provided by Turner are nouns depicting various body parts (καρδία, κεφαλή, ὀδύφος, σῶμα, and ἀείρ), it is important to further investigate the abnormal singular construct with a noun depicting a body part in the Pauline epistles. These include κεφαλή, πρόσωπον, οὖς, λάρυγξ, ὀφθαλμός, στόμα, ἀείρ, νῶτος, and ποὺς. Six of these nouns appear in the normal plural construct: ποὺς (Rom 3:15; 16:20), ὀφθαλμός (Rom 3:18; 11:10; Gal 4:15), and ἀείρ (1 Thess 4:11). Four of these nouns appear in the abnormal singular construct: πρόσωπον (1 Thess 2:17), στόμα (2 Cor 6:11), λάρυγξ (Rom 3:13), and νῶτος (Rom 11:10). These four occurrences are examined below, to ascertain whether they are examples of the distributive singular.

161 As noted, only καρδία, ὀδύφος, and σῶμα appear as examples of the distributive singular in the Pauline epistles.
First, πρόσωπον almost always appears in singular form in the NT: 76 times, including only eight in plural form. Of these eight, four are in the normal plural construct, πρόσωπα αὐτῶν (Matt 6:16; Rev 7:11; 9:7; 11:16). As such, πρόσωπον nearly always occurs in singular form in the Pauline epistles, with one abnormal singular construct in 1 Thess 2:17. This passage depicts Paul’s longing to visit the Thessalonians: τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν ἰδεῖν ἐν πολλῇ ἑπτημίᾳ. This noun can be understood as a distributive singular, pointing to Paul’s desire to see each of the faces of the Thessalonians. However, the singular noun can also be understood as metaphorical. For example, πρόσωπον depicts the Thessalonian community (indicated by the singular in number), which comprises many members (indicated by the plural ὑμῶν). Therefore, τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν highlights the apostle’s desire to visit the community.

Second, the noun στόμα occurs in 2 Cor 6:11: τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν ἀνέψυχεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Κορίνθιοι, ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτυνται. Paul expresses his emotion and love for the Corinthians using the parallel terms, τὸ στόμα and ἡ καρδία. The plural ἡμῶν is commonly understood as an epistolary plural. The use of ἡμῶν, in light

---

162 Green claims that unlike σῶμα and καρδία, πρόσωπον always appears in the singular, in phrases like “they fell upon their face,” with only a few exceptions in Revelation. Green, Grammar, 202.

163 The plural form of πρόσωπον also occurs in Luke 24:5; 2 Cor 1:11; Jude 1:16.

164 πρόσωπον occurs 21 times in the Pauline epistles, with only one plural construct in 2 Cor 1:11: ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων. In this phrase, the term is clearly constrained by its modifier, πολλῶν, an adjective in plural form. In other words, grammatically speaking, πρόσωπον needs to acquire a plural form on this occasion.

165 Green highlights the unique usage of the term in 1 Thess 2:17. Green, Grammar, 202.
of the context, points to Paul himself, who defends his apostleship. As such, στόμα in this abnormal singular construct is not a distributive singular.\(^{166}\)

Third, the noun λάρυγξ appears in Rom 3:13: τάφος ἀνεψημένα ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν. This phrase is a direct quotation from Ps 5:10 in the LXX.\(^{167}\) However, the construct in 3:13 is not Pauline, and thus cannot be used to illustrate Paul’s literary style. Paul’s heavy quotation of the OT in Romans and Galatians is well known in the scholarship. The quotations do not always exactly agree with the texts in the LXX, as sometimes Paul simply approximates the original text.\(^{168}\) Nonetheless, in terms of this phrase, Paul could have corrected the construct and presented a normal construct. However, Paul arguably retains the abnormal construct to highlight the sinful attitude (indicated by the singular λάρυγξ) of the group (indicated by the plural αὐτῶν).\(^{169}\)

Finally, νῦν in Rom 11:10 is the singular noun. This passage, illustrated by καθός γέγραπται (11:8a), is also a direct quotation from Ps 68:24 in the LXX.\(^{170}\) Therefore, similarly this construct is not indicative and may not be a good illustration of Paul’s literary style.

\(^{166}\) Various scholars wholly view 2 Cor 6:11 as a description of Paul’s relationship with the Corinthians, which supports the use of an epistolary plural. Barnett, 335; Barrett, Second Corinthians, 191–2; Bruce, Corinthians, 213; Lambrecht, 117; Martin, 2 Corinthians, 185, Thrall, 468–9; Matera, Corinthians, 160–1; Best, Corinthians, 63–4; Keener, 190–1; Roetzel, 86–7; Watson, Second Corinthians, 73; Harris, 487–8. However, Furnish argues that the phrase “our hearts” refers to Paul and his associates. Furnish, II Corinthians, 369–70.

\(^{167}\) This phrase is Ps 5:9 in modern English versions.


\(^{169}\) Moyise summarises the different viewpoints of the LXX quotations in the Pauline epistles. He argues that the usage is best comprehended by referring to different viewpoints, although some may be “more illuminating than others.” Steve Moyise, “Quotations,” in As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture (SBLSymS 50; Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 15–28.

\(^{170}\) This phrase is Ps 69:23 in modern English versions.
In summary, in the Pauline epistles, there are four occurrences of the abnormal singular construct with a noun depicting a body part. Two nouns are direct quotations from the LXX (λάρυγξ and νότος), and may not be considered authentic illustrations of Paul’s literary style. πρόσωπον can be understood as a distributive singular, or as a singular noun used in a metaphorical sense, pointing to “one” community, the corporate entity. Finally, the combination of στόμα with ἡμῶν is to be interpreted as an epistolary plural.

2.3.2.3 Abnormal Singular Construct with Concrete Nouns

In the Pauline epistles, there are 182 occurrences of the abnormal singular construct. As noted, although rare, this construct does occur with abstract nouns in Greek literature. The examination in this section, or this thesis as a whole, focuses on concrete nouns in this construct in the Pauline epistles. To effectively conduct this examination, first, all abstract words are excluded from the 182 occurrences (including ἐλπίς, ἔλευθερία, and δόξα). Second, the nouns depicting body parts (including πρόσωπον, στόμα, λάρυγξ, and νότος, as previously examined) and the anthropological terms (including σῶμα, πυρήνη, πνεῦμα, σάρξ, καρδία, νοῦς, σύνειδησίς, and ἐσω ἀνθρώπος, to be examined later), are also excluded. These exclusions reduce the occurrences of the abnormal singular construct to 32. Of these

171 The excluded abstract nouns are: ἀγάπη, ἀγιασμός, ἀδεια, ἀισχύνη, ἀκοή, ἀκρασία, ἀπίστια, ἀπλότης, ἀποβολή, ἀσθένεια, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιώμας, δοκιμή, δόξα, εἰσοδος, ἐκλογή, ἐλευθερία, ἐλπίς, ἐξουσία, εὐαγγέλιον, εὐλογία, ἠττημα, θλίψις, ἱκανότης, καθαίρεσις, κανών, καρπός, καύχημα, καύχησις, κηρύγμα, κλήμας, κοινωνία, κόπος, λατρεία, μιακαρισμός, μέσος, μνεία, νουθεσία, οικολογία, οἰκόλογος, ὁμολογία, ὄρεξις, παιδοφυγία, παράκλησις, παράπτωμα, πάσχα, πειρασμός, πίστις, πλάνη, πλήρωμα, προθεωμα, πτωχεία, σοφία, στρατηγεία, ταπείνωσις, θάνατος, χάρα, χάρις, and χρεία. καρπός is included in this list, since it is used figuratively in Paul’s work (instead of elucidating edible fruit). The singular form of all the above nouns occur in combination with a plural personal possessive pronoun. There are only two occurrences in which their plural form combines with a plural personal possessive pronoun: Rom 4:25 and 2 Cor 5:19 (παράπτωμα). In addition, terms for God and the Lord, θεός and κύριος, are also excluded.
32, there are 22 occurrences with a noun that clearly depicts a singular object, including πατρός ἡμῶν (to describe θεὸς in Rom 1:7; 9:10; 1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Gal 1:3; or Ἀβραάμ in Rom 4:12); προπάτορα ἡμῶν (to describe Ἀβαάμ in Rom 4:1); ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν (to denote Φοίβη in Rom 16:1); συνεργόν ἡμῶν (to denote Οὐρβανός in Rom 16:9); συνεργῶ ἡμῶν (to describe Φίλήμων in Phlm 1:1); ἀδελχυὸν ἡμῶν (to denote Τίτος in 2 Cor 8:22; 1 Thess 3:2); συνέκδημος ἡμῶν (to denote Σάρρα in Gal 4:26); and συστρατιώτη ἡμῶν (to denote Ἀρχιππος in Phlm 1:2). The remaining 12 occurrences require close examination, including τράπεζα αὐτῶν (Rom 11:9), οἶκον αὐτῶν (Rom 16:5, 1 Cor 16:19), λόγος ἡμῶν (2 Cor 1:18), ἐπιστολή ἡμῶν (2 Cor 3:2), οἰκητήριον ἡμῶν (2 Cor 5:2), σπόρον ύμων (2 Cor 9:10), παιδαγωγός ἡμῶν (Gal 3:24), ἔχθρος ύμων (Gal 4:16), λόγον ύμων (Phil 4:17), ὠδὸν ἡμῶν (1 Thess 3:11), and ἔργον αὐτῶν (1 Thess 5:13). This examination will show that only one of these occurrences can be identified as the distributive singular.

In Rom 11:9, the phrase τράπεζα αὐτῶν is a direct quotation from Ps 68:23–24 in the LXX, and τράπεζα is a metaphor. Thus, this is arguably not Pauline.\(^{172}\) Both Rom 16:5 and 1 Cor 16:19 use οἶκον to portray the church gathered in a house. The word is not a distributive singular denoting many houses. In 2 Cor 1:15–18, Paul discusses his original plan and desire to visit the Corinthians despite a failed attempt. Responding to his unsuccessful attempt, in 1:17b, he asks a rhetorical question (ὅ ἂν βουλεύομαι κατὰ σάρκα βουλεύομαι, ἵνα ἂν παρ᾿ ἐμοῖ τὸ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὐ;), and in 1:18 expresses his thought (πιστῶ δὲ ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ὁ πρὸς ὑμᾶς

---

\(^{172}\) This phrase is Ps 69:22–23 in modern English versions. In the LXX, the phrase ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν is replaced by καὶ εἰς θήραν.
οὐκ ἐστὶν ναὶ καὶ οὐ). Thus, λόγος is not a distributive singular, and instead, ἡμῶν can be interpreted as an epistolary plural, pointing to the Paul himself. In 2 Cor 3:2, ἐπιστολή ἡμῶν is a metaphor in the clause: ἡ ἐπιστολή ἡμῶν ὑμεῖς ἐστε. Hence, ἐπιστολή is not a distributive singular. In 2 Cor 5:2, οἰκητήριον is also a metaphor, portraying the heavenly dwelling that is built by God. The phrase οἰκητήριον ἡμῶν does not denote a concrete object (in this case, a literal house), and therefore is not a distributive singular. In 2 Cor 9:10, Paul uses seed sowing as a metaphor to discuss offering. The phrase χορηγήσει καὶ πληθυνεῖ τὸν σπόρον ἡμῶν describes God’s gracious provision. Nonetheless, σπόρον never occurs in plural form in the NT. Therefore, it is unlikely that σπόρον is a distributive singular. In Gal 3:24, ὁ νόμος is portrayed as παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν. παιδαγωγὸς is not a distributive singular. In Gal 4:16, Paul questions the Galatians (ὡστε ἐχθρός ἡμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ἡμῖν;). The word ἐχθρός is a normal singular noun, pointing to Paul himself. In Phil 4:17, λόγον ἡμῶν should be translated as “your account”173 in the following clause: οὐχ ὧτι ἐπιζητῶ τὸ δόμα, ἀλλὰ ἐπιζητῶ τὸν καρπὸν τὸν πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ἡμῶν. Paul does not discuss individual accounts, and instead indicates a communal benefit.174 Thus, the word λόγος is not a distributive singular. In 1 Thess 3:11, Paul expresses a wish: ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Paul does not mention the “ways” that he and his associates take, and therefore ὁδὸν does not denote a distributive singular. In 1 Thess 5:13, Paul teaches the Thessalonians to respect those who labour among them: καὶ ἤγείσθαι αὐτοῖς

173 BDAG, 478.

174 As previously mentioned in Turner’s examples, the singular noun points to the corporate and communal reference of a community. In this example, the singular λόγος perhaps points to the corporate dimension of the Philippians.
The noun *τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν* is seemingly a distributive singular, depicting their “works.” Nevertheless, the argument that *ἔργον* is a concrete noun representing a concrete object is debatable.

In summary, only one concrete noun in the abnormal singular construct is identified as a distributive singular: *τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν* (1 Thess 5:13). However, the interpretation of *ἔργον* as a concrete noun is debatable. Therefore, the abnormal singular construct with a concrete noun is extremely rare in the Pauline epistles. Furthermore, the singular concrete noun in the abnormal singular construct seemingly denotes corporate and relational dimensions of the community, as illustrated by *λόγον ὑμῶν* (Phil 4:17).

### 2.3.2.4 Anthropological Terms

In the Pauline epistles, there are 15 occurrences of the abnormal singular construct, which combines an anthropological term and a plural personal possessive pronoun. Previous analysis has shown that the abnormal singular construct with a concrete noun (including nouns depicting body parts) is rare in the Pauline epistles. Some of these nouns are possibly classified as the distributive singular, and some can be understood as highlighting the commonality, singleness, corporate, or communal dimensions of a group. However, overall, the distributive singular is seemingly not a regular Pauline grammatical construct. Therefore, it is unpersuasive and ungrounded to automatically designate the 15 occurrences of a singular anthropological noun in an abnormal singular construct as the distributive singular.

Following is an investigation of the anthropological terms that are combined with a plural personal possessive pronoun. These terms include *σῶμα, καρδία,*
Table 2.1 presents an overview of the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Singular term with a plural personal possessive pronoun</th>
<th>Plural term with a plural personal possessive pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Occurrence: 15</td>
<td>Total Occurrence: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σώμα</td>
<td>Occurrence: 4</td>
<td>Occurrence: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom 8:23; 1 Cor 6:19, 20; 2 Cor 4:10</td>
<td>Rom 1:24; 8:11; 12:1; 1 Cor 6:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψυχή</td>
<td>Occurrence: 0</td>
<td>Occurrence: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Cor 12:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πνεῦμα</td>
<td>Occurrence: 4</td>
<td>Occurrence: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom 8:16; Gal 6:18; Phil 4:23; Phlm 1:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καρδία</td>
<td>Occurrence: 2</td>
<td>Occurrence: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Cor 3:15; 6:11</td>
<td>Rom 1:24; 2:15; 5:5; 2 Cor 1:22; 3:2; 4:6; 7:3; Gal 4:6; Phil 4:7; 1 Thess 2:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σάρξ</td>
<td>Occurrence: 3</td>
<td>Occurrence: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom 6:19; 2 Cor 4:11; 7:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νοῦς</td>
<td>Occurrence: 0</td>
<td>Occurrence: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνείδησις</td>
<td>Occurrence: 2</td>
<td>Occurrence: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Cor 8:7; 2 Cor 1:12</td>
<td>2 Cor 5:11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For σώμα, previous analysis demonstrated that of the four occurrences of this term in the abnormal singular construct, only the one in Rom 8:23 can be interpreted as a distributive singular. In 2 Cor 4:12, the personal noun is an epistolary plural. In 1 Cor 6:19–20, two occurrences denote a community rather than an individual physical body, which will be further examined in Chapter 4.

For καρδία, three occurrences of this term in the abnormal singular construct (Rom 1:21; 2 Cor 3:15; 2 Cor 6:11), will be thoroughly examined in Chapter 5.
For πυείμα, there are four occurrences of this term in the abnormal singular construct. Three of the four occurrences are in Pauline benedictions (Gal 6:18; Phil 4:23; Phlm 1:25), and will be discussed in Chapter 6.

For σάρξ and συνείδησις, the five occurrences of these terms in the abnormal singular construct are briefly analysed below. Although these two anthropological terms are beyond the scope of this study, they shed light on the subject of the distributive singular.

In Rom 6:19, σάρξ appears in an abnormal singular construct. During his discussion on sin, Paul utters: Ἰνθρωπίνων λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν. In this context, σάρξ cannot be interpreted as a distributive singular, elucidating the “fleshes” (meats) of the Romans. Instead, the term is likely to be a metaphor for human limitation or human weakness, as argued by many scholars.175

In 2 Cor 4:11, at first glance, the term is seemingly a distributive singular. The phrase τῇ θυτητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν occurs in the clause: ἀεὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἐστὶ διὰ θάνατον παραδιδόμεθα διὰ Ἰησοῦν, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ψωῇ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ φανερωθῇ ἐν τῇ θυτητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν. The plural pronoun can depict Paul and his associates, and the singular σάρξ is a distributive singular. Nonetheless, the context of 4:1–18 concerns the suffering and distress endured by Paul during his apostolic ministry for the sake of the Corinthians (marked by his statement in 4:15, τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι’ ὑμᾶς). The majority of scholars regard the experience portrayed in 4:7–15 as the apostle’s own experience.176 Therefore, the use of “we” in 4:12 and first person plural verbs in the

175 Human weakness is specified by different scholars as “intellectual difficulty” (Bryne), “inadequacy of human perception” (Dunn), “weakness in understanding” (Moo), “failure to understand” (Jewett), and “weak human nature” (Fitzmyer). Byrne, 206; Dunn, Romans, 345; Moo, Romans, 403–4; Jewett, Romans, 420; Fitzmyer, Romans, 450.

176 See footnote 159 on page 54.
whole segment are likely to be an epistolary plural, pointing to Paul himself. As such, the singular σάρξ is not a distributive singular. Even if the plural pronouns points to Paul and his associates, the singular σάρξ is not necessarily a distributive singular either. This can portray the common weakness shared by the Paul and his associates.

In 2 Cor 7:5, σάρξ does not appears as a distributive singular: Καὶ γὰρ ἐλθόντων ἡμῶν εἰς Μακεδονίαν οὐδεμίαν ἐσχήκεν ἀνεσιν ὡς σάρξ ἡμῶν ἀλλ’ ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι. The identity of ἡμῶν is problematic. If the pronoun (and first person verb) denotes the visit of a group to Macedonia, including Paul, then ἡ σάρξ ἡμῶν is a distributive singular construct that refers to the exhausted physical bodies of the visitors. However, as otherwise suggested Paul is the focus of 7:1–16, whereby the apostle is comforted by the later coming of Titus (7:6). The plural pronouns and first personal plural verbs are epistolary plurals, pointing to Paul himself. Thus, σάρξ is not a distributive singular depicting the bodies.

In 2 Cor 1:12, συνείδησις is also not necessarily a distributive singular, given that the phrase τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνείδησεως ἡμῶν denotes Paul himself. The first person plural pronouns and the first personal plural verbs in 1:3–12 point to Paul, and hence, the term in 1:12 is not a distributive singular.

In 1 Cor 8:7, συνείδησις is the only distributive singular anthropological term. In discussing idol worship, Paul comments on the practice of offering food to idols by former idol worshippers: τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἔως ἄρτι τού εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἔστιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἄσθενής ὡς ἀριστεύει. The phrase ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν clearly identifies former idol worshippers. The singular συνείδησις is not a collective singular, and instead is a distributive singular, pointing to the consciences of the former idol worshippers.
Overall, out of the five occurrences of σάρξ and συνείδησις, only συνείδησις in 1 Cor 8:7 is likely to be a distributive singular noun.

2.3.3 Conclusion

In summary, the best explanation regarding the 15 occurrences of the abnormal singular construct with anthropological terms in the Pauline epistles is not always the distributive singular. As previously stated, the abnormal singular construct with concrete nouns (including nouns depicting body parts and anthropological terms) is rare in the Pauline epistles. Some of these singular nouns, employed by Paul, can be understood as alluding to the commonality, singleness, corporate, or communal dimension of a group. Given that Paul could employ the normal plural construct or the abnormal singular construct with his anthropological terms, the pertinent question is whether the apostle uses the abnormal construct purposefully to convey a particular point, rather than randomly or without reason. The possibility of a random usage seems unlikely given the rare occurrence of this abnormal construct in Paul’s work. As such, this study intends to ascertain the nuance of this rare usage. Building on the above analysis, the following chapters in this study will examine certain occurrences of the abnormal singular construct with Paul’s anthropological terms. In the following part, a research method that aims to overcome some of the deficiencies of previous scholarship is presented.

2.4 Research Approach: The Basic Principles of Discourse Analysis

As previously discussed, recent studies addressing Paul’s anthropological terms have largely failed to fully attend to James Barr’s comments and criticism about the best method for determining semantic meaning. Given their limitations, there is a need to
formulate a sound research approach that carefully attends to the following key proposals. The first key proposal is that biblical semantic study must follow the modern science of linguistics, applying sound linguistic principles in conducting semantic study. The second key proposal is the importance of adopting the synchronic approach, and examining the textual context and the wider context. Barr emphasises the importance of treating the sentence as the linguistic bearer of a word’s semantic meaning, and the importance of attending to the “larger literary complex,” the whole discourse. This study, therefore, applies some basic principles of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is a method in the field of linguistics that investigates what Barr calls the “larger literary complex.”

2.4.1 Discourse Analysis: A Summary

In what follows will initially define the concepts of discourse and discourse analysis, then elucidate the connection between discourse analysis and NT studies, and finally identify the key features of discourse analysis relevant to this semantic study. After this overview, the research approach used to examine Paul’s anthropological terms will be formulated, based on the principles of discourse analysis.

2.4.1.1 Discourse

A discourse is “the entirety of the author’s communication to his or her audience.” Reed also states that a discourse “represents the largest linguistic level of communication.”

In the field of linguistics, a discourse can be broadly defined as anything “beyond the
sentence,”178 from a structural unit,179 to an entire written or oral text, to “any aspect of language use.”180

In particular, written discourse comprises various grammatical elements, including grapheme, word, clause, sentence, and paragraph.181 For example, a narrative containing many paragraphs is a single discourse, as is a letter comprising various elements. Hence, a discourse is a combination of paragraphs or a complete speech, or as Barr depicts the “larger literary complex.” In this study, a discourse is considered an entire written or oral text that comprises various structural units, which is communicated by an author to his or her audience.182

---


179 In this study, a structural unit is called a semantic unit. A unit is the grouping of sentences by an author to express a theme or a topic. A more detailed explanation of a semantic unit is provided later.


181 Reed, Discourse, 43–5. Based on the definition of discourse in this study, a paragraph can be a single semantic unit or part of a semantic unit (which contains more than one paragraph).

182 While this study adopts Reed’s definition, examples by other linguists do not necessarily follow this definition. For example, Terry suggests that 1 Corinthians contains ten “discourses”: (A) Church division 1:10–4:17; (B) Fornication 4:18–6:20; (C) Marriage 7; (D) Idol food 8:1–11:1; (E) Head coverings 11:2–16; (F) The Lord’s Supper 11:17–34; (G) Spiritual gifts 12–14; (H) The Resurrection 15; (I) Contribution 16:1–11; and (J) Apollos 16:12. Terry treats each structural unit as one discourse. However, this study would identify 1 Corinthians as one entire discourse, and the ten “discourses” as ten “semantic units.” Ralph Bruce Terry, A Discourse Analysis of First Corinthians (Dallas: SIL and The University of Texas at Arlington, 1995), 38–43.
2.4.1.2 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis originated as a method in the field of general linguistics,\textsuperscript{183} and is employed by linguists to investigate a written or oral text.\textsuperscript{184} Discourse analysis is the thorough examination of the structure and the pragmatics of a text, extending from the sentence to the entire discourse. There are four major schools of thought regarding discourse analysis: the North American model, the English and Australian model, the Continental European model, and the South African model.\textsuperscript{185} Stanley Porter suggests that the differentiation of these schools is not clear-cut since “there is more

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{184} Some scholars, such as Porter, focus on a written text. Porter, “Discourse,” 17. Others focus on an oral text. For example, for Beaugrande discourse analysis is the study of conversation. Robert-Alain de Beaugrande and Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler, \textit{Introduction to Text Linguistics} (London and New York: Longman, 1983), 19.
  \item \textsuperscript{185} Porter provides a detailed discussion of these four schools, as well as the key linguists in each school and their publications. Porter, “Discourse,” 24–35. The North American model is represented by the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL). This model is influenced by the works of some famous linguists, including Robert Longacre, Kenneth Pike, and Sydney Lamb. This model focuses on “the principle of levels and layers of language, proceeding from … the smallest parts of the language (whether phonetically or morphologically) to increasingly larger structures. Porter, “Discourse,” 25. The English and Australian model is represented by M. Halliday and R. Hasan. This model is influenced by J. R. Firth, a leading British linguist in the 1940s, and professor of General Linguistics at the University of London. Firth regards language as a “a social semiotic consisting of networks of systems.” A discourse consists of “four categories of structure: experiential, interpersonal, logical and textual,” and each category has “a number of networks of choices that are realized in the phenomena of the language.” Porter, “Discourse,” 28. The Continental European model draws on the works of several linguists, including Robert Beaugrande, Wolfgang Dressler, Elizabeth G"ulich, Wolfgang Raible, Tuen A. van Dijk, R. Jacobson, and C. Perelman. This model addresses “the macro-structure” of text, leading to an examination of “syntax, semantics and pragmatics.” Porter, “Discourse,” 30. The South African model is represented by J. P. Louw and A. B. du Toit. This emphasises the method of “colon analysis.” As described, a colon is “a unit that is formed around a nominative and predicative structure. These cola are first isolated and then their interconnections are re-established in diagrammatic form, illustrating the semantic relations among them as increasingly larger semantic units are formed.” Porter, “Discourse,” 32–3.
\end{itemize}
commonality in methods than has been realized.”186 In addition, some scholars apply more than one school of thought in their work.187

Although there are various definitions of discourse analysis, there are three aspects commonly identified. Discourse analysis focuses on examining “(1) anything beyond the sentence, (2) language use, and (3) a broader range of social practice that includes nonlinguistic and nonspecific instances of language.”188 Jeffrey Reed defines discourse analysis as “a sub-discipline of modern linguistics that seeks to understand the relationships between language, discourse, and situational context in human communication.”189 Porter offers a succinct description, stating that discourse analysis can “provide as comprehensive a description as possible of the various components of a given discourse, including its meaning and structure, and the means by which these are created and conveyed.”190 He argues that discourse analysis is a method that attempts to coherently integrate three areas of linguistic analysis: “semantics, concerned with the conveyance of meaning through the forms of the language; syntax, concerned with the organization of these forms into meaningful units; and pragmatics, concerned with the meanings of these forms in specific linguistic context (“what

188 Schiffrin, Tanner, and Hamilton, Handbook, 1.
speakers mean when they use the form’). Thus, this study will gather these three areas into its structural and pragmatic analyses.

### 2.4.1.3 Discourse Analysis and NT Studies

The connection between discourse analysis and NT studies stems from the work of North American linguists in the area of NT translation, in the 1950s and 1960s. They recognised the importance of going beyond the sentential level of a text, in order to thoroughly understand the context. Kenneth Pike, a prominent linguist of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), emphasised the application of discourse analysis in the linguistic field work of Bible translation. Hence, SIL has been using discourse analysis in their training and projects for many years. However, their work is not well known in wider NT scholarship, perhaps due to the tendency to publish

---

192 Bodine, Discourse, 3–4.
193 Bodine, Discourse, 3.
work within their own organisation. For example, SIL has published a series on the discourse analysis of different NT books.\(^{195}\)

Although discourse analysis is a relatively new method in NT studies, there are a number of NT scholars who discuss or apply it in their work. These scholars include, but are not limited to, Birger Olsson, Jean Calloud, Wolfgang Schenk, J. P. Louw, Bruce Johanson, George Guthrie, Jeffrey Reed, Moisés Silva, David Black, Stanley Porter, Cynthia Westfall, Mark Boda, Joel Green, Jae Hyun Lee, and Steven 

Nonetheless, many NT scholars are reluctant to apply discourse analysis in their work partly due to the perception that “discourse analysis is something difficult to get a handle on and therefore difficult to use.”

2.4.2 Key Features of Discourse Analysis

The above explanation of discourse analysis identifies different schools of thought, and complex concepts and definitions. In this study, three key features of discourse analysis inform the examination of Paul’s anthropological terms. These features do not thoroughly represent the conceptual principles of discourse analysis, and instead are the synthesis of some basic principles. These three features are: scope, structure, and pragmatics.

---


2.4.2.1 Scope

First, the wider context is taken into account when conducting linguistic analysis of a text. Fundamentally, the analysis of a text must go beyond the sentential level, from merely studying the morpheme, word, phrase, clause, or sentence to examining the paragraph and whole discourse. M. Halliday highlights that “the sentences are … the realization of text.”\(^\text{198}\) Hence, sentential analysis fails to grasp the meaning intended by the author for his or her audience because human communication transcends words, phrases, and sentences.\(^\text{199}\)

As previously discussed, Barr perceives the sentence as the bearer of semantic meaning, and in the post-Barr era, many scholars undertaking semantic study focused on sentential exegetical analysis. Barr also articulates the importance of the “larger literary complex” in semantic study. Therefore, an emphasis on examining the wider textual context, rather than only considering the immediate textual context, addresses Barr’s comments. Accordingly, a thorough semantic study must be conducted “beyond the sentence,” whereby the whole discourse, defined as “the entirety of the author’s communication to his or her audience,” is the intended scope. Therefore, in this study, the discourse scope refers to conducting linguistic and semantic analysis at the level of the whole discourse.

2.4.2.2 Structure

Although the whole discourse is the primary concern of discourse analysis, this can also be divided into smaller units. In this study, the discourse structure refers to the
identification, function, and correlation of these smaller units. Discourse structure
denotes the segmentation of a discourse, or “the pattern an author uses to organize
[the entire] text.” This structure can be conceptualised as follows. A discourse is a
cohesive text formed by linguistic cohesion. A discourse is composed of different, yet
cohesive, semantic units. Each semantic unit is formed by thematic grouping, and is
usually marked by one or more discourse markers. Together these units form a
coherent flow, through which the macrostructure can be identified. These concepts are
discussed further below.

2.4.2.2.1 Cohesion, coherence, and prominence

A discourse does not consist of randomly inserted sentences. Instead, a discourse
comprises sentences that are unified and connected through various grammatical and
lexical devices employed by the author. This connectedness is called cohesion. This
cohesion enables an audience to interpret different elements of a text and form “a
single overall mental representation.”

Andrej A. Kibrik, Reference in Discourse (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory;

Westfall, Discourse, 28.

Both Beaugrande and Renkema also use the term “cohesion.” Jan Renkema, Discourse Studies: An Introductory Textbook (Amsterdam: John
Benjamin, 1993), 35; Beaugrande, Linguistics, 48, 194. However, other linguists use other terms. For example, Reed uses the term “cohesiveness.” Reed, Discourse, 89.

employed by the author) leads to coherence (an overall mental representation formed by the reader).

Within a discourse, a sentence does not stand alone and is closely related to neighbouring and distant sentences. All sentences in a discourse, except the first one, are “forcibly constrained by” the preceding text.\(^{204}\) In other words, there is a cohesion that is crucial to the correct interpretation of a discourse. Some of the grammatical and lexical devices employed to achieve cohesion, include synonyms, parallels, inclusion, and chiasm. These contribute to the coherence of a discourse,\(^ {205}\) which is arguably “of central importance to discourse analysis.”\(^ {206}\)

One of the most important devices to achieve cohesion, and thus coherence, is prominence. Due to human limitations in processing information, it is easier for an audience to perceive something that stands out from its background. Prominence is the usage of linguistic devices to highlight and emphasise a point. One basic form of prominence is thematic repetition (thematic prominence), whereby the same theme is repeated.\(^ {207}\) A related form of prominence is lexical cohesion (lexical prominence),


\(^{205}\) There are at least three levels of coherence within a discourse: referential, situational, and structural. Referential coherence refers to the “sameness” of a particular textual element. Situational coherence refers to a consistent emotive tone in a semantic unit, characterised by the choice of words. For example, an author cannot be concurrently angry and happy, even though the successive units can display a change of tone. Structural coherence refers to the compatibility and correlation of different parts in a semantic unit, so that the reader can make sense of the text. John Beekman, John Callow and Michael Kopsesec, *The Semantic Structure of Written Communication* (Dallas: SIL, 1981), 21.


\(^{207}\) Wilbur Pickering, *A Framework for Discourse Analysis* (SIL Publications in Linguistics 64; Dallas: SIL, 1980), 40. A similar concept is redundancy, which is the use of multiple means to convey a point in a text. Pickering cites Halliday and argues that all forms of grammatical agreement lead to redundancy, which contributes to the linear cohesion of a text. Human limitation is believed to be the reason behind repetition. Humans can only process a limited amount of information in a linear sequence and repetition helps humans grasp the meaning of a lengthy text. Pickering, *Discourse Analysis*, 29–30.
whereby the same word or words conveying the same theme are repeated.\textsuperscript{208} The study of repetition at the textual level is well established in semantic study.

In summary, the usage of cohesive linguistic devices by an author (cohesion) leads to a coherent message, and one of the key devices to achieve this is prominence (thematic or lexical repetition).

To illustrate these concepts, John 15:5 is examined: \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμι ή ἄμπελος, ύμεις τὰ κλῆμαψα}. This passage is closely connected to preceding text. First, the expression \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμι} occurs 20 times before 15:5,\textsuperscript{209} which illustrates prominence. The author highlights \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμι} through lexical repetition (lexical cohesion). Second, the personal pronouns \textit{ἐγὼ} and \textit{ὑμεῖς} are related, given the implicit relationship between Jesus and his disciples portrayed in a previous context. Third, \textit{ἄμπελος} and \textit{κλῆμαψα} are compatible since they belong to a similar semantic domain.\textsuperscript{210} These three linguistic devices enable cohesion, which allows the audience to form a mental representation and perceive a coherent meaning.

Imagine this passage had been written as follows: \textit{εἰμι ή ἄμπελος, αὐτοῖ oί δέσμιοι (prisoners)}. The loss of cohesion would lead to the loss of coherence. First, the audience would not see the clear connection between \textit{εἰμι} and previous occurrences of \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμι}. Second, the audience would not identify or locate the personal pronoun \textit{αὐτοῖ}. Third, the audience would not recognise \textit{ἄμπελος} and

\textsuperscript{208} Halliday, \textit{Discourse}, 8. Halliday argues that when similar lexical items, with two or more occurrences, appear in close proximity in a discourse, these items possibly belong to the same lexical set. Halliday’s argument is a direct attack on the diachronic approach in semantic study, as he clearly points out that any lexical item is defined by its environment. Therefore, analysing a de-contextualized word by purely consulting a dictionary or grammar book will fail to rightly grasp its intended meaning. Halliday, \textit{Discourse}, 29.


\textsuperscript{210} The use of pronouns (a referential device) and compatible words facilitate a coherent message.
δέσμοι as compatible words. As a result, the audience would be unable to make sense of the text.\textsuperscript{211}

2.4.2.2.2 Thematic groupings, semantic units, and macrostructure

In addition to employing linguistic devices (cohesion), the author also usually groups sentences into units according to different themes (known as thematic groupings).\textsuperscript{212} As a result, a discourse can be divided into smaller semantic units.\textsuperscript{213} In other words, each unit contains a group of sentences that express a particular topic or theme, and these semantic units are cohesively connected to form the whole discourse.

A discourse usually contains a core message intended and communicated by the author for his or her audience (known as macrostructure).\textsuperscript{214} A macrostructure is the short summary that can be given by an audience member after engaging with a particular discourse. This term is also used by linguists for the summary of a theme portrayed in a semantic unit. For example, as previously mentioned, Terry’s discourse analysis of 1 Corinthians identifies ten discourse or semantic units in the epistle.\textsuperscript{215}

\textsuperscript{211} This is an example of structural coherence.

\textsuperscript{212} For example, in the English language, paragraphs can be used to achieve this thematic grouping. Dooley and Levinsohn, Discourse, 35–6.

\textsuperscript{213} As previously mentioned, semantic units are also called structural units. Louw, however, calls these colons. A colon is a unit with a nominative and predicate structure. These colons are first identified, grouped, and then examined to illustrate their place in a discourse. The underlying philosophy of colon analysis highlights the continuity of different linguistic units within a discourse. Louw provides various examples, including 1 Cor 12:4–11 and Rom 1:8–17, to demonstrate the structure of colons. J. P. Louw, Semantics of New Testament Greek (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982), 95–158. On the other hand, Porter uses “discourse sub-unit” to describe the “units that join together a number of paragraphs, to mark off sub-sections within a discourse.” Porter and Boda, Translating (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 120.

\textsuperscript{214} The concept of macrostructure is a key part in the Continental European model, and is also known as “global meaning.” According to Renkema, the concept is introduced by Dijk who adopts the approach of the Continental Europeans School and influences Longacre. Renkema, Discourse, 57.

\textsuperscript{215} For some linguists, such as Terry, “discourse” denotes a major semantic unit. However, in this study, discourse denotes the entire text and smaller units are called semantic units.
and he then articulates a macrostructure for each unit. The macrostructure of the seventh unit is as follows: “Seek spiritual gifts, especially prophecy, which builds up the church, but above all, show love.”

2.4.2.2.3 Discourse markers

A discourse, with a central macrostructure, contains various cohesive semantic units, and the boundaries of these units are marked by different linguistic devices. These devices are called discourse markers. These markers provide clues about the boundary of a semantic unit within a discourse and the specific relationship between different sentences. Notably, a discourse marker can indicate either the beginning or the end of a semantic unit due to their “anaphoric and cataphoric character.”

Some discourse markers include spatiotemporal changes, summary statements, rhetorical questions, vocatives, changes of cast, and changes of verb tense/mood/aspect. One of the most commonly used discourse markers are conjunctions.

---

216 Terry, *Corinthians*, 54.

217 Different models emphasise different discourse markers. Some use connective particles to mark a semantic unit, such as conjunctions, while others use conceptual elements. Blakemore suggests that no single category of discourse markers can be identified as absolute, and that it is futile to unify these because scholars are divided in their classification. Therefore, Blakemore discredits research on discourse makers as a class or category, but upholds research on different expressions that have been called discourse markers. Diane Blakemore, *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 99; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 185.

218 Schiffrin argues that a semantic unit, or in her words a “bracket,” refers “simultaneously forward and backward.” Therefore, discourse markers, which set the boundaries, can either mark the beginning or the end of a semantic unit. Schiffrin, *Discourse Marker*, 36–7.


220 Conjunctions can be considered a discourse marker because they imbue cohesion within the linear perspective of a discourse. Pickering, Discourse Analysis, 9, 34.
Steven Runge illustrates how different conjunctions function as discourse markers.\textsuperscript{221} For example, in Matt 2:1–10, δέ is used to mark the boundaries of this short narrative and the sub-units, including the introduction to the incident (2:1–2), Herod’s response (2:3–4), Herod’s inquiry (2:5–6), Herod’s instruction (2:7–8), and the response of the wise men (2:9–10).\textsuperscript{222}

2.4.2.2.4 Discourse flow
As previously discussed, different semantic units cohesively connect together to form a coherent discourse. Robert Longacre argues that a narrative discourse usually comprises a “plot,” whereby the discourse displays “progress” and shows “some sort of climatic development.”\textsuperscript{223} This plot development is also known as the flow of the discourse.\textsuperscript{224} This plot can be perceived by dividing a discourse into different stages of progression: aperture, stage, pre-peak episodes, peak, post-peak, closure, and finis.\textsuperscript{225}


\textsuperscript{222} Runge, \textit{Discourse}, 31–3.

\textsuperscript{223} Robert, E. Longacre, \textit{The Grammar of Discourse} (2d ed.; Topics in Language and Linguistics; New York: Plenum, 1983), 33. Longacre calls this “climatic development” the, “peak.”

\textsuperscript{224} In this study, plot progress is called the flow of the discourse (or discourse flow). Longacre, \textit{Discourse}, 38.

\textsuperscript{225} Longacre, \textit{Discourse}, 36. Aperture is a formulaic phrase or sentence, serving as an introduction. Stage is usually an expository paragraph or discourse which lays out the issue. The key theme of a discourse is developed through various episodes. Peak episode contains the climax of the discourse, which can sometimes be subdivided into “climax,” signifying of the very climax itself (usually with a conflict element in it), and “dénouement,” appearing after a resolution is offered right after the climax. Post-peak is the episode that follows peak. Closure is usually an expository paragraph, marking the end of the discourse. Finis is similar to aperture, a formulaic phrase or sentence. Longacre, \textit{Discourse}, 34–8.
Longacre defines the peak as “a zone of turbulence” that occurs at the climax of the narrative.\(^\text{226}\) The peak “is signified by a shift in the proportion of use of a particular grammatical device.”\(^\text{227}\) Importantly, Longacre argues that the peak also occurs in expository and hortatory discourses,\(^\text{228}\) and uses 1 John 4:7–21 to illustrate the “hortatory peak.”\(^\text{229}\)

Similarly, Terry argues that this flow also occurs in non-narrative texts, such as epistles. By using statistical models to analyse 1 Corinthians, Terry determines that the peak or “Expository Climax” occurs in 1 Cor 12–15.\(^\text{230}\) Lee also demonstrates this discourse flow in his discourse analysis of Romans.\(^\text{231}\)

\(^{226}\) Longacre, *Discourse*, 38.

\(^{227}\) This quote is Terry’s succinct summary of Longacre’s explanation of the peak. Longacre argues that there is usually a grammatical shift in the peak, which distinguishes it from the rest of the discourse. This shift may involve a change of tense, a change of pace, a change in the concentration of participants, or the introduction of new particles. Ralph Bruce Terry, “Peak in Discourse,” n.p. [cited 23 December 2011]. Online: http://bible.ovu.edu/terry/discourse/peak.htm; Longacre, *Discourse*, 40–8.

\(^{228}\) Longacre, *Discourse*, 48.

\(^{229}\) Longacre, *Discourse*, 49.

\(^{230}\) The “expository climax” or “zone of grammatical turbulence” is indicated by the large amount of verb-less clauses starting in 1 Cor 12 and the change of tone in 1 Cor 15 (from hortatory to persuasive, indicated by a sudden lack of imperatives). Terry, *Corinthians*, 120–1. Terry also cites Longinus, who discusses the use of various shifts in ancient Greek literature to create climax, which resembles the shifts in a peak episode. According to Terry, Longinus indicates that present tense is used to depict a past event, and the use of a single individual to represent the whole audience heightens the vividness. Terry, *Corinthians*, 119–20. Terry’s interpretation is persuasive. Longinus states that “the changes of case, tense, person, number, or gender” are used to achieve “κόλασις,” and then provides various examples to illustrate these shifts. Longinus, *On the Sublime*, 23.1–29.2 (Fyfe, LCL).

2.4.2.3 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a complex subfield of the modern science of linguistics, and is primarily concerned with the bearing of context on meaning. In particular, this considers how the audience (a reader or a listener) retrieves information from the “uttered sequence of words” of an author. There are several elements of pragmatics that are relevant to this study, including relevance theory, thematic meaning, and sociolinguistics.

2.4.2.3.1 Relevance theory

According to proponents Dan Sperber and Deidre Wilson, relevance theory attempts to explain how the audience searches for meaning in a communicative situation. Within this theory, there is a crucial difference between sentences and utterances. A sentence contains various grammatical elements. An utterance is the intended meaning of an author, and comprises both linguistic and non-linguistic elements. Therefore, while informed by grammatical elements, the audience relies on implicated linguistic and non-linguistic elements in the context to retrieve the intended

---

232 According to Levinson, pragmatics is “the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language.” As such, semantic study must consider the sentences and the contexts where a word occurs. Stephen C. Levinson, Pragmatics (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 9, 20–1. For Dijk, the pragmatics of discourse is “the systematic relations between structures of text and context.” Teun A. van Dijk, Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse (Longman Linguistics Library 21; ed. R. H. Robins and G. N. Leech; New York: Longman, 1977), 205.


235 Sperber and Wilson, Relevance, 9.

236 Sperber and Wilson, Relevance, 9.
The author actively helps the audience attain and understand the intended meaning by producing an utterance that is relevant. For example, in the following English conversation, the intended meaning of the speaker cannot be expressed without an understanding of the linguistic and non-linguistic context.

John (husband): Have you talked to my Mum lately?

Mary (wife): I haven’t spoken to that woman for ages.

The meaning of “woman” in Mary’s statement cannot be ascertained by isolating the sentence and addressing the grammatical elements: “I haven’t spoken to that woman for ages.” For Mary, “woman” does not simply denote a female human being. This meaning can only be ascertained by considering the context. First, the textual context indicates that “woman” refers to Mary’s mother-in-law, which is marked by a point of relevance uttered by her husband (John), “my Mum.” Second, the socio-relational context (a husband and wife dialogue) reveals a negative connotation in Mary’s statement by addressing her mother-in-law as “that woman.” This implies a negative relationship between her and her mother-in-law. This meaning cannot be ascertained by solely analysing the grammatical elements, since there is no grammatical element in this sentence suggesting a negative connotation: “I haven’t spoken to that woman for ages.”

---


239 Sperber and Wilson provide many similar examples to illustrate relevance theory. Sperber and Wilson, *Relevance*, 9–15.
Furthermore, the grammatical elements of this sentence, εἶπεν οὖν Θομᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Διόνυσος τοῖς συμμαθηταῖς: ἀγωμεν καὶ ἥμείς ἓνα ἀποθάνωμεν μετ’ αὐτοῦ (John 11:16), are insufficient to ascertain the meaning of ἀγωμεν καὶ ἥμείς ἓνα ἀποθάνωμεν μετ’ αὐτοῦ. The third person plural subjunctive of ἀγω and ἀποθησκω seem to express Thomas’ determination to follow Christ and to die with him. However, when considering the point of relevance in the immediate context (the disciples question Jesus’ decision to go to Judea because of the imminent danger, in John 11:8), and in the entire discourse (Thomas’ character, in John 14:5; 20:24–28), the meaning of the sentence may be very different. Thomas’ pronouncement may reflect his “unbelief and despair,” a meaning intended by the author.

2.4.2.3.2 Thematic meaning

A word comprises three kinds of meaning, lexical meaning, sentence meaning, and thematic meaning. The pragmatics subfield is primarily concerned with thematic meaning. Lexical meaning denotes “the meaning-potential of a word … in a system network of lexicogrammatical semantic options.” Sentence meaning refers to the

---

240 Beasley-Murray understands this expression as reflecting Thomas’ “blind devotion.” Beasley-Murray, 189.

241 Michaels, 625.

242 This study neither defends nor repudiates this view, and instead uses this to illustrate the insufficiency of the analysis of grammatical elements in a sentence.


244 Lemke, “Intertextuality,” 89.
“fully contextualized meaning” associated with the word as part of a sentence.\textsuperscript{245}

Thematic meaning refers to meaning of a word, which is realised in “a recurrent discourse pattern that is familiar in many texts.” The meaning of a word is implicated in the utterance of the whole discourse, and may or may not match the conventional meaning.\textsuperscript{246} In other words, the audience can only ascertain the meaning by examining the linguistic and non-linguistic elements in the context, rather than merely analysing the grammatical elements in the sentence. Hence, examining discourse structure is extremely important since it provides a framework to understand the context, through which the thematic meaning of a word can be identified.\textsuperscript{247}

For example, in Acts, there are 25 occurrences of \(\text{oikos}\). The lexical meaning of \(\text{oikos}\) is house or a household.\textsuperscript{248} In Acts 16:15, \(\text{oikos}\) occurs two times: \(\omega \delta \epsilon \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\eta \kappa\alpha \iota \text{oikos} \alpha\uvt\eta\zeta, \pi\alpha\rho\varepsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\varepsilon\sigma\nu\sigma\iota \lambda\varepsilon\gamma\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\cdot \epsilon\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\iota}\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\nu \pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\nu \mu\nu \epsilon\iota \kappa\alpha \iota \text{oikon} \mu\nu \mu\nu\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\varphi\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\nu\eta\nu\iota\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\nu \kappa\acute{\iota} \varphi\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\nu \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\varsigma.

Judging from the context, the first \(\text{oikos}\) denotes household (since a house cannot be baptised), and the second \(\text{oikos}\) denotes house (illustrated by \(\epsilon\iota\sigma\varepsilon\lambda\theta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\epsilon\varsigma \text{oikos}\)). Hence, in 16:15, the sentence meaning of \(\text{oikos}\) is household in the phrase \(\epsilon\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\iota} \kappa\alpha \iota \text{oikos} \alpha\uvt\eta\zeta, \alpha\text{nd house in the phrase} \epsilon\iota\sigma\varepsilon\lambda\theta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\epsilon\varsigma \text{oikon}.

Scholars observe that the occurrence of \(\text{oikos}\) throughout the discourse of Acts displays an intriguing pattern, in which “there is a regular shift of scene between

\textsuperscript{245} Lemke, “Intertextuality,” 89. Lemke’s “use meaning” is more general, referring to a text, rather than a particular sentence.

\textsuperscript{246} This resembles Grice’s utterer’s meaning, which is the intended meaning of an author, and is implicated in the utterance of the author. Grice, “Utterer’s Meaning,” 65.

\textsuperscript{247} Louw argues that “the structure of a discourse is a vital point in determining its intention. It is the hinge on which the communication turns; it is part and parcel of the semantics of a discourse.” Johannes P. Louw, “Discourse Analysis and the Greek New Testament,” \textit{BT} 24 (1973): 104.

\textsuperscript{248} BDAG, 560.
house and temple.” On some occasions οἶκος is employed to denote the temple, and on other occasions it is used to denote a house in which religious activities take place, alluding to the concept of a church and the kinship shared by people who belong to the family of God. In other words, the thematic meaning of οἶκος may point to church or God’s family. This meaning of οἶκος is neither a lexical meaning nor a sentence meaning. Instead, this connotation is deduced by investigating the discourse context and observing its pattern in the whole discourse.

2.4.2.3.3 Sociolinguistics

As discussed above, in relevance theory the audience relies on implicated linguistic and non-linguistic clues in the context to ascertain the intended meaning of an author. Sociolinguistics is an important non-linguistic clue in an utterance.

Since language is culturally embedded, analysing a text without considering the situational and cultural settings of a text is “open to more misinterpretation than interpretation”. As indicated, the consideration of historical or cultural perspectives is well established in NT semantic study. However, in pragmatics there is a heavy


250 Holmås, “House,” 401


252 This study neither defends nor repudiates this conclusion, and instead uses this illustration to differentiate the thematic meaning from the lexical meaning and the sentence meaning.

253 Sperber and Wilson emphasise the importance of sociolinguistics, although admit that their study of sociolinguistics is limited and hope that relevant theory can contribute more. Sperber and Wilson, *Relevance*, 279.

emphasis on the social dimensions of a word.\textsuperscript{255} The linguistic features of a word vary according to the social classes in a society.\textsuperscript{256} In other words, the meaning of a word for people in a certain social class may be very different for those in a different social class.\textsuperscript{257} Hence, to understand the meaning of a word in a discourse, it is necessary to investigate and understand the place and roles of the author and audience,\textsuperscript{258} including the underlying institutional power and social hierarchy.

For example, Paul calls himself δοῦλος Χριστοῦ in the epistles.\textsuperscript{259} In this self-designation, the connotation of δοῦλος can greatly differ from the meaning ascribed to a contemporary slave who has low social status. There are various interpretations of this self-designation. First, Paul employs this self-designation to indicate that his role being a δοῦλος of Christ resembles the role of an OT prophet.\textsuperscript{260} Second, this is a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{255} Mey, Pragmatics, 185–8.
  \item \textsuperscript{256} Although a regular relationship between social and linguistic factors can be demonstrated in many modern languages, Romaine points out the “prevailing trends” in linguistics to marginalise the study of the social role of language. Suzanne Romaine, Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 1, 69–75.
  \item \textsuperscript{257} For example, Brown and Gilman, reflecting on ancient languages, argue that a “historical study of the pronouns of address reveals a set of semantic and social psychological correspondence. The nonreciprocal power semantic is associated with a relatively static society in which power is distributed by birthright and is not subject to much redistribution. The power semantic was closely tied with the feudal and manorial systems.” Roger Brown and Albert Gilman, “The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity,” in Sociolinguistics: The Essential Reading (ed. Christina Bratt Paulston and G. Richard Tucker; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2003), 156–176.
  \item \textsuperscript{258} Halliday names this relationship “tenor”. M. A. K. Halliday, Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective (Burwood, Vic.: Deakin University Press, 1986), 49.
  \item \textsuperscript{259} Rom 1:1; Gal 1:10; Phil 1:1.
\end{itemize}
metaphorical “designation of leadership,” whereby Paul is a “slave agent” with the God-given authority to manage other slaves of Christ (believers). Third, δοῦλος of Christ denotes a slave of a Roman Emperor, “a position of honor.” Nonetheless, whether this self-designation connotes Paul as an OT prophet, a slave manager, or an imperial slave, the noble status is implicated, which is vastly different from the experience of a low status δοῦλος.

In summary, this analysis of Paul’s self-designation as a δοῦλος Χριστοῦ illustrates the importance of understanding the social dimensions implicated by the non-linguistic context, which is a key concern in sociolinguistics.

2.4.2.4 Summary

In this study, as shown in Figure 2.1, three key features inform the discourse analysis of Paul’s anthropological terms: scope, structure, and pragmatics. Scope refers to the analysis of a text beyond the sentential level and at the level of the whole discourse. Structure refers to the organisation of semantic units within a text through linguistic devices, in order to enable cohesion (unified and connected sentences) and coherence (mental representation, meaning, and macrostructure). Pragmatics refers to the impact

---


262 Martin, Slavery, 75–6.

263 Kenneth S. Wuest, Romans in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader (London: Pickering & Inglis, 1947), 12. According to Wuest, Christ is the “King of kings” and resembles the Roman emperor. Christ does not merely resemble an ordinary slave master in the Greco-Roman world. Wuest, Romans, 12. Wuest’s suggestion is persuasive because he considers the role of Christ in an ecclesial community.

264 However, Lyall argues that this self-designation indicates Paul’s powerlessness and his surrender to Christ. Francis Lyall, Slaves, Citizens, Sons (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1984), 37–8. Whilst Lyall considers the status of a slave, he fails to see the importance of Χριστοῦ in this self-designation. As mentioned above, the kingship of Christ should be considered in the interpretation of δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.
of linguistic and non-linguistic context on understanding the intended meaning of an author. Arguably, discourse analysis is a research method that attends to Barr’s comments on biblical semantic study.

Figure 2.1 Key Features of Discourse Analysis

2.4.3 Research Approach

As previously discussed, discourse analysis addresses Barr’s key comments on biblical semantic study, by following the modern science of linguistics and attending to the context of the larger literary complex. Overall, this study applies basic principles of discourse analysis to key anthropological terms in the Pauline epistles to ascertain their meaning.

2.4.3.1 Discourse Analysis and Paul’s Anthropological Terms

In examining Paul’s anthropological term, this study adopts a synthetic approach and employs three basic features of discourse analysis commonly used by linguists. These
features are scope, structure, and pragmatics. However, it is crucial to recognise that there are many discourses within the corpus of the Pauline epistles (see Figure 2.2), and that within each discourse there may be various anthropological terms (see Figure 2.3). Therefore, a comprehensive analysis of Paul’s anthropological terms can only be achieved by an approach that covers all of these dimensions (see Figure 2.4). This multifaceted approach and the specific analytical steps are detailed further below.

Figure 2.2 The Pauline Epistles

Figure 2.3 Individual Pauline Discourse

265 The number of discourses and the number of terms in Figures 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 are merely illustrative, and do not represent the real numbers in the Pauline epistles.
2.4.3.2 A Multifaceted Approach

The semantic study of key anthropological terms in the Pauline epistles occurs in four stages. Each stage integrates the three features of discourse analysis, as the analytical steps.

2.4.3.2.1 The four stages

The two attributes mentioned above, number of discourses and number of terms, are used to form the four research stages (see Table 2.2).

---

266 ‘D’ stands for discourse, and ‘T’ stands for term.
Table 2.2 Four Research Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single Discourse</th>
<th>Multiple Discourses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Term</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Terms</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three features of discourse analysis can be most adequately applied in Stage I and Stage II. Although all of the Pauline epistles can be loosely regarded as *one corpus*, the core principles of discourse analysis are best applied to one single discourse. Following this examination, this study turns to Stage III and Stage IV, which apply the core principles of discourse analysis to multiple discourses. This analysis may provide insights into how Paul establishes and employs anthropological terms across epistles.

Given that some Pauline epistles are considered pseudepigrapha, to minimise controversy this study only focuses on analysing seven epistles that are commonly considered authentic: Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon.

Overall, the findings of these four stages can be used to verify the meaning of Paul’s anthropological terms, and whether some of these on some occasions connote corporate and relational dimensions.\(^\text{267}\)

---

\(^{267}\) This study does not negate other connotations of Paul’s anthropological terms; by no means is the social dimension the only thematic meaning. Rather, it simply seeks to identify the corporate and relational connotations of some terms in certain contexts.
2.4.3.2.2 Analytical steps

Below are the steps involved in analysing the Pauline epistles and anthropological terms to ascertain their meanings, including their thematic meanings.

(1) Scope: Consider an entire discourse, a specific Pauline epistle.

(2) Structure: Examine the discourse structure of the Pauline epistle by:
   a) employing discourse markers to identify the semantic units of a discourse;
   b) examining the key cohesive linguistic devices displayed in and across all the semantic units, to ascertain the coherent theme of the discourse;
   c) identifying the macrostructure of the entire discourse.

(3) Pragmatics: Ascertain the thematic meaning of a term by:
   a) examining the term in relation to:
      i. the discourse structure, taking into account the linguistic context of each semantic unit and the entire discourse;
      ii. the sociolinguistic aspect, taking into account the non-linguistic context of the entire discourse.
   b) analysing the term according to the discourse flow.

2.4.3.3 Specific Areas for Analysis

This study is admittedly far from exhaustive. However, by choosing to investigate some Pauline epistles and some anthropological terms the scope is more manageable. Also, by adopting a multifaceted approach, the study is more synchronic and coherent. In addition, in terms of pragmatics, more emphasis is placed on the linguistic context than the non-linguistic context. As such, the sociolinguistic aspect only serves as a reference, and this study focuses on the thematic meaning informed by a detailed analysis of discourse structure. Below is a detailed description of the four stages.
Stage I — a single anthropological term within a single discourse: the corporate dimension of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians. The social and corporate dimensions of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians have been thoroughly researched and well documented. Therefore, σῶμα in 1 Corinthians is used as a test case and has a two-fold purpose. In this study, σῶμα in 1 Corinthians will be re-examined to demonstrate the value of discourse analysis for the investigation of such key terms, and to provide further insights about this particular anthropological term.

Stage II — multiple anthropological terms within a single discourse: the key anthropological terms in Philippians. The terms ψυχή, πνεῦμα, καρδία, and πνεῦμα in Philippians will be analysed. These will initially be examined individually, and then collectively to see how they are related.

Stage III — a single anthropological term within multiple discourses: καρδία in Romans, 2 Corinthians, Philippians, and 1 Thessalonians. καρδία occurs 37 times in the Pauline epistles, including 15 times in Romans and 11 times in 2 Corinthians. Accordingly, the meaning of καρδία in these two epistles is a primary focus. Similar to Stage II, the epistles will initially be examined individually, and then a comparison of the usage of καρδία between the Pauline epistles will be made.

Stage IV — multiple anthropological terms within multiple discourses: a focus on Pauline Benedictions. The combination of a singular anthropological noun and a plural personal possessive pronoun is a peculiar grammatical construct that can be found in some benedictory phrases, including Phil 4:20, 1 Thess 5:23, Gal 6:18, and Phlm 1:25. In all four benedictory phrases, the singular noun, πνεῦμα, is present. In 1 Thessalonians, σῶμα and ψυχή are also present. Traditionally, scholars have either treated benedictions as separate entities, independent from the epistle, or have simply ignored them. However, in light of the concept of coherence in discourse analysis, this
study aims to investigate the benedictory phrase at the discourse level. Again, each benedictory phrase and anthropological term/s will initially be examined individually, and then a comparison will be made to ascertain any significant analogous meaning.

By comparing the overall findings, this study will then verify whether the key anthropological terms within different Pauline epistles have corporate, relational, and thus ecclesiological connotations.

2.4.3.4 Limitations of Research Approach

Although this thesis adopts discourse analysis as a linguistic based research approach, this thesis does not aim to provide a detailed and holistic discourse analysis for each of the Pauline epistles. The works on discourse analysis of biblical literature mentioned in this chapter, both monographs and articles, only focus on one biblical book, one single discourse. It would be, therefore, an excessively overwhelming task to have substantial discourse analyses conducted for all of the seven Pauline epistles, a task that would far exceed the manageable scope of a research at this level. This thesis aims to utilize some of the key principles in the field of discourse analysis for analysing the Pauline epistles.

This limitation causes the arguments presented in this thesis to appear to be tautological and overtly descriptive, which is largely due to the absence of a fully comprehensive statistical analysis of all the linguistic elements in any given epistle. However, the benefits of adopting this research approach, although far from ideal, outweigh its deficiencies. The principles gleaned from the field of discourse analysis are employed on top of exegetical analysis and literal analysis (for instance, inclusio and chiasm), enabling a more linguistic based research approach to be adopted to overcome some of the deficiencies raised by Barr.
In response to Barr’s comments on biblical semantic studies, this thesis aims to examine both the textual context and the wider context of the key Pauline anthropological terms. In the following chapters, the key terms are to be examined by attending to their textual context, their usage in various Pauline epistles. However, it is important to first investigate how the key terms are employed in contemporary Greek literature—an attempt to attend to the wider context by identifying the semantic range of the key terms.

Although there are numerous work written in Koiné Greek in the first century, this section mainly focuses on the work by Philo, Epictetus, and Plutarch due to the following reasons. First, they are contemporary authors of Paul, which is a key consideration in conducting synchronic semantic studies. Second, like Paul, they are thinkers (as theologian or philosopher) in the first century. Third, they also represent different philosophical or theological backgrounds: Philo as a representative of Hellenistic Judaism, Epictetus and Plutarch as representatives of Hellenism with the former representing Stoic and the latter representing Platonist. Fourth, each of them contributes a considerable volume of work. In other words, unlike many other fragmented first century Koiné Greek manuscripts that are currently available, their work resembles the corpus of Pauline epistles. Consequently, the key anthropological terms are used in their work with a range of connotations. Thus, this serves as a good reference in understanding the semantic range of these terms.

In the following part, the general usage of the four key terms, σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα (τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), and καρδία, in the work of Philo, Epictetus, and Plutarch are presented. The purpose of this section does not aim to provide an exhaustive
analysis of the key anthropological terms. Instead, it aims to provide a general overview of their semantic range in the first century Koiné Greek literature.

2.5.1 Σῶμα in First Century Koiné

The occurrences of σῶμα are 1698, 101, and 1019 times in the work of Plutarch, Epictetus, and Philo respectively.\(^{268}\) In most cases, the term simply denotes physical body. For instance, in Plutarch’s work Theseus, the phrase τῇ τοῦ σώματος ῥώμη is used to describe the strength of the physical body of θησεᾶς (Theseus).\(^{269}\) In Epictetus’ work Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae, people on earth are portrayed as: ἐπὶ γῆς γὰρ ὄντας καὶ σώματι συνδεδεμένους τοιούτω.\(^{270}\) In this text, σῶμα denotes physical body. Similarly, the term points to physical body in Philo’s work. For instance, the phrase στερεοῦ σώματος in Legum allegoriae I portrays an organic body that is capable of motion.\(^{271}\) This meaning of σῶμα as physical body is also extended to the connotation of a dead body, a corpse. For example, in De Abrahamo σῶμα occurs in the following text: ὁτι βραχέα τῷ σώματι ἐπιδιακρύσας.\(^{272}\) The word σῶμα points to the corpse of Abraham’s wife.

Intriguingly, σῶμα is also used by Philo to denote the cosmos as having a body. In Philo’s account of creation, the world (cosmos) is portrayed as having a σῶμα. The

\(^{268}\) The occurrences are based on the statistical database of Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG) regarding the Greek texts of these authors.

\(^{269}\) Plutarch, Thes. 6.2.

\(^{270}\) Epictetus, Diatr. 1.1.

\(^{271}\) Philo, Leg. 1.3–4.

\(^{272}\) Philo, Abr. 258.
world before creation is depicted as ἀσώματος κόσμος, and the created world is portrayed by this phrase: τὸ γὰρ σῶμα φύσει στερεῶν.\(^{273}\)

In summary, the connotation of σῶμα is not limited to denote physical body in the first century Koiné Greek literature. The word is also used in a metaphorical sense to describe the cosmos having a body.\(^{274}\)

2.5.2 Ψυχή in First Century Koiné

Ψυχή occurs 1141 times in Plutarch’s work.\(^{275}\) The key connotations of ψυχή are as follows. First, the term is employed to depict the centre of the inner life of a human being. For instance, Plutarch writes in *Marcius Coriolanus* that ἀνομολον αἰσθήσει πάθος ἐγγυνόμενον τῷ φανταστικῷ τῆς ψυχῆς συναναπείθει τὸ δόξαν, ὡσπερ ἐν ὑπνοῖς ἁκουόντες καὶ βλέπουσιν οὐ βλέποντες δοκοῦμεν.\(^{276}\) The term ψυχή is described as the seat of human imagination, leading to creating different sensations (vision and sound). Second, ψυχή denotes physical life. In *Comparatio Pelopidae et Marcelli*, the parallel between life and soul in ἀφειδήσαντες τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς is used in the context of portraying death.\(^{277}\) Third, ψυχή is used to describe the seat of emotion and thought. For example, the term denotes human’s inner courage in *Pyrrhus*: τὸ λίμιν δὲ καὶ ρώμη τῆς ψυχῆς.\(^{278}\) Fourth, the term

\(^{273}\) Philo, *Opif.* 36.

\(^{274}\) *TDNT* also discusses the semantic range of σῶμα in the first century Koiné Greek, indicating that physical ody and the living body of the cosmos are common meanings in that era. Schweizer, “Σῶμα,” *TDNT* 7:1036–41.

\(^{275}\) The occurrence is based on the statistical database presented in TLG.

\(^{276}\) Plutarch, *Cor.* 38.3.

\(^{277}\) Plutarch, *Comp. Pel. Marc.* 3.5.

\(^{278}\) Plutarch, *Pyrrh.* 15.4.
depicts the invisible soul, together with the physical body, forms a human life. In portraying the impact of a plague Plutarch writes in his work Pericles:

διαχρωμένην τὸ σῶμα σχολαίως καὶ ὑπερείπουσαν τὸ φύσημα τῆς ψυχῆς.  

The two aspects of a human life are represented by σῶμα and ψυχῆ.

The occurrence of ψυχῆ in Epictetus is 63 times. First, the term denotes the seat of emotion and thought. For instance, ψυχῆ is associated with understanding and apprehension in Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae: καὶ νὴ Δία ἐπὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ψυχῆς ἄν μὲν ἢ ὦτως διακείμενος.  

Ψυχῆ is also portrayed as being attracted to the appearance of good: ὦτως ἔχει καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς. τὸ ἀγαθὸν φανέν εἰσθαν ἐκκνησεν ἐφ᾿ αὐτῷ, τὸ κακὸν ἀφ᾿ αὐτοῦ. οὐδὲποτε δ᾿ ἀγαθοῦ φαντασίαν ἐναργῆ ἀποδοκιμάσει ψυχῆ.  

Second, the term depicts the inner life or invisible part of a human, which is a constituent of a human being. For instance, Epictetus writes: ὅτι μὲν γὰρ τρία ἐστὶ περὶ τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ψυχῆ καὶ σῶμα καὶ τὰ ἐκός.  

ψυχῆ, σῶμα, and τὰ ἐκός are considered to be the three constituents of a human.

In Philo’s work, ψυχῆ occurs 1833 times. First, the term is used to depict the inner life of a human being, which is the seat of reason, emotion, and desire. In De specialibus legibus 4, Philo states: διερευνησάμενοι φύσιν ψυχῆς καὶ τρεῖτων ἕνδος ἐνιδότες αὐτῆ, τὸ μὲν λόγον, τὸ δὲ θυμοῦ, τὸ δ᾿ ἐπιθυμίας. Second, Philo uses ψυχῆ to denote a part of human person, which connect a person to God. In

279 Plutarch, *Per.* 38.1.

280 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.5.

281 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.3.

282 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.7.

283 The occurrence is based on the statistical database presented in TLG; it includes the only occurrence of the form ψυχῆσιν in *Aet.* 111.2.
his discussion of Abraham (and Moses’ comment on Abraham), Philo argues that ὁντως γὰρ ἀτρέπτω ψυχὴ πρὸς τὸν ἀτρεπτὸν θεὸν μόνη πρόσοδὸς ἐστι.285

Third, Philo even goes further by describing ψυχὴ as the dwelling place for God’s Spirit. In De virtutibus, Philo states that τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, ὃπερ ἀνωθεν καταπνευσθὲν εἰςψφάσατο τῇ ψυχῇ.286

In summary, ψυχὴ carries the following connotations in first century Koiné: the seat of reason, emotion, desire, the inner life of a human person, part of the constituent of a human being, and the inner or invisible part of a human being in which God’s Spirit dwells.287

2.5.3 Πνεῦμα in First Century Koiné

Πνεῦμα occurs 313 times in the work of Plutarch. There are several meanings connoted by Πνεῦμα. First, the term denotes wind in the air. For instance, Πνεῦμα is used to describe the wind brought by a descending cloud: καὶ νέφους ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐρείσαντος ἅμα πνεύματι καὶ ζάλη.288 This connotation is very common in Plutarch’s work.289 Second, Πνεῦμα connotes breath. This can be illustrated by the

284 Philo, Spec. 4.92.

285 Philo, Post. 27.

286 Philo, Virt. 217.

287 TDNT also provides a discussion of the usage of ψυχὴ in the first century Koiné Greek literature. Dihle, “Ψυχή,” TDNT 9:616–7, 634–5. Dihle states that “the impalpable essential core of man, the bearer of thought, will and emotion, the quintessence of human life” are the key meanings of ψυχῆ in the post-classical age. Dihle, “Ψυχή,” TDNT 9:616.

288 Plutarch, Num. 2.2.

289 For instance, Πνεῦμα denotes wind in the following work: Arist. 6.3; Cam. 34.4; Pel. 9.1; Caes. 52.1; Cat. Min. 70.3; Pyrrh. 15.3; and Rom. 1.2.
usage of πνεύμα in a phrase occurred in Demosthenes: πνεύματος κολοβότης. 290

The phrase is used to describe the shortness of breath suffered by Δημοσθένης (Demosthenes).

Πνεύμα only occurs twice in Epictetus’ work. First, the word denotes a matter that God infuses into human eyes, enabling the capability of vision. In the following text from Dissertationes ab Arrano digestae, πνεύμα is closely associated with ὀφθαλμός: εἰκῇ οὖν σοι ὁ θεὸς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐδωκεν, εἰκῇ πνεύμα ἐνεκέρασεν αὐτοῖς οὕτως ἰσχυρὸν καὶ φιλότεχνον. 291 However, the relation between πνεύμα and ὀφθαλμός is unclear. Second, πνεύμα appears in an obscure passage in Dissertationes ab Arrano digestae. Πνεύμα is portrayed as something could be disturbed, and it could be restored into a more settled state: καὶ ὅταν τοῖνυν σκοτωθῇ τις, οὐχ αὐτὸς τείχη καὶ αὐτὸς ἀρεταὶ συγχέονται, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεύμα, ἐφ’ οὗ εἴσιν καταστάντως δὲ καθίσταται κάκεινα. 292

Πνεύμα occurs 149 times in the work of Philo. 293 The term carries different connotations. First, πνεύμα means air. In his discussion of creation, De opificio mundi, Philo states that God created the incorporeal matter of water and of air: ἐθ’ ἔδατος ἄσωματον οὐσίαν καὶ πνεύματος. 294 Second, πνεύμα connotes wind. In De opificio mundi, strong wind is depicted in the phrase νημείας καὶ βίας πνευμάτων. 295 Third, the term points to soul or life. For instance, in his comments of Genesis, Philo

290 Plutarch, Dem. 6.3.
291 Epictetus, Diatr. 2.23.
292 Epictetus, Diatr. 3.3.
293 The occurrences are based on the statistical database presented in TLG.
294 Philo, Opif. 29.
295 Philo, Opif. 58.
writes: πνοής νῦν ἄλλ’ οὐχὶ πνεύματος μέμνηται, as he attempts to explain why God does not create human life in places such as desert and ocean. Similarly, the clause, ὅτι πνεῦμα ἐστιν ὡς ζωής οὐσία, occurred in Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat demonstrates the same connotation as Philo equates πνεῦμα and ψυχή in his explanation of the Genesis account. Fourth, πνεῦμα is employed to denote human spirit that dwells inside a person. In De gigantibus, the spirit of Moses is described as coming upon the seventy elders: τὸ Μωυαδέως πνεῦμα, ὃ ἐπιφοιτᾶ τοῖς ἐβδομήκοντα πρεσβυτέρους τοῦ διευγεκείν ἐτέρων.

In summary, πνεῦμα carries the following connotations in first century Koiné Greek literature: air, wind, breath, a matter that gives human eyes vision state of mind, life or soul, and human spirit.

2.5.4 Καρδία in First Century Koiné

In Plutarch’s work, καρδία carries four main connotations. First, the word is used in a physiological sense, denoting the human organ, heart. For instance, in his work Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat καρδία denotes the physical heart in the

---

296 Philo, Alleg. Interp. 1.34.

297 Philo, Det. 81. Philo explains the meaning of πνεῦμα in Genesis 2.

298 Philo, Gig. 24.

299 For further discussion of the meaning of πνεῦμα in the first century Koiné Greek. Kleinknecht combines the Koiné Greek era and the Classical Greek era together under the section “πνεῦμα in the Greek World” to discuss the semantic range of πνεῦμα, stating that the term connotes wind, breath, life, and soul in the ancient Greek world. Kleinknecht, “Πνεῦμα,” TDNT 6:334–9.

300 Based on the statistical database presented in TLG, καρδία occurs 51 times in the work of Plutarch.
following sentence: τοῦ μὲν καυδωνεύοντος ἢ καρδία πηδᾶ μόνον. In the context, καρδία is used to describe the heart of Ἑκτορό (Hector) beating. Second, καρδία is used to portray emotion or the seat of emotion. In Quomodo quis suos in virtute sentiat profectus Plutarch quotes the words of Ἀλκιβιάδης (Alcibiades), τὴν καρδίαν στρέψαται καὶ δάκρυα ἐκπίπτειν, to describe a heart being ‘moved,’ which points to emotion. Third, the term is associated with passion and desire. In Quaestiones convivales, the word occurs in the text, ὃτι τὴ καρδία τὸν θυμὸν ἐνστρατοπεδεύειν ὄντο, τοὺς περιδεραίους τῶν στεφάνων ύποθυμίδας ἐκάλουν. Thus, καρδία is employed to portray the seat of passion and desire.

Καρδία occurs once in Epictetus’ work. In Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae, καρδία appears in the sentence τὸν δὲ τρέμοντα καὶ ταρασσόμενον καὶ ῥηγνύμενον ἐσωθεὶν τὴν καρδίαν ἄλλῳ τινὶ δὲ προσευκαιρεῖν. In this text, καρδία is used to describe a broken heart of a person who is trembling. In light of this, the meaning of καρδία is associated with emotion. Καρδία occurs 39 times in the work of Philo. The word carries a range of meaning. First, it denotes the physical heart. In De specialibus legibus, the phrase ἐγκέφαλον ἢ καρδίαν points to the two organs, brain and heart, and in De opificio mundi, καρδία is listed with other body

301 Plutarch, Adol. poet. aud. 30A.
302 Plutarch, Virt. prof. 84D.
303 Plutarch, Quaest. Conv. 647E.
304 The occurrence is based on the statistical database presented in TLG.
305 Epictetus, Diatr. 1.27.
306 The occurrence is based on the statistical database presented in TLG.
307 Philo, Spec. 1.215.
Second, καρδία means mind. In Quod deus sit immutabilis, καρδία is employed in the clause, καὶ πᾶς τις διανοεῖται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐπιμελῶς τὰ πονηρὰ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, to portray evil people thinking wickedness. Third, Philo uses καρδία as an equivalent to ἡγεμονικόν, a dominant power of human. For instance, in De specialibus legibus Philo mentions that ἡγεμονικόν is equal to καρδία in the following text: οὔτε δὲ καρδίαν οὔτε ἐγκέφαλον, τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ τῷ ἐτέρῳ τούτων ἐνδιαιτωμένου.

In summary, καρδία carries the following meanings in the first century Koiné Greek: heart as an organ, the seat of emotion, mind, and a dominant power of human.

This section provides an overview of the semantic range of the key anthropological terms, σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα, and καρδία, by investigating their occurrences in the first century Koiné Greek literature, in particular, the work of Plutarch, Epictetus, and Philo.

---

308 Philo, Opif. 118.

309 Philo, Deus. 20.


311 TDNT also discusses the semantic range of καρδία in the ancient Greek world. Behm combines the Koiné Greek era and the Classical Greek era together under the section “καρδία among the Greeks” and states that καρδία denotes heart “in a physiological sense as the central organ” and metaphorically, “the central organ of intellectual life, the seat of reason, from which feeling, willing and thinking proceed” in the ancient Greek world. Behm, “Καρδία,” TDNT 3:608–9.
CHAPTER 3

ΣΩΜΑ IN 1 CORINTHIANS IN LIGHT OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

3.0 Introduction

The social and corporate dimensions of σώμα in 1 Corinthians have been thoroughly researched and well-established by scholars. The phrase τὸ σώμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ is widely accepted as denoting the church. This chapter intends to re-examine σώμα in 1 Corinthians by employing the basic principles of discourse analysis. This aims to show that the key thematic meaning of σώμα intended by Paul in 1 Corinthians is indeed communal, and thus demonstrates the value of discourse analysis as a sound methodological approach for the investigation of other anthropological terms.

1 Dunn provides a detailed discussion, including an analysis of the corporate connotations of the phrase “the body of Christ.” James D. G. Dunn, The Theology of Paul the Apostle (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006), 533–564. Gundry maintains the communal aspect of this phrase and rejects Bultmann’s individualistic understanding. Gundry, Sōma, 223–44. Both Dunn and Gundry provide an overview of scholarship addressing this Pauline phrase. Carter makes a recent contribution and asserts that the body of Christ is a metaphor to portray the church. This metaphor “subverts social distinctions because such distinctions have no place” in the church. Timothy L. Carter, “Looking at the Metaphor of Christ’s Body in 1 Corinthians 12,” in Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman (ed. Stanley E. Porter; vol. 5 of Pauline Studies, Leiden: Brill, 2008), 93–115.
This chapter cannot provide a detailed analysis of all individual occurrences of σῶμα, and a traditional focus on the “lexical meaning” and the “sentence meaning” is not the primary concern. Instead, the “thematic meaning” is the centre of attention. According to discourse analysis, an author sometimes employs a word throughout a discourse to convey a meaning that cannot be identified by solely investigating the sentence and lexical meanings of the word. This thematic meaning can only be ascertained by investigating the context of the entire discourse in which a word occurs. By applying the basic principles of discourse analysis, this chapter intends to show that Paul does employ σῶμα to elucidate the social and corporate identity of the Corinthian community. This is the key thematic meaning of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians.

Therefore, Stage I in this research will analyse a single anthropological term within a single discourse. Initially, the discourse structure will be identified, and then the thematic meaning of σῶμα will be ascertained by examining the linguistic context of individual semantic units (at the paragraphic-sentential-clausal level) and the entire discourse, and by examining the sociolinguistic aspect.

3.1 Discourse Structure

As previously defined, the discourse structure refers to “the pattern an author uses to organize [the entire] text.” A discourse is composed of different semantic units that are unified and connected through various linguistic devices, enabling cohesion. This

---

2 For an explanation of lexical meaning, sentence meaning, and thematic meaning, see pages 83–5 in Chapter 2.

3 For a description of the analytical steps, see pages 92–4 in Chapter 2.

4 Westfall, Discourse, 28.
leads to a coherent flow and forms the core message, known as the macrostructure. The following section initially elucidates the major semantic units in 1 Corinthians by investigating the discourse markers, and then identifies the macrostructure towards ascertaining the thematic meaning of σωμα.

3.1.1 Discourse Markers

In composing a discourse, an author sometimes uses linguistic devices to indicate the beginning or end of a semantic unit, and thus the change of topic. These devices are called discourse markers. Whilst there are various discourse markers, conjunctions are one of the most commonly used. However, not every conjunction is a discourse marker. Given the frequency of conjunctions in any given discourse, including the Pauline epistles (for instance, there are 1044 conjunctions in 1 Corinthians), it is vital and more practical to focus on special conjunctive formulas. In 1 Corinthians, there are two special conjunctive formulas, περί δὲ and verb-δέ-pronoun, which mark the boundary of a semantic unit. As well as conjunctions, a summary statement can also act as a discourse marker. In 1 Corinthians, Paul uses a specific summary statement to begin the first topic of church division, referring to Chloe’s report (1:11). In two subsequent statements, to begin two new topics, Paul refers back to the oral report and

---

5 For a detailed discussion of cohesion and coherence, see pages 74–7 in Chapter 2.

6 For an explanation of discourse markers, see pages 78–9 in Chapter 2.

7 Pickering, Discourse Analysis, 9.

8 A formula is defined as a phrase or a clause with the combination of specific grammatical particles. This combination is used repeatedly in a discourse or multiple discourse by the same author to mark a new topic.

9 For further examples of discourse marker, see pages 78–9 in Chapter 2.
uses the verb ἄκουω (5:1; 11:8). As such, although there may be various discourse markers in this epistle, an analysis of the two conjunctive formulas and the specific summary statement is enough to identify the major semantic units.

3.1.1 Περὶ Δὲ

The prepositional phrase περὶ δὲ occurs six times in 1 Corinthians (7:1, 25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1, 12). This phrase is rare in the Pauline epistles, and otherwise only occurs twice in 1 Thessalonians (4:9; 5:1). περὶ δὲ can be interpreted as “as for,” and contains three elements: a conjunction δὲ, a preposition περὶ, and a word or a phrase in the genitive case. Notably, the peculiar word order in this phrase, placing περὶ before δὲ, has attracted some discussion. Despite a few objections, it is widely believed that this phrase refers to a letter written by the Corinthians to Paul.

10 C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 62–3. This phrase is not discussed by grammarians such as Robertson, Moulton, and Turner.

11 For example, a genitive pronoun, ὁν, in 1 Cor 7:1; a genitive articular noun, τῶν παρθένων, in 1 Cor 7:25; a genitive substantival adjective, τῶν εἰδωλοθυτῶν, in 1 Cor 8:1; and a genitive articular noun, τῆς λογείας, in 1 Cor 16:1.


13 Many scholars hold that περὶ δὲ refers to the questions written by the Corinthians to Paul. Barrett, First Corinthians, 154; Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 273, 314; Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 272, 330; Horsley, 95, 115; Fee, Corinthians, 274; Collins, 309. Hurd argues that the first occurrence in 7:1 reads “περὶ δὲ ὃν ἐγράφατε,” and the subsequent occurrences are simply an abbreviation, omitting ὃν ἐγράφατε. John Coolidge Hurd, The Origin of I Corinthians (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1983), 63–5. However, Mitchell counters this interpretation and argues that in “a wide variety of ancient Greek texts” περὶ δὲ is “simply a topic marker, a shorthand way of introducing the next subject of discussion.” Mitchell, “Concerning,” 233–4; 236–50. Thiselton supports this view. Thiselton, First Corinthians, 617.
Regardless, most scholars agree that περὶ δὲ is a linguistic device in 1 Corinthians, used to introduce new topics.¹⁴

In 7:1, after discussing the topic of sexual immorality, Paul begins to address the topic of marriage using the prepositional phrase περὶ δὲ. In 7:20, Paul suddenly digresses to the topic of slavery, and in 7:25, again using περὶ δὲ returns to the topic of marriage. Then in 8:1, Paul proceeds to the topic of food and idols using the same phrase. In 12:1, Paul also uses περὶ δὲ to begin a lesson on spiritual gifts, and in 16:1, περὶ δὲ introduces the topic of contribution. Finally, in 16:12, Paul begins to address the topic of Apollos again using περὶ δὲ. Therefore, this study concurs with the view that περὶ δὲ is a discourse marker employed by Paul to introduce new topics in 1 Corinthians.¹⁵

### 3.1.1.2 Verb-Δέ-Pronoun

In 1 Corinthians, the occurrence of a particular independent clause exhibits an unusual pattern. This combines a first person singular indicative verb, the conjunction δὲ, and a second person plural personal pronoun (ὑμεῖς and its case variants), and occurs seven times in the epistle.¹⁶ If those occurrences with the verb θέλω are put aside, this

---

¹⁴ Orr and Walther call this a “transitional phase” that introduces a new inquiry posed by the Corinthians. Orr and Walther, 227. Collins, Hays, and Fee call this phrase a “formula,” and Collins specifically calls this a “textual marker.” Collins, 257, 288; Hays, 110; Fee, Corinthians, 274. Mitchell calls this phrase a “topic marker.” Mitchell, “Concerning,” 234; Mitchell, Paul, 191. Lee calls this a “boundary marker.” Jae Hyun Lee, Paul’s Gospel in Romans: A Discourse Analysis of Rom 1:16–8:39 (Linguistic Biblical Studies 3; Boston: Brill, 2010), 36; Mark I. Wegener, “The Rhetorical Strategy of 1 Corinthians 15,” Theology and Mission 31 (2004): 438–55. For both Collins and Hays, περὶ δὲ is a classic formula in Hellenistic letters used to identify a topic for consideration. There is a debate about the specific function of this phrase. It is regarded as a linguistic device either introducing a topic raised by the letter from the Corinthians to Paul or raised by Paul himself.

¹⁵ However, 1 Cor 7:25 is an exception, wherein Paul returns to a previous topic after a short digression, rather than introducing a new topic.

¹⁶ In this study, this combination is called the “verb-Δέ-pronoun” clause.
particular combination only occurs four times: Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, in 1:10; Ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, in 11:2; Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, in 15:1, and Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, in 16:15. Notably, all four of these occur when a new topic is introduced. In 1:10, following Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, Paul begins to address the topic of church division. Similarly, in 11:2, following Ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, Paul begins a teaching on the Lord’s Supper. In 15:1, following Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, Paul begins to address the issue of resurrection. Lastly, in 16:5, following Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, Paul begins to discuss the household of Stephanus. Many scholars notice that these four independent clauses are rhetorical devices in 1 Corinthians, used to introduce new topics. However, none of the work reviewed identifies this verb-δὲ-pronoun clause as a discourse marker. This study contends that this is a valid discourse marker because it is too coincidental to have four occurrences of this particular clause at the beginning of four new topics.

On the other hand, θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς occurs three times (7:32; 10:20; 11:3). In 7:32, Paul includes his own perspective in the middle of a discussion on marriage. In 10:20, Paul expresses the implication of partaking in idolatry. In 11:3, Paul presents a

---

17 Bailey contends that the phrase Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς (4:16) has a similar function as the phrases Ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς (11:2) and Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν (15:1). These mark the boundary of a topic. Kenneth E. Bailey, “The Structure of I Corinthians and Paul’s Theological Method with Special Reference to 4:17,” NovT 25 (1983): 160–1.

18 Many scholars perceive these clauses as transitional sentences, introducing a new topic. For example, Collins interprets Παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς in 1:10 as a standard formula in friendly Hellenistic letters to introduce an important theme. Also, “I commend you” in 11:2 introduces a new topic, and “I want you to know, brothers and sisters, the gospel I have proclaimed to you” in 15:1 is a disclosure formula that establishes a transition. Collins does not identify the verb-δὲ-pronoun as a pattern or a formula. Collins, 76, 404, 533. Fee similarly interprets 1:10 as an immediate transition, and 15:1 as introducing some new concerns. Fee also does not identify the verb-δὲ-pronoun clause. Fee, Corinthians, 52, 719. Both Barrett and Fitzmyer interpret the beginning of new topics in 1:10; 11:2; 15:1, and do not identify the combination clause. Barrett, First Corinthians, 41, 247, 335; Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 140, 404, 544. Mitchell interprets the function of 1:10 as introducing the topic of ecclesial unity, which is the central theme in 1 Corinthians. Mitchell, Paul, 1.
theological statement that he uses to discuss the issue of head coverings. Notably, all three of these do not begin new topics, and instead signify a shift in emphasis or act as a point of reference.

3.1.1.3 Summary Statement: Report from Chloe’s People

Paul begins the first topic, church division, using the phrase παρακαλῶ δὲ ύμᾶς (1:10), which is a special conjunctive formula. He then immediately mentions the report from Chloe’s people: ἐδηλώθη γὰρ μοι περὶ ύμων, ἀδελφοί μου, ὑπὸ τῶν Χλόης ὁτι ἐριδές ἐν ύμιν εἰσιν (1:11). Paul later states: Ὅλως ἀκούεται ἐν ύμιν πορνεία (5:1a). This short statement has two functions. First, it provides a succinct introduction to the discussion of πορνεία in 5:1b–6:20. Second, the word ἀκούεται links back to ἐδηλώθη in 1:11. Thus, the topic of sexual immorality in 5:1–6:20 is a part of Chloe’s report.

Similarly, the statement in 11:18, γὰρ συνερχομένων ύμων ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ύμιν, begins a teaching on the Lord’s Supper. The use of ἀκούω

19 Many scholars interpret this phrase as having a transitional function or as emphasising the issue. Thus, this phrase is not used to begin a new topic. For instance, Wimbush argues that this phrase signifies a shift in 7:32, enabling the inclusion of Paul’s own perspective in the middle of a discussion about marriage. Vicent L. Wimbush, Paul, The Worldly Ascetic: Response to the World and Self-Understanding according to 1 Corinthians 7 (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1987), 49–50. Ciampa and Rosner argue that the phrase in 7:32, is used to transit the discussion of marriage from an eschatological perspective to a Christological perspective. Ciampa and Rosner, 349. Fee suggests that the phrase in 10:20 places the previous discussion of the Lord’s Table and Israel’s history into right perspective. Fee, First Corinthians, 472.

20 Collins argues that all three occurrences, together with other occurrences of όλως (7:7; 10:1; 12:1; 14:5; 16:7), simply express Paul’s wish. This phrase provides Paul with an opportunity to clarify his wish by referring back to the previous argument. Collins, First Corinthians, 295.

21 Both Thiselton and Collins favour this interpretation, although various scholars are silent on this connection (Conzelmann, Horsley, Fitzmyer, Barrett, Orr and Walther). Thiselton, 385; Collins, 209. Ciampa and Rosner argue that the adverb όλως suggests that the report in 5:1 has been publicly circulated. Fee suggests that the connotation of όλως is “actually” instead of “universally.” Ciampa and Rosner, 199; Fee, First Corinthians, 199.
in this short statement, links back to Chloe’s report, and points to a forthcoming new topic regarding σχίσμα. Notably, the previous discussion of head coverings in 11:2, begins with Ἐπαίνω δὲ ἴματι (the verb-δέ-pronoun clause). In 11:17, Paul begins the topic of the Lord’s Supper with: Τούτῳ δὲ παραγγέλλων οὐκ ἔπαινον. The contrast between ἔπαινον and οὐκ ἔπαινον is striking. This contrast, together with the specific summary statement including ἀκούω, is used by Paul to begin a new topic. Thus, the two summary statements in 5:1 and 11:18 are discourse markers.

3.1.2 Semantic Units

As previously described, a discourse can be divided into smaller segments, which are called semantic units. Based on the three identified discourse markers, this study divides 1 Corinthians into 13 segments: the letter-opening, 11 major semantic units, and the letter-closing (see Table 3.1).

---

22 The scholars that hold this view include Fitzmyer, Collins, Fee, and Hurd. Collins, 421; Fee, First Corinthians, 537; Hurd, Corinthians, 82. Thiselton maintains that Chloe’s people are the source of the report in 11:18 (referring back to 1:10; 5:1). Thiselton, 849. Fitzmyer mentions that it is an oral report, but does not mention Chloe. Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 432.

23 For further discussion of semantic units, see pages 77–8 in Chapter 2.
Table 3.1 Semantic Units of 1 Corinthians\textsuperscript{24}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Unit</th>
<th>Discourse Marker</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Markers (1:1–9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>V+ δέ+ ὑμᾶς in 1:10</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>περι + δέ + ὑμᾶς in 7:1</td>
<td>περι + δέ in 8:1</td>
<td>V+ δέ+ ὑμᾶς in 11:18</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>περι + δέ + ὑμᾶς in 12:1</td>
<td>περι + δέ in 15:1</td>
<td>V+ δέ+ ὑμᾶς in 16:12</td>
<td>περι + δέ in 16:15</td>
<td>περι + δέ in 16:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter-closing (16:19–24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each major semantic unit contains a specific topic: Unit A: Church Division (1:10–4:21), Unit B: Sexual Immorality (5:1–6:20), Unit C: Marriage (7:1–40), Unit D: Food and Idols (8:1–11:1), Unit E: Head Coverings (11:2–16), Unit F: The Lord’s Supper (11:17–34), Unit G: Spiritual Gifts (12:1–14:40), Unit H: Resurrection (15:1–58), Unit I: Contribution (16:1–11), Unit J: Apollos (16:12–14), and Unit K: Stephanas (16:15–18). Table 3.2 outlines the perspectives of other scholars, regarding the major semantic units in 1 Corinthians.

\textsuperscript{24} V + δέ is an abbreviation for the combination of a first person singular indicative verb and δέ. SS is an abbreviation for “summary statement,” accompanied by the verb ἀκοινο, which alludes to Chloe’s report.
Table 3.2 Outline of 1 Corinthians by Scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline of this Study</th>
<th>Semantic Unit A</th>
<th>Semantic Unit B</th>
<th>Semantic Unit C</th>
<th>Semantic Unit D</th>
<th>Semantic Unit E</th>
<th>Semantic Unit F</th>
<th>Semantic Unit G</th>
<th>Semantic Unit H</th>
<th>Semantic Unit I</th>
<th>Semantic Unit J</th>
<th>Semantic Unit K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Division 1:10–42</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>Food and Idols</td>
<td>Head Coverings</td>
<td>The Lord’s</td>
<td>Spiritual Gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:1–11</td>
<td>11:2–16</td>
<td>Supper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thielson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciampa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thielson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fitz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ciampa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Although this study and these scholars suggest slightly different outlines, the main issue concerns whether a particular topic is considered a major segment or a minor sub-division. For example, C. K. Barrett divides 5:1–6:20 into three major segments:


26 According to Terry, Ciampa and Rosner, and Bailey, this semantic unit ends in 4:17, and the second semantic unit begins in 4:18.


A comparison of the outline in this study and those proposed by other scholars reveals some slight differences. First, one of the most comprehensive and recent discourse analyses of 1 Corinthians was conducted by Terry, in *A Discourse Analysis of First Corinthians*. Even though many scholars have undertaken work on the epistle, a comprehensive study of 1 Corinthians, applying the principles of discourse analysis, is rare. Therefore, it is important to compare the proposed semantic units in this study with Terry’s. As shown above in Tables 3.1 and 3.2, the two outlines are remarkably similar.

Second, both Terry and Kenneth Bailey do not regard 4:21 as the end of the first semantic unit. Terry argues that the first unit ends in 4:17, proven by the chiastic

---


31 Fee proposes the same segmentation, but the titles are slightly different. Fee, *Corinthians*, 21–23.

32 Following are the topics of the semantic units proposed by Terry: (A) Church division 1:10–4:17; (B) Fornication 4:18–6:20; (C) Marriage 7; (D) Idol food 8:1–11:1; (E) Head coverings 11:2–16; (F) The Lord’s Supper 11:17–34; (G) Spiritual gifts 12–14; (H) The Resurrection 15; (I) Contribution 16:1–11; and (J) Apollos 16:12. Terry calls these “ten discourses;” however, in this study, the divisions are called “semantic units” and “discourse” refers to the whole epistle. An exception is 2 Corinthians due to the multi-letter theory, whereby 2 Cor 1–9 is considered a single discourse. This will be further discussed in Chapter 5. Ralph Bruce Terry, *A Discourse Analysis of First Corinthians* (Dallas: SIL and The University of Texas at Arlington, 1995), 38–43. There are only two minor differences between the outline in this study and Terry’s outline: Terry interprets 4:17 as the end of the first unit, and does not consider the discussion of Stephanas a semantic unit.
structure of the unit. Bailey contends that 4:17 serves as a critical point, where Paul introduces his “ways in Christ” to the Corinthians, and then elaborates on these in subsequent parts. However, it seems more natural for the first unit to include 4:18–21. Contextually, Paul’s travel plan in 4:18–21 can be interpreted as either part of the first segment “Church Division” or the second segment “Sexual Immorality.” In 4:21, Paul mentions that he might discipline the Corinthians: εν ῥάβδῳ ἥλθον πρὸς ὑμᾶς. This can refer to dissention in relation to church division or sexual immorality. Whilst it is possible for Paul to mention his disciplinary authority before addressing the issue of sexual immorality, it seems more natural for Paul to mention this as a conclusion to warn the Corinthians against fractures and church division.

Third, most scholars, with the exception of Fee and Terry, do not perceive the discussion of Apollos as a separate segment, and instead interpret this as only part of the final unit in 16:1–24 (see Table 3.2). However, the discourse marker περί δὲ in 16:12 strongly indicates that the discussion is a major concern in the epistle, despite

---

33 According to Terry, the first segment comprises two chiasms. The first chiasm is: A Division (1:10–17), B Wisdom (1:18–2:26), and A’ Division (3:1–4). The second chiasm is: C Servanthood (3:5–15), D Wisdom and Division (3:16–23), and C’ Servanthood (4:1–17). Notably, “Travel Plans” in 4:18–21 is perceived by Terry as part of the second segment, which avoids “disturbing” the chiasms. Terry, Corinthians, 43.

34 Bailey’s argument is three-fold. First, Παρακαλῶ oǐν ὑμᾶς (4:16) marks the boundary of a topic, which is the same function as the two other phrases (11:2; 15:1). Second, oǐν (4:16) concludes a segment and διὰ τοῦτο (4:17) is prospective. Third, evidence from some earlier manuscripts shows a division between 4:16 and 4:17. Bailey, “Structure,” 160–1, 179.
its brevity. In addition, the mention of Apollos in the first unit plays an important role in Paul’s argument against the communal schism.\(^{35}\)

Fourth, none of the reviewed outlines separate the discussion of Stephanus. Together with the discussion of Apollos, it is considered part of the final unit. Whilst the five imperatives in 16:13–14, which denote a general encouragement,\(^ {36}\) are consistent with a typical concluding segment in the Pauline epistles,\(^ {37}\) the clause Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς in 16:15 is a discourse marker. In fact, this clause begins the first semantic unit (1:10). The occurrence of the same clause near the beginning and the end of the epistle is an inclusio. Despite its brevity, the discussion of Stephanas is a valid semantic unit. The following discussion of discourse coherence will show that this inclusio, together with the mention of Stephanus are significant in terms of the understanding of the epistle.

Nevertheless, these differences are comparatively minor when considering the outlines of the whole discourse. In summary, the semantic units outlined in this study, based on the three identified discourse markers, are fundamentally similar to those

\(^{35}\) Ker contends that the discussion of Apollos in 16:12, although brief, is significant. Donald P. Ker, “Paul and Apollos—Colleagues or Rivals?” JSNT 77 (2000): 96. In addition, Mihaila states that περὶ δὲ in 16:12 introduces a new topic. He argues that the mention of Apollos earlier in the epistle is important to the discussion of communal disunity, and the later mention of Apollos in 16:12 should be studied in light of this. Corin Mihaila, The Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul’s Stance towards Greco-Roman Rhetoric: An Exegetical and Socio-historical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–4 (Library of New Testament Studies 402; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 181–93.

\(^{36}\) The five consecutive imperative verbs in 16:13–14 are γρηγορεῖτε, στήκετε, ἀνδρίζεσθε, κραταίωσθε, and γενέσθω.

\(^{37}\) For example, Collins, Fee, Fitzmyer, Horsley, and Thiselton consider 16:13 as the formal closing of the epistle. Some of these scholars perceive the five seriatim imperatives as signifying the hortatory part of the conclusion. Thiselton rightly argues that this is a Pauline style, as this short series of exhortation occurs in other Pauline epistles, including Romans (16:17–19), 2 Corinthians (13:11), Philippians (4:8–9), and 1 Thessalonians (5:12–22). Collins, 599; Fee, Corinthians, 827; Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 623; Horsley, 224; Thiselton, 1333–4.
suggested by scholars. The discrepancy is two-fold: whether a topic is considered a major segment or a minor sub-division, and the title of the topic.

3.1.3 Discourse Coherence

Overall, a discourse is not a random compilation of thoughts and sentences. Instead, different elements in a discourse, including various semantic units, are joined through cohesive linguistic devices.\(^\text{38}\) Although the epistle is Paul’s response to the questions from the Corinthians, as well as the oral reports, these semantic units are purposefully arranged in a coherent manner. Bailey remarks that the questions from the Corinthians are “worked into Paul’s outline,” in order to fit his agenda and convey his intended message.\(^\text{39}\) The following part explicates several cohesive linguistic devices to demonstrate that the communal relationship, both among the Corinthians and between Paul and the Corinthians, is the coherent theme connecting various semantic units.

3.1.3.1 Inclusio

As previously mentioned, the clause παρακαλῶ δὲ ἵμας occurs in 1:10 and 16:15. In 1:10, the subordinate clause following παρακαλῶ is used to urge the Corinthians to be united (τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες). In 16:15, the subordinate clause following παρακαλῶ is used to urge the Corinthian to submit to Stephanas.\(^\text{40}\) The repetition of the clause παρακαλῶ δὲ ἵμας at both the beginning and the end of the epistle should

\(^{38}\) For a detailed discussion of cohesion and coherence, see pages 74–7 in Chapter 2.


\(^{40}\) Both subordinate clauses are introduced by ἵνα.
not be treated as mere coincidence.\textsuperscript{41} In addition to this repeated clause, Stephanas and the Corinthians are also mentioned in both Unit A and Unit K. In Unit A, Paul contends that he has only baptised a few people, including Stephanas: ἑβάπτισα δὲ καὶ τῶν Στεφανᾶ ὁ ὅκον, λοιπὸν οὐκ οἶδα εἰ τινὰ ἄλλον ἑβάπτισα (1:16).\textsuperscript{42} In Unit K, Paul urges the Corinthians to submit to Stephanas, ὑμεῖς ὑποτάσσηθε τοῖς τοιούτοις (16:16).

In addition to these similarities, there are also two contrasting elements. First, at the beginning of Unit A, Paul rebukes the Corinthians for their communal disunity: μὴ ἢ ἐν ὑμῖν σχίσματα ... ἔριδες ἐν ὑμῖν εἰσίν (1:10–11). Conversely, in Unit K, Paul commends Stephanas’ service: εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτοὺς (16:15). The rebuke and the praise form a sharp contrast. Second, at the end of Unit A, Paul’s emotional expression is stark: τῇ θέλετε; ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐν ἀγάπῃ πνεῦμα τε πραύτητος; (4:21). However, in Unit K, Paul expresses joy regarding Stephanas’ presence: χαίρω δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ παρουσίᾳ Στεφανᾶ (16:17).

\textsuperscript{41} Thiselton perceives this phrase as a replication of the παρακαλῶ formula in 1:10. However, he does not consider it a form of inclusio. Instead, the formula serves to introduce a request based on an institutional relationship. Thiselton, 1337. Similarly, Collins argues that the clause in 6:15 serves to make a request. Mitchell argues that παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς in 1:10 is a rhetorical device that introduces an important theme in this epistle, but does not comment on the exact same replication in 6:15. Mitchell, \textit{Paul}, 294. In short, based on the comments, this occurrence is seemingly a mere coincidence. However, it would be too happenstance to have Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, a verb-ε-pronoun clause, occurring in both the first and the last chapter. Thus, it is more prudent to consider this occurrence as a form of inclusio.

\textsuperscript{42} Paul first mentions Crispus and Gaius in 1:14 as the people that he has baptised. He then names Stephanas afterwards (1:15). Some scholars argue that this is not a lapse of memory (Collins, 84; Fee, \textit{Corinthians}, 62–3; Thiselton, 141). Dahl argues that the omission of Stephanas is a deliberate act, since Paul does not want to involve Stephanas in the discussion of disunity. Nils A. Dahl, “Paul and the Church at Corinth,” in \textit{Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church} (ed. Edward Adams and David G. Horrell; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2004), 92. Pascuzzi suggests that it is “an attempt to avoid calling attention of how many he had actually baptised.” Maria Pascuzzi, “Baptism-based Allegiance and the Divisions in Corinth: A Reexamination of 1 Corinthians 1:13–17,” \textit{CBQ} 71 (2009): 824. Stephanas is also considered to be holding a form of leadership in the Corinthian community. Hurd, \textit{Corinthians}, 49; Ciampa and Rosner, 858.
These similarities and contrasts between Unit A and Unit K, together with the use of inclusio, are cohesive linguistic devices that create a coherent flow and enable the audience to perceive and understand a particular topic. Notably, Nils Dahl argues that the disunity in the community is related to the opposition to Paul and Stephanas. However, Bailey suggests an alternative understanding to the inclusion of Stephanas in 16:15, and argues that Paul uses the voluntary service of Stephanas as an example to show the Corinthians the right attitude of living within a community. These two hypotheses are not mutually exclusive. The use of inclusio and contrastive elements prove that the mention of Stephanas is not a random insertion, and instead is used by Paul to silent the opponents of Stephanas, and concurrently show the community the right attitude through the example of Stephanas.

3.1.3.2 Prominence

Prominence is another linguistic device to demonstrate the coherence of a discourse by highlighting an important point through the repetition of a theme (thematic prominence) or the repetition of a word (lexical cohesion). In 1 Corinthians, both thematic prominence and lexical cohesion are observed.

3.1.3.2.1 Thematic prominence

The 11 major semantic units in 1 Corinthians address various issues either raised by the Corinthians or by Paul through the verbal reports. However, they are arranged by

---


44 Bailey, Paul, 490–1.

45 For discussion of discourse prominence, see pages 74–7 of Chapter 2.
Paul to purposefully convey the importance of corporate unity and communal relationship, which is the central theme. Before discussing this central theme in light of thematic prominence, it is vital to attend to two discussions stemming from the scholarship. Both relate to the structural outline of the letter.

First, some scholars divide the epistle into two main parts: oral reports (1–6) and written questions (7–16). Other scholars separate the topic of schism (1–4) from the oral and written reports (5–16). Regardless, Paul is thought to arrange his letter by separating his response to the oral reports from his response to the written questions. The strongest objection to this kind of neat division is how Paul commences Unit F. Unit F (11:17–34) is situated in the division (7–16), which most scholars presume to be the apostle’s answer to the questions raised. As previously discussed, the summary statement in 11:18, γὰρ συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν, begins the topic of the Lord’s Supper. Whether the report (suggested by ἀκοῦω) is from Chloe’s people or not, it is obvious that Paul does not respond to a written question from the Corinthians here. As such, it is more probable that the apostle arranges the letter in his own way to convey a particular point, rather than following this kind of neat grouping.

The second issue is related to the first one. If Paul deliberately separates the oral reports and places the discussion of schism in the front, what is his purpose?

---

46 Scholars who support a three-part division include Conzelmann, Thiselton, Orr and Walther. Conzelmann, *Corinthians*, vii–viii; Thiselton, vi–xii; Orr and Walther, x–xv.


48 Burk also holds this view. He argues that the oral reports are signified in 1:11, 5:1, and 11:18; and Paul deals with the written questions in 7:1 onwards. Denny Burk, “Discerning Corinthians Slogans through Paul’s Use of the Diatribe in 1 Corinthians 6:12–20,” *BBR* 18 (2008): 106.
There are two different suggestions. It is suggested that Paul has to defend his apostolic authority before he could address the questions raised.\textsuperscript{49} Alternatively, it is suggested that the epistle is centred on one key theme: ecclesial unity. Thus, it is important for Paul to set the tone at the beginning of the letter.\textsuperscript{50} These two seemingly opposite suggestions are not necessarily mutually exclusive.\textsuperscript{51} This study argues that Paul addresses the communal disunity whilst asserting his apostolic authority. In other words, the letter is written to attend to two main issues: the communal relationship within the Corinthian community, and the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians. This is proved by the thematic prominence displayed in the epistle.

In 1 Corinthians, some discussions are noticeably a common concern for the whole Corinthian community, including the issues of church division (A), the Lord’s Supper (F), spiritual gifts (G), and contribution (I). Some are less obvious, such as the discussions of sexual immorality (B) and head coverings (E). The rest, including the discussions of marriage (C), food and idols (D), resurrection (H), Apollos (J), and Stephanas (K), are comparatively obscure in terms of their communal focus. Nonetheless, this study argues that all of the semantic units are connected by one central theme as explained below.

In his discussion of the schism (A), Paul urges the whole community (as illustrated by πάντες in 1:10) to be united by the same mind (ἐν τῷ ἀπαντῷ νοί). The


\textsuperscript{50} Mitchell, \textit{Paul}, 1, 301–2.

\textsuperscript{51} According to Fee, many people regard the schism mentioned in the first four chapters is behind every issue discussed in the subsequent part of the epistle. Fee repudiates this idea based on two observations. First, no factional parties are mentioned in Chapters 5–16. Second, there is no evidence in the epistle that Apollos and Cephas are the “rallying points” for these parties. Fee, \textit{Corinthians}, 47. Hence, Fee does not agree with Mitchell who suggests that disunity is the key issue discussed in the whole letter.
concern is for the entire community, emphasising on communal relationship and corporate unity. However, the relationship between Paul and the community is also clearly a focal point in his discussion, which is demonstrated by the account of factionalism (1:12–14) and the Corinthians’ challenge to Paul’s authority (4:1–3).

In dealing with the case of sexual immorality (B), Paul commands the Corinthians to deal with the fornicator when they assemble (συναχθεντω, in 5:4), alluding that the whole community should act together to deal with this issue. Most importantly, by using the metaphor of yeast Paul warns the Corinthians about the adverse effect of this situation on the whole community (as indicated by the phrase ὁλον τὸ φύραμα, in 5:6). Hence, the problem of sexual immorality is not confined to an individual person. Rather, it has an effect on the entire community.52

The discussion of marriage (Unit C) seems to be unrelated to the entire community. However, Paul noticeably connects this discussion with the previous one at the beginning of Unit C: διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἐκαστὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἔχετω καὶ ἐκάστη τὸν ἰδίων ἄνδρα ἔχετω (7:2).53 The ultimate concern for Paul to discuss marriage is sexual immorality, a practice which could spread like yeast in a community as discussed in Unit C.54 Furthermore, Paul addresses those who are

---

52 Kim provides a convincing argument regarding the connection between sexual immorality and the Corinthian community. He argues that the issue is related to the power conflicts among the Corinthians, since “some people exercise their freedom irresponsibly at the expense of the whole community.” Yung Suk Kim, Christ’s Body in Corinth: The Politics of a Metaphor (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), 57.

53 The word πορνεία only occurs five times in the letter: 5:1 (twice); 6:13; 6:18; and 7:2. The word occurs four times in Unit C (5:1–6:20) and one time in Unit D (7:1–40).

54 Various scholars commonly consider that this segment is related to the issue of sexual immorality depicted in the preceding context. Ciampa and Rosner, 266; Orr and Walther, 207; Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 274; Fee, Corinthians, 277–8. Some scholars, including Bailey, Mitchell, and Collins, consider 7:1–40 as part of the semantic units of 5:1–6:20 (see Table 3.2).
single (7:8) and married (7:10). Therefore, the discussion in this unit is relevant to every member in the community.\textsuperscript{55}

In Unit D, Paul discusses the issue of food and idols. This is an issue which impact the whole community, and is related to the conflict among the Corinthians. Unit D is written in the form of chiasm. The issue of food and idols is discussed in 8:1–13 (E1) and 10:1–11:1 (E3),\textsuperscript{56} with the topic of freedom appearing in the centre of the chiastic structure, 9:1–27 (E2).\textsuperscript{57} There are three basic observations about the entire Unit E. First, the issue is a concern for the entire community. For example, Paul mentions τινὲς (8:7) are accustomed to idol worship in E1, but his emphatic call in E3 addresses the whole community: Διόπερ, ἀγαπητοί μου, φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας (10:14). Second, the conflict between two parties within the community is subtly portrayed throughout the unit. In E1, Paul begins his discussion by mentioning “the wise”: αἰδαμέν ὅτι πάντες γνώσιν ἔχομεν (8:1). Then, he attends to the underlying conflict between “the weak” (τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν, in 8:9) and

\textsuperscript{55} Some scholars argue that this issue is of a communal concern. For example, Scroggs argues that the passage is to counter a group of “Corinthian extremists” who insist on the practice of sexual abstinence among the married. Fee also supports the view regarding the extremists. Robin Scroggs, “Paul and the Eschatological Woman,” JAAR 40 (1972): 283–303; Fee, Corinthians, 269–70. In addition, Paul’s teaching on marriage, for Scroggs, hinges on the apostle’s concern “for the larger community of the church over the smaller community of the family” given the imminent advent of Christ. Scroggs, “Eschatological Woman,” 297. On the other hand, Mitchell contends that “marital relationship is a component of the larger community group” based on contemporary Greek philosophical background. Thus, she concludes that the issue of marriage also contributes to the contention within the community. Mitchell, Paul, 121–2. Although the text itself does not provide a clear illustration that this issue is directly related to the unity of the church, Mitchell’s proposed theory is possible.

\textsuperscript{56} In 8:1–13, Paul deals with the general principle of food offered to idols.

\textsuperscript{57} Ciampa and Rosner, 367; Terry, Corinthians, 43; Bailey, Paul, 229. In Bailey’s structural analysis of this segment, he demonstrates the parallelism employed in the text, which is more complex than a simple chiasm.
“the wise” (σὲ τὸν ἐχοντα γνώσιν, in 8:10). The wise (also known as the strong) believe that they possess the true knowledge, and they despise the weak. Third, E2 seems to be out of place. There are two views regarding the purpose for Paul to write E2. Some argue that Paul uses his own example in E2 to teach the truth of exercising freedom. Therefore, his teaching, on the one hand, rebukes the attitude of the wise people whom he mentions in E1; and on the other hand, instructs the weak regarding the truth of idol worship detailed in E3. Conversely, some argue that Paul uses E2 to defend his apostolic authority. The two views are considered by some as mutually exclusive. Nonetheless, this study argues that these two views coexist based on two reasons. The theme of freedom depicted in E2 re-emerges in E3, as indicated by the occurrence of ἐλευθερία in 10:29. This shows that E2 is not an unrelated digression. Rather, it is in the centre of a chiasm, and it provides an example for the Corinthians to learn the truth of exercising freedom in relating to food offered to idols. However,  

---

58 This is a common view held by various scholars. The wise is also known as “the strong.” For Mitchell, the concern of food and idols is a divisive issue, Mitchell, Corinthians, 237. There are two groups in the community, “the Strong” and “the Weak” (Thiselton, 606; Fee, Corinthians, 358–62; Conzelmann, 140–1). Murphy-O’Connor argues that the phrase πάντες γνώσιν ἐχομεν (8:1) denotes “the Strong,” and suggests that the Weak is under the oppression of the Strong. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 88, 97. Fee further argues that Paul uses his own example regarding the discussion of freedom to illustrate the problematic attitudes held by both groups. Fee, Corinthians, 358–9. However, some scholars, including Horsley and Hurd, reject the presence of the Strong and the Weak. Horsley, 115; Hurd, Corinthians, 123–5. Hurd argues that “some Corinthians were less secure in their new faith than others,” but there is no proof in the text indicating they formed a group.

59 Thiselton, 662–3; Collins, 328–9; Ciampa and Rosner, 396.

60 Barrett, First Corinthians, 200; Orr and Walther, 240; Fee Corinthians, 392–3; Wendell Lee Willis, Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10 (SBLDS 68; Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1985), 270–2.

61 For example, Collins, Robertson and Plummer argue that the text is the discussion of Paul’s personal example, and reject the notion that Paul defends his apostleship in this segment. Collins, 328; Robertson and Plummer, 176. Conversely, Fee argues that Paul devotes this segment to defend his apostolic authority rather than providing personal example. For Fee, the Corinthians challenge Paul’s apostolicity, by questioning his teaching (as he forbids them to attend pagan temple). Fee, Corinthians, 392–3.
Paul also uses this opportunity to further defend his apostolic authority that is challenged by some Corinthians, a topic that he has previously mentioned (4:1–3). In summary, the discussion of food and idols concerns the entire community that is in conflict. Paul also uses this discussion to reaffirm his apostolic authority in facing the opposition from the community.

In Unit E, Paul discusses the issue of head covering. The two words, προσευχομένη and προφητεύοντα (11:5), elucidate that the situation is related to a Christian assembly instead of a private incident. Therefore, the issue concerns the whole community, with reference to their worship assembly.

In Unit F, the word συνερχομένων (11:18, 20) points to the gathering of the community at the Lord’s Supper. This focus of communal gathering is further accentuated by the repetition of συνέρχομαι (11:17, 18, 20, 33, 34). The underlying issue in this unit points to communal schism as indicated by σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν (11:18). Thus, the issue involves the entire community.

In Unit G, the discussion of exercising spiritual gifts is set in the background of Christian gathering (ὅταν συνέρχησθε, in 14:26). The Corinthians are urged to do all things in right order (πάντα δὲ εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω, in 14:40). In other words, this is the concern of the whole community when they gather together in worship.

---

62 Fitzmyer also includes both views in his interpretation of Chapter 9. Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 353.

63 Mitchell further argues that the issue of head coverings and women’s authority is a reflection of factionalism. Mitchell, Corinthians, 262–3.

64 Horsley argues that the word is employed in other Greek literature to denote the uniting of different factions. Horsley, 158.
In Unit H, the discussion of the resurrection seems to be purely theological. However, the argument presented by Paul alludes to factionalism. Paul challenges the wrong view held by the Corinthians: πῶς λέγουσιν ἐν ὑμῖν τινὲς ὧτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἐστὶν (15:12). The phrase πῶς λέγουσιν ἐν ὑμῖν is particularly intriguing. This indicates that the wrong view of resurrection is not embraced by the whole community. Instead, there are some members proclaiming it. In addition, the previous context touches on Paul’s apostleship: Ἐγώ γὰρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων ... ἀλλὰ περισσότερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκκλησίασα (15:9–10). Therefore, it is highly possible that the phrase ἐν ὑμῖν τίνες points to the faction that challenges Paul’s apostolic authority, and this faction also proclaims a wrong belief of resurrection. Thus, the schism within the community and the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians are two underlying issues in the discussion of resurrection.

When Paul discusses the contribution (I), he asks the Corinthians to follow the direction he gives to ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας (16:1). In other words, this alludes to the notion that the collection involves the whole Christian community.

Concerning Apollos (J), the appearance of his name in 16:12 forms an inclusio, since Paul first introduces him in 1:12 and then mentions his name in the context of schism (3:5–8). As such, there is a connection between 16:12 and the issue of division. Some argue that the absence of Apollos among the Corinthians (or his

---

65 Mitchell argues that Paul mentions the gospel in 15:1 to encourage the community to be united by citing their common foundation—Christ’s gospel. Hence, the passage in 15:9–11 serves as “an exemplary function,” illustrating Paul’s humility. Mitchell, Paul, 287. On the other hand, 15:9–10 can also be understood from the perspective of the schism. According to Fee, the seemingly unnecessary account of Paul’s apostleship in this text alludes to the underlying conflict between the apostle and the community. Paul asserts his apostleship by invoking his relationship with the Risen Christ to tackle the conflict in the community. Fee, Corinthians, 719. This theory is considerably sound when the context of the whole letter is considered.

66 Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 622–3; Fee, Corinthians, 824–5; Conzelmann, 297.
reluctance to visit the community as indicated in 16:12) is his own attempt to avoid either escalating the disunity in the community\textsuperscript{67} or being exploited by the factionalists.\textsuperscript{68} Thiselton is more specific as he argues that Apollos is disgusted by the disunity.\textsuperscript{69} Regardless of the reason for Apollos’ absence, there is a general understanding that Apollos’ visit is connected to the problem of the communal schism.

As previously discussed, the discussion of Stephanas (K) forms an inclusio. Paul uses the selfless service offered by Stephanas as an example to illustrate the desirable attitude in the life of a community. This attitude is required to tackle communal schism.

In summary, the theme of communal relationship and corporate unity is the thematic prominence shown across all the semantic units. All the units discuss topics that concern the entire Corinthian community. Amongst these units, some specifically point to the strained relationship between Paul and the Corinthian community (A, H, J, and K).

3.1.3.2.2 Lexical Cohesion

In terms of another form of prominence, σωμα is the fourth most frequent noun in the letter, displaying a strong pattern of lexical cohesion (see Appendix 1). The word is repeated 46 times in 1 Corinthians.\textsuperscript{70} The high occurrence rate signifies the

\textsuperscript{67} Barrett, \textit{First Corinthians}, 392; Mitchell, \textit{Paul}, 293.

\textsuperscript{68} Pascuzzi, “Baptism,” 822.

\textsuperscript{69} Thiselton, 1332.

\textsuperscript{70} The occurrence of σωμα in 1 Corinthians are as follows: 5:3; 6:13 (twice), 15, 16, 18(twice), 19, 20; 7:4 (twice), 34; 9:27; 10:16, 17; 11:24, 27, 29; 12:12 (thrice), 13, 14, 15 (twice), 16 (twice), 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27; 13:3; 15:35, 37, 38 (twice); 40 (twice), 44 (thrice). σωμα occurs 74 times in all the authentic Pauline epistles.
importance of Σωμα in this epistle. Figure 3.1 shows that Σωμα occurs in six semantic units, with an exceptional frequent occurrence in Units B, G and H.

Figure 3.1 The Occurrences of Σωμα in Semantic Units of 1 Corinthians

By providing a detailed analysis of individual occurrence of Σωμα in each semantic unit and its overall occurrence in the entire discourse, this study demonstrates that Σωμα is used to connote communal and corporate unity, which is its thematic meaning.

3.1.3.3 Macrostructure

A macrostructure denotes the core message of a discourse, which is intended by the author for the audience. It is a short abstract that can be summarised by the audience after reading a particular discourse.71 From the coherence displayed by various linguistic devices, including the inclusio and the thematic prominence, this study argues that the macrostructure of 1 Corinthians can be understood as follows. In response to the written questions of the Corinthians and the oral reports, Paul asserts his apostolic authority in facing an opposition from some Corinthians, and calls for

---

71 For discussion of macrostructure, see pages 77–8 in Chapter 2.
corporate unity by reproaching the schism within the community and highlighting the importance of communal relationship among the Corinthians.

3.2 Σῶμα in 1 Corinthians

The following part analyses the occurrence of σῶμα in each semantic unit, and then examines its overall occurrence in the entire discourse in light of the sociolinguistic aspect, the macrostructure, and the discourse flow.

3.2. Σῶμα in Semantic Units

Table 3.3 shows the occurrences of σῶμα in all the major semantic units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Semantic Unit</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Division</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Code</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1.1 Σῶμα in Unit B

Σῶμα occurs nine times in Unit B. The word occurs in a clustered form, and its overall occurrences connote a strong corporate and communal reference.

In Unit B, Paul discusses the case in which a man in the Corinthians community commits incest (5:1–13). Then, he digresses to comment on a legal
dispute (6:1–8) before resuming the topic of sexual immorality (6:9–20). Instead of focusing on a specific case (as in 5:1–13), the discussion in 6:9–20 involves the general issue of prostitution. Paul warns the Corinthians against visiting prostitutes. In this discussion, σῶμα occurs in one big cluster, with eight occurrences appearing in 6:13–20. Table 3.4 shows the distribution of σῶμα in Unit B. In this table (and the subsequent tables, Tables 3.5 to 3.9), an asterisk is used to symbolize the occurrence of an individual σῶμα.

Table 3.4 Σῶμα in Unit B “Sexual Immorality” (5:1–6:20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* ***</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the concept of lexical cohesion, when two or more occurrences of similar lexical items appearing in close proximity, these lexical items likely belong to

---

72 Deming provides an insightful explanation of this “digression.” He argues that 1 Cor 5–6 centres on a single case of sexual immorality. The failed attempt by some Corinthians to resolve this case in the public courts leads to “strife and moral confusion within the community.” Therefore, Deming argues that the three divisions, 5:1–13, 6:1–8, and 6:9–20, can be understood as a coherent segment. Will Deming, “The Unity of 1 Corinthians 5–6,” JBL 115 (1996): 289–312. Deming’s argument is helpful in understanding the transition from 5:1–13 to 6:1–8. However, Paul clearly discusses a general scenario in 6:9–20: sexual immorality with the practice of visiting prostitutes. Hence, it is likely that Paul arranges his discussion as follows. Both the single case (5:1–13) and the general practice (6:1–8) of sexual immorality would destroy a Christian community, which is exemplified by the strife-fueled court case (6:1–8).

73 These sub-divisions are created for showing how σῶμα is “spatially” distributed in a major semantic unit. The division is determined by dividing the semantic unit according to its context. For example, the discussion of Sexual Immorality in 5:1–13 temporarily digresses to the discussion of a law suit in 6:1–8 before returning to the topic of Sexual Immorality in 6:9–20. Therefore, it is appropriate to divide the semantic unit into three parts: 5:1–13, 6:1–8, and 6:9–20. The creation of this sub-division is for visual enhancement, aiming to illustrate the occurrences of the clustered σῶμα.

74 One of the most intriguing observations is the use of chiasm in Units B, C and D. There is a short digression in each major semantic unit, in which Paul discusses a specific topic before returning to the main theme. For example, the law suit in Unit B and the slavery in Unit C are both obvious digressions. Terry also notes this chiastic structure. Terry, Corinthians, 43.
the same semantic domain.\textsuperscript{75} As shown in the table, σώμα occurs eight times within eight verses, appearing as a cluster in the last sub-division (6:13–20). The clustered occurrence of σώμα suggests that the word connotes a similar, if not identical, meaning throughout, as explained below.

Paul begins his argument in 6:13 by explaining this principle: τὸ δὲ σῶμα οὐ τῇ πορνείᾳ ἀλλὰ τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ὁ κύριος τῷ σώματι. He further explains this principle in 6:15 by stating that τὰ σώματα ύμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἔστιν; and it is wrong that τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποιήσω πόρνης μέλη. Then, Paul contrasts the two different scenarios in: ὁ κολλώμενος τῇ πόρνῃ ἐν σώμα ἔστιν (6:16) and ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν πνεύμα ἔστιν (16:17). Paul continues his argument in 6:19 by stating that τὸ σῶμα ύμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ύμίν ἀγίον πνεύματός ἔστιν.

Finally, he concludes the argument in 6:20 by giving a hortatory statement: δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεόν ἐν τῷ σώματι ύμῶν.

In this cluster, σώμα is first employed to denote the physical body (6:13). Then, the term is used as a metaphor, depicting the community in which the people are the members of Christ, as illustrated by τὰ σώματα ύμῶν (6:15).\textsuperscript{76} The plural form τὰ σώματα highlights each individual member. The term undergoes further shift in 6:16, pointing to sexual union as suggested by the phrase ὁ κολλώμενος ... ἐν σώμα (the joining of σώμα during conjugation).\textsuperscript{77} Sexual union is compared with a spiritual union in 6:17 (ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν πνεύμα ἔστιν). Then, σώμα is used

\textsuperscript{75} For the discussion of lexical cohesion, see pages 74–6 in Chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{76} Fee comments that this is “an abrupt change of direction.” Fee, Corinthians, 253.

\textsuperscript{77} Horsley argues that the shift changes from physical body to sexual union. Horsley, 92.
to depict the physical body again in 6:18, before shifting to a new dimension in the following verse: τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν (6:19), denoting the temple of the Holy Spirit.  

The term σῶμα seems to connote different meanings in each individual occurrence. However, the word is commonly employed to elucidate relationship: sexual relationship between two people (their physical bodies), and spiritual relationship between believers and Christ. The latter form of relationship peculiarly resembles a sexual one. In Unit B, the reference to relationship is the shared meaning of the occurrences of σῶμα. Of interest, sexual intercourse performed by an individual is used to explain a communal Christ-believers relationship. In this relationship, σῶμα carries a metaphorical sense, portraying a relationship between Christ and his believers, as a corporate community.

The following part focuses on two exegetical issues. The solution to both issues further illuminates this corporate and communal connotation of σῶμα in Unit B. The first exegetical problem is the replacement of σῶμα by ἡμᾶς in 6:14. In 6:13, as σῶμα connotes the physical body that God cares for (ὅ κύριος τὸ σῶματί). In 6:14, Paul discusses the future resurrection in which ἡμᾶς is employed (καὶ ἡμᾶς

78 Jewett comments on the σῶμα-temple language, and argues that Paul “establishes the principles of exclusive corporal relationship”. Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 262.

79 This study agrees with Martin’s analysis that ethical immorality is not the main reason why Paul argues against visiting prostitutes. Instead, the greater concern is the symbolic message conveyed by this kind of immoral sexual union. This analysis focuses on the resemblance between sexual union and Christ-believers relationship in a positive sense. On the contrary, Martin focuses on the negative implication behind this kind of union. He argues that this is a dichotomy deliberately set up by Paul. Christians are part of Christ body. And παρεία represents the cosmos, the very essence of this world that is antithetical to God’s kingdom. The copulation between a man and a prostitute becomes the conjoining of Christ and this cosmos, which is totally inappropriate. Martin, Body, 174–7.

80 May argues that the σῶμα language in 6:12–20 is “unequivocally communal.” Alistair Scott May, The Body for the Lord: Sex and Identity in 1 Corinthians 5–7 (JSNTSup 278; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 143. Both May and Mitchell consider that communal identity is the focal concern in 6:12–20. May, Body, 140; and Mitchell, Paul, 120.
If the connection between σῶμα in 6:13 and the discussion of resurrection in 6:14 are considered, taking into account the coherent flow, the parallel between σῶμα and ἡμᾶς becomes apparent. In 6:14, instead of using σῶμα as in the previous verse, Paul argues that God will raise the physical body of the believers: ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ. In other words, ἡμᾶς replaces the word σῶμα. As such, the use of this plural pronoun expresses a subtle nuance. The focus of the resurrection is not on “individual” believers. Rather, the resurrection of the community (signified by a plural personal pronoun) is Paul’s emphasis. If the community is truly Paul’s focus, the σῶμα that denotes the physical body in its own sentence (6:13) carries an undertone which alludes to the corporate and communal reference as illuminated by ἡμᾶς in the immediate context (6:14).

The second exegetical issue is the interpretation of the combination of a singular σῶμα and a plural ὑμῶν in this passage. In this cluster, there are three occurrences in which σῶμα are combined with a personal plural possessive pronoun (6:15, 6:19, and 6:20). Two of the three occurrences have the combination of a singular σῶμα and ὑμῶν. They occur in 6:19 (τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν) and 6:20

---

81 Some scholars also note this replacement. Ciampa and Rosner, 255.

82 Jewett argues that σῶμα defines ἡμᾶς as a “corporal entity,” emphasizing the union between a person “with another person or God.” Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 260. On the other hand, Thiselton suggests that ἡμᾶς points to “single in-Christ corporeity,” illustrating the bodily resurrection. Thiselton, 464. Both Fee and Fitzmyer repudiate the interpretation of Robinson who argues that σῶμα means the whole person in light of ἡμᾶς. Robinson, Body, 29; Fee, Corinthians, 256; Thiselton, 466. Both Jewett and Thiselton argue for the bodily identity denoted by σῶμα, pointing to either the physical union (as suggested by Jewett) or the single bodily entity of Christ-believers (as argued by Thiselton). However, both scholars suggest that the term alludes to some form of communal union and oneness. Their view is similar to what this study holds: the corporate connotation behind the overall occurrence of σῶμα in this cluster.
As discussed in Chapter 2, this peculiar construct is called the abnormal singular construct. This conclusion of the abnormal singular construct in 6:19–20 seems to contradict the preceding phrase in 6:15, in which τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν occurs. Why is σῶμα used in the plural form instead of the singular form? This can be explained by two reasons. First, the predicate nominative in 6:15 is a plural noun, μέλη. The two phrases, τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν and μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, are joined by a singular copula verb ἐστιν. Therefore, it would be grammatically natural for the nominative to use a plural noun (and in this case, τὰ σώματα) to highlight the parallel. Second, 6:15 emphasises the fact that each member of the Corinthian community (suggested by the plural σῶμα) is also a member of Christ (suggested by the plural μέλη). However, this abnormal construct in 6:19–20 is not widely mentioned by many commentators. Among those who discuss it, Fee advocates the use of the distributive singular for σῶμα without providing any reason. Apart from critical commentaries, the textual variant in 6:19 provokes further observation. Although a number of ancient and reliable manuscripts (P46, A, B, D, F) argue for the reading of a singular σῶμα, a plural reading, τὰ σώματα, is found in a number of prominent manuscripts (A, L, ψ, 33, 1881). If the singular reading is the original, which is widely understood to be the case, then the plural reading could well be a “correction” intended by some scribes when they copied manuscripts. In other words, the singular construct was considered to be so abnormal that some scripts rectified it with a plural σῶμα as they believed the plural was supposed to be the correct reading. This is further demonstrated by the corrected version of the Codex Alexandrinus, A, in around c. 400. In other words, the peculiarity regarding the use of a singular σῶμα is highlighted as the construct was probably considered to be wrong by some scribes. It is possible that an attempt to harmonize the text (an abnormal singular construct) with another text in the preceding context in which τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν is used (6:15). However, this is only a conjecture. Of all the reviewed works, only a few mention this variant. For example, Robertson and Plummer notice the textual variant, but no explanation is provided. Robertson and Plummer, 129.

Of interest, the textual variant in 6:19 provokes further observation. Although a number of ancient and reliable manuscripts (P46, A, B, D, F) argue for the reading of a singular σῶμα, a plural reading, τὰ σώματα, is found in a number of prominent manuscripts (A, L, ψ, 33, 1881). If the singular reading is the original, which is widely understood to be the case, then the plural reading could well be a “correction” intended by some scribes when they copied manuscripts. In other words, the singular construct was considered to be so abnormal that some scripts rectified it with a plural σῶμα as they believed the plural was supposed to be the correct reading. This is further demonstrated by the corrected version of the Codex Alexandrinus, A, in around c. 400. In other words, the peculiarity regarding the use of a singular σῶμα is highlighted as the construct was probably considered to be wrong by some scribes. It is possible that an attempt to harmonize the text (an abnormal singular construct) with another text in the preceding context in which τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν is used (6:15). However, this is only a conjecture. Of all the reviewed works, only a few mention this variant. For example, Robertson and Plummer notice the textual variant, but no explanation is provided. Robertson and Plummer, 129.

See pages 43–4 in Chapter 2.

This construction is not mentioned in the work of Barrett, Collins, Thiselton, Conzelmann, Orr and Walther, Robertson and Plummer, Ciampa and Rosner.

Fee, Corinthians, 263.
this construct is mentioned in several monographs, in which some support the use of
the distributive singular.87

As previously discussed, it must not be assumed that the distributive singular
always explains the abnormal singular construct in the Pauline epistles.88 In terms of
the singular σώμα in 6:19–20, the use of the distributive singular can be refuted on
three grounds. First, previous analysis of the macrostructure reveals that the central
theme in the epistle is the corporate unity and communal relationship of the
Corinthians. Therefore, it is likely that Paul employs a singular form of σώμα to
emphasise the corporate unity and communal aspect.89 According to the context, the
discussion in 6:12–20 concerns the immoral conjugal union between the Corinthians
and prostitutes. In 6:19, Paul asks a rhetorical question (ἡ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα
ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν υἱὸν ἀγίου πνεῦματος;). Putting the textual variant aside, σῶμα
in this verse can be viewed in two different perspectives. The term denotes either the
physical body, pointing to the physical union between a man and a woman, or a
metaphor, alluding to the Christian community.90 As per earlier discussion, the

87 By referring to other Pauline passages, Robinson argues that one should not place too much
emphasis on this combination because of the inconsistency demonstrated in Paul’s usage. He suggests
that this combination can be a purely grammatical variation, and cites the example of καρδιά in Paul’s
work. He also suggests that this can be a collective singular with an emphasis on the “mass” in contrast
to the “individualization.” Robinson, Body, 29–30. Gundry also supports the use of the collective
singular in 6:19–20, but he repudiates Robinson’s theory. Gundry argues that the collective singular
does not negate individualization. Gundry, Sōma, 220.

88 See page 65 in Chapter 2.

89 Although this is not a common view, commentators do not always have a definite
conclusion on this matter. For example, both Thiselton and Collins consider the passage, the peculiar
syntax of τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν in particular, points to an individual dimension. However, Thiselton argues
for the corporate aspect of σῶμα based on his comparison of 6:19 and 3:16. For both Thiselton and
Conzelmann, the community focus in 3:16 has shifted to an individual application. Thiselton, 316, 474;
Conzelmann, 112.

90 Fee suggests that Paul takes the imagery of the church (denoted by σῶμα) in 3:16 and
applies it as a depiction of an individual person in 6:19. Fee, Corinthians, 264.
connotation of relationship is the same semantic domain shared by the occurrences of σῶμα in Unit B. In terms of the wider context, in Chapter 3, Paul compares himself to a builder. The apostle constructs a building by laying a good foundation; and the building is a metaphor which connotes the Corinthian community. In concluding his argument, Paul asks a rhetorical question: Οὐκ ὁδηγεῖ ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; (3:16). The physical temple (the tabernacle or the temple in Jerusalem), which is now represented by the church, being realised in the Christian community in which God dwells through his Holy Spirit. The clause in 3:16 is strikingly similar to the clause in 6:19 (η οὐκ ὁδηγεῖ ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεῦματος). Since both of them occur in the same discourse, it is natural to consider that they are connected. Paul’s concern in 3:16 is for the community. Although Paul discusses sexual union, when considering the above-mentioned connection in the wider context, his core concern is for the community in which God dwells instead of the individual physical body.⁹¹

Although many commentators hold the view that σῶμα in Chapter 6 points to the individual physical body,⁹² several scholars argue for the corporate and communal connotation of σῶμα. For example, Kempthorne contends that the σῶμα refers to the

---

⁹¹ Conzelmann argues the opposite, the focus of community in 3:16 is now “transferred to the individual.” Conzelmann, 112.

⁹² For example, Fee, Collins, and Fitzmyer support this view. Thiselton defines the singular form of σῶμα as the distributive singular. Fee, Corinthians, 263–4; Collins, 249–50; Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 269–70; Thiselton, 474.
“corporate Body;” the peculiar singular construct provides this “corporate allusion.”

He also notices that the phrase in 6:19 echoes with another phrase in the later part of the epistle, ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους (12:27). Murphy-O’Connor argues that the singular σῶμα is a true singular which denotes the identity of the community. The main reason is because both the immediate context, ὦκ ἐστὲ ἐαυτῶν (6:19), and the wider context, ὑμεῖς δέ Χριστοῦ (3:23), elucidate the “authentic humanity” that Christ embodies. Thus the focus is on the community instead of individuality.

Newton also suggests that τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν is in parallel with ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν. Both phrases point to a corporate understanding. Fitzmyer also argues that Paul urges the “community of Corinth” to have “a corporate honoring of God” in 6:20. This study agrees with the view of Kempthorne and Murphy-O’Connor. By considering the wider textual context, it is more reasonable to argue that Paul first addresses the issue of sexual immorality (6:12–18); he then shifts his focus by providing a teaching regarding the impact of sexual immorality on the Christian community (6:19–20). The concluding remark of this passage, δοξάσατε

93 He argues that the term is used in parallel with the temple, which points to the corporate dimension. Furthermore, the genitive pronoun can be interpreted as appositional, meaning “the Body that you are members,” with the allusion to the corporate Body of Christ. He deduces his argument from a similar usage in contemporary Greek literature. Finally, he claims that the phrase τὸ ἱδρυν σῶμα in the preceding verse does carry a corporate allusion. R. Kempthorne, “Incest and the Body of Christ: A Study of I Corinthians VI. 12–20,” NTS 14 (1968): 568–74.

94 Kempthorne, “Incest,” 573.

95 Murphy-O’Connor, 53–4.

96 Michael Newton, The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul (SNTSMS 53; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 57.

97 Fitzmyer suggests that σῶμα in 6:19 connotes the physical body, and σῶμα in 6:20 points to a corporate reference. Although Fitzmyer is ambiguous and inconsistent in his conclusion, he pinpoints this corporate connotation by arguing that the plural ὑμῖν is used to encourage the Corinthians to honour God in a “corporate” manner, and the singular form emphasises on the “individual” conduct of honouring. Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 270.
δὴ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν (6:20), should also be understood accordingly. To sum up, the immediate context of 6:12–20 concerns immoral conjugal union; the ultimate concern of the apostle, however, is in fact for the community which is denoted by the true singular σῶμα.

Second, this combination only occurs in 6:19 and 6:20 in the whole discourse. In all the occurrences of σῶμα combining with ὑμῶν, σῶμα is always in plural form in other authentic Pauline epistles.98 There is no credible evidence that shows that the distributive singular for σῶμα in the abnormal singular construct is Paul’s common practice.99 This study argues that the usage of a singular σῶμα is a deliberate act with a particular purpose.

Third, in the preceding context, 6:14 in particular, the replacement of σῶμα by ἡμᾶς suggests the synonymous nature of the two words. If ἡμᾶς is deliberately employed by Paul to convey the communal focus in 6:14, it would be natural for him to use the singular σῶμα in 6:19–20 to highlight the same point. Since the concept of coherence is prominent according to discourse analysis, σῶμα, in place of ἡμᾶς, is employed by the apostle to help his readers to perceive the corporate connotation highlighted in his written message.

One of the most recent and revolutionary explanations regarding this combination is given by Gupta. Although in favour of the distributive singular, he suggests two speculative possibilities. First, Paul attempts to create a “more direct engagement with the readers by addressing the whole but communicating vividly to

98 This combination only occurs two times in the authentic Pauline epistles apart from 1 Corinthians. Furthermore, σῶμα is always in its plural form (Rom. 8:11, 12:1).

99 See the discussion on pages 52–4 in Chapter 2.
the individual.” Second, Paul draws attention “to the corporate while speaking particularly about each individual.” After considering the singular/plural oscillation in the context, Gupta argues that 6:19 demonstrates Paul’s concern for “both the embodied person and the corporate body.” Of interest, Gupta’s conclusion repudiates his own assumption of the distributive singular. According to his interpretation, σῶμα appears as a true singular noun instead of a distributive singular noun, since he speculates that the singular σῶμα highlights the corporate connotation of a community and the plural pronoun emphasises the individual within the community. Thus, Gupta’s identification of the distributive singular is incorrect while his speculative conclusion of the use of the singular σῶμα is accurate.

In short, there are different sentence meanings behind each individual σῶμα in this semantic unit. However, the overall occurrences of σῶμα (as a cluster) demonstrates a corporate and communal connotation s in Unit B.

3.2.1.2 Σῶμα in Unit C

Σῶμα occurs three times in Unit C, and its distribution is shown in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5 Σῶμα in Unit C “Marriage” (7:1–40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7:1–19 Marriage</th>
<th>7:20–24 Slavery</th>
<th>7:25–40 Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

σῶμα occurs twice in a close proximity in a sub-segment regarding marriage. In 7:4, by employing the phrase τοῦ ἰδίου σῶματος οὐκ ἔξουσιάζει twice, Paul sets forth that a person should not deprive his or her marriage partner of conjugal rights. Again, σῶμα simply alludes to sexual relations.

3.2.1.3 Σῶμα in Unit D

Σῶμα occurs three times in Unit D, with two of its occurrences forming a cluster as shown in Table 3.6. The clustered σῶμα displays a strong corporate and communal connotation, as explain below.

Table 3.6 Σῶμα in Unit D “Idolatry” (8:1–11:1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8:1–13</th>
<th>9:1–27</th>
<th>10:1–11:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food and Idol</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Food and Idol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Unit D, Paul warns the Corinthians against idolatry. In particular, he urges them not to partake in idol feasts (10:1–11:1). In 10:16, the phrase τοῦ σῶματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ is introduced to portray the Eucharistic bread shared by the Corinthians.

Then, Paul states that ἐν σῶμα οί πολλοί ἐσμεν (10:17). Obviously, σῶμα does not depict the physical body. In the clause ἐν σῶμα οί πολλοί ἐσμεν, there are two predicate nominatives: ἐν σῶμα and οί πολλοί. The two predicate nominatives are appositional in nature, with the implied ήμᾶς as the subject and ἐσμεν as the verb. The contrastive nature between ἐν and πολλοί is employed here to denote the unity of
the community. Therefore, σῶμα in 10:17 carries a corporate reference, as the believers of the Corinthian community are portrayed as ἐν σῶμα, highlighting the corporate unity.

The close proximity between the phrase ἐν σῶμα and the previous phrase τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ indicates a connection between the two. The bread shared by the community is described as the body of Christ, and intriguingly, the community is in return the one body. This corporate and communal aspect is also accentuated by the two words in the context: κοινωνία (10:16) and μερτέχομεν (10:17). Both words emphasise the communal participation. The focus of community is again highlighted by the usage of σῶμα in this semantic unit. This concurs with the previous analysis of the macrostructure of 1 Corinthians.

---

101 Collins also argues that unity is depicted by this phrase, and indicates that this motif is reiterated in Chapter 12. Fee suggests the parallel between the clause ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἔσμεν and the following clause οἱ γὰρ μαίνετε ἐκ τοῦ εἰσόδου ἀρτου μετέχομεν is constructed in a chiastic structure. This parallel connects the common bread with the church community. Collins, 380; Fee, Corinthians, 469.

102 As well argued by Murphy-O’Connor, this σῶμα shows that Paul is “conscious of the unity of the community that he alludes to the multiplicity of its members only in subordinate clauses.” Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, Becoming Human Together: The Pastoral Anthropology of St. Paul (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 178–9.

103 According to Fee, the bread represents Christ’s death. The eating of the bread symbolises that believers becomes “partners in the redeemed community.” Thiselton makes a similar comment, and argues that the communal aspect must not be minimised in this passage because “communal participation in the identity and redemptive work of Christ” is the focus. Fee, Corinthians, 469; Thiselton, 762. Of interest, Conzelmann sees the underlying emphasis of this passage is to encourage unity. Conzelmann, 172. Since Mitchell asserts that unity is the key theme of 1 Corinthians, she argues that raising the contrast between the cult meal and Eucharist is a means for Paul to deal with the Corinthian factions. Mitchell, Paul, 254–6. The focus of community depicted in this segment is the common conclusion made by various scholars. As well summarised by Fitzmyer, the connection of κοινωνία and σῶμα establishes “the corporate sense of the ecclesiastical meaning of the phrase τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.” Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 391.
3.2.1.4 Σῶμα in Unit F

Σῶμα occurs three times in Unit F, appears in a cluster (11:24–29) as shown in Table 3.7. The corporate and communal connotation behind σῶμα is also evident, as detailed below.

Table 3.7 Σῶμα in Unit F “The Lord’s Supper” (11:17–34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Problem</td>
<td>The Lord’s Word</td>
<td>The Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The topic of this semantic unit is the Lord’s Supper. The famous saying of Christ, τοῦτο μοῦ ἐστίν τὸ σῶμα, is quoted by Paul in 11:24 as he urges the Corinthians to be prudent in partaking in the Lord’s Supper. The phrase does not seem to highlight any communal connotation, since it is uttered by Christ to elucidate his redemptive death. However, Paul provides an intriguing statement in 11:29 (ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων κρίμα ἐαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα). The identification of τὸ σῶμα is not as straightforward as it seems to be. Some argue that σῶμα in 11:29 points to the Eucharistic bread; with the community being urged to discern (διακρίνων) the sacred bread for Eucharist from the ordinary bread for normal feast. Or it denotes the body of Christ in the church, the presence of Christ in the church more specifically,

---

104 Some manuscripts have the reading τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου (including א², C¹, D, F, G and 1881). Many important manuscripts, including the manuscripts of the Alexandrian text-type, support the absence of τοῦ κυρίου (φ², κ, B, C, 33, 1739, and 1881).
as some argue. As indicated by συνερχεσθε in 11:17, the Lord’s Supper is observed when the community gathers around. Given the wider textual context of this segment, the problem faced by the Corinthians does not merely concern the discernment of the Eucharistic bread, there are divisions. When Paul addresses the issue faced by the Corinthians gathered for Eucharist, he mentions γάρ συνερχομένων ύμων ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἄκούω σχίσματα ἐν ύμιν ὑπάρχειν (11:18). The issue is clearly σχίσμα instead of wrongly identifying the nature of the bread. As such, the clause διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα does not illustrate the Eucharistic body, nor does it concern the presence of Christ. Rather, the clause should be understood as Paul urging the Corinthians to discern the gathering as the body of Christ, the church. The focal point is not merely on Eucharist. It emphasises on unity (in contrast with σχίσμα). In other words, σῶμα in Unit F alludes to the corporate unity and communal relationship.

3.2.1.5 Σῶμα in Unit G

The most frequent occurrences of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians occur in Unit G “Spiritual Gifts.” Σῶμα occurs 18 within three chapters, forming a huge cluster in 12:12–27 in particular as shown Table 3.8.

---

105 Fitzmyer provides a detailed account of how both views are understood by major commentators. He argues that the term means “take stock of oneself” when receiving the body and blood of Christ. However, he fails to pinpoint the exact connotation of the term. Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 446–7. Surburg combines the two views together, and argues that σῶμα connotes both the sacramental body and the ecclesiastical body. Mark P. Surburg, “Structural and Lexical Feature in 1 Corinthians 11:27–32,” Concordia Journal 26 (2000): 212.

106 Many scholars adopt this view. Ciampa and Rosner, 555; Collins, 439; Robertson and Plummer, 252; Orr and Walther, 274; Horsley, 162; Hays, 200; Stanley, 203. Fee and Kim provide an insightful argument, suggesting that Paul rebukes the ideology of the powerful and the rich who abuse the poor. The body of Christ, as Kim notes, points to the “living Christ crucified,” which “deconstruct the powers and reconstructs the community.” Kim, Christ, 62; Fee, Corinthians, 563.

107 Collin holds a similar view, and mentions that various Church Fathers quote 11:28 in their work to encourage “ecclesial unity.” Collins, 438–9.
Within this cluster, the contrast between ἐν σῶμα and μέλη πολλὰ is repeated. For example, the clause τό σῶμα ἐν ἔστιν καὶ μέλη πολλὰ ἔχει (12:12) is followed by the clause τό σῶμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν μέλος ἀλλὰ πολλὰ (12:14). Then, he reiterates the concept in 12:20 by stating: δὲ πολλὰ μὲν μέλη, ἐν δὲ σῶμα. Finally, Ἄμεις δὲ ἔστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους is the concluding remark in this segment.

The emphasis on ἐν unequivocally highlights the corporate and communal essence connoted by σῶμα. Not only is the Corinthian community reminded of their identity being the body of Christ, the community is also urged to remember their unity. In the following part, the occurrences of σῶμα in 12:12–27 will be examined individually.

In 12:1, Paul commences the discussion of spiritual gifts by writing Περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν. In 12:4–11, he reiterates the argument regarding διαφορέσεις χαρισμάτων ... τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα. He also provides a list of various spiritual gifts. Then, Paul compares the variety of gifts operating within the faith community with σῶμα. The clause Καθάπερ γὰρ τό σῶμα ἐν ἔστιν καὶ μέλη πολλὰ ἔχει (12:12) echoes a previous utterance in Unit D (ἐν σῶμα οἶ πολλοὶ ἐσμεν, in 10:17). The unity of a community portrayed by ἐν σῶμα re-emerges. ἐν σῶμα is further elaborated in 12:13, in which the contrastive elements, including Jews and Gentiles, slaves and the free, are employed to heighten the unity as portrayed by the clause, πάντες εἰς ἐν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν. Whether βαπτίζω denotes water baptism (pointing to the initial rite of entering into a Christian community) or common

Table 3.8 Σῶμα in Unit G “Spiritual Gifts” (12:1–14:40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ********** **** * *

* **
experience in the Holy Spirit (pointing to immersion as a metaphor), the unity of the Corinthian community is highlighted by the phrase πάντες εἰς ἑν σῶμα in either case. Son rightly connects the phrase ἑν σῶμα in 12:12–20 to the earlier portrayal of the sexual union between a man and a prostitute. The sexual union between a man and a woman described in Chapter 6 is in analogically parallel with the spiritual union between Christ and the church in Chapter 12, since they both employ the phrase ἑν σῶμα to denote this union. The use of ἑν σῶμα marks the phenomena that individual believers become corporately the body of Christ created by the Holy Spirit. Then, he concludes that the usage of ἑν σῶμα illustrates the existence of a person: the existence of an individual person “extends beyond his individual boundaries to form a corporate unity (body) with others and with Christ.” This study concurs with Son’s conclusion, as it is obvious that σῶμα in 12:13 denotes the faith community and the use of ἑν σῶμα highlights the corporate connotation.

Scholarship offers a rich discussion of the meaning of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians 12. Some focus on the function of σῶμα in the text, determining whether Paul uses

---

108 For example, Collins and Barrett adopt the understanding of water baptism; Fee supports the metaphorical sense of the term. Barrett, First Corinthians, 289; Collins, 604–5; Fee, Corinthians, 462–3. On the other hand, Neyrey notes that the body language in Chapter 12 denotes wholeness and unity, whereas the Holy Spirit portrayed in this chapter functions “to unify the cornucopia of gifts given to the body’s diverse members.” Jerome H. Neyrey, “Body Language in 1 Corinthians: The Use of Anthropological Models for Understanding Paul and His Opponents,” Semeia 35 (1986): 157.


110 Son, “One Flesh,” 121.

111 Jewett provides a detailed account of the views held by various scholars. Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 202–50.
it to promote unity or diversity. Others focus on the communal aspect of σώμα. The following discussion argues that the word is employed to denote both the communal aspect and the call for unity despite the diversity.

As discussed above, the use of σώμα in 12:12–14 is metaphorical, denoting the community. Paul temporarily switches the connotation of σώμα to create an illustration. In 12:15–17, the word is employed to connote the physical body, describing the relationship of different organs, including πούς, χείρ, οὖς, and ὄφθαλμός, with the body. The prepositional phrase ἐκ τοῦ σώματος is repeated four times within the two verses, illustrating that organs, despite the differences, are part of the body. Paul temporarily shifts the connotation of σώμα from a metaphorical one, denoting a faith community (12:12–14), to an ontological one, connoting the physical body (12:15–17) as a means to vividly explain the concept of unity. Paul argues that it is necessary to have differences in order to carry out different functions (as explains in 12:17), and asks two rhetorical questions (εἰ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ὄφθαλμός, ποῦ ἢ ἀκοή; εἰ ὅλον ἀκοή, ποῦ ἢ ὀσφρησις;). Following this explanation, Paul subtly shifts the connotation of σώμα back to denote a community in 12:18. In 12:18, the clause νυνὶ

112 For example, Hurd, Robinson, and Horsley reject that Paul primarily attends to the issue of communal schism by promoting unity through the use of σώμα. Hurd, 190; Robinson, Body, 59; Horsley, 169. Rather, Paul encourages diversity, since σώμα best portray the notion of “in diversity without ceasing to be a unity.” Robinson, Body, 60. Conversely, Murphy-O’Connor also argues that unity is Paul’s primarily concern for the community to the extent that the apostle “alludes to the multiplicity of its members only in subordinate clauses.” Murphy-O’Connor, Becoming, 178–9. However, there are scholars who consider that both unity and diversity are emphasised. Ernest Best, One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul (London: SPCK, 1955), 96; Martin, Body, 94; Collins, 458.

113 For example, Jewett argues that the “ecclesiastical body” is the meaning of σώμα, and highlights the communal aspect of the term. Käsemann repudiates the understanding of σώμα as an individual human self, and advocates that the concept behind the term points to the notion of believers being “incorporated into the kingdom of Christ.” Nonetheless, he also argues that the physical aspect of the human body must not be denied, since Christ uses our bodies to glory God. Ernst Käsemann, Perspectives on Paul, (trans. Margaret Kohl, London: SCM, 1971), 114–5. The view of Käsemann on σώμα is largely communal based, which is in accord with the conclusion of this study.
The subject is now changed to θεός. σῶμα in 12:18 refers back to the faith community (τὸ σῶμα ... ἀλλὰ πολλὰ (μέλη) mentioned in 12:14. Then, in Paul uses a similar rhetorical question 12:19 as in the case of 12:17. However, the content is no longer related to the physical body: εἰ δὲ ἦν τὰ πάντα ἐν μέλος, ποῦ τὸ σῶμα; Of interest, the phrase εἰ δὲ ... ποῦ is the exact wording used in 12:17. Nonetheless, σῶμα in 12:19 denotes the community, and μέλος refers to the individual Christians within it. Following a thorough exposition, Paul summarises his argument by reiterating δὲ πολλὰ μὲν μέλη ἐν δὲ σῶμα (12:20).

The expression πολλὰ μέλη ἐν σῶμα has been repeated three times in similar manner (12:12, 14, 20).

Subsequently, Paul focuses on the specifics regarding the members of the one body. In 12:22, Paul introduces an argument regarding τὰ δοκοῦντα μέλη τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενέστερα. However, the connotation of σῶμα throughout its occurrences in 12:22–23 remains unchanged. The term clearly denotes the community in which there are weaker members (μέλη τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενέστερα, in 12:22), less honourable members (ἀτιμότερα εἶναι τοῦ σώματος, in 12:23a), and less respectable members (τὰ ἀσχήμονα ἡμῶν, in 12:23b).114 Despite the varieties, Paul argues that οἱ θεοὶ συνεκέρασεν τὸ σῶμα (12:24). The purpose of God’s arrangement, according to the apostles, is explained in 12:25 by the ἐνα clause ἐνα μὴ ἦ σχίσμα ἐν τῷ σώματι. This phrase echoes the exact same phrase μὴ ἦ

114 Fitzmyer defines the triple comparison (ἀσθενέστερα, ἀτιμότερα, and ἀσχήμονα, in 12:22–23) as the “alpha-privative” adjectives, “one of positive degree and two of comparative degree.” Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 480.
εν ἰμῖν σχίσματα in 1:10, located in the first verse of the first semantic unit (Unit A). The significance of this echo is as follows. First, the word σχίσμα does not occur in other Pauline epistles except here.115 Second, the position of the exact same phrase in both the beginning and the end of the epistle is not a mere coincidence. It is in accordance with how σῶμα is presented in the whole discourse. In Unit A, Paul addresses the issue of church division, the σχίσμα. Various topics are then discussed by Paul in different semantic units. However, in the midst of these semantic units the concept of community alluded by σῶμα is gradually developed. When it comes to the seventh major semantic unit (Unit G), the key concept of ἐν σῶμα is thoroughly elaborated. This concept is the key to address the issue of σχίσμα.

Following his discussion on the concept of many members within one body and the purpose of God’s arrangement, Paul proceeds to provide a powerful summative statement in 12:27, Ὡμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους. The community, despite having different μέλη, is one body of Christ. The phrase σῶμα Χριστοῦ in this summative statement unequivocally denotes the faith community, emphasising its corporate entity. The phrase is followed by a detailed description of different offices and gifts operated in the church (12:28–31), before the apostle pinpointing the most important gift of all: love (13:1–13). σῶμα no longer occurs after 12:27 except one time in 13:3, in which the term is employed to connote the physical body. Paul argues that παραδω τὸ σῶμα μου ἵνα καυχήσωμαι,

115 Some scholars suggest that the usage of σχίσμα alludes to the presence of political element as the word is used in Hellenistic era to denote political fissure. Welborn argues that the word is used to portray “a cleft in political consciousness.” L. L. Welborn, “On the Discord in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Ancient Politics,” JBL 106 (1987): 85–111. Fitzmyer is more specific as he argues that the verb derived from σχίσμα is employed by contemporary historians to portray the conflicts between city and states in the Greco-Roman world. Fitzmyer, Corinthians, 141. According to Mitchell’s analysis, the four phrases, τὸ αὐτῷ λέγειν, σχίσμα, καταρτίζειν, and ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, all carry a heavy political sense in contemporary Greek literature. Mitchell, Paul, 68–77.
In conclusion, the 18 occurrences of σῶμα in this semantic unit, 12:12–27 in particular, are mainly employed by Paul to elucidate the faith community of Christ, highlighting the communal relationship and calling for corporate unity.

3.2.1.6 Σῶμα in Unit H

As shown in Table 3.9, there are nine occurrences of σῶμα in Unit H. Again, a cluster can be observed. Although the term clearly carries anthropological connotations, the nuance of the corporate aspect of σῶμα in Unit H must not be overlooked, as explained below.

Table 3.9 Σῶμα in Unit H “Resurrection” (15:1–58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resurrection</td>
<td>Bad Company</td>
<td>Resurrection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>******* **** * * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last cluster of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians occurs in Unit H, in which Paul discusses the topic of resurrection. This cluster is big, with σῶμα occurring nine times in a relatively short segment, 15:35–44. In 15:35, Paul responds to the question which inquires about the nature of the resurrected σῶμα. By employing the analogy of a seed, Paul explains the nature of this σῶμα in 15:37–38. Then, σῶμα is used in 15:39 interchangeably with σάρξ. Finally, in 15:44, Paul distinguishes between σῶμα

116 3:33–34 displays a digression in the discussion of the resurrection. In the first subdivision, Paul addresses the issue of resurrection (πῶς λέγουσιν ἐν ἑμῖν τίνες ὑπ’ ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἐστιν; 15:12). Then, he digresses, and warns the Corinthians against ὠμολογεῖται κακά. Finally, he resumes the discussion of resurrection (πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί; ποίῳ δὲ σώματι ἐρχοῦσαι; 15:35). This digression becomes the centre of the chiasm in 1 Cor 15.
ψυχικόν and σῶμα πνευματικόν. σῶμα ψυχικόν denotes the physical body that a believer has on earth; and σῶμα πνευματικόν denotes the body that believers have when ἐγείρωται. Paul does not elaborate on the nature of σῶμα πνευματικόν despite providing the comparison between σῶμα ψυχικόν and σῶμα πνευματικόν. More importantly, it aims to repudiate the denial of future resurrection. Paul concludes this major semantic unit by highlighting the immortality that is brought forth by the resurrection. Hence, the individual occurrence of σῶμα in this unit does not denote the corporate and communal connotation.

Nonetheless, there is one particular nuance worth noting. Paul anticipates a question asked by some people who respond to his teaching of resurrection: πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί; ποίῳ δὲ σώματι ἔχουνται; (15:35). Of interest, the singular σῶμα is used with a third person plural verb, ἔχουνται. None of the reviewed commentators notice this nuance. Thiselton and Fee do discuss the possible parallel between οἱ νεκροί and σώματι. If these two words are indeed in parallel, then the

117 There has been an on-going attempt to understand this ambiguous phrase σῶμα πνευματικόν. Several decades ago, there were Schweizer’s definition in light of ancient Gnosticism and Conzelmann’s argument according to the antithesis of ψυχικόν—πνευματικόν. Schweizer, “Πνεύμα,” TDKT 6:389–415; Conzelmann, 282–7. For the last ten years, various scholars have been contributing to this discussion. For example, Dunn, in his lengthy comments on Thiselton’s view, suggests that σῶμα πνευματικόν is a body that will not be subject to death and decay, a body that is “beyond the reach of corruption and atrophy.” James D. G. Dunn, “How Are The Dead Raised? With What Body do They Come? Reflections on 1 Corinthians 15,” SwJT 45 (2002): 4–18. Endsjø provides one of the most recent contributions. Although he does not analyse this phrase, his focuses on the wider issue to explain why the Corinthains refuse to believe in the general resurrection of the dead. His study is based on some ancient Greek stories of resurrection, which can provide further insights into understanding σῶμα πνευματικόν. Dag Øistein Endsjø, “Immortal Bodies, before Christ: Bodily Continuity in Ancient Greece and 1 Corinthians,” JSNT 30 (2008): 417–436. However, this study does not provide a detailed analysis to uncover the meaning of this phrase. The focus of this study aims to ascertain the thematic meaning of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians. In other words, rather than providing a thorough analysis of the sentence meaning of σῶμα πνευματικόν, this study focuses on discourse coherence indicated by the recurrent theme of σῶμα and resurrection in 1 Corinthians.

118 They include Collins, Orr and Walther, Robertson and Walther, Ciampa and Rosner, Fitzmyer, Murphy-O’Connor, Conzelmann, Thielston, Fee, and Horsley.

119 Thiselton, 1261; Fee, Corinthians, 780.
contrast of comparing a plural ὁι νεκροί and a singular σῶματι becomes even more peculiar. Despite failing to notice this nuance and providing a clear explanation, Horsley argues that σῶμα as “the principle of continuity” points to a “social-political” life of resurrection in which it requires “embodied people.”

This study argues that Paul leaves traces of a corporate connotation in his usage of σῶμα, despite his teaching focusing on the resurrected body. This can be supported by the wider textual context. The discussion of resurrection does not begins in Unit H. Paul briefly mentions the future resurrection in Unit B: τὸ δὲ σῶμα οὐ τῇ πορείᾳ ἄλλα τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ὁ κυρίος τῷ σῶματί ὁ δὲ θεός καὶ τὸν κύριον ἠγείρεν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ (6:13–14). The corporate connotation of σῶμα is subtly alluded to in this verse, indicated by the replacement of σῶμα with ἡμᾶς. In light of the discourse coherence previously discussed, it is possible that Paul subtly adopts the corporate connotation and communal aspect of σῶμα underlined in Unit B and ‘mildly’ employs it in his discussion of resurrection in Unit H. In other words, Paul leaves some kind of trails in his usage of σῶμα in Unit H, which carries an undertone of this corporate connotation.

3.2.2 Sociolinguistic Aspect

The sociolinguistic aspect involves an investigation of the relationship between the author and the audience to ascertain whether the relationship can provide any further insights regarding the content of a discourse. Notably, in analysing the form of the Pauline epistles, Luther Stirewalt Jr. argues that Paul combines “the forms and functions of personal and official letter writing” of the Greco-Roman era so that he

---

120 Horsley, 209.
addresses “the community as community… the corporate body that worshipped, confessed, educated, and disciplined together.” The following part explores the different forms of relationship between Paul and the Corinthians.

3.2.2.1 Apostle and Teacher

Paul begins his letter by stating that he is κλητὸς ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, a phrase that asserts his authority as an apostle over the Corinthians. When he commences his first major semantic unit, he begins with παρακαλῶ δέ ύμᾶς in 1:10. This phrase is a common literary device in Hellenistic letters. However, when the phrase is used by a Hellenistic ruler—someone with authority, Paul appears to be “distinctly polite” whilst refraining from commanding the audience. As previously mentioned in the macrostructure, Paul does not simply deal with the schism within the community; otherwise, he could have used a more assertive approach by formally commanding the Corinthians. The apostle also calls for unity between some members of the community and himself. His polite tone fits his message which attempts to “deconstruct the ideologies of powers,” which is the cause of the schism, by demonstrating an enormous humility. This is evident in his appeal to the Corinthians in 2:1–6, in which he describes his arrival at the Corinthian community ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ καὶ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ (2:3). This portrayal is far from the authoritarian tone delivered by an ancient ruler.

121 M. Luther Stirewalt Jr., Paul, the Letter Writer (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003), 113.

122 Conzelmann, 31.

123 Kim, Christ, 38.
As an apostle, Paul carries the role as a teacher. Winter provides some valuable insights regarding the teacher-student relationship in the first century.\footnote{124}{Bruce W. Winter, After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), 32–9.} He argues that teachers in the first century “competed among themselves for students.”\footnote{125}{Winter, After, 36.} Furthermore, students displayed loyalty to their teachers, since they were “encouraged to be extremely zealous” in showing their loyalty.\footnote{126}{Winter, After, 39.} This finding sheds light on the unrest described in 1:12–17. Some members in the community attempt to display exceptional loyalty and zeal towards their own teacher (such as Apollos, Cephas, or another teacher) by rejecting Paul’s authority. This contributes to the internal schism and the rejection of Paul’s apostolic ministry.

### 3.2.2.2 Brother in Christ

The vocative ἀδελφοί occurs 20 times in this letter.\footnote{127}{The occurrences of the vocative ἀδελφοί are as follows: 1:10, 11, 26; 2:1; 3:1; 4:6; 7:24, 29; 10:1; 11:33; 12:1; 14:6, 20, 26, 39; 15:1, 31, 50, 58; 16:15. In NT scholarship, some scholars do not consider the vocative to be a real case and treat many vocatives in NT texts as nominatives of direct address (see Wallace, Grammar, 56; Porter, Idioms, 86–8). This thesis acknowledges this divided opinion, but affirms that the vocative is a valid case.} Among all the authentic Pauline letters, this is the most frequent occurrence.\footnote{128}{The vocative ἀδελφοί occurs ten times in Romans and three times in 2 Corinthians. 1 Thessalonians is the only other epistle that displays an unusually frequent occurrence of the vocative, in which it occurs 14 times (with only five chapters).} This provides insights into the socio-dynamic relationship between Paul and his readers, reflecting his underlying intention. He could have heavily exerted his apostleship in the epistle. Instead, he appeals to the Corinthians as “brothers,” a more egalitarian address. In responding to issues of

---

\footnote{124}{Bruce W. Winter, After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), 32–9.}

\footnote{125}{Winter, After, 36.}

\footnote{126}{Winter, After, 39.}

\footnote{127}{The occurrences of the vocative ἀδελφοί are as follows: 1:10, 11, 26; 2:1; 3:1; 4:6; 7:24, 29; 10:1; 11:33; 12:1; 14:6, 20, 26, 39; 15:1, 31, 50, 58; 16:15. In NT scholarship, some scholars do not consider the vocative to be a real case and treat many vocatives in NT texts as nominatives of direct address (see Wallace, Grammar, 56; Porter, Idioms, 86–8). This thesis acknowledges this divided opinion, but affirms that the vocative is a valid case.}

\footnote{128}{The vocative ἀδελφοί occurs ten times in Romans and three times in 2 Corinthians. 1 Thessalonians is the only other epistle that displays an unusually frequent occurrence of the vocative, in which it occurs 14 times (with only five chapters).}
division and the rejection of his authority, the use of the vocative ἀδελφοί emphasises the communal relationship over authority. In a community of Christ, everyone is equal. This attitude is the solution to the fractures and strife that trouble the community.

3.2.2.3 Parent-Founder

Paul addresses the Corinthians by calling them τέκνα μου ἀγαπητὰ (4:14), which reflects another dimension of their relationship. In Paul’s time, the key elements of the parent-child relationship were authority, imitation, affection, and education.\(^\text{129}\) The imitation element is evident in 4:16 and 11:1 when Paul calls for their imitation to “correct the Corinthians’ behaviour, and to regain their allegiance.”\(^\text{130}\) Furthermore, the authority element is evident when Paul portrays himself as the builder in 3:10, “asserting for himself a place of priority.”\(^\text{131}\) Paul expects the Corinthian community to respect and obey him.\(^\text{132}\) The expression of these elements allows Paul to address the challenges to his apostolicity. On the other hand, the affection element enables Paul to convey his care for the Corinthian community, a display of love, which is the key solution to a divided community.\(^\text{133}\)

In summary, when considering the sociolinguistic aspect, it is not difficult to see how Paul uses various relational expressions to call for unity, a unity not merely


\(^\text{131}\) Sandra Hack Polaski, *Paul and the Discourse of Power* (Gender, Culture, Theory 8; The Biblical Seminar 62; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 110.


\(^\text{133}\) The topic of love is beautifully expressed in 1 Cor 13.
prescribed to resolve the schism within the community. The apostle also calls for unity between the community and himself.

3.3 Thematic Meaning of σῶμα

The dominant occurrences of σῶμα in various semantic units in 1 Corinthians connotes social and corporate dimensions. This study, therefore, argues that the key thematic meaning of σῶμα intended by Paul in the epistle is communal. The thematic meaning of this anthropological term is in accordance with the macrostructure of the epistle and the sociolinguistic aspect. The macrostructure shows that the central theme of the epistle concerns communal relationship and corporate unity (within the community), and the relationship between Paul and the community. The sociolinguistic aspect also confirms that various expressions by the apostle call for this communal relationship. The following part addresses the discourse flow, and how σῶμα fits into the epistle.

3.3.1 The Flow of Discourse

As previously discussed, a narrative discourse displays a flow, involving the progress of various stages towards a climax or a peak episode. This peak is defined as “a zone of turbulence,” and is characterised by a shift in the occurrence of a grammatical device. This discourse flow also occurs in non-narrative texts, wherein the peak is

---

134 Longacre, Discourse, 38.

135 For further discussion of discourse flow, see pages 79–80 in Chapter 2.
known as an expository climax. Through the application of statistical models, Terry determines that the climax in 1 Corinthians occurs in Chapters 12–15.¹³⁶

In this chapter, drawing on the analysis of σῶμα found in various semantic units, a similar “flow” is observed. In Unit A, church division is a key issue, and appears as the first “episode.” The communal connotations of σῶμα in subsequent “episodes,” ἐν σῶμα in 1 Cor 12 finally emerges as the “climax.” This climax is characterised by a shift in the proportion of use of two grammatical devices: the unusually frequent occurrence of σῶμα (18 occurrences in Unit G), and the exceptionally frequent occurrence of the vocative ἀδελφοί (the vocative mostly occurred in Units G and H). The discourse then proceeds to its dénouement, the mentioning of σῶμα in the topic of the resurrection with a subtle communal nuance pointing to the communal aspect (15:35). Despite the seemingly diverse topics discussed in 1 Corinthians covered in this epistle, there is a central, yet covert theme running throughout the whole discourse. The flow of discourse can be observed by examining the usage of σῶμα throughout the epistle, as shown in the following table.

Table 3.10 The Flow of Discourse of 1 Corinthians Based on Σώμα

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aperture</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>First Episode</th>
<th>Various Developing Episodes</th>
<th>Climax</th>
<th>Dénouement</th>
<th>Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Division</td>
<td>σχίσμα occurs</td>
<td>σώμα alluding to community: τὸ σώμα ὑμῶν (1 Cor 6) τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (1 Cor 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>σώματι ἐρχονται in future resurrection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: → → Development of prominent theme; ← ← ← : Inclusio

3.4 Conclusion

By applying the basic principles of discourse analysis, this chapter has analysed the usage of σώμα in 1 Corinthians. This chapter could not provide a detailed analysis of all individual occurrences of σώμα, nor was the lexical meaning or sentence meaning the primary concern. Instead, this chapter focused on the thematic meaning, which is conveyed by an author through the recurrent use of a word throughout a discourse.

Through an exploration of the discourse structure, the overall occurrences of clustered σώμα in various semantic units, and the sociolinguistic aspect, this chapter has shown that social and corporate connotations are present in the thematic meaning of σώμα in 1 Corinthians. This communal interpretation is particularly illustrated by the body of Christ and ἐν σώμα, and well-established and widely accepted in Pauline scholarship.

Thus, this chapter has demonstrated the value of discourse analysis in ascertaining and verifying this understanding of σώμα in 1 Corinthians.
CHAPTER 4

ANTHROPOLOGICAL TERMS IN PHILIPPIANS IN LIGHT OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction
This chapter contains Stage II of our analysis — multiple anthropological terms within a single discourse: the key anthropological terms in Philippians. The terms ψυχή, πνεῦμα, καρδία, and σῶμα will be investigated to ascertain the presence of any social and corporate connotations. As in Chapter 3, the discourse structure of Philippians will initially be identified, which provides a framework for analysing the anthropological terms.

4.1 Discourse Structure
An initial examination of the discourse structure of Philippians elucidates the major semantic units in Philippians by investigating the discourse markers, exploring the discourse coherence, and ascertaining the macrostructure of the epistle. However,
before proceeding it is important to review a significant issue, regarding the integrity of Philippians.

4.1.1 The Unity of Philippians

The application of discourse analysis assumes that each Pauline epistle is one single discourse. Since the integrity of Philippians has been challenged, it is important to review the issue of unity.

The partition theory, also known as the compilation theory, originated in the 19th century German scholarship. This suggests that Philippians is the result of the redaction of two or more Pauline letters. For example, early proponent J. E. Symes, in his 1914 work, argues that the epistle comprises five letters. This theory became prominent in the mid-20th century, and Philippians was considered a combination of two or three letters because of inherent irregularities.

---

1 Reed provides a detailed account of the history of this theory. Reed, Discourse, 125–31.


3 The main irregularities used to support the partition theory are as follows. First, there is an unusual disjuncture in 3:1. Το λαπφων άδελφοι χαίρετε εν κυρίω can be interpreted as “Finally, brothers, farewell in the Lord.” Since a similar phrase also appears at the end of the Corinthian epistle (2 Cor. 13:11), this phrase in 3:1 is interpreted as marking the end of a letter. However, 3:1 occurs in the middle of Philippians instead of the end. This anomaly is further supported by the sudden change of tone, from a joyful tone in 3:1 to a harsh tone in 3:2. Beare 3–5. Second, 4:10–20 is an expression of thanks that is abruptly included at the end of the Philippians. Since this content is alienated from its previous context, this is interpreted as a separate letter. Beare, 149–50; Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, Paul: A Critical Life (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 216–7. Third, there is external evidence proving that Paul sent multiple letters to the Philippians. In Polycarp’s letter (ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΦΕΣ B), he mentions to the Philippians the letters sent by Paul (δεκα δεκα εργασιον επιστολάς, in 3:2). The plural ἐπιστολας indicates more than one letter. P. N. Harrison, Polycarp’s Two Epistles to the Philippians (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), 329; Hansen, 17. Therefore, based on these irregularities, the current form of Philippians is the result of redaction, which combines several letters into one. For example, Beare argues that Philippians comprises a letter of thanks (4:10–20), a letter despatched with Epaphroditus on his return to Philippi (1:1–3:1; 4:2–9, 21–23), and a letter of interpolation containing two warnings (3:2–4:1). Beare, 4–5.
This theory was later vigorously repudiated by modern scholars on three grounds. First, there is no textual tradition, from manuscripts to patristic allusions, supporting the circulation of different portions of Philippians. Second, the method of redaction makes the epistle more convoluted, which violates the spirit of redaction. Third, the thematic unity of Philippians is well illustrated by common themes that appear throughout. Many modern NT scholars support the unity of Philippians, including Moisés Silva, Gordon Fee, Bonnie Thurston, Peter O’Brien, Ralph Martin, and Walter Hansen.

If Philippians comprises several letters, it would not be possible to apply some basic principles of discourse analysis. For example, the notion of coherence depends on the epistle being one single discourse with a perceptible flow intended by the author. Nonetheless, given that most modern scholars soundly support the unity of Philippians, this study also confidently supports the unity and integrity of the epistle.

---

4 According to both O’Brien and Hansen, although Polycarp does mention ἡμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς, the plural ἐπιστολάς can be otherwise explained: the plural ἐπιστολή was sometimes employed in Greek for an important letter; the plural noun might refer to other Pauline letters; or the plural might refer to another letter sent to the Philippians, as alluded to in Philippians 3:2. O’Brien, Philippians, 12; Hansen, 17.

5 For example, Hawthorne questions why the supposed compilation makes the epistle so convoluted, given that redaction usually aims to create a “neat” piece of work. Hawthorn, xxix–xxxii.


7 For details of their arguments, see Silva, 14–5; Fee, Philippians, 398–400; Thurston and Ryan, 30–3; Hansen, 15–9; O’Brien, Philippians, 10–18; Martin, Philippians, 10–21. Despite this support for the unity of Philippians, the partition theory has advocates in modern scholarship. For example, Reumann suggests that the epistle combines three letters in A.D. 90–100. Reumann, 3, 12–3.
The findings of an analysis, regarding the thematic prominence, lexical cohesion, and discourse flow, provide further proof of unity.

4.1.2 Discourse Markers

Four discourse markers demarcate the semantic units in Philippians: change of verb mood, use of the vocative, formulas,⁸ and lexical cohesion. Due to the transitional role of these discourse markers, they may indicate the boundary of a major or minor semantic unit.⁹

4.1.2.1 Change of Verb Mood

The change of verb mood is a linguistic clue for marking the boundary of a semantic unit. The imperative mood is generally used for command and exhortation although it can sometimes be employed to express a request or a concession.¹⁰ The occurrence of the imperative is approximately ten times less than that of the indicative and slightly less than that of the subjunctive in the NT.¹¹ The investigation into the occurrence of

---

⁸ As mentioned in Chapter 3, a formula is the combination of specific grammatical particles, which is used repeatedly in a discourse or multiples discourses by the same author to mark a new topic. For example, the special conjunctive phrase περὶ δὲ, and the special conjunctive formula verb-δὲ-pronoun, are considered two formulas that function as discourse markers in 1 Corinthians.

⁹ A major semantic unit is a new topic discussed in a discourse. Within each major semantic unit there may be sub-divisions that are called minor semantic units in this study.

¹⁰ Robertson, Grammar, 946–7; BDF, 195.

the imperative mood, given its smallness in number, may indicate whether there is a significant change of discussion within a discourse.\textsuperscript{12}

There are 26 imperative verbs in Philippians.\textsuperscript{13} Table 4.1 shows the spatial distribution of individual occurrences.

Table 4.1 The Occurrences of Imperative in Philippians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chapter 1</th>
<th>Chapter 2</th>
<th>Chapter 3</th>
<th>Chapter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperative as indicated by ^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{12} The first person plural subjunctive, also called the hortatory subjunctive is a common usage in exhortation. Wallace, \textit{Grammar}, 464. However, the hortatory subjunctive only occurs once in Philippians (3:15). Hence, this analysis does not include the subjunctive.

\textsuperscript{13} 1:27 (twice); 2:2, 5, 12, 14, 18 (twice), 29 (twice); 3:1, 2 (thrice), 17 (twice); 4:1, 3, 4 (twice), 5, 6 (twice), 8, 9, 21. There is no imperative used in the letter-opening (1:1–2) and the letter-closing (4:21–23).
In 1:27–2:18, Paul encourages the Philippians by providing an example of Christ. The focus of this segment is different from the previous one (1:12–26) in which Paul discusses his imprisonment. Hence, 1:27–2:18 is a semantic unit marked by the use of imperatives. In 4:1, the conjunction Ὄστε is employed to conclude the previous discussion as Paul proceeds to discuss a new topic: the issue of Ἐνδιά and Ἄντιπτα in 4:2. 4:2–9, therefore, is likely to be a semantic unit. Finally, the concentrated imperatives in 2:29–3:2 are an indicator of a shift between two semantic units. Prior to 3:1, the discussion focuses on Timothy and Epaphroditus. The discussion is then shifted to mention the οὶ κύνες in 3:2.

Given these observations, it is possible to identify the boundaries of a few semantic units, namely 1:27–2:18, 4:2–9, and two semantic units divided by 3:1.  

4.1.2.2 Vocative  
The second discourse marker is the usage of vocative. The following part examines the usage of the vocative ὅτελαφοί, which occurs six times in Philippians: 1:12; 3:1, 13, 17; 4:1, 8. Most of these occurrences are used to begin a new topic.

---

14 The segment 2:5–11, is widely considered an early Christian hymn. For instance, Martin provides a detailed literary analysis of 2:5–11 in the history of New Testament studies, in which he cites different reasons why the section is regarded by many as a hymn. Ralph P. Martin, A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation & in the Setting of Early Christian Worship (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1997), 24–41. Hansen also provides his argument for the hymnal structure of this section. Hansen, 122–7. However, not everyone is convinced by the hymnal nature although he does not deny the poetic essence of the passage. Fee, Philippians, 192–4. The focus of this analysis is not to determine whether it is a hymn. Instead, the focus is on a topic in Unit D, which is undoubtedly the example of Christ.

15 These identified units will be further confirmed when other discourse markers are reviewed.
In 1:12, Paul addresses the Philippians using the vocative: ἀδελφοί. He then
discusses his own imprisonment in 1:12–26.16 Therefore, ἀδελφοί, combined with the
special conjunctive formula (verb-ἐ-pronoun), which was discussed in Chapter 3,17
begins a new topic.

In 3:1, ἀδελφοί is combined with Τὸ λοιπόν.18 In 3:1, Paul begins to warn the
Philippians against a problematic group by calling them dogs, evil workers, and the
mutilated (3:2). Hence, the vocative marks this new discussion. This is also supported
by the use of imperatives as mentioned above.

Both ἀδελφοί in 3:13 and 3:17 appear in the middle of Paul’s argument
regarding the warning against τοὺς κύνας by citing himself as an example, his
relationship with Christ in particular. Therefore, the two vocatives do not function as a
marker commencing a new topic. Rather, they are employed to make an emotional
statement. Paul proclaims that ἐγώ ἐμαυτόν οὗ λογίζομαι κατειληφέναι ... δὲ

---

16 White argues that the vocative is used in the Roman era as a marker to mark major
transitions of the body of a letter. He provides some interesting examples, including γινώσκειν σὲ
θέλω, μήτηρ and φανερῶν σα ποιῶ, ἀδελφέ, which demonstrate a striking resemblance to Paul’s
utterance in 1:12. John Lee White, The Body of the Greek Letter (SBLDS 2; Missoula: Scholars Press,
1972), 15–6. This vocative use is also discussed by Mullin who cites various examples in the

17 Ἀδελφοί in 1:12, appearing in the formula (γινώσκειν δὲ ἤμας βούλομαι), is widely
discussed by commentators. Fee, Philippians, 106; O’Brien, Philippians, 86; Hansen, 65–6. Sanders
provides numerous examples in Pauline letters, showing that Paul frequently marks the beginning of a
new discussion by employing this specific formula: the combination of a verb in the first person
present tense, the conjunction ἐδέ, the recipients denoted by ἤμας, and the vocative ἀδελφοῖ. Sanders
illustrates this point by citing passages in Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Philippians, and 1
Thessalonians. Jack T. Sanders, “The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the

18 The function of τὸ λοιπόν as a marker will later be discussed.
εμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος (3:13), and he urges the Philippians to imitate him (3:17).¹⁹

In 4:1, ἀδέλφοι is combined with ὁστε. Without coupling with an infinitive, ὁστε is usually an inferential particle. Resembling ὁς τέ, it simply means “and so.”²⁰

As previously mentioned, 4:1 concludes the previous discussion, with ἀδέλφοι marking the end of the topic discussed in Chapter 3.

In 4:8, ἀδέλφοι is used together with Τὸ λοιπόν. The clauses in 4:8–9 conclude the discussion of Εὐλογία and Συντύχη before moving to the last topic in the letter, in which the gift sent by the Philippians to Paul through Epaphroditus is the focus. This gift demonstrates the concern of the Philippians for Paul (τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν, in 4:10).

An analysis of ἀδέλφοι indicates that the vocatives in 1:12; 3:1; 4:1; 4:8 are discourse markers, delineating the boundaries of several semantic units.

4.1.2.3 Formulas

The formulaic praise (in 1:3) and the use of τὸ λοιπόν (in 3:1 and 4:8) are the formulas which function as discourse markers, marking either the beginning or the end of several semantic units, as explained below.

Paul commences his first discussion, expressing his concern for the Philippians in his prayer (1:3–11). The clause Ἐυχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου (1:3) appears to be a formula, marking the first discussion of a letter.

---


²⁰ Moule, Idiom, 144.
Τὸ λοιπὸν is an inferential conjunction formed by the combination of the article, τὸ, and the adverb, λοιπὸς. The phrase means “from now” or “therefore.”

The phrase is found in 3:1 and 4:8. There is little doubt that τὸ λοιπὸν in 3:1 is one of the most discussed conjunctions in Philippians. The debate of the unity of the letter hinges on the peculiar location of this conjunction. However, there is little dispute among those who support and repudiate the partition theory regarding the function of τὸ λοιπὸν being as a marker which initiates a new topic in Philippians.

---

21 In this study, this conjunctive is called a formula due to the fact that it is peculiarly formed by the combination of an article and an adverb instead of any conjunctive particles.

22 Both Turner and Thrall set forth that the conjunction has been “weakened” in Hellenistic Greek to a mere connective particle meaning “so.” In the post-classical Greek, the conjunction usually serves as a transitional particle, either introducing a new line of thought or a logical conclusion. BDF, 235; Turner, Syntax, 3:336; Margaret E. Thrall, Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies (vol. 3 of New Testament Tools and Studies; ed. Bruce M. Metzger; Leiden: Brill, 1962), 25–30.

23 As mentioned above, those who favour the partition theory argue that the conjunction means “finally,” drawing a comparison between Philippians and 2 Corinthians in which Paul uses λοιπὸν to mark the end of his letter. This theory is vigorously repudiated by many modern scholars. For instance, it has been pointed out that (τὸ) λοιπὸν does not always mean “finally, nor does it mark the end of a letter (1 Cor 1:16; 4:2; 7:29; and 1 Thess 4:1). Silva, 167; O’Brien, Philippians, 348.

24 Banker defines the function of this conjunction as a “topic introducer” in 3:1, and Fee identifies it as a “framing device” to highlight the section of 3:1 to 4:1. John Banker, A Semantic and Structural Analysis of Philippians (Dallas: SIL, 1996), 112; Fee, Philippians, 286. Both O’Brien and Hawthorne consider this conjunction marks a new section. O’Brien, Philippians, 348; Hawthorne, 123–4. The most insightful observation of all, however, is given by Reed. He argues for the single-letter theory of Philippians by providing an intriguing observation regarding the “hesitation formula” used in the Hellenistic letters. By citing several examples he argues that λοιπὸν “may be used as a discourse marker either at the beginning, middle, or end” of a Hellenistic letter. When it is used in the middle of a letter, the word often concludes “a previous narrative or list of commands with the final request,” usually carrying a connotation of “with respect to the future. Jeffrey T. Reed, “Philippians 3:1 and the Epistolary Hesitation Formulas: The Literary Integrity of Philippians, Again,” JBL 115 (1996): 83.
As previously discussed, τὸ λοιπὸν in 4:8 is used with ἀδὲ λῇφοί to conclude the discussion commenced in 4:1 by providing a general exhortation.²⁵

4.1.2.4 Lexical Cohesion

Most commentators observe the frequency of χαίρω throughout Philippians, which illustrates the motif of joy.²⁶ This study particularly examines the unusual occurrence of a cluster of χαίρω (with two χαίρω appearing in close proximity) throughout the epistle.²⁷ The word is the fourth most frequent verb in Philippians (see Appendix 2). Figure 4.1 shows the spatial distribution of these clusters.

Figure 4.1 The Occurrences of χαίρω in Philippians²⁸

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>1:4</th>
<th>1:18</th>
<th>1:25</th>
<th>2:2</th>
<th>2:17, 18</th>
<th>2:28, 29; 3:1</th>
<th>4:1, 4</th>
<th>4:10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key: * : Occurrence of χαίρω; # : Occurrence of χαρά; ~ : Occurrence of Συγχαίρω;</td>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁵ Hawthorne argues that τὸ λοιπὸν does not denote the end of the letter. Instead, it elucidates the imperative λογίζεσθε as the last imperative of all the imperatives in the section beginning at 4:1. On the other hand, Fee, arguing that Philippians is a letter of friendship, suggests that Paul adds another set of exhortations. Similar to Hawthorne’s view, τὸ λοιπὸν signifies the “final” vocative in the hortatory dimension. Hawthorne, 185; Fee, Philippians, 413–5.

²⁶ The motif of joy (signifying by the frequent occurrence of both χαίρω and χαρά) is widely observed in scholarly works, including modern critical commentaries. Thurston and Ryan, 33; Hawthorne, Philippians, 17–9; Fee, Philippians, 52–3; Reed, Discourse, 333; Jewett, “Epistolary,” 52; Bockmuehl, Philippians, 58–9; Silva, 46; and O’Brien, Philippians, 58.

²⁷ Apart from χαίρω, the corresponding noun χαρά, and corresponding verb συγχαίρω, are considered. Halliday provides a succinct explanation, stating that the clearest form of lexical cohesion is demonstrated by “two or more occurrences, in close proximity, of the same lexical item.” M. A. K. Halliday, Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse (ed. Jonathan Webster; London: Continuum, 2002), 8.

As well as illustrating thematic prominence, which will be discussed later, the clusters also function as discourse markers. These clusters are found in 1:18; 2:17–18; 2:28–3:1; 4:4. Except in 1:18, all of these occur in the transitions between major semantic units as identified earlier. This confirms their transitional function. Although the cluster in 1:18 does not begin a new discussion, it is combined with ἀλλά καί in the middle of the topic of Paul’s imprisonment, focusing on Paul’s στηρίγμα. Thus, the cluster marks the minor semantic unit in which Paul articulates his hope of release from prison.

29 According to Levinsohn, repetition can sometimes be an indicator of a point of departure, signifying a switch in topic in a discourse. Levinsohn, Discourse, 19–20. Moreover, he demonstrates this kind of points of departure occur more frequent in non-narrative texts by by citing texts from James, Titus, and Galatians. Levinsohn, Discourse, 69–74.

30 Based on an earlier analysis, the following semantic units are identified: 1:12–26; 1:27–2:18; 3:1–4:1; 4:1–9.

31 The reason behind their transitional function will be explained in the following discussion of prominence in this chapter. Thurston and Ryan also note the transitional nature of χαίρω by suggesting that the word “appears at major point of transition.” Thurston and Ryan, 112.

32 The combination of ἄλλα and καί denotes a strong addition with an emphatic force. Turner, and Blass and Debrunner argue that ἄλλα-καί provides an additional force to the previous discussion; and Robertson even suggests that the combination found in Phil. 1:18 is climatic. Turner, Syntax, 3:330; BDF, 233. O’Brien, Hawthorn, Thurston, and Ryan all define the conjunctive particles ἄλλα-καί in 1:18f as progressive, moving “the letter on to a new topic.” O’Brien argues that the repetition of χαίρω reinforces such progressive sense. Thurston and Ryan notice that the use of future tense, χαίρομαι, accentuates this progressive force. Hawthorne, 39; O’Brien,Philippians, 108; Thurston and Ryan, 62. Nevertheless, the conjunctive particles are not widely considered to be marking the boundary of a major discussion. Instead, the new topic introduced in 1:18f–26 is part of the major segment, 1:12–26. Banker, Hansen, O’Brien, Thurston and Ryan all consider 1:18f–26 as only one of the minor units within the major segment 1:12–26. Banker,Philippians, 16; Hansen, 65–76; O’Brien,Philippians, 38, Thurston and Ryan, 38. The conclusion in this study concurs that the combination of χαίρω and ἄλλα-καί begins a minor semantic unit in 1:18, in the middle of the major discussion of Paul’s imprisonment.
Conversely, the single occurrence of χαίρω in 4:10 occurs at the beginning of the segment in which gifts are sent by the Philippians to Paul through Epaphroditus. In combination with δέ, χαίρω marks the beginning of a new topic.33

4.1.3 Semantic Units

Through the four identified discourse markers, the letter can be divided into: the letter-opening, seven major segments, and the letter-closing. As shown in Table 4.2 the boundaries of some units are marked by more than one discourse marker.34

---

33 Although δέ can be a adversative conjunction, it is more commonly a transitional or continuative particle, which is almost equivalent to καί. Turner, Syntax, 3:331; H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1928), 244. Robertson, however, sets forth that δέ can also be used to introduce a new topic, which is in “harmony with the preceding discussion.” Robertson, Grammar, 1183–4. As previously mentioned, there is general support (from scholars who support or repudiate the partition theory) that 4:10–20 is a major topic of discussion.

34 Georgakopoulou and Goutsos suggest that the transitional function “may be realised by more than one discourse marker. Alexandra Georgakopoulou and Dionysis Goutsos, Discourse Analysis: An Introduction (2d ed.; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004), 95.
Table 4.2 Semantic Units of Philippians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Unit</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Markers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 1: Change of Verb Mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 2: Vocative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 3: Formulas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 4: Lexical Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, each of the major semantics unit contains a topic: Unit A (Paul’s Concern for Philippians), Unit B (Paul’s Imprisonment), Unit C (Christ’s Example), Unit D (Timothy and Epaphroditus), Unit E (Paul’s Example), Unit F (Euodia and Syntyche), and Unit G (Philippians’ Concern for Paul).

35 “Clustered χαίρω” in the table is the abbreviation for the cluster in which χαίρω and its associated nouns (χαρά and συγχαίρω) appear.

36 Although ἀδελφοί and τῶ λοκτήνων occur in 4:8, the idea expressed in the sentence in which these markers are situated is completed in 4:9. Hence, the unit ends in 4:9 instead of 4:8.

37 Since it is clear that 3:1–4:1 belongs to the same semantic unit, we consider 4:2 as the beginning of Unit F.
Table 4.3 Outline of Philippians by Scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline of this Study</th>
<th>Semantic Unit A</th>
<th>Semantic Unit B</th>
<th>Semantic Unit C</th>
<th>Semantic Unit D</th>
<th>Semantic Unit E</th>
<th>Semantic Unit F</th>
<th>Semantic Unit G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outline of Scholars</strong></td>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td><strong>Banker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Craddock</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hansen</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lightfoot</strong></td>
<td><strong>Marchal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Philippians’ Concern for Paul</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Bockmuehl</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>Bockmuehl</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craddock</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Bockmuehl</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>Bockmuehl</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>Bockmuehl</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchal</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td>Peterlin</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Peterlin</td>
<td>Reumann</td>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>Reumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>Bockmuehl</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Peterlin</td>
<td>Reumann</td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>Reumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Reumann</td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>Witherington</td>
<td>Reumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osiek</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Reumann</td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reumann</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Peterlin</td>
<td>Peterlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>Peterlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witherington</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>Peterlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


39 For Fee, this segment ends in 4:3, rather than 4:1. For Lightfoot, 3:2 begins this segment.

40 Some scholars consider this segment as two separate divisions. For instance, Thurston and Ryan regard 4:2–3 and 4:4–9 as two major segments. For Hawthorne, this segment starts in 4:1. According to Lightfoot, 4:2–3 and 4:4–9 are two sub-divisions. Together with 3:1 and 3:2–4:1, they belong to 3:1–4:9. For Martin, this segment commences in 4:1. O’Brien considers 4:1 as the commencement of this unit. Since the previous segment is concluded in 4:3, Fee considers this segment commences in 4:4. In this segment, 4:4–9 and 4:10–20 are two sub-divisions, with 4:21–23 being the closing remark. For Silva, 4:2–23 belong to one segment, which is consisted of three sub-divisions: 4:2–9; 4:10–20; and 4:21–23.

41 According to Lightfoot, 1: 1–2, 1:3–11, and 1:12–26 are three sub-divisions of a bigger unit (1:1–26).

42 According to Reed, 1:27–2:18 is Paul’s petition to the Philippians, and the segment can be sub-divided into 1:27–30 and 2:1–18. Reed, *Discourse*, 210–1.

43 Reed regards 3:1a as the ending of this segment.

44 4:10–20, for Bockmuehl, is a sub-division of 4:4–23.
As shown in Table 4.3, the semantic units outlined in this study are similar to those proposed by various scholars. In particular, the outline in this study is nearly identical to the outlines of John Banker, Jeffrey Reed, and Hansen. Two of the most comprehensive and recent discourse analyses of Philippians were conducted by Banker and Reed. When comparing their approach with this study, the point of focus is different. Banker focuses on thematic grouping based on different constituents, Reed focuses on letter format, and this study focuses on discourse markers. Nonetheless, all three approaches derive a similar conclusion. Arguably, this is due to the fact that all three approaches are based on the same underlying principles of discourse analysis.

4.1.4 Discourse Coherence

As previously mentioned, the concept of coherence is arguably “of central importance to discourse analysis.” Different elements in a discourse, including various semantic

---

45 The main difference hinges upon whether a particular topic is considered to be a major segment or a minor sub-division.

46 Banker, Philippians, 15–9.

47 Reed argues that the letter is written according to ancient letter format. According to Reed, Philippians is fundamentally epistolary, combining with “personal and paraenetic functions of language.” Reed, Discourse, 178–9. Hence, his analysis incorporates the comparisons between the parallels exhibited between ancient letters and Philippians; and illustrates how Philippians adopts different formulas used in ancient letters. Reed, Discourse, 178–295.

48 According to discourse analysis, an author divides the whole discourse into segments by means of thematic grouping. These segments (key topics) are usually marked by linguistic clues known as discourse markers, and all the segments are connected coherently. Therefore, the three approaches are not contradictory. Their differences rest on how each study begins its analysis. Banker begins by focusing on the thematic grouping to identify the key topics in the epistle; Reed examines the coherent structure indicated by how an ancient letter flows; and this study identifies the discourse markers to ascertain the thematic groups (such as, the key topics within a discourse).

49 Schiffrin, Discourse Marker, 21.
units, are connected through various cohesive linguistic devices to form a coherent message. The following part reviews several linguistic devices, such as inclusio and prominence, to demonstrate that communal relationship is the central theme, both among the Philippians and between Paul and the Philippians.

4.1.4.1 Inclusio

There are several occurrences of inclusio in Philippians. First, κοινωνία, which occurs in Unit A, reappears in the last unit (Unit G) in the form of κοινωνέω. At the beginning of the letter, Paul expresses his prayer of thanksgiving regarding his partnership with the Philippians: ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (1:5). The thanksgiving prayer in Unit A sets the tone of the letter with the occurrence of κοινωνία denoting partnership. Then, Paul reiterates this partnership at the end of the letter in a stronger expression: οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκκοινώνησεν ... εἰ μή ὑμεῖς μόνοι (4:15).

Second, the phrase τὸ αὐτὸ φρονήτε in 2:2 is repeated in 4:2 as τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν. Paul emphasises the communal oneness of the Philippians, first in a general sense (for the whole community in 2:2), then in a specific manner (regarding the issue of the two women in 4:2).

Third, στήκω in 1:27 re-emerges in 4:1. The word only occurs twice in the letter, in both cases in the imperative mood. In an early unit, Paul urges the Philippians to communal unity by stating: στήκετε ἐν ἑαυτῶν πνεύματι (1:27). Near the end of Unit E, Paul reiterates a similar concept by encouraging them to unite together: στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ (4:1).
Fourth, the word συναθλεω occurs in 1:27 and 4:3. In both cases, συναθλεω is associated with εναγγελιων. In 1:27, the word depicts the Philippians working together. In 4:3, the word depicts Paul working together with the Philippians.

Lastly, the phrase χάρις … Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ occurs in both the letter-opening (1:2) and the letter-closing (4:23).

As shown in this examination, many of the occurrences of inclusio point to the corporate and relational aspect, which is a prominent theme in the epistle.50 The letter is centred in the relationship, friendship in particular, between Paul and the Philippians, and among the Philippians. This key theme will further be explored as follows.

4.1.4.2 Prominence

As previously defined, prominence is the repetition of a theme (thematic prominence) or a word (lexical cohesion) throughout a discourse to enable and facilitate coherence. The following part demonstrates the centrality of friendship and corporate unity in Philippians through thematic prominence and lexical cohesion.

4.1.4.2.1 Thematic prominence

The two inter-related themes highlighted by thematic prominence are friendship and corporate unity.

50 Both Hansen and Garland discuss the use of inclusio in Philippians. Garland provides a list of words that show the use of inclusion in Philippians, for instance, σωτηρία (1:28) and σωτήρ (3:20), παράκλησις (2:1) and παρακαλω (4:2). Of importance, the rare words in 1:27 (πολιτεύσει, στήκετε, συναθλοῦστες) reappear later in the epistle: πολιτεύμα (3:20), στήκετε (4:3), συνηθίζουσίν (4:3). For Garland, this demarcates 1:27–4:3 as a single unit. Garland, “Philippians,” 160–1. Hansen identifies six references to ΚΟΣΜΟΦΑΙ (1:5, 7; 2:1; 3:10; 4:14, 15), highlighting the motif of partnership throughout the epistle. Hansen, 48–50.
The friendship theme, between Paul and the Philippians, appears in all the semantic units. In Unit A, Paul expresses his affection and care for the Philippians in the following clauses: ἐπὶ πάση τῇ μνείᾳ ὑμῶν (1:3); ἕστω δίκαιον ἑμοῦ τούτῳ φρονεῖν ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν (1:7a); διὰ τὸ ἔχειν μὴ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς (1:7b); and ἐπιποθῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς (1:8). The friendship is also evident from the use of κοινωνία language: συγκοινωνοῦντες μοι τῆς χάριτος πάντας ὑμᾶς ὑπετασμένους (1:7b).

In Unit B, the focus shifts to Paul’s imprisonment (1:12–26). Nonetheless, the relationship between Paul and the Philippians remains in the background. Paul explains the reason behind the possibility of his σωτηρίαν from his δεσμός by stating: διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν δεήσεως (1:19).

In Unit C, Paul uses Christ as an example (2:1–4) to urge for unity: Τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὡς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (2:5). However, the relational tone can be detected in the description of Philippians’ obedience to Paul. The apostle exhorts the Philippians’ obedience both ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ μου and ἐν τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ μου (2:12). Furthermore, Paul expresses his delight in the Philippians: εἰς καύχημα ἐμοὶ εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ (2:16). Lastly, the unit ends with the announcement of the shared joy: χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ... χαίρετε καὶ συγχαίρετε μοι (2:17–18).

In Unit D, the relationship is reflected by the sending of Timothy (from Paul to the Philippians) and Epaphroditus (originally from the Philippians to Paul).

51 This phrase could refer to the Philippians’ care for Paul. Reumann, 102–3; O’Brien, Philippians, 58–61; Thurston and Ryan, 49. However, either interpretation would still point to the friendship between Paul and the Philippians.

52 The phrase διὰ τὸ ἔχειν μὴ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς will be discussed in detail later in this chapter.
In Unit E, Paul uses himself as an example to urge the Philippians to imitate him (3:17). As previously mentioned, Paul employs ἀδελφοί twice (3:13 and 3:17) to express his emphatic emotion in his encouragement.

Although Εὐδοξία and Σωτήριος are the focal point in Unit F, the relational tone between Paul and the Philippians can be detected. Paul urges the Philippians to help the two women: ἔρωτό καὶ σέ, γινήσει σύζυγε, συλλαμβάνειν αὐταῖς (4:3). Paul addresses the Philippians as γινήσει σύζυγε,\(^{53}\) while the women are portrayed as ἀποτυγκεὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ συνήθησάν μιστά. Later in this chapter, the analysis reveals that Unit F is the peak in Philippians, and displays unusual grammatical and syntactic phenomena. The relationship, in particular unity, between Paul, Εὐδοξία, Σωτήριος, and the Philippians is strongly highlighted in this climatic unit.

Finally, in Unit G, Paul’s relationship with the Philippians is again highlighted in the following clauses: Ἐξάρην … ἀνεθάλατε τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν (4:10); and ἐποιήσατε συγκοινωνήσαντες μου τῇ θλίψει (4:14).

In summary, in this analysis aspects of the relationship between Paul and the Philippians are highlighted through thematic prominence. Many scholars specify this relationship as friendship,\(^{54}\) with some drawing on research by Stanley Stowers and

\(^{53}\) A detailed discussion of the identity of γινήσει σύζυγε will be provided later in this chapter.

Luke Johnson.\textsuperscript{55} In the mid-1980s, both Stowers and Johnson provided important insights regarding the epistle.\textsuperscript{56} In his research on ancient letters in the Greco-Roman era, Stowers identifies a particular form of letter called “letters of friendship.” He argues that some NT letters, including Philippians, follow this letter form.\textsuperscript{57} In addition, Johnson identifies and explains the use of friendship rhetoric in Philippians.\textsuperscript{58} In a recent commentary, Hansen explains why Philippians is parallel with Hellenistic letters of friendship and summarises ten arguments.\textsuperscript{59} Overall, the insights provided by Stowers and Johnson correspond with the thematic prominence highlighted in this analysis.

4.1.4.2.2 Lexical cohesion

The second form of prominence is known as lexical cohesion. The repetition of an identical or similar lexical item or the repetition of several lexical items with the same topic is employed to highlight a coherent theme. In Philippians, there four key

\textsuperscript{55} For example, Stowers and/or Johnson are referred to in the work of Fee, Fowl, Hansen, and Reed. Fee, \textit{Philippians}, 1–2; Fowl, 8–9, 218; Hansen, 6–10; Reed, \textit{Discourse}, 169–71.

\textsuperscript{56} Both Stowers and Johnson conclude that Philippians is a letter of friendship. Alexander suggests that Philippians follows the format of the Hellenistic “family letter.” Loveday Alexander, “Hellenistic Letter-Forms and the Structure of Philippians,” \textit{JSNT} 37 (1989): 87–101. However, not everyone agrees that Philippians is a letter of friendship or family. Bockmuehl rejects this and cites similar disagreement by some Greek patristic commentators. Bockmuehl, 35. Peterlin suggests that defining Philippians as a family letter is part of the reason why the epistle is treated as an informal correspondence.


\textsuperscript{59} Hansen, 8–11.
patterns of lexical cohesion. The following part demonstrates how these patterns illustrate corporate unity and communal relationship.

The first pattern of lexical cohesion is demonstrated by the repetition of the words relating to κοινωνία throughout the epistle. There are six references to κοινωνία in the letter, elucidating the motif of partnership: 60 ἔπι τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν (1:5); τοῦ εὐαγγελίου συγκοινωνίως μου (1:7); εἰ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ (2:1); κοινωνίαν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ (3:10); ἐποίησατε συγκοινωνήσαντες μου τῇ θλίψει (4:14); and οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκουσώρησεν ... εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνοι (4:15). Four out of the six references point directly to the partnership between Paul and the Philippians (1:5, 1:7, 4:14, and 4:15). Not only is partnership mentioned throughout the letter through the lexical cohesion of κοινωνία, it is also reiterated as a form of inclusio (1:5 and 4:15).

Second, words with the prepositional prefix συν- occur with striking frequency. The prefix is used for both verbs and nouns, including συγκοινωνίωσ (1:7), συναθλοῦντες (1:27), σύμψυχοι (2:2), συγχαίρω (2:17), συγχαίρετε (2:18), συνεργῶν (2:25), συνστρατιώτην (2:25), συμμορφεζόμενος (3:10), σύμμορφον (3:21), σὺζυγε (4:3), συλλαμβάνου (4:3), συνήθλησαν (4:3), συνεργῶν (4:3), and συγκοινωνήσαντες (4:14). Apart from συμμορφεζόμενος in 3:10 and σύμμορφον in


61 Nongbri argues for a variant reading of 1:7, in which μου is possibly placed after τῆς χάριτος in the original letter. Thus through the support to Paul, the Philippians become partakes of the benefaction (which χαρίς denotes) that the apostle has originally received from God. In other words, Paul is a broker of divine benefaction. Brent Nongbri, “Two Neglect Textual Variants in Philippians 1,” JBL 128 (2009): 803–8.
3:21, twelve words with this prefix are employed to depict a communal and corporate reference. Nine out of these twelve words elucidate the relationship between Paul and the Philippians, with only three of them illustrating the relationship among the Philippians. This demonstrates that the theme of unity is not limited to portray the Philippians, since the same theme is also used to portray the unity between the apostle and the Philippians. Regarding words with συν- prefix, there is one particular nuance that invites curiosity, which centres on the use of συζυγε. In 4:3, the Philippians are addressed by Paul as σε, in the singular form, instead of the plural ΰμας, before calling them his γνήσιος συζυγε. The majority of the commentators consider γνήσιος συζυγε to be an unnamed person in the community. However, συζυγε, a masculine singular noun, might also refer to the whole church as if addressing to one person. A pronoun is used to refer to the identified subject in the previous context. In this case, the immediate masculine subject is ἄδελφοι μου ἄγαπητοι in 4:1.

Furthermore, this unit is the climax of the letter (as discussed later) which highlights

---

62 Συλλαμβάνω in 4:3 means “help” in its middle voice. However, the connotation behind the word carries the essence of corporate unity and communal relationship. BDAG, 777.

63 Words with the συν- prefix illustrate the corporate unity and communal relationship between Paul and the Philippians, and occur in 1:7; 2:17, 18, 25 (twice); 4:3 (three times), 14. Words with same connotation are used to depict the same theme among the Philippians, and occur in 1:27 (twice); 4:3.

64 Martin, Philippians, 152–3; Marshall, Philippians, 109; Fowl, 178–9; Bockmuehl, 240–1; Lightfoot, Philippians, 158–9; Thurston and Ryan, 141; Osiek, 113; Beare, 145; Hansen, 284–5; Reumann, 628–30; O’Brien, Philippians, 481. Many of these commentators would provide a list of people whom they conjecture to be the possible identity of this person, mostly with uncertainty except a few. For instance, Fee provides an interesting argument suggesting that this person is Luke. Fee, Philippians, 393–5. Some argue that it refers to a person with the proper name, Συζυγε. Vincent, 131. The problem of this view is that this name is not found in either other Greek literature or early church writings. Marshall, Philippians, 109. It is also suggested that Συζυγε is Paul’s wife since ἡ συζυγος means wife in some Greek literature. BDAG, 775–6; Lightfoot, Philippians, 159. However, this view is refuted because of the masculine gender attached to its modifier, γνήσιος. Bockmuehl, 240–1.

65 Craddock, 70. In fact, Hawthorne considers this possibility to be the best deduction as he argues that “Paul sees the entire Philippian church as a unit, as a single individual.” Hawthorne, 180.
the issue of communal unity. Using a singular σε to address to the whole community (represented by ἄδελφοι) is a natural utterance. Thus the use of the singular masculine noun σύζυγε as well as singular σε in the same verse further accentuates the corporate entity of the Philippian community. The unusual grammatical choice is not unique in Unit F, since this unit also displays many unusual grammatical phenomena, indicating the climatic point of Paul’s argument, which will be detailed later in this chapter.

Third, as previously mentioned, χαίρω and its cognates (χαρά and συγχαίρω) occur 16 times in Philippians. Whilst this repetition in clustered form is perceived as a discourse marker, it is also a form of prominence. Joy is therefore a prominent theme, and, in particular, also highlights the relationship between Paul and the Philippians. In 1:4, Paul prays for the Philippians: μετὰ χαράς. In 1:19, Paul rejoices due to his possible release: διὰ τῆς υμῶν δεήσεως. In 1:25, Paul prefers to live (παραμενώ πάσιν υμῖν) with a purpose: εἰς τὴν υμῶν προκοπὴν καὶ χαρὰν τῆς πίστεως. In 2:2, Paul calls for unity among the Philippians, which would fill him with joy (2:2). In two clauses, the relationship between Paul and the Philippians is accentuated: χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πάσιν υμῖν (2:17); and ὑμεῖς χαίρετε καὶ συγχαίρετε μοι (2:18). When Paul sends Epaphroditus back to the Philippians, χαρῆτε (2:28) and χαράς (2:29) portray the joy. In 4:1, Paul calls the Philippians his χαρά καὶ στέφανος. In 4:10, Paul rejoices because of the Philippians’ concern: Ἐχάρην … μεγάλως. Given these occurrences, the repetition of χαίρω and its cognates clearly emphasise the theme of friendship and relationship. As previously

---

66 Heil argues that “a connotation of joy envelopes the letter.” The cause of rejoicing is “in being conformed to Christ,” which indicates unity among and between the Philippians, Paul, Timothy, and Epaphroditus. John Paul Heil, Philippians: Let us Rejoice in Being Conformed to Christ (SBL Early Christianity and Its Literature 3; Atlanta: SBL, 2010), 2–3.
discussed, the clustered χαίρεω functions as a discourse marker, and the reason for this is now evident. When Paul shifts topic, he highlights his relationship with the Philippians through the use of χαίρεω, which probably reminds the audience of the joyous and positive affection shared between them.

Fourth, other words can be used as “thematically equivalent synonyms or even figurative expressions” to portray the same thematic meaning. The anthropological terms employed in Philippians belong to the same lexical set, which facilitates lexical cohesion, and illustrate corporate and communal dimensions, both in relation to the Philippians and between Paul and the Philippians. These key terms occur in: ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς (1:7); ἐν πνεύματι (1:27); μιᾷ ψυχῇ (1:27); κοινωνίᾳ πνεύματος (2:1); σύμψυχοι (2:2); ἰσόψυχοι (2:20); παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ (2:30); τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἦμῶν (3:21a); τῷ σῶματι τῆς δόξης (3:21b); and μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν (4:23). The remainder of this chapter will focus on the thematic meanings of these anthropological terms, and will detail the corporate and communal connotations.

The following table summarises these four patterns of lexical cohesion, which function as thematic equivalent synonyms to portray the theme of corporate unity and communal relationship.

---

67 Lemke, “Intertextuality,” 89.
Table 4.4 Lexical Cohesion—Thematic Equivalent Synonyms—Theme of Corporate Unity and Communal Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter-opening</th>
<th>Unit A</th>
<th>Unit B</th>
<th>Unit C</th>
<th>Unit D</th>
<th>Unit E</th>
<th>Unit F</th>
<th>Unit G</th>
<th>Letter-closing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μιᾷ ψυχῇ</td>
<td>συμβολή</td>
<td>1:27 PH</td>
<td>σύμβασις</td>
<td>2:27 PH</td>
<td>Θείας πατερικῆς</td>
<td>4:3 PH</td>
<td>συμβολή</td>
<td>4:23 P&amp;PH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: P&PH: Between Paul and the Philippians,  P&C: Between Paul and Christ, PH: Among the Philippians

In summary, both the inclusio and the prominence (thematic prominence and lexical cohesion) indicate that the coherent theme of the discourse centres on the
communal, relational, and corporate unity, both among the Philippians and between Paul and the Philippians.\textsuperscript{68}

4.1.5 Macrostructure

Many commentators perceive disunity among the Philippians to be the key issue that Paul addresses, with the conflict between Euodia and Syntyche especially prompting Paul to write this letter.\textsuperscript{69} Nonetheless, the analysis thus far shows that the focal point, which is illustrated by the discourse coherence, centres on the friendship between

\textsuperscript{68} Some commentators contend that the epistle has mixed themes and multiple purposes. For example, Hawthorne asserts that Paul has many things in mind, from expressing his deep affection for the Philippians, informing them of the erroneous teaching they might encounter, to thanking them for the gift of money. Hawthorne concludes that the letter “follows no logical progression” with “[s]wift changes of topic and … tone.” Hawthorne, xlvii. O’Brien, Hansen, and Fee propose that there is more than one key issue in Philippians, pointing to the multipurpose nature of the epistle. Fee, *Philippians*, 29–33; Hansen, 25–30; O’Brien, *Philippians*, 38. Acknowledging the multifaceted issues addressed by Paul, Fee argues that the epistle still follows a basic chronological scheme. Fee, *Philippians*, 38–9. However, other commentators contend that the epistle does have a single purpose, with a coherent theme. Peterlin concludes that disunity is the core issue addressed by Paul, and argues that there are “numerous allusions to disunity in the Philippian church.” Conversely, Winter argues that Paul seeks to foster his own relationship with the Philippians, and contends that the major texts in the epistles “are not attempts to encourage community harmony among the Philippians.” These two pieces of research were conducted in the 1990s, and although arriving at opposite conclusions, they both attempt to prove that Philippians is not Paul’s random collection of thoughts. Peterlin, *Philippians*, 227; Sean F. Winter, “‘Worthy of the Gospel of Christ’: A Study in the Situation and Strategy of Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians” (PhD. diss., The University of Oxford, 1997), 213.

\textsuperscript{69} Most commentators support this view. Silva, 222; O’Brien, *Philippians*, 477–8; Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 179; Martin, *Philippians*, 152; Thurston and Ryan, 142; Hansen, 282; Bockmuehl, 238; Beare, 142–3; Fee, *Philippians*, 391–3. However, Winter argues that the conflict is between the two women and Paul. First, the same construction in 2 Cor 4:13; 12:18, τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, refers to Paul and either the Corinthians or his associates. Second, Paul addresses an unnamed helper (γνήσιε σύζυγε) in Phil 4:3 and asks her to help the two women who were working with Paul. Hence, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν should be understood as an encouragement to “resume their cooperation with Paul.” Third, had Paul promoted reconciliation between the two women, he would have used παρακαλῶ once not twice. The repeated use indicates an urge for cooperation with the apostle, and is “the same demand specific to two individuals.” Winter, “Philippians,” 166. Winter’s alternative conclusion may be valid (except in one argument he treats γνήσιε σύζυγε as female, which contradicts the masculine vocative, γνήσιε). Nevertheless, the immediate context can be explained either way. The repetition of παρακαλῶ can be interpreted as Paul refusing to take sides and treating the two women equally. Or as Paul addressing the two women individually, appealing for reconciliation with Paul. However, the wider context heavily emphasises the friendship between Paul and the Philippians. Thus, Winter’s argument concurs with the macrostructure. It is most certain that the tone of unity, within the community and between Paul and the community, underlies the coherence of the whole discourse.
Paul and the Philippians, despite the discord between Euodia and Syntyche. If the conflict between the two women was vital, then the thematic prominence of friendship would have been surpassed. Therefore, this study proposes that the macrostructure can be expressed as follows. The friendship between Paul and the Philippians is under stress due to an undefined conflict between Euodia and Syntyche. As a result, by invoking his friendship with the Philippians, Paul calls for unity within the community and between himself and his friends, and reconciliation between Euodia and Syntyche.

4.2 Anthropological Terms in Philippians

As previously mentioned, the key anthropological terms produce a pattern of lexical cohesion, involving a prominence, which highlights corporate and communal unity. The following part analyses the occurrences of the key anthropological terms in each semantic unit, and then examines their overall occurrences in the entire discourse in light of sociolinguistic aspect, the macrostructure, and the discourse flow.

4.2.1 Anthropological Terms in Semantic Units

The anthropological terms that occur in each semantic unit are: καρδία (1:7; 4:7), ψυχή (1:27; 2:30), the corresponding words of ψυχή: σώματος (2:2) and ἰσώματος (2:20), πνεῦμα (1:27; 2:1; 4:23), and σῶμα (3:21). In addition, φρονέω will also be examined. Although φρονέω is not an anthropological term, its cognate φρήν is.70 The plural form, φρένες, means diaphragm, and the singular form is used metaphorically.

---

to depict “inner part” or “mind,”71 functioning as a parallel of νοῦς, which is an anthropological term.72 As such, φρονέω will also be examined.

4.2.1.1 Καρδία in Units A and G

Καρδία occurs twice in Philippians: 1:7 (Unit A); and 4:7 (Unit G). Καρδία in Unit A denotes the corporate and communal aspect; while the one in Unit G does not carry this connotation.

4.2.1.1.1 Τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς in Unit A

In Unit A, Paul expresses his affections towards the Philippians through various utterances as mentioned. One of the expressions is: διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς (1:7b). The articular infinitive clause consists of διὰ, which indicates cause.73 Hence, the clause explains the cause of a preceding idea. In 1:7a, Paul makes known his concern for the Philippians (τούτῳ φρονεῖν ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν). His reason is then explained in 1:7b. Grammatically speaking, the infinitive clause can be understood as either “I have you in my heart” or “You have me in my heart.” The word order suggests the former is a more appropriate reading, since με has a closer

71 According to Bertram, the word is used by Homer to depict “inner part,” “mind,” and “understanding.” Bertram, “φρήμ,” 220.

72 Bertram states that this usage is adopted by the works of Josephus. Bertram, “φρήμ,” 229. The findings in this study are consistent with Bertram’s observation. For instance, Josephus uses the phrase ἔξεστικότα τῶν φρενῶν αὐτῶν to describe how οἱ ἀσεβεῖς consider Jeremiah. The genitive noun τῶν φρενῶν does not denote diaphragm. Instead, it connotes mind as the context depicts how the godless people believe that Jeremiah is “out of his mind.” Josephus, Ant. 10.114 (Marcus, LCL).

proximity to the infinitive phrase, διὰ τὸ ἐχεῖν, than ὑμᾶς. Therefore, the reason why Paul thinks of the Philippians is because the apostle has the Philippians in his heart. The following context also supports this reading, since Paul’s expression, ἐπιθυμῶν πάντας ὑμᾶς (1:8), aligns with interpretation of “I have you in my heart.” Paul employs καρδία to express affection in 1:7 in the context that highlights the friendship between Paul and the Philippians.

4.2.1.1.2 Τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν in Unit G

The phrase τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν appears as a normal plural construct in 4:7. Paul uses the phrase to encourage the Philippians to make known their request to God instead of being anxious (4:6). The term is likely to be used in contrast with τὰ νοηματα (4:6), portraying emotion. The plural noun emphasises all the individuals of the Philippian

---


75 This understanding is also held by a number of scholars, including O’Brien, Martin, Hansen, Fee, Bockmuehl, Silva, Thurston and Ryan. O’Brien, Philippians, 68; Martin, Philippians, 66; Hansen, 52; Fee, Philippians, 90; Bockmuehl, 63; Silva, 56; Thurston and Ryan, 50. For instance, O’Brien argues that the following phrase in 1:8 supports the reading “I have you in my heart” since Paul states: μάρτυς γὰρ μοι ὁ θεὸς. “I have you in my heart… for God is my witness” is a more natural reading than “You have me in your heart … for God is my witness.” O’Brien, Philippians, 68. Nonetheless, this view is objected by some. Hawthorne, 22–3; Reumann, 117. For example, Hawthorne argues against this understanding based on a number of reasons, including the absence of personal pronoun modifying καρδία, and the impossibility to verify whether this word order follows the typical Pauline pattern. Hawthorne, 22–3.

76 Καρδία and νοῦς in this verse are considered to be denoting two different aspects: emotion and thought/volition. Hawthorne, 185; Vincent, 137; O’Brien Philippians, 498. Fee understands καρδία as the “centre of one’s being.” Fee, Philippians, 411; and Lightfoot considers it as the “seat of thought as well as of feeling.” Lightfoot, Philippians, 161.
The term does not highlight the strong corporate and communal aspect in this occurrence.

4.2.1.2 Ψυχή in Units C and D

Ψυχή occurs twice in Philippians (1:7; 2:30). Other words related to ψυχή are also found in the epistle, including σύμψυχοι (2:2) and ισόψυχοι (2:20). The following part explores the usage of ψυχή, and its cognates, which have corporate and communal connotations.

4.2.1.2.1 Μιᾶς ψυχῆς and σύμψυχοι in Unit C

Ψυχή occurs at the beginning of Unit C (1:27–2:18) in the following clause: στήκετε ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾶς ψυχῆς συναθλοῦντες (1:27). This study argues that the phrase μιᾶς ψυχῆς, based on its context, denotes corporate unity and communal relationship.

Referring to the context of Unit C, Paul begins the semantic unit by urging the Philippians to conduct their life worthy of Christ’s gospel by uniting together as a community (1:27–30). This unity, according to Paul, can only be achieved by being humble (2:1–4); and Christ is a perfect example of humility (2:5–11). Paul then ends this unit by invoking his friendship with the Philippians (2:12–17).

From the immediate context, ψυχή is not used to connote a human soul (in an ontological sense) as the apostle urges the community to fight “in one soul.” Instead, the singular ψυχή, emphasised by μία, is used in a metaphorical sense to portray the

---

77 Hansen argues that the plural of καρδία highlights all individuals in the community. Hansen, 294–5.
This unity is further accentuated by a verb with a συν- prefix: συναθλούντες to emphasise togetherness. The clause μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλούντες is also connected to its previous clause στήκετε ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι. As discussed later, some scholars consider two clauses to be in parallel, with ψυχῇ and πνεῦμα being synonymous. Putting aside this suggestion for the moment, it is obvious that unity is highlighted through the use of ἑνὶ, μιᾷ, and συν-. In other words, the corporate unity and communal oneness is highlighted. Moreover, this corporate and communal reference is also supported by the preceding and the following context of μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλούντες as explained below.

In the preceding context, through the conjunction ὅτι the verb στήκετε is linked back to ἀκούω, while ἀκούω is connected to the preceding main verb ποιεῖσθε through ἱνα. In other words, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλούντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is syntactically associated with the main clause τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύσθε. The main command stated in 1:27 is “Conduct your live in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ.” πολιτεύομαι means “live,” “conduct oneself,” or “lead one’s life,” with a connotation alluding to the life as a citizen. This word is likely chosen by Paul to elucidate that the Philippians are like citizens within the Christian community in the kingdom of God. Hence, it is coherent to regard ψυχῇ

78 Many commentators regard ψυχῇ to be used in a metaphorical sense. For instance, the terms is understood as denoting social life (Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 352); communal sharing (Hansen, 8; O’Brien,Philippians, 152); “unity and oneness” (Fee,Philippians, 164); “attitude and life principle” (Thurston and Ryan, 69); “mental harmony” (Silva, 94); or single minded (Marshall,Philippians, 35; Beare, 67).

79 A detailed analysis of πνεῦμα in 1:27 will later be provided in this chapter.

80 See Figure 4.2 for the syntactical chart of 1:27.

81 BDAG, 686.
as relating to social life (possibly as a citizen) instead of connoting a human soul. In other words, the communal aspect depicted by πολιτείας in the preceding context is further elaborated by the corporate unity emphasised by μιᾶ ψυχή.

In the following context, the focus on corporate unity continues. Before asking the Philippians to imitate Christ (2:5) and detailing Christ’s example of humility (2:6–11), Paul encourages the Philippians to fill him with joy by being united: ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε, τὴν ἀγάπην ἔχωντες, σύμψυχοι, τὸ ἐν φρονοῦντες (2:2). Not only is the ἵνα clause a clear exhortation to corporate unity, the striking occurrence of σύμψυχοι also reminds the readers of the earlier occurrence of μιᾶ ψυχή. The lexical meaning of the adjective σύμψυχος is harmonious or united in spirit.

Given the context of ψυχή in 1:27, this study concludes that ψυχή connotes the corporate reference, highlighting the corporate unity. The Philippian community is portrayed metaphorically as a human person, and is urged to be united as if a single communal being with one ψυχή.

Surprisingly, at the end of Unit C (2:12–17), Paul invokes his friendship with the Philippians, despite focussing on unity among the Philippians throughout the unit. He begins by discussing their obedience with and without his presence (2:12) and finishes by expressing: χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ ύμεῖς χαίρετε καὶ συγχαίρετε μοι (2:17–18). The request, χαίρετε καὶ

---


83 BDAG, 781.

84 Fee also notes the unusual way to end this segment. Fee, Philippians, 256.
συγχαίρετε, seems out of place given the focus on corporate unity. Perhaps Paul is comforting those who are worried about his imprisonment.\textsuperscript{85} Or perhaps Paul is asking the Philippians to share his joy due to the advance of the gospel\textsuperscript{86} or due to his sacrifice.\textsuperscript{87} However, taking into consideration the repetition of the συν- prefix in the same verse, it seems that Paul wants to highlight the partnership between himself and the community.\textsuperscript{88} Thus, perhaps the overt call for corporate unity in previous clauses (στήκετε ἐν ἑαυτῷ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες, in 1:27; ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε τὴν ἀγάπην ἔχοντες, σύμψυχοι, τὸ ἐν φρονοῖμεν, in 2:2) is actually a subtle call for unity between Paul and the Philippians. The repetitive use of συν- throughout the epistle reflects the patterns of lexical cohesion, as previously discussed. Overall, the heavy emphasis on partnership and friendship by Paul denotes a particular point, which will be further addressed in an examination of discourse flow.

4.2.1.2.2 Ψυχή and ἰσόψυχοι in Unit D

Ψυχή occurs at the end of Unit D (2:19–30) in the following clause: ἥγγισεν παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ (2:30). Whilst ψυχή connotes the life of Epaphroditus, the usage alludes to relationship.

\textsuperscript{85} Hansen, 190.

\textsuperscript{86} Fee, Philippians, 256.

\textsuperscript{87} Beare, 94.

\textsuperscript{88} Hawthorn specifies this as friendship that the apostle shares together “with his friends at Philippi.” Hawthorne, 106.
In Unit D, Paul discusses Timothy and Epaphroditus. In the second half of the unit, he mentions the need to send Epaphroditus back to the Philippians. The clause παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, which modifies the preceding clause διὰ τὸ ἔργον Χριστοῦ μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισεν, portrays the near death experience of Epaphroditus. Hence, ψυχή simply means life, Epaphroditus’ physical life. Nonetheless, if the wider textual context is considered, there is a nuance worth noting. The following ἵνα clause indicates that the noble act of Epaphroditus is closely related to Paul’s discussion of friendship. The clause ἵνα ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ύμων ὑστέρημα τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργίας illustrates the relational aspect of Epaphroditus’ action. Risking his life is not merely an individual act of sacrifice. Instead, it is deeply related to the Philippian community as indicated by ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ύμων ὑστέρημα. In other words, the clause παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ alludes to the deep friendship between Epaphroditus (who represents the Philippians) with Paul.

Based on an analysis of the wider textual context, the allusion to friendship becomes more evident. As previously mentioned, the theme depicted in Unit D contributes to the thematic prominence of relationship in the letter. The relationship between Paul (who is going to send Timothy to the Philippians) and the Philippians (who have previously sent Epaphroditus to Paul) dominates the discussion in this unit. Of interest, Paul employs ἵσοψυχος to portray Timothy in the early part of Unit D: οὐδένα γὰρ ἐχω ἵσοψυχον, ὡς τοις γνησίως τὰ περὶ ύμων μεριμνήσει (2:20). The

---

89 The connotation of ψυχή in 2:30 is widely understood as physical life. O’ Brien, *Philippians*, 343; Hawthorne, 119; Beare, 99; Reumann, 432; Fee *Philippians*, 283; Martin, *Philippians*, 123; Hansen, 208–9; Thurston and Ryan, 105.

90 Thurston and Ryan argue that the participle, παραβολευσάμενος, is used in the papyri to describe someone who “exposes himself to danger for the sake of friendship.” Thus, it highlights the theme of friendship. Thurston and Ryan, 105.
lexical meaning of ἰσοφυσχος is like-minded,\textsuperscript{91} which points to Timothy in this text. This like-mindedness actually refers to the concern of Paul (and Timothy) for the Philippians (τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν μεριμνήσει). A comparison of ἰσοφυσχος (in the early part of Unit D) and ψυχή (in the latter part of Unit D) is meaningful. On the one hand, Timothy, who is like-minded (ἰσοφυσχος) with Paul, genuinely concerns for the Philippians. On the other hand, Epaphroditus, who represents the Philippians, risks his life (ψυχή) for the sake of his friendship with Paul. Although ἰσοφυσχος and ψυχή do not share an identical meaning in their own sentence, both words are used in the context of the relational aspect. Putting different elements together, μιᾶ ψυχή plus σύμψυχοι (Unit C) and ἰσοφυσχος plus ψυχή (Unit D) all point to the same direction: the corporate unity and friendship.

4.2.1.3 Πνεῦμα in Units C and D

The term πνεῦμα occurs five times in Philippians. Two of these occurrences denote the divine Spirit: τοῦ πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1:19); and πνεύματι θεοῦ (3:3). The remaining three occurrences, including ἐν πνεύματι (1:27); κοινωνία πνεύματος (2:1); and τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν (4:23), show that the term carries the corporate and communal reference.

4.2.1.3.1 Ἐν πνεύματι and κοινωνία πνεύματος in Unit C

In 1:27, πνεῦμα neither connotes the human spirit in an ontological sense nor denotes the Holy Spirit. Resembling ψυχή in 1:27, πνεῦμα is used as a metaphor, depicting

\textsuperscript{91} BDAG, 381.
the Philippians united together as a corporate entity, as if a single communal being, having one πνεῦμα. The rationale behind this argument is as follows.

First, the phrases ἑνὶ πνεύματι and μιᾷ ψυχῇ are synonymous, portraying corporate and communal aspects.92 As shown in Figure 4.2, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες is a subordinate clause of στήκετε ἑνὶ πνεύματι. The participle συναθλοῦντες modifies its main verb στήκετε. συναθλοῦντες is a post-verbal present participle that follows the present imperative στήκετε, which can well be a participle of means.93 “Stand firm in one spirit by means of fighting together in one soul” as Paul states. The subordinate clause is used to augment the meaning of the main clause. Thus it is logical to see that ἑνὶ πνεύματι and μιᾷ ψυχῇ are in parallel, synonymously pointing to communal unity. Just as ψυχή is not used to connote a human soul, since Paul urges the community to fight “in one soul,” neither should πνεῦμα be regarded as depicting a human spirit.94 Instead, they both are used to portray the community as one united corporate being, which is further highlighted by the lexical cohesion of corporate entity through the use of ἑνὶ, μιᾷ, and συν- prefix.

---

92 This view is also held by a number of scholars. Banker argues that the two phrases are idiomatic, both mean “unitedly” (Banker, *Philippians*, 71). For Hawthorne, the two expressions are “equivalent in meaning” (Hawthorne 56–7). Silva also suggests that πνεῦμα and ψυχή are in the form of parallelism (Silva, 94). O’Brien sets forth that the two clauses are employed to depict “unity of heart and purpose,” a view that is similar to Beare, Hawthorne, Silva, Peterlin, Thurston and Ryan (O’Brien, *Philippians*, 152; Beare, 67; Thurston and Ryan, 69; Peterlin, 56–7).


94 The term denotes “a common spirit” behind the ideas of “Christian harmony” instead of the Holy Spirit (Hawthorne, 96); “mental harmony” and “singleness of purpose” (Silva, 94); “one common purpose” (O’Brien, *Philippians*, 150); single mind (Marshall, *Philippians*, 35); “common attitude” (Thurston and Ryan, 69); communal disposition (Vincent, 33); “collective spirit of the Philippians” (Reed, *Discourse*, 300); or “inward unity” (Beare, 67).
Figure 4.2 Syntactical Structure of 1:27
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Second, this study refutes the idea that πνεῦμα connotes the Holy Spirit, even though this interpretation is widely supported by scholars.95 Two key arguments support this interpretation. First, the locative phrase ἐν πνεύματι in 1 Cor 12:13 and Eph 2:18 refers to the Holy Spirit, and is never used in the Pauline epistles to describe oneness or unity. Second, given the occurrence of a similar clause στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ (4:1), πνεῦμα should be understood as parallel with κυρίος. However, this study identifies two problems with these two arguments, as explained below.

First and foremost, as discussed in Chapter 2, the meaning of a word must be determined by its textual context, both at the sentential level and the discourse level. In ascertaining the meaning of ἐν πνεύματι, whilst there is value in consulting other discourses from Paul (ἐν πνεύματι, in 1 Cor 12:13; Eph 2:18)96 and referring to a similar clause in the same epistle (στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ, in 4:1), the immediate textual context must be given utmost priority. Therefore, its subordinate clause (μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλούντες) and its preceding main clause (τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύεσθε) must be considered. As previously argued, πνεῦμα is best understood as a metaphor portraying corporate unity, which is illustrated by its parallel μιᾷ ψυχῇ and the citizenship of a community denoted by πολιτεύεσθε.

Second, the syntax shows that the Holy Spirit is a less preferred interpretation. If πνεῦμα denotes the Holy Spirit, then πνεῦμα would be a personal noun (instead of an object) by definition. The combination of a preposition ἐν and a dative personal

95 Fee, Philippians, 163–6; Martin, Philippians, 83; Bockmuehl, 99; Osiek, 49; and Reumann, 266. Bockmuehl, Osiek, and Reumann quotes the arguments provided by Fee in their work.

96 Whether Ephesians is an authentic Pauline letter is disputed.
noun is used to depict means or instrument.⁹⁷ If the subordinate clause is considered, which contains the participle of “means,” the text would read: “Stand by means of one Spirit, by means of fighting together in one soul.” The two “means” (“one Spirit” and “fighting together in one soul”) would become parallel in meaning. This would almost equate the Holy Spirit with fighting in one soul, an unnatural interpretation.⁹⁸ On the other hand, if the dative noun is interpreted as an agent,⁹⁹ it would be even more problematic. στήκετε is clearly understood as an action taken by the Philippians instead of the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁰ In contrary, it is much more natural to regard πνεῦμα and ψυχή as in parallel: “Stand unitedly (as if one corporate being) together by fighting unitedly (as if one corporate being) for the faith of the gospel.”

One minor argument supporting the meaning of the Holy Spirit rests on the phrase κολυμνία πνεύματος (2:1) in the following context. Since πνεῦμα in 2:1 connotes the Holy Spirit, as widely argued,¹⁰¹ it is natural for πνεῦμα in 1:27 to have the same connotation.¹⁰² However, this interpretation is not entirely unambiguous.¹⁰³

---

⁹⁷ Wallace, Grammar, 373–5. Fee argues that it is definitely a locative, a dative denoting sphere. Nonetheless, the Holy Spirit is a divine being instead of an object. Fee, Philippians, 165.

⁹⁸ The clause στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ in 4:1 does not have this problem, since it stands without any subordinate clause attaching to it. “Stand by means of the Lord” is an appropriate interpretation.

⁹⁹ The function of the Holy Spirit, according to Martin, gears towards the definition of agent. Martin, Philippians, 83.

¹⁰⁰ Unlike the passage in 1 Cor 12:13, the main verb, ἐβαπτίσθημεν, is in passive voice. Therefore, understanding the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι) as the agent or instrument doing the action is natural: “We were baptized by the agent/means of the one Spirit.”

¹⁰¹ This view is supported by many commentators (Lightfoot, Philippians, 107; Osiek, 52; Vincent, 54; Reumann, 302; Hansen, 110; Martin, Philippians, 86–7; Fee, Philippians, 181; Marshall, Philippians, 42; Fowl, 80; Beare, 71; Hawthorne, 66; O’Brien Philippians, 173; Witherington, Friendship, 61–2).

¹⁰² Fee, Philippians, 165.

¹⁰³ As well argued by Bockmuehl, the connotation of πνεῦμα in 1:27 and 2:1 are ambiguous. Bockmuehl, 106.
The strongest argument supporting the meaning of the Holy Spirit is the occurrence of a similar phrase in Paul’s final benediction in 2 Cor 13:13: ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.\textsuperscript{104} However, this argument is contestable. πνεύμα in Phil 2:1 is anarthrous, but πνεύμα in 2 Cor 13:13 is articular. Given this, F. F. Bruce interprets the indefinite πνεύμα in Phil 2:1 as “spiritual” instead of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{105} This study agrees with Bruce’s interpretation. The anarthrous genitive noun πνεύματος, together with κοινωνία, should be interpreted as “spiritual fellowship.” This interpretation does not contradict the context in which corporate unity is emphasised. Furthermore, if πνεύμα denotes the Holy Spirit, then it would have been in dative case to form a parallel with the preceding phrase in the same verse: ἐὰν τις οὖν παράκλησις ἐν Χριστῷ … ἐὰν κοινωνία πνεύματος. Furthermore, the genitive singular πνεύμα is almost always articular or coupled with a relevant modifier (such as, ἁγίου and θεοῦ) when used by Paul to denote the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{106}

\textsuperscript{104} An argument cited by scholars such as Bockmuehl, Reumann, and O’Brien. Bockmuehl, 107; Reumann, 302; O’Brien, \textit{Philippians}, 173. \textit{κοινωνία πνεύματος} is not found elsewhere in other Pauline works. Hence, the similar phrase in 2 Cor 13:13 is its closest form.

\textsuperscript{105} F. F. Bruce, \textit{An Expanded Paraphrase of the Epistles of Paul: Printed in Parallel with the Revised Version, with Fuller References by Drs. Scrivener, Moulton, & Greenup} (Exeter, Devon: Paternoster, 1965), 167.

\textsuperscript{106} \textit{Πνεύματος} (the singular genitive noun) occurs 36 times in Paul’s letters, 29 of them clearly denote the Holy Spirit. Among them, 19 are articular (Rom 8:2, 5, 6, 23, 27; 15:30; 1 Cor 2:10, 14; 12:7, 8; 2 Cor 1:22; 3:8; 5:5; 13:13; Gal 3:14; 5:17, 22; 6:8; Phil 1:19), and eight are coupled with a relevant modifier (ἁγίου in Rom 5:5; 8:11; 15:13; 1 Cor 6:19; 1 Thess 1:6; θεοῦ in Rom 15:19; αὐτοῦ (Christ’s) in Rom 8:11; κυριοῦ in 2 Cor 3:18). In other words, only 3 of 29 occurrences of the anarthrous πνεύματος denote the Holy Spirit (Rom 7:6; 1 Cor 2:4, 13). Occurrences of πνεύματος that do not denote the Holy Spirit (either obviously or contestable) are found in Phil 2:1; 1 Cor 5:4; 2 Cor 3:6, 7:1; Gal 6:18; Phil 4:23; Phlm 1:25.
4.2.1.3.2 Τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν in letter-closing

The phrase μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν (4:23) in the letter-closing is part of the benediction which ends the letter. The singular πνεῦμα occurs in the abnormal singular construct. A detailed analysis of this Pauline benediction, together with the exact same benediction occurring in Galatians and Philemon, is presented in Chapter 6. Nonetheless, an overview of the findings is as follows. The phrase μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν is synonymous with μεθ’ ὑμῶν. The singular πνεῦμα is not a distributive singular noun. Rather, πνεῦμα is a normal singular, pointing to one united corporate being despite the presence of many members denoted by a plural ὑμῶν.

4.2.1.4 Σῶμα in Unit E

Σῶμα occurs twice in Unit E (τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, in 3:21). In discussing future resurrection, the two occurrences of the singular σῶμα denote the body of the Philippians. The phrase τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν is another abnormal singular construct found in the epistle. In light of the context, σῶμα should not be automatically treated as a distributive singular. In the immediate context, believers are portrayed as ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς (3:20), which contrasts with another group, τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ

---

107 Many scholars do not comment on the singular use of σῶμα in 3:21. Hawthorne, 172; Beare, 138–40; Vincent 120–1; Marshall, Philippians, 104; Silva, 215; Bockmuehl, 236; Fowl, 175; Martin Philippians, 148; Hansen, 272–3; Fee Philippians, 382–3; Osiek, 106; Thurston and Ryan, 134. However, O’Brien defines it as a collective singular. O’Brien, Philippians, 464.

108 According to Bauer, the lexical meaning of πολίτευμα is commonwealth, usually denoting “a colony of foreigners or relocated veterans.” BDAG, 686.
σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (3:18). The singular πολίτευμα denotes a group of heavenly citizens, pointing to the believing community. Therefore, the singular σῶμα (3:21) can be interpreted as a deliberate act to highlight the corporate unity. In addition, this reflects the wider context, in which communal relationship is the focus. This nuance suggests that Paul is not interested in the resurrection and transformation of an individual believer. However, he is chiefly concerned with all the individuals (indicated by ἡμῶν) in the community (singular σῶμα).

4.2.1.5 Φρονέω in Philippians

Φρονέω occurs ten times in Philippians. As previously mentioned, its corresponding noun φρής denotes mind (which literally means diaphragm in its plural form). In the epistle, Φρονέω appears in most semantic units (A, C, E, F, and G).

In Unit A, Paul portrays his thought for the Philippians: ἐμοὶ τοῦτο φρονεῖν ὑπὲρ πᾶντων ἡμᾶς (1:7). In Unit C, Paul urges the Philippians to unite (τὸ αὐτὸ...

109 Krentz argues that πολίτευμα is used in 3:20 to portray the Philippians as “a heavenly, eschatological colony inside Philippi.” Edgar Krentz, “Civic Culture and the Philippians,” Currents in Theology and Mission 35 (2008): 258. This colony concept is supported by archaeological findings, which suggest that Philippi went through “at least 500 years of successive colonization.” Zerbe, “Citizenship,” 198. Doble argues that πολίτευμα in 3:20 points to “a community living in allegiance to its acknowledged authority.” Peter Doble, “‘Vile Bodies’ or Transformed Persons? Philippians 3.21 in Context,” JNT 86 (2002): 18. By explaining σῶμα in light of πολίτευμα, σώμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως denotes the “embodied selves … whose citizenship (1.27; 3.20), are characterized by their embracing ‘humility’.” Doble, “Bodies,” 26. This study agrees with Doble regarding the communal dimension of σῶμα, given that the usage here is coherent with the citizenship alluded in πολίτευμα (1.27). As previously argued, communal unity is the key message portrayed by πολίτευμα and ἐνί πνεύματι and μιᾷ ψυχῇ.

110 Otherwise, the text would have been written as follows: τὰ σώματα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν … τῶν σωμάτων τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν.

111 Φρονεω occurs in 1:7; 2:2 (twice), 5; 3:15 (twice), 19; 4:2, 10 (twice). Its corresponding word ταπεινοφροσύνη occurs in 2:3.
φρονήτε ... τὸ ἐν φρονόυντες, in 2:2) by showing humility (τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνη, in 2:3)\(^{112}\) as shown by Christ (Τούτο φρονέιτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὡς καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, in 2:5). In Unit E, Paul encourages the mature to have the same mind (τούτο φρονώμεν, in 3:15), indicating communal unity.\(^{113}\) This word is also used to describe the mindset of the enemies (οἱ τὰ ἑπίγεια φρονόυντες, in 3:19). In Unit F, Paul urges Euodia and Syntyche to be united (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονέιν, in 4:2). Lastly, in Unit G, the friendship between Paul and the Philippians is addressed (τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονέιν, ἐφ’ ὑ καὶ ἐφρονέιτε, in 4:10).

Given these occurrences, φρονέω is predominately used to elucidate corporate unity and communal friendship, which is a central theme highlighted by the inclusio, as previously discussed (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονήτε, in 2:2; τὸ αὐτὸ φρονέιν, in 4:2). The phrase literally means “to think the same.” However, this does not mean to share an identical thought and opinion.\(^{114}\) Rather, this is used to engender unity, a unity in purpose through humility.\(^{115}\) Overall, this review of φρονέω shows that corporate and communal aspects are connoted in the thematic meaning of φρονέω, according to its common pattern and usage, which certainly transcends its lexical meaning (“think”).

---

\(^{112}\) Doble regards all the words relating to φρονέω points to the “mindedness,” with the community-mindedness highlighted with the combination of ταπ- and φρον-. Doble, “Bodies,” 6–11.

\(^{113}\) Φρονέω is used to describe those who do not share the same mind, εἰ τι ἑτέρος φρονέετε (3:15).

\(^{114}\) As well argued by Hawthorne, to demand “drab uniformity of thought” and “everyone holding in common a particular opinion” would only contribute to disunity. Hawthorne, 67.

\(^{115}\) O’Brien argues that the phrase in 2:2 denotes “intent on one purpose.” O’Brien, Philippians, 179. It can also be understood as “unity of mind” (Silva, 161), “unison of thought” (Lightfoot, Philippians, 108), “like-minded” (Hansen, 111).
4.2.2 Sociolinguistic Aspect

As previously discussed, the sociolinguistic aspect involves examining the relationship between the author and the audience to see whether further insights can be gained for understanding the discourse. In Philippians, instead of calling himself an apostle to exert his apostolic authority, Paul begins his letter by calling himself a δοῦλος of Christ (1:1). This illustrates a “friendlier relationship” between the apostle and the recipients. This kind of relationship is further indicated by other expressions. In addition to ἀδέλφοι, he addresses the Philippians by using various words with the συν- prefix instead of calling them φίλος: συγκοινωνοῦς (1:7); συζυγεῖ (4:3); συνεργῶν (4:3); and συγκουσονήσαντες (4:14). For Epaphroditus, a representative of the Philippians, Paul addresses him as συνεργόν (2:25) and συστηράτωτην (2:25). As reiterated, the use of words with συν- prefix indicates that

---

116 Paul’s self-designation, a δοῦλος of Christ, carries a positive connotation, alluding to his noble status and his leadership, which is different from an ordinary slave with a low status in the Greco-Roman world. For the discussion of this positive connotation, see pages 86–7 in Chapter 2.

117 Agosto argues that Paul calls himself both an apostle and a servant of Christ in Romans and Galatians. Comparatively speaking, the absence of stating his apostleship in Philippians reflects this “friendlier relationship” between Paul and the Philippians. Efraim Agosto, Servant Leadership: Jesus & Paul (St Louis, Mo.: Chalice, 2005), 102. Brown conjectures that this self-designation “resonated with the Philippians in a way that it would not have among the Galatians,” since there is a possible connection between the Philippians and the family of Caesar, whom Paul met during his imprisonment in Rome during the composition of Philippians. Michael Joseph Brown, “Paul’s Use of ΔΟΤΑΩΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ἩΣΟΥ in Romans 1:1,” JBL 120 (2001): 725.
Philippians is a letter of friendship. In other words, the relationship between Paul and the Philippians is friendship and partnership.

However, there are two important issues in identifying this relationship as mere friendship. First, Paul does not use φίλος to address his friends in Philippi. Second, the gift giving segment in the epistle does not fit with the Greco-Roman friendship category.

Paul’s hesitation to address the Philippians as φίλος invites discussion. For instance, Witherington presents a sound argument. He argues that Paul is the mentor of the Philippians. Their relationship is “friendly and affectionate,” to the extent that Paul does not need to “pull rank” to persuade them. Thus, he appeals to them on the basis of this close relationship. It is likely that the friendship language is only a means adopted by Paul to achieve a particular goal.

The friendship described in the letter is at odds with the Greco-Roman practice, in particular Paul’s response to the gift received from the Philippians (4:15–19). In the Greco-Roman world, gift giving invites social reciprocity in which the receiver should

---


119 Lyons and Malas argue for that the six key characteristics in Greco-Roman friendship (unity, partnership, equality, moral excellence, frankness, and loyalty) are detected in Philippians. George Lyons and Williams H. Malas, “Paul and His Friends within the Greco-Roman Context,” Wesleyan Theological Journal 42 (2007): 61–6.

120 Witherington, Friendship, 120–1.
repay the gift to the giver as if repaying a debt, who is socially more superior, in order to form a lasting relationship.\textsuperscript{121} Nonetheless, the writing of Paul does not reflect that he is indebted to the Philippians. In fact, he expresses that he shares a deeper partnership with them, which transcends the normal exchange embedded in Greco-Roman gift-giving.\textsuperscript{122} The letter is not simply a friendship letter, expressing affection. Instead, Paul has a particular purpose which he desires to persuade the Philippians by using the partnership and friendship language.\textsuperscript{123}

The answers to these two issues, together with the findings of the discourse analysis, provide further insights regarding the following question: Why does Paul emphasise his deep partnership and friendship with the Philippians when the letter primarily concerns communal disunity? Does he use his friendship as a platform to persuade those who are in conflict to be united? Or, Paul is in fact part of the cause of this disunity. Although the text itself does not overtly name the connection between Paul and the conflict, it is a plausible argument. This study agrees with Witherington that Paul is a mentor and teacher of the Philippians. However, the heavy friendship and partnership language is not employed to simply appeal to a troubled community. Rather, it is highly likely that Paul appeals to the Philippians in a friendly and affectionate way for unity, a unity between the apostle and the community, vis-à-vis,


\textsuperscript{122} Peterman, \textit{Gift}, 158–9.

\textsuperscript{123} Zerbe argues that merely treating the epistle as a letter of friendship with a nice, warm tone overlooks the “political and subversive” tone. He suggests that Philippians is primarily about practicing “Messianic citizenship.” Zerbe, “Citizenship,” 199–200. Although citizenship is the language that Paul uses, arguably the epistle addresses a deeper issue, which is the relational challenge between Paul and the Philippians.
reconciliation. In other words, the disunity among the Philippians is somehow related to the apostle himself. This argument will be tested in the following discussion.

4.3 Thematic Meaning of Anthropological Terms

The previous analysis demonstrates that the coherent theme displayed in Philippians centres on friendship (between Paul and the community), communal relationship and corporate unity (within the community). The analysis of the key anthropological terms shows the corporate and communal reference illustrated by the use of various terms, including καρδία, ψυχή (σύμψυχοι and ἴσόψυχοι), πνεῦμα, and σῶμα. Although each of the anthropological terms carries a specific meaning in its sentence, many of their occurrences share a common thematic meaning. The terms are usually used in a metaphorical sense; and their occurrences form a coherent pattern within the discourse. Their common thematic meaning points to the corporate and communal aspect. This thematic meaning is the intended meaning of Paul who uses various terms to appeal for unity.

4.3.1 The Flow of Discourse and Peak

As discussed in Chapter 2 and demonstrated in Chapter 3, as well as other discourse analyses, a discourse, including an epistle, usually displays a flow of progress. The peak of a discourse usually reveals the core message of a discourse; and it can be identified by several features. As previously mentioned, peak is “a zone of turbulence,” in which an epistolary climax appears and is then followed by a dénouement, the

---

124 For further discussion of discourse flow, see pages 79–80 in Chapter 2 and pages 147–8 in Chapter 3.
release of tension. Peak is signified by a shift of the proportion of use of a particular grammatical device, or a shift to specific person. In addition, in order to prevent the audience from missing the utmost important point the narrator would employ extra words, including parallelism, paraphrase, and tautologies to highlight the key climatic event.¹²⁵

The peak or climax of a discourse usually exhibits several characteristics. First, it normally appears towards the end of a discourse. Second, it is marked by a shift in the occurrence of a grammatical device. Third, specific persons might be emphasised, usually those involved in a conflict situation. Fourth, the theme of the climax is developed in earlier episodes before reappearing more fully in the peak. Fifth, extra words, serving either as parallelism or synonym, highlight the climatic event. Finally, a resolution is presented, signifying the dénouement.

In Philippians, Unit F matches all the characteristics of a peak. First, it is situated near the end of the epistle, appearing as the second last major semantic unit. Second, there is a significant shift in the use of imperatives. Eight imperatives are used in only eight verses. Unlike the imperative verbs in previous segments, the frequency and intensity is striking.¹²⁶ Third, the unit does show a shift to specific participants. The communal unity issue discussed in the earlier semantic units is now specified as the problem surrounding two persons, Ἐλληνες and Συντύχων, with a conflict element

¹²⁵ Longacre, Discourse, 39. As previously mentioned, peak also occurs in non-narrative discourses, including expository and hortatory discourses. For an explanation of peak, see pages 79–80 in Chapter 2.

¹²⁶ As previously mentioned, there are also eight imperatives throughout Unit C (1:27–2:18). However, these eight imperatives are spread across 22 verses, and as such, the intensity and frequency is less than in Unit F.
alluded by the expression, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν.ⁱ²⁷ Fourth, the concepts of στήκετε and τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν are fully “developed” and clearly expressed in 4:1–3. The general exhortation to the Philippians, στήκετε ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες (1:27), is now specified in the pre-peak episode, στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ (4:1), since Paul is about to focus on the two women. In addition, the general encouragement to the Philippians, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε (2:2), in an earlier episode (Unit C) is now “fully developed” into a specific expression, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν (4:2) in the peak, pointing to the two women. Fifth, the clustered use of prefix συν- is found in the same verse, σύζυγε, συλλαμβάνου, συνήθλησάν, and συνεργῶν (4:3), highlighting the relationship between Paul and the Philippians. The issue of unity moves from within the community to the relationship between Paul and the Philippians.ⁱ²⁸ Arguably, this repetition is not mere coincidence. This study contends that the repetitive use of prefix συν as a cluster, in 4:3, underscores the climatic point in 4:2–3. This displays a form of synonym by including other words with similar connotations to emphasise the climax.

Finally, regarding the resolution offered to the issue, the occurrence of συλλαμβάνω αὕταίς (4:3) is most intriguing. Among all the imperatives occurring in Unit F, the clause συλλαμβάνω αὕταίς (4:3) unmistakably stands out. Apart from the intransitive imperative verb χαίρετε in 4:4 (which does not require an accusative noun as an object in the clause), συλλαμβάνω is the only transitive verb in this unit that does not follow the Object-Verb word order.ⁱ²⁹ All the other imperatives display

---

¹²⁷ In 4:2, the repetition of the verb, παρακαλῶ, is commonly perceived as a means to heighten Paul’s exhortation and to emphasise the equal importance of both women. Hawthorne, 178; O’Brien, Philippians, 477; Silva, 222; Thurston and Ryan, 140.

¹²⁸ Although one of the lexical meanings of συλλαμβάνω is “help,” the word connotes “togetherness” in regard to this particular meaning. BDAG, 777.

¹²⁹ It is abbreviated as VO hereafter. Similarly, Object-Verb is abbreviated as OV.
an OV structure, including μηδὲν μεριμνάτε (4:6), τά αἰτήματα ὑμῶν γνωριζέσθω (4:6), ταῦτα λογίζεσθε (4:8), and ταῦτα πράσσετε (4:9). The common OV order is the norm, or known as “unmarked” in linguistic term. On the contrary, the clause, συλλαμβάνων αὐταῖς, displays a VO word order. Being a “marked” structure, the clause signifies its prominence in this climatic unit. In this climax, “Help them!” is the resolution offered by Paul, a prominent exhortation made in the peak. As previously mentioned, συλλαμβάνω also alludes to the connotation of “togetherness.” Moreover, Philippians is addressed by Paul as the singular σὲ (4:3) in instead of a plural ὑμᾶς before calling them as his γνήσει σύζυγε. The use of σὲ further accentuates the single corporate entity of the Philippian community.

The dénouement is marked by χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ πάντωτε πάλιν ἐρῶ, χαίρετε (4:4). As argued, the transitional role of the clustered χαίρω is now employed to signify a new sub-division. The climax is winded down, followed by exhortatory encouragements illustrated by the intensive use of imperative.

The flow of discourse is shown in the following table.

---

130 Since the subject of an imperative verb is not stated as it is implied by the verb itself, the normal rule of word order, as VSO as the unmarked word order scheme, cannot be applied. Reed, Discourse, 380.

131 The term “unmarked” denotes the usual norm of the grammatical or syntactical structure used in a text. The opposite is “marked,” as the writer wants to highlight an important point by altering the “normal” grammatical or syntactical structure. Therefore, a “marked” structure is the emphasis.

132 Regarding the discussion of word order in the NT, Voelz gives a brief account of how Semitic language impacts on the word order of some of the NT book. On the other hand, Terry provides a very detailed analysis. He shows that VSO is rare in hortatory writings (epistles) by conducting an analysis of several selected NT epistles with only 2.8% of all the different word order (although this word order is more frequent in the gospels). Jame W. Voelz, “Word Order: Part 1,” Concordia Journal 31 (2005): 425–7; Terry, Corinthians, 137–54.

133 According to Longacre, dénouement can be considered as part of the peak episode, occurring right after the climactic moment. Longacre, Discourse, 22.
Figure 4.3 The Flow of Discourse of Philippians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aperture (Letter-opening)</th>
<th>Stage (A)</th>
<th>Various Developing Episodes (B–D)</th>
<th>Pre-peak (E)</th>
<th>Peak F</th>
<th>Post-peak</th>
<th>Closure (G)</th>
<th>Finis (Letter-closing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:12–26</td>
<td>1:27–2:18</td>
<td>2:19–30</td>
<td>3:1–4:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:19–30</td>
<td>3:1–4:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:2–9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1–4:1</td>
<td>4:2–9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:2–9</td>
<td>4:10–20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10–20</td>
<td>4:21–23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Words in red: anthropological terms, Words in green: relating to \( \psi \sigma \mu \), Words in blue: with \( \sigma \mu \)-prefix.

\( \psi \sigma \mu \): Inclusio and development of prominent theme, \( \ldots \ldots \ldots \): Inclusio

8 imperatives in 8 verses

8 imperatives in 8 verses

8 imperatives in 8 verses

8 imperatives in 8 verses

8 imperatives in 8 verses

8 imperatives in 8 verses

8 imperatives in 8 verses

8 imperatives in 8 verses

8 imperatives in 8 verses
From the flow of discourse, the dominant and coherent theme is corporate unity. The community is metaphorically portrayed as a single corporate being, which is depicted as having a πνεύμα or a ψυχή, and having a mind with the capacity of τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν. The members of this being are σύμψυχοι, whom Paul calls σύζυγοι. They are regarded as his συνεργοὶ and συγκοινωνοί. As a corporate being, Paul urges them by this exhortation: συγχαίρετε. And in his benediction, the apostle calls for the grace of Christ to be with this corporate being which is portrayed as πνεῦματος (singular) ὑμῶν. Furthermore, Paul considers himself as part of this community as demonstrated by many words with a συν- prefix, highlighting the partnership between him and the community. The climax reveals that the issue that disturbs the unity is the rife between Εὐοδία and Συντύχη. However, the constant approach for Paul to invoke his friendship throughout the letter, including in the peak, subtly illustrates that the relational unity between Paul and the Philippians is what the apostle concerns about. By appealing to his friends, Paul explicitly calls for reconciliation between the two women. Nonetheless, he implicitly requests for reconciliation between the Philippians and himself.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter concludes that there is a common thematic meaning in Philippians, connotated by the key anthropological terms, καρδία, ψυχή, πνεύμα, and σῶμα. Based on an investigation of the discourse structure, the anthropological terms in various semantic units, the sociolinguistic aspect, and the flow of discourse, the common thematic meaning is corporate unity and communal relationship.
CHAPTER 5

ΚΑΡΔΙΑ IN ROMANS AND 2 CORINTHIANS 1–9

IN LIGHT OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter addresses Stage III of this study— a single anthropological term within multiple discourses. It investigates the term καρδία, and its possible social and corporate connotations in the Pauline epistles. καρδία occurs 37 times in the Pauline epistles,\(^1\) with 71% of occurrences in Romans and 2 Corinthians.\(^2\) As such, this chapter will initially examine καρδία in these two epistles. As in previous chapters,

\(^1\) If καρδία is compared with other Pauline anthropological terms, its occurrence is relatively infrequent (for example, σάρξ 71 times, and σώμα 74 times). Comparatively less attention is paid to the study of καρδία in the NT. The most comprehensive works are by Behm, Bauer, and Jewett. Behm, “Καρδία,” TDNT 3:611–3; BDAG, 403; Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 305–33. Many scholars quote the dictionary definition found in the TDNT, which defines καρδία as the seat of emotion, volition, and reason.

\(^2\) Καρδία occurs 15 times in Romans (41%), five times in 1 Corinthians (14%), 11 times in 2 Corinthians (30%), one time in Galatians (3%), twice in Philippians (5%), three times in 1 Thessalonians (8%), and no times in Philemon. The percentages indicate the occurrences in a given epistle over the total occurrences in all seven Pauline epistles. The ratio of occurrences of καρδία per chapter in a given epistle is as follow: 0.9 in Romans, 0.3 in 1 Corinthians, 0.8 in 2 Corinthians, 0.2 in Galatians, 0.5 in Philippians, 0.6 in 1 Thessalonians, and 0 in Philemon. Romans and 2 Corinthians have the highest ratio of occurrences of καρδία per chapter.
the discourse structure of a particular epistle will initially be identified, which
provides a framework for analysing καρδία according to its occurrences in various
semantic units and in the entire discourse.

5.1 Καρδία in Romans in Light of Discourse Analysis
The first part of this chapter focuses on καρδία in Romans. The discourse structure of
the epistle will be identified, and then the thematic meaning of καρδία in this
discourse will be ascertained.

5.1.1 Discourse Structure of Romans
As in previous chapters, an analysis of the discourse structure elucidates the major
semantic units in Romans by investigating the discourse markers, examining the
discourse coherence, and ascertaining the macrostructure.

5.1.1.1 Discourse Markers
The four discourse markers that elucidate the semantic units in Romans are change of
verb mood, lexical cohesion, formulas, and use of the vocative.

5.1.1.1.1 Lexical cohesion
In Romans, some key words are unusually frequent when comparing with their
overall occurrences in the Pauline epistles (see Appendix 3). These words are useful
in identifying different major topics, including δικαίωμα, ἁμαρτία, πίστις, Ἰσραήλ,
First, justification and sins are two key motifs in Romans. Δικαίωμα and ἁμαρτία occur 15 and 48 times respectively. Their occurrences are concentrated in the first half of the letter, 100% of the occurrences of δικαίωμα and 96% of the occurrences of ἁμαρτία occur in Rom 1–8.

Figure 5.1 The Occurrences of Δικαίωμα and Ἁμαρτία in Romans

Second, in the discussion of justification (Rom 1–8), there are three sub-topics. The first topic is illustrated by the occurrences of Ἰουδαῖος and Ἑλλην, which are clustered in Rom 1–3. In these chapters, Paul argues that both the Jews and the Gentiles are sinful, under God’s judgment, and in need of the gospel. The second

---

3 For δικαίωμα, ἁμαρτία, and Ἰσραήλ, more than half of their occurrences in Pauline letters are found in Romans alone. The following are the percentage of their occurrences in Romans when comparing with that in all of the Pauline letters: δικαίωμα (60%); ἁμαρτία (81%); Ἰσραήλ (69%). For πίστις, Ἰουδαῖος, and θάνατος, nearly half of their occurrences are found in Romans. The percentage of their occurrences in Romans when comparing with that in all of the Pauline letters are as follows: πίστις (44%); θάνατος (49%); Ἰουδαῖος (44%).

4 The occurrences of δικαίωμα: 2:23; 3:4, 20, 26, 28, 30; 4:2, 5; 5:1, 9; 6:7; 8:30 (twice), 33.

5 This is illustrated by the occurrences of Ἰουδαῖος and Ἑλλην (1:16; 2:9, 10; 3:9). These reappear in Chapters 9–10 after being absent for several chapters.
topic focuses on faith as illustrated by the frequent occurrences of πίστις, which are clustered in 3:22–4:20. In these chapters, Paul discusses the role of faith in justification. The third topic discusses the occurrences of θάνατος, which are clustered in Chapters 5–8. In these chapters, Paul explains the following relations: sin and death (5:12), the Law and death (7:13), the Holy Spirit and freedom from the principle of death (8:2). The following figures show the clustered occurrences of Ἰουδαῖος and Ἔλλην, πίστις, and θάνατος.

Figure 5.2 The Occurrences of Ἰουδαῖος and Ἔλλην in Romans

---

6 The occurrences of πίστις are as follows: 1:8; 12, 17 (thrice); 3:3, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30 (twice), 31; 4:5, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20.

7 Paul’s discussion of this topic is exemplified by 3:24–25.

8 These three relations can be understood as three sub-topics within Rom 5–8. The divisions can further be proved by the lexical cohesion of νόμος and πνεῦμα. In Rom 7:1–25, the occurrences of νόμος and πνεῦμα are 23 and 1 respectively. However, the occurrences of νόμος and πνεῦμα in 8:1–29 are 5 and 21 respectively. Although both segments discuss the issue of death, there is a shift of focus from νόμος (chapter 7) to πνεῦμα (chapter 8). Regarding νόμος in 8:2 (ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεῦματος καὶ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας), the word does not denote the OT Law. The word denotes principle, which is one of the meanings of νόμος in Koine Greek. BDAG, 542. According to Gosnell, the connotation of νόμος in 7:1–8:2 alternates “between a sense of written regulation, and a sense of some other overriding, controlling entity.” Peter W. Gosnell, “Law in Romans: Regulation and Instruction,” NovT 51 (2009): 262.
Third, the discussion of justification (1–8) is followed by the topic of the salvation of Israel (9–11). This is reflected by the lexical cohesion of the word Ἰσραήλ with all of its occurrences appearing in 9–11.
As shown in this examination, the lexical cohesion of various key words indicates that Rom 1–11 is divided into two major discussions: justification (1–8) and the salvation of Israel (9–11). In the discussion of justification, there are three sub-topics: the sinfulness of both the Jews and the Gentiles (1–3), the role of faith in justification (3–4), and the freedom from death in Christ (5–8).

5.1.1.1.2 Change of Verb Mood

There are 62 imperative verbs in Romans. Approximately 90% of them occur in Rom 11–16. The contrast between the early part and the latter part of the epistle is evident as shown in Figure 5.6.

Figure 5.6 The Imperative Verbs in Romans

---

9 The occurrences of the imperative verbs are as follows: 3:4; 6:11, 12, 13 (twice), 19; 11:9, 10 (twice), 18, 20 (twice), 22; 12:2 (twice), 14 (thrice), 16, 19, 20 (twice), 21 (twice); 13:1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 14 (twice); 14:1, 3 (twice), 5, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22; 15:2, 7, 10, 11 (twice); 16:3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 (twice), 11 (twice), 12 (twice), 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. The imperative form of ἀσπαζόμαι occurs 16 times in Rom 16.
Since Rom 11 is part of the major topic of the salvation of Israel (9–11) and Rom 16 is the final greeting of the epistle, Rom 12–15 appears to be a semantic unit. This is further confirmed by the formula in Rom 12:1, which will be discussed below. Since the imperative is frequently used for exhortation, Rom 12–15 is a hortatory segment.

5.1.1.1.3 Formulas

There are two types of formulas in Romans: formulaic praise and verb-conjunction-ὑμᾶς-ἀδελφοί. Most of these formulas demarcate a major semantic unit.

First, the phrase ἐνχαριστήσω τῷ θεῷ (1:8) occurs after the initial greeting. It marks the discussion of the gospel and its power as summarised in 1:16. Second, the doxological expression αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν (11:36) marks the end of the topic of the salvation of Israel. Third, the formula Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς,

10 According to the statistics, there are 59 imperatives directed to the Romans. Since 49 of them occur in Rom 12–16, 83% of the imperatives (directed to the Romans) dwell in these five chapters. On the other hand, there is also a display of lexical cohesion in Rom 16, since ἀπάχομαι occurs 16 times in 16:1–16. This signifies that this segment is a semantic unit in which Paul gives his final greeting to the Romans.

11 The clauses οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν (1:13) and οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν (11:25) are excluded. As demonstrated in the analysis of 1 Corinthians, the clause, θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς, do not function as a discourse marker. See pages 109–110 in Chapter 3.

12 As discovered, this kind of formulaic praise/prayer occurs in both 1 Corinthians and Philippians, functioning as a boundary marker that begins the major discussion of Paul’s epistles. This formula and its functions are also noted by Dunn. Dunn, Romans, 1:28. Jewett calls this the “thanksgiving formula.” Jewett, Romans, 118

13 Scholars widely consider 1:16–17 as the key theme that Paul seeks to expound in the main body of the epistle. For example, Dunn describes these verses as the “launching pad” that provides “the primary thrust and direction for the rest of the letter.” Dunn, Romans, 1:46. For Jewett, these verses “set the tone for the entire letter.” Jewett, Romans, 136. Similarly, Cranfield considers 1:16b–17 as the “theological theme” that is detailed in the main body of the epistle, and Schlatter argues that Rom 1–8 is the “theological treatise” that supports the “thesis” stated in these verses. Cranfield, 87; Schlatter, 25. Schreiner widely claims that “[v]irtually all scholars acknowledge that these verses are decisive for the interpretation of Romans.” Schreiner, 58.
āδελφοί (12:1) begins the hortatory section. This segment contains a multitude of imperatives. The exhortation centres on Christian living in a community.14 Byrne also this view, argues that this segment concerns how the audience should “live out as a community” in response to the gospel explained in the preceding context.15 Fourth, this exhortation is concluded in 15:30–33, in which, Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, āδελφοί (15:30),16 combined with the subsequent blessing (15:33), marks the end of this semantic unit.17 Finally, the formula Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, āδελφοί (16:17) introduces a warning from Paul. However, it occurs in the middle of the final greeting and the final remarks. Thus, this formula demarcates a minor unit.18

5.1.1.1.4 Vocative

Apart from the occurrences of vocative āδελφοί that forms part of the formulas (in 12:1; 15:30; 16:17), there are five occurrences of āδελφοί in Romans: 7:1, 4; 8:12;

14 According to Dunn, οὕτω refers this exhortation back to the previous context (Rom 5–11), a view shared by Schreiner. Dunn, Romans, 2:708; Schreiner, 639.

15 Byrne, 361.

16 There is a textual variant regarding the āδελφοί in 15:30. Quite a number of manuscripts support the presence of this vocative, including manuscripts of the Alexandrian text-type (a, A, C, 33, 1739) and other important manuscripts (D, F, ψ, and1881). Only 986 and B support the absence of āδελφοί. Hence, it is more likely that Paul includes āδελφοί in 15:30 in the original manuscript.

17 Jewett regards 15:30 as the “typical request formula;” and in this context it connects back to the preceding arguments in chapters 1–15. Jewett, Romans, 934.

18 Dunn observes that there is a discontinuity as 16:17–24 is not connected with the previous context. Dunn, Romans, 2:902 Jewett also notices the abrupt placement of this “exhortative formula.” Jewett, Romans, 988. Moo considers that 16:17 marks the shift of discussion. Moo, Romans, 928. Byrne states that this segment “remains an oddity in Paul’s letter to Rome.” Byrne, 456. Some scholars attempt to explain this strangeness. For example, Schreiner argues that this indicates Paul’s own inscription, and Stuhlmanner argues that Paul refers back to the enemies that he previously mentioned in 3:8. Schreiner, 801. Despite various suggestions, this study argues that 16:17 marks a new minor discussion within the segment, in which Paul gives his final remarks.
10:1; 15:14, 30. Some of them are discourse markers.

In 7:1, ἀδελφοὶ marks the minor unit in which Paul focuses on the discussion of the Law, a topic within the major unit in Rom 5–8. In 7:4, ἀδελφοὶ appears in the middle of the discussion of the Law, and it is followed by the pronoun μοι. Hence, it functions as an emphatic address instead of a boundary marker. In 8:12, ἀδελφοὶ does not function as a boundary marker, since it appears in the middle of the discussion of the Holy Spirit. In 10:1, the vocative appears in the middle of the topic of the fate of Israel, and commences a sub-topic that focuses on the salvation of the Israelites (αὐτῶν ἐξ σωτηρίᾳ). Thus, it begins a minor unit. Finally, ἀδελφοὶ in 15:14 marks a new semantic unit, in which Paul reiterates his travel plan to Rome.

5.1.1.2 Semantic Units

Through the four identified discourse markers, the letter can be divided into: the letter-opening, the subsequent seven major semantic units, and the letter-closing. Table 5.1 shows that each of the nine major semantics unit contains a topic: Unit A (The gospel and its power), Unit B (Sinfulness of both Jews and Gentiles), Unit C (Justified by faith), Unit D (Freedom from sin and death), Unit E (Salvation of Israel), Unit F (Exhortation on Christian living in community), and Unit G (Final greetings and remarks).

19 The emphatic address, as argued by Wallace, is demonstrated by the use of the vocative preceded by ὦ. However, in Koine and Semitic usage, Blass and Debrunner observe that the omission of ὦ is common in the NT. The use of ἀδελφοὶ μοι as a comparatively emphatic address lacks substantial evidence. The suggestion is a conjecture that needs to be verified. Wallace, Grammar, 68–9; BDF, 81.
Table 5.1 Semantic Units of Romans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Units</td>
<td>D1 5–6</td>
<td>D2 7</td>
<td>D3 8</td>
<td>E1 9</td>
<td>E2 10–11</td>
<td>G1 16:1–16</td>
<td>G2 16:17–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Topic</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Salvation of Israel</td>
<td>Exhortation on Christian living in community</td>
<td>Final greeting and remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gospel and its power</td>
<td>Sinfulness of both Jews and Gentiles</td>
<td>Justified by faith</td>
<td>Freedom from sin &amp; death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 compares the semantic units identified in this study with those suggested by other scholars.
Table 5.2 Outline of Romans by Scholars20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byrne Cranfield Stuhl.</td>
<td>Deibler Fitzmyer Kasemann Sanday Schreiner Stuhl.</td>
<td>Hultgren Käsemann Schreiner Fitzmyer</td>
<td>Barrett Byrne Cranfield Deibler Dunn Hultgren, Jewett Kasemann Moo Schreiner</td>
<td>Barrett Byrne Cranfield Deibler Dunn Fitzmyer Jewett Kasemann Moo Sanday Schlatter Schreiner Stuhl.</td>
<td>Barrett Byrne Cranfield Deibler Dunn Fitzmyer Kasemann Moo Sanday Schlatter Schreiner</td>
<td>Barrett Byrne Cranfield Deibler Dunn Fitzmyer Kasemann Moo Sanday Schlatter Schreiner</td>
<td>Barrett Byrne Cranfield Deibler Dunn Fitzmyer Kasemann Moo Sanday Schlatter Schreiner</td>
<td>Barrett Byrne Cranfield Deibler Dunn Fitzmyer Kasemann Moo Sanday Schlatter Schreiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn Fitzmyer Hultgren, Stuhl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne Cranfield Jewett Moo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed outline in this study is similar to the structural outlines proposed by various scholars. The following part examines the discourse coherence and macrostructure of the major semantic units.

20 Hultgren, v–viii; Byrne, 27–8; Cranfield, 28–9; Barrett, First Corinthians, 14–5; Deibler, Romans, 23–34; Moo, Romans, 33–5; Dunn, Romans, 1:7–xi; Fitzmyer, Romans, viii–xii; Adolf Schlatter, Romans: The Righteousness of God (trans. Siegfried S. Schatzmann; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995), v–vi; Stuhl, Stuhl, 14–6; Jewett, Romans, vii–ix; Käsemann, Romans, ix–xi; Schreiner, 25–7; Sanday and Headlam, xlvii–I. In this table, Stuhl, Stuhl, is abbreviated as Stuhl.; and Sanday and Headlam, Sanday.

21 1:1–7 and 1: 8–17 are considered by Byrne to be two sub-segments of 1:1–17. According to Cranfield, 1:8–16a is one segment, and 1:16b–17 is another.

22 3:21–4:25 is considered by Fitzmyer to be two segments: 3:21–31; 4:1–25.

23 For Dunn and Moo, 15:14–16:27 is divided into three sub-segments: 15:14–33; 16:1–23; 16:25–27. According to Sanday and Headlam, the epilogue is composed of 15:14–33, 16:1–16, 16:17–20, 16:21–23, and 16:25–27. For Byrne and Schlatter, 15:14–16:27 is a major segment which is subdivided into 15:14–33 and 16:1–27. Schreiner considers 15:14–16:23 as one major segment which is divided into 15:14–33 and 16:1–23. However, for Jewett and Stuhl, 15:14–16:23 is one major segment with many sub-segments in it.
5.1.1.3 Discourse Coherence

The two major cohesive linguistic devices, inclusio and prominence, are the central focus in ascertaining the coherent message of Romans. This examination will show that the letter is highly community focused.

5.1.1.3.1 Inclusio

An inclusio occurs in Units A and F. In Unit A, Paul begins his first discussion with a prayer Πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου (1:8,) Then, Paul discloses his true intention in 1:13, and expresses his desire to visit Rome with a specific purpose: ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ εἰς ὕμῖν καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐθνεῖς. Of interest, a corresponding utterance occurs near the end of the letter, forming an inclusio. In 15:28, καρπὸς re-emerges as Paul reiterates his intention: τοῦτο ὁ ἐπιτελέσας καὶ σφαιρισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον, ἀπελεύσομαι δὲ ὕμων εἰς Σπανίαν. This inclusio reveals the purpose of this letter: Paul needs the support from the Romans to bring the gospel to τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐθνεῖς. In other words, Romans is not a letter for Paul to merely express his doctrinal belief, the salvation of individual
believers. Rather, it focuses on the faith community. As argued by Byrnes, Paul aims to use Romans to invoke “sympathy” to his approach of including the Gentiles “as equal citizens in the eschatological people of God.” Nonetheless, for Byrne, Paul ultimately hopes that “the Gentile Christians in Rome will be in the same relationship to himself as the communities he has personally founded.”

This study argues that Paul is concerned about different communities, including the Gentiles in Spain.

This emphasis on the Gentiles is also observed in another inclusio. In the letter-opening, Paul proclaims that he receives grace and the apostleship εἰς ὑπάκοην πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἑθνεσιν (1:5). A similar phrase re-emerges in the letter-closing: εἰς ὑπάκοην πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἑθνη (16:26). Paul calls himself an apostle of the Gentiles in this letter (11:13), and he highlights in this inclusio that the Gentiles is of his concern.

24 Although different scholars have different views on the ultimate purpose of Romans, they commonly do not consider Romans as Paul’s doctrinal letter. Rather, the letter is deeply connected with the community. For Jewett, this epistle is “an ambassadorial letter” of Paul to seek support from the Romans in order to launch a successful mission to Spain. Since there is little Jewish population in Spain, Paul cannot reply on the Jewish God-fearers in that region to do his work. Hence, he needs the support of the Christians in Rome. Jewett, Romans, 74–5, 932. On the other hand, Käsemann argues that the letter is carefully crafted to reflect the importance of Israel in salvation history in order to win over the Jewish Christians, who is the minority in the largely Gentile Christian congregation in Rome. Käsemann, Romans, 405. According to Smiga, the letter is Paul’s a request to the Romans for supporting his need in Jerusalem in light of the “lack of support from the Roman community” in facing “upcoming challenge in Jerusalem.” George Smiga, “Romans 12:1–2 and 15:30–32 and the Occasion of the Letter to the Romans,” CBQ 53 (1991): 272–3. Despite the difference in these views, they commonly indicate Paul’s focus on the communal and relational aspect. Paul is not primarily concerned about the salvation plan for individuals. This focus in accordance with the suggestion of this study.

25 Byrne, 19.

26 Jewett provides a detailed explanation of this “Spanish mission.” He demonstrates how various texts in Romans, including 1:14 and16:1–2, point to this purpose. Jewett, Romans, 74–80. However, Barclay contends that Jewett’s explanation is based on a shaky hypothesis. Barclay argues that the contextual hypotheses, such as the role of Phoebe in this Spanish mission and the Spanish cultural situation, are “immensely attractive” but are speculative. Nonetheless, Barclay does not negate the “missional” instead of the “doctrinal” purpose, in writing Romans. For Barclay, the substantiation of this purpose does not require the contextual hypotheses, as suggested by Jewett. John M. G. Barclay, “Is It Good News that God is Impartial? A Response to Robert Jewett, Romans: A Commentary,” JSNT 31 (2008): 96–7.
The connection of these two foci, faith community and Gentiles, will be explained in the section of sociolinguistics aspect.

5.1.1.3.2 Prominence
The following part demonstrates the emphasis on the communal aspect in Romans through two forms of prominence, thematic prominence and lexical cohesion, which generate the coherence of a discourse.

5.1.1.3.2.1 Thematic prominence. Throughout the letter, Paul focuses on different communities in various semantic units. In Unit A, Paul expresses his desire to visit the Romans. Paul describes himself as a debtor of Ἔλλησιν τε καὶ βαρβάρος (1:14), and articulates his intention to proclaim the gospel. This gospel is the power of God for salvation to Ἰουδαίω τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἔλλην (1:16). In other words, the central concern of Paul is about the salvation of these three communities: Ἰουδαίος, Ἔλλην, and βαρβαρός.27 Dunson also advocates a similar view. He connects 1:16–17 with other passages in Romans (3:21–5:2; 9:30–10:17), and demonstrates that Paul employs the “faith-righteousness relationship” to articulate the power of the gospel to break down the partition between the Gentiles and the Jews,

27 Jewett similarly argues that the phrase πιστεύων τῷ πιστεύοντι does not denote individual believers. Instead, it refers to different “cultural groups” in the schema of God’s salvation. Jewett, Romans, 146. Dunson connects 1:16–17 with other passages in Romans (3:21–5:2 and 9:30–10:17), demonstrating that the “faith-righteousness relationship” is employed by Paul to articulate the power of the gospel to “dissolve the division between the Jew and the Gentiles, emphasising the communal aspect instead of the individualistic aspect.
highlighting the importance of communal aspect.\textsuperscript{28}

In Unit B, Paul points out that both the Greeks and the Jews are equally in need of salvation. The phrase Ἰουδαῖος τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλην is repeated three times in this semantic unit: 2:9; 2:10; 3:9.\textsuperscript{29} As stated in 3:9, γὰρ Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλλήνας πάντας ἴπτ ἀμαρτίαν εἶναι, both groups are sinful. Hence, Paul is not concerned with the sinfulness of individual human beings. Instead, the two communities, Ἰουδαῖος and Ἑλλην, are his centre of discussion.

In Unit C, Paul details his argument regarding justification by faith. Although he begins his argument by seemingly focusing on individuals (γὰρ δικαιοῦσαι πίστει ἀνθρωπίνα, in 3:28), he immediately refers to the two communities, the Jews and the Gentiles: ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεός μόνον; οὐχὶ καὶ ἔθνων; ναὶ καὶ ἔθνων (3:29). Then, Paul cites Abraham as an example (4:1–12). However, his argument soon focuses on Abraham’s descendands (4:13–25). The quotation, πατέρα πολλῶν ἔθνων τέθεικά σε (4:17), highlights Paul’s concern for the ἔθνος.

In Unit D, Paul discusses the topic of freedom from sin and death. Whilst no specific community is mentioned in this semantic unit, there are two main observations that show that Paul’s discussion centres on Christians, particularly the Christian community in Rome. First, there are various expressions that denote Christians, including ὁσι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν (6:3), νυνὶ δὲ


\textsuperscript{29} The three occurrences of Ἰουδαῖος and Ἑλλην are different: genitive in 2:9; dative in 2:10; and accusative in 3:9.
This word generally emphasises kinship among believers. However, in this context it specifically refers to the Christian community in Rome, based on its first occurrence in 1:13 to address the Romans before re-emerging in 7:1.  

In Unit E, Paul’s discusses Israel’s fate as illustrated by the frequent occurrences of Ἰσραήλ. Moreover, the relationship between the two communities, Ἰσραήλ and ἐθνὸς, is highlighted. Of interest, the expressions such as, Ἄμην δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἐθνεσιν (11:13), μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων (11:18), and μὴ ἦτε [παρ'] ἐαυτοῖς φρονίμοι, ὃτι πώρωσις ἀπὸ μέρους τῶν Ἰσραήλ γέγονεν ἄχρι οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ (11:25), may subtly reflect the tension between the Gentile Christians and the majority of the Jewish non-believers. Regardless of the presence of this tension, the key theme of Unit E is clearly the salvation of Israel, its...
corporate solidarity instead of an individual Israelite.34

In Unit F, Paul discusses Christian living. Nonetheless, he focuses on the communal aspect, the Christians in Rome in particular. This is demonstrated by this encouragement: καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ σῶματι πολλὰ μέλη ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πρᾶξιν, οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σῶμα ἔσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, τὸ δὲ καθ’ εἷς ἀλλήλων μέλη (12:4–5). Furthermore, the call to love is reiterated in this unit: 12:9; 13:8; 13:10; and 14:15.35 In addition to this general call, Paul deals with the issue of food in 14:1–15:13, which troubles the Christian community in Rome. Scholars commonly argue that the central focus of this segment is on community.36 Dunson and Moxnes further argue that the key concern is the unity of the faith community.37

34 Schreiner and Abasciano disagree with each another concerning the nature of Rom 9–11. Abasciano argues that the segment centres on the corporate election of Israel, whilst Schreiner argues for both corporate election and individual election. For Schreiner, these two kinds of election are inseparable. Despite their differences, both scholars affirm the corporate aspect in Rom 9–11, the same argument that this study holds. Brain J. Abasciano, “Corporate Election in Romans 9: A Reply to Thomas Schreiner,” JETS 49 (2006): 353–8; Thomas R. Schreiner, “Corporate and Individual Election in Romans 9: A Response to Brain Abasciano,” JETS 49 (2006): 376–7.


36 Many commentators support this view. Moo, Romans, 746–7; Jewett, Romans, 738; Byrne, 361–2; Schreiner, 649; Fitzmyer, Romans, 637; Dunn, Romans, 2:705; Stuhlmacher, 185; Schlatter, Romans, 227.

In Unit G, the final semantic unit, the concern for community is evident in Paul’s greetings to various individuals in the church in Rome (16:3–16).\(^{38}\)

As shown above, the thematic prominence in this epistle is the focus of different communities, a common theme being reiterated throughout various semantic units.

**5.1.1.3.2.2 Lexical cohesion.** The second form of prominence is lexical cohesion. In addition to the lexical cohesion previously discussed, the occurrences of \(\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\) also display signs of lexical cohesion. The term occurs in patterns, pointing to the communal response of different communities towards God. This will be detailed in the second part of this chapter.

**5.1.1.4 Macrostructure**

Based on the analysis presented above, this study argues that the macrostructure of Romans is as follows. God’s salvific plan includes the salvation of both the Jews and the Gentiles. Through the gospel, both groups are freely justified by God in Christ through faith. As being set free from sin and death by the work of the Holy Spirit, the members of the Christian community should live by the principle of love.

**5.1.2 \(\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\) in Romans**

Of all the Pauline epistles, \(\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\) occurs most frequently in Romans, 15 times in

\(^{38}\) Schreiner suggests that the greetings reflect the “warm relationships [that] characterized the Christian community.” Schreiner, 789.
The following part analyses the occurrences of καρδία in various semantic units, and then examines its overall occurrences in the entire discourse in light of the sociolinguistic aspect, the macrostructure, and the discourse flow.

5.1.2.1 Καρδία in Semantic Units

As demonstrated in the previous analyses of 1 Corinthians and Philippians, the thematic meaning of an anthropological term cannot be solely determined by referring to the immediate textual context at the sentential level, since this is insufficient in ascertaining its meaning expressed through the discourse coherence. Hence, this analysis focuses on understanding καρδία by recognizing its occurrences as a pattern within and across various semantic units. In other words, the sentential meaning of καρδία in each individual occurrence is not the primary concern of this study. In Romans, καρδία occurs in Units B, D, E, and G. Its thematic meaning indicated by its overall occurrences points to the corporate and communal aspect as explained below.

5.1.2.1.1 Καρδία in Unit B

In Unit B, καρδία denotes a corporate reference. The term occurs in 1:21, 1:24, 2:5, and 2:15. In all of these occurrences, καρδία is either associated with the Gentiles or the Jews. For both groups, the term denotes their darkened unrepentant hearts. Forming a pattern, καρδία reflects the enmity between the Gentiles, as a corporate entity, and God. The term also reflects the disobedience of the Jews, as another

39 The occurrences of καρδία are as follows: 1:21, 24; 2:5, 15, 29; 5:5; 6:17; 8:27; 9:2; 10:1, 6, 8, 9, 10; 16:18.
corporate entity, towards God.

In 1:21, the two concepts, ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν and ἐσκοτίσθη ἢ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία, are identical in meaning. Hence, καρδία and διαλογισμός are likely in parallel. Since διαλογισμός is related to the mind, it is reasonable to consider that καρδία either alludes to or denotes mind. 40 Most importantly, καρδία describes the negative response of the Gentiles, as a group, towards God, as indicated in the immediate context (οὐχ ὡς θεόν ἐδόξασαν, in 1:21).

In 1:24, the genitive form of καρδία modifies ἐπιθυμία. The genitive can well be the genitive of production (the desires produced by the hearts). 41 Кαρδія denotes

40 Schreiner also suggests this parallel, and concludes that καρδία connotes mind. Schreiner, 87. However, most commentators express their understanding of καρδία without mentioning this parallel. Fitzmyer argues that καρδία connotes mind in Romans, which “designates the responsive and emotional reactions of the intelligent and planning self.” Fitzmyer, Romans, 128. Some scholars hold a similar view. Although they argue that elsewhere in Romans καρδία generally denotes inner life, they assert that καρδία here refers to the faculty of thought and understanding in light of its modifier ἀσύνετος. Hence, the intellectual aspect is highlighted. Cranfield, 1:118; Dunn, Romans, 1:60; Morris, Romans, 85. Conversely, some scholars stress the “neutrality” of καρδία as the home of either evilness or goodness. Sanday and Headlam, 45; Barrett, Romans, 37. Notably, in comparing Romans and Matthew, Brodie suggests that Matthew assimilates some of the ideas in Romans. Regarding the darkness of heart in 1:21, Brodie argues that Matthew adopts this theme and reshapes it as the “darkness in the body” in 6:22–3, illustrating the lost sight of God. T. L. Brodie, “Countering Romans,” in The Letter to the Romans (ed. Udo Schnelle; vol 226 of Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2009), 528. Jewett emphasises the Hebraic nature of καρδία, and argues that this is the source of both διαλογισμοί and ἐπιθυμίαι. This understanding is vastly different from the portrayal of a human having a rational part and a sensual part within Hellenistic anthropology. Jewett, Romans, 332. Jewett’s view is similar to Stacey’s. According to Stacey, the Pauline usage of καρδία is a continuum of the Hebraic זְכֶר, and καρδία is almost synonymous with the Greco concept of νοῦς, citing the occurrence of καρδία in 1:21 and νοῦς in 1:28. Stacey, Man, 196–7. Similarly, Moo traces καρδία back to the OT Hebrew word זֶכֶר, denoting the “thinking, feeling, willing ego” of humans in their relationship with God. Moo, Romans, 107. Byrne compares ἀσύνετος καρδία with the OT usage, quoting Ps 76:5 in the LXX, and suggests that καρδία in Pauline literature points to the “inward self of human beings as thinking, willing and feeling subjects.” Byrne, 74. The problem with their analyses, which traces καρδία back to זכֶר, is two-fold. First, it is a diachronic approach. Second, if the audience are mostly Gentile Christians, as many commentators claim, it would be strange for Paul to use a Hebraic concept (which is alien to the Gentile audience) to convey a point. It is obvious that καρδία in 1:21 is closely linked to διαλογισμός, which is generated by the mind. The two words are simply in parallel. This observation is deduced from the immediate context without tracing the word back to its so-called OT equivalent.

41 For this category of genitive, refer to the discussion of Wallace. Wallace, Grammar, 104–5.
the seat of emotion or thought, which produces desire. In this text, ἐπιθυμία connotes sinful desire as illustrated by the context, and points to ungodly sexual lust (1:24). Καρδία also carries the same function as that in 1:21, pointing to the enmity between the Gentiles and God as evident in the context: παρέδωκεν αὐτοῦς ὁ θεὸς (1:24).

There is one peculiar phenomenon in 1:21 and 1:24, which requires a careful investigation. A singular καρδία is modified by a plural possessive pronoun αὐτῶν in 1:21 (ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία), but a plural καρδία is modified by a plural possessive pronoun in 1:24 (τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν). As previously mentioned, καρδία occurs 36 times in all the Pauline epistles. The plural forms of καρδία occur 15 times, with eleven of them modified by personal possessive pronouns. All of these pronouns are plural. The singular forms of καρδία occur 22 times, with nine of them modified by personal possessive pronouns. However, only three of these possessive pronouns

---

42 Most commentators, including Cranfield, Fitzmyer, Schreiner, Byrne, Dunn, Moo, Käsemann, Stuhlmacher, Schlatter, Sanday and Headlam, do not discuss the nature of this genitive as they focus on “desire.” By citing the example in Ps 21:3, Jewett argues that the phrase ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν is a Hebrew expression that means “the motivational centre of humankind.” Jewett, Romans, 167.

43 Ἐπιθυμία can be employed to denote both good desires and evil desires as the word is not always negative as many assume. Ἐπιθυμία also connotes longing. In fact, Paul uses the word four times (Rom 1:24; 6:12; Gal 5:24; 1 Thess 2:17), one of those is used to describe his longing to see the Thessalonians: ἵδειν ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ. BDAG, 293.

44 Pauline texts with the plural forms of καρδία include Rom 1:24, 2:15, 5:5, 8:27; 16:18; 1Cor 4:5; 2 Cor 1:22; 3:2, 4:6, 7:3; Gal 4:6; Phil 4:7; 1 Thess 2:4; 3:13. The symbol * indicates the presence of a possessive pronoun (all the pronouns are in plural form). Amongst them, first and second person plural possessive pronouns occur in Rom 5:5 (ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν); 2 Cor 7:3 (ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν); Gal 4:6 (ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν); Phil 4:7 (ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν); 1 Thess 2:4 (ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν); and 1 Thess 3:13 (ἡμῶν ταῖς καρδίαις).

45 Pauline texts with the singular forms of καρδία include Rom 1:21, 2:5, 29; 6:17; 9:2; 10:1, 6, 8, 9, 10; 1 Cor 2:9; 7:37a, 37b; 14:25; 2 Cor 2:4; 3:15; 5:12; 6:11; 8:16; 9:7; Phil 1:7; 1 Thess 2:17. The symbol * indicates the presence of a singular possessive pronoun; * indicates the presence of a plural possessive pronoun; and * denotes the presence of a singular reflexive pronoun.
are in plural form: αὐτῶν καρδία (Rom 1:21); τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν (2 Cor 3:15); and ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν in (2 Cor 6:11). As argued in Chapter 2, the singular noun must not be automatically defined as the distributive singular to explain the abnormal singular construct.

The text in 1:21 states that ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία is darkened. In 1:24, the text discusses the ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν. Semantically, καρδία is closely associated with foolishness or desires. In both cases, καρδία is connected to ἀσύνετος and ἐπιθυμία, words depicting emotion and mind. Both cases display an agreement in number. In ἡ ἀσύνετος ... καρδία, the singular substantive adjective is correlated with the singular καρδία. In ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν, the plural noun is modified by the plural καρδία. It would be a relatively forced interpretation to argue that καρδία in 1:21 is a distributive singular noun. Rather, it is more convincing to perceive it as the normal singular, given the singular use of the substantival adjective despite the presence of a plural pronoun αὐτῶν. In the discussion of the wrath of God, καρδίαν (2:5) is directly modified by

46 In Pauline pseudopigrapha, intriguingly, all the plural forms of καρδία are modified by plural possessive pronoun without any exception. For singular forms of καρδία, if a personal possessive pronoun is present, then it is always a plural possessive pronoun. The singular forms of καρδίας in pseudo-Pauline Epistles occur in Eph 1:18; 4:18; 5:19; 6:5; Col 3:22; 1 Tim 1:5; and 2 Tim 2:22. The symbol Ω indicates the presence of a personal possessive pronoun, and all of them are in plural form. All the plural forms of καρδία are always modified by plural possessive pronouns: Eph 3:17 (ταῖς καρδιαῖς ὑμῖν); 6:22 (τάς καρδίας ὑμῶν); Col 2:2 (αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν); 3:15 (ταῖς καρδιάς ὑμῶν); 3:16 (ταῖς καρδιαίς ὑμῖν); 4:8 (τάς καρδιάς ὑμῶν); 2 Thess 2:17 (ὑμῶν τάς καρδιάς); 3:5 (ὑμῶν τάς καρδιάς).

47 Many major commentators, including Barrett, Cranfield, Byrne, Moo, Dunn, do not mentioned this nuance regarding the singular use of καρδία, let alone the combination between καρδία and αὐτῶν. Byrne and Dunn refer to the similarity between 1:21 and Psalm 75:6 (76:5 in LXX). However, in the LXX a plural ἀσύνετος is linked with a singular dative καρδία: αὐτῶν τῇ καρδίᾳ. Paul may be alluding to the LXX, it is certainly not a direct quotation though. Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 332; Byrne, 74; Dunn, Romans, 60; Barrett, Romans, 37; Cranfield, 1:118; Moo, Romans, 107.
the adjective ἀμετανόητος, a *hapax legomenon* in the NT. Ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν is conjoined with σκληρότητα by καί, forming a parallel to indicate that “hardness” is synonymous with “unrepentant heart.” Cranfield provides a valuable insight and valid argument by suggesting that another cognate of σκληρότης, σκληροκαρδία (a word that only occurs in Matthew), points back to the OT with reference to the unrepentant Israel. The singular form of καρδία in 2:5 is qualified by σοῦ, a pronoun which points to the Jews as a corporate entity, instead of an individual. The sentence meaning of καρδία in 2:5 is likely associated with volition, since unrepentance can be regarded as an attitude, alluding to volition. Nonetheless, the corporate entity is well illustrated by καρδία, as the term is used to portray the disobedience of a people group, the Jews.

In 2:29, καρδία is associated with περιτομή, in which Paul makes a sharp contrast between περιτομή καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι (2:29) and ἐν σαρκί περιτομή (2:28), by defining the difference between ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαίος (2:29) and ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαίος (2:28). Of interest, the description of “the circumcision of hardened hearts” also occurs in Deut 10:16 and Jer 4:4, portraying the stubborn

---

48 Bauer defines the word as “hardness of heart”, a usage commonly found in other Greek literature. BDAG, 756. As such, 2:5 could be rendered as τὴν σκληρότητά (τῆς καρδίας) σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν. σκληρότητά and ἀμετανόητον are in parallel, both describing καρδία.

49 Cranfield, 1:145.

50 This view can further be supported by the *Shema* text in Deut 6. In Deut 6:4 (LXX), the text reads: Ἄκουε Ἰσραήλ, κύριος ὁ θεός ἡμῶν, κύριος εἰς ἐστί, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου ... καὶ ἔσται τὰ ρήματα ταῦτα, ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλεσον σοι σήμερον, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου. The interplay between ἡμῶν and σου, as well as the usage of a singular καρδία treat the Israelites as “one”, as the nation Ἰσραήλ is in the text instead of using the plural proper noun, Ἰσραήλαται.

51 The genitive of καρδία can be understood as an objective genitive, a view supported by Moo. It is a contrast that Paul sets up: the dative of σαρκί illustrates περιτομή done in the flesh, comparing with περιτομή done in καρδία. Moo, *Romans*, 174.
Israelites. The notion of having the heart circumcised is contrasted with ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομῆ. In the context, 2:5 in particular, the unrepentant attitude of the ancient Israelites is in view. Therefore, καρδία in 2:29 indicates a contrastive attitude. In other words, the two occurrences of καρδία, in 2:5 and 2:29, are associated with volition according to their sentence meanings. However, they both are employed to convey a message to reflect the corporate disobedience of the Jews.

5.1.2.1.2 Καρδία in Unit D

In Unit C, there is a shift regarding the community with which καρδία is associated. The occurrences of καρδία in this unit (5:5; 6:17; 8:27) are associated with believers. καρδία denotes the hearts of the believers, which receive God’s love, obey teaching, and are searched by the Holy Spirit. Again, the pattern of καρδία indicates a corporate reference.

In the discussion of justification, Paul argues in 5:5 that the hope of believers is not in vain because ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν. Contextually, ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν and τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν share a similar meaning. The concept (the love of God being poured out in our hearts) can also be interpreted as the love of God given to us. Of interest, of all the Pauline epistles, the verb ἐκχύνω only occurs in

---

52 Dunn notes this similarity. Jewett argues that the concept of περιτομῆ καρδίας is a popular OT and rabbinic idea. The understanding of Dunn regarding καρδία as the “experiencing and motivating” centre of human is also similar to Jewett’s idea of καρδία being the “centre of human with the emphasis on intentionality.” Jewett does give a strong argument that καρδία in this text is a continuum of the Hebraic concept. Dunn, Romans, 1:91, 124; Jewett, Romans, 333, 448.

53 The love of God is interpreted as the Spirit of God (Byrne, 167), a view that Cranfield repudiates. Cranfield, 1:261–3.
Romans.\textsuperscript{54} In 5:5, καρδία is the object, or the recipient of the pouring. Based on the context, it is a reasonable conjecture to argue that God’s love is directed to ‘people,’ instead of the seat of emotion, will, and reason.\textsuperscript{55} Therefore, ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν and ἡμῖν are synonymous, denoting the whole person instead of illustrating mere emotion and volition. More importantly, the phrase ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν denotes a specific group of people: believers.

In 6:17, καρδία is linked to the imperative verb ὑπηκούσατε. Paul discusses how believers are free from the slavery of sin and obedience ἐκ καρδίας to God’s teaching. The uncommon occurrence of ἐκ καρδίας, the only occurrence in Paul’s work, has invited some discussion.\textsuperscript{56} Cranfield asserts that the phrase is in contrast to outward obedience, as ἐκ καρδίας elucidates inward obedience. Dunn also proposes this kind of inward–outward contrast, and argues that καρδία denotes deep motivation.\textsuperscript{57} Contextually, the connotation of καρδία as “motivation” lacks substantial support, since there is no such contrast presented in the textual context of

\textsuperscript{54} Cranfield observes that the verb ἐκχύω (and its Hellenistic form ἐκχύνει) is normally used in the LXX to describe the pouring of the wrath of God. For Cranfield, this usage can be demonstrated in Rev 16, in which nine times ἐκχύω is employed to portray the pouring of the Seven Bowls of God’s wrath. Thus, God’s love as the subject of ἐκχύσατε is unusual. Cranfield, 1:262–3.

\textsuperscript{55} Some scholars do not specify the meaning of καρδία, and they simply interpret the text as God’s love for “people” (Fitzmyer, Romans, 398; Stuhlmacher, 80; Byrne, 171; Sanday and Headlam, 125; Moo, Romans, 304–5). Others argue that καρδία denotes the inner life of an individual (Schlatter, Romans, 122), including human experience (Schreiner, 257), and the seat of thought, volition and emotion (Jewett, Romans, 356; Dunn, Romans, 1:253).

\textsuperscript{56} Cranfield rejects Bultmann’s interpretation of ἐκ καρδίας as a non-Pauline insertion (the phrase does not occur elsewhere in Paul’s work). He argues that the phrase is a good Greek expression which can be found in other contemporary Greek literature and 2 Pet 1:22. Cranfield, 1:324. This study agrees with Cranfield. It is not persuasive to repudiate Paul’s authorship of a text merely based on the occurrence of a rare linguistic construction. For example, there are approximately 87 hapax legomena in the Romans alone.

\textsuperscript{57} Dunn, Romans, 1:343.
both the preceding and the following texts. Jewett fails to consider the Deuteronomy quotation as he simply defines καρδία as “the centre of man” in Rom 10.58 However, this study argues that the word denotes a positive orientation of the audience towards God’s teaching, as indicated by the context. In 6:17, καρδία is neither modified by other adjective and pronoun, nor associated with nouns that depict volition, emotion, and reason. However, based on the context this study proposes the term reflects the positive attitude expressed by a group, the believers in general, and the Roman Christians in specific,59 towards God and God’s teaching. The sentence meaning of καρδία denotes volition. However, the usage of καρδία indicates a corporate aspect.

In 8:27, καρδία occurs in the middle of the passage in which Paul discusses the help of the Holy Spirit offered to believers. In portraying the role and the work of the Holy Spirit, Paul writes: ὁ δὲ ἐραυνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἴδεν τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος. The masculine participle ὁ ἐραυνῶν points to God who does the searching of καρδία. God is also the one who knows τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος.60 To ascertain the meaning of καρδία in 8:27, it is essential to refer to the immediate context. The text in 8:26 states that προσευχώμεθα καθό δεῖ οὐκ οἴδαμεν (8:26). Both the phrase οὐκ οἴδαμεν (8:26) and the word οἴδεν (8:26) point to “knowledge.” Hence, it is reasonable to interpret καρδία as the mind. The text can be interpreted as follows. The human mind is unable to know what to pray for (8:26), but God is able

58 Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 333.

59 Schreiner, Jewett, and Moo also support that Roman Christians are in view in 6:17. Schreiner, 334; Jewett, Romans, 418; Moo, Romans, 400.

60 Byrne, 266–70; Dunn, Romans, 1:479. Dunn repudiates the argument that the Holy Spirit is the subject of ἔραυνών. This study agrees with Dunn on the basis of the usage of the masculine participle. Had the Holy Spirit been the acting subject of the participle, τὸ ἐραυνῶν would have been used. Byrne renders the participle as “Searcher of hearts”, suggesting God as the subject.
to search our mind (8:27).\textsuperscript{61} Most importantly, the teaching in 8:26 is about the help of Holy Spirit offered to believers as indicated by the plural pronoun ἡμῶν in 8:26 (τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἁθενείᾳ ἡμῶν) and the plural noun ἁγίων in 8:27 (ὅτι κατὰ θεόν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων). Therefore, καρδία is once again used in the context to denote a corporate entity, believers.

5.1.2.1.3 Καρδία in Unit E

In Unit E, καρδία first portrays Paul’s heart (9:2; 10:1), depicting his grief and his desire concerning the welfare of the Israelites, his own people. Then, the term is employed to denote the heart of the Israelites (10:6, 8, 9, 10). The corporate entity that is associated with καρδία is shifted from Christians (Unit D) to the Jews (Unit E). The term is once again used to describe the response of a particular community towards God. In this case, the context of καρδία is related to the Israelites, as they, a corporate entity, are invited to accept the salvific grace of God.

In this unit, Paul first discusses the negative response of the Israelites towards Christ and his salvation, and then describes his feelings by employing the phrase λύπη μοί μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὀδύνη τῇ καρδίᾳ μου (9:2) to. Although καρδία is directly linked with ἀδιάλειπτος, combined with λύπη in the previous phrase the

\textsuperscript{61} Dunn argues that καρδία denotes the “seat of inner life”, the “center where ambitions and values and motives are rooted” by referring to the OT texts in which the searching of heart is mentioned (for example, Ps 44 and Ps 139). However, he does not explain how he derives “motive” in his definition. Dunn, Romans, 1:479. This study argues the understanding of καρδία in 8:27 depends on the previous verse in which the verb οἶδα could provide clues. The meaning of καρδία in this text is quite ambiguous, and the connotation of “mind” is by far the best conjecture according to this analysis.
text is centred on Paul’s emotion, his grief and pain in specific.\(^6^2\) Then, καρδία in the phrase ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας (10:1) elucidates Paul’s longing\(^6^3\) for the salvation of his own people, vis-à-vis the Israelites. Paul wishes to see his own people receiving God’s salvation in Christ. This desire comes from his καρδία.\(^6^4\) Regardless whether it is a genitive of possession or a genitive of source, καρδία in both texts is clearly associated with “desire.”\(^6^5\)

Καρδία occurs four times in 10:5–13. In 10:6 and 10:8, the text in which καρδία occurs are both quotations from the LXX. The exact phrase μὴ εἰπής ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου (10:6) appears in Deut 8:17 and 9:4 (LXX). Both texts in the LXX are employed to warn the Israelites against boasting about their wealth and righteousness. The phrase in 10:8 resembles the phrase in Deut 30:14 (LXX), ἔστιν σοι ἐγγὺς τὸ ῥῆμα σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου αὐτῷ ποιεῖν. The passage is the teaching that reminds the Israelites to obey

\(^{62}\) Byrne observes that the two nouns, λύπη and δόνη, are used together in Isa. 35:10 and 51:11 (LXX). Fitzmyer makes the same observation. Byrne, 286; Fitzmyer, Romans, 544. This usage illustrates the lament nature of the text, portraying painful emotion. Moo, Romans, 557. In this verse, the association between δόνη and καρδία could have been written as δόνη τῆς καρδίας. Rather, a dative is used. This study argues that it is likely that the two phrases conjoined by καὶ are in parallel—λύπη μοι and δόνη τῇ καρδίᾳ— with λύπη and δόνη expressing the same emotion.\(^{62}\) Thus, μοι and καρδίᾳ are synonymous—“in me” can also be expressed as “in my heart”. As such, καρδία illustrates Paul himself as a person whilst emphasizing on the emotional aspect.

\(^{63}\) Εὐδοκία can be defined as good will, good pleasure, or wish. BDAG, 319; Moulton, MM, 260. However, when εὐδοκία is combined with καρδία as in Rom 10:1, the word connotes “wish.” BDAG, 404.

\(^{64}\) Of interest, following the initial discussion of καρδία in 1:24, most commentators do not analyse the meaning of καρδία in the subsequent texts in which καρδία occurs (Dunn, Romans, 1:73; Moo, Romans, 111; and Schreiner, 92); or they simply refer it back to 1:21 (Morris, Romans, 88). It seems that a definition of καρδία is assumed, and the same definition is imposed on all the occurrences of καρδία. This imposition reflects a problematic approach of semantic study as discussed in Chapter 2.

\(^{65}\) The genitive form of καρδία modifies εὐδοκία. The genitive can be a genitive of possession, meaning that the desire that belongs to καρδία. It can also be a genitive of source or a genitive of production. Wallace suggests that the genitive of production is not common in the NT. However, the two categories of genitive are very similar. Wallace, Grammar, 104–5.
God’s commandments. In all three LXX texts, καρδία is a translation of υἱός. The most captivating notion of these LXX texts is the combination of στόμα and καρδία. στόμα and καρδία are explicitly used in Deut 30:14 (LXX). Although στόμα does not appear in Deut 8:17 and 9:4 (LXX), the word εἰπης, the aorist form of λέγω, is likely an allusion to στόμα. Of interest, Paul adopts the combination of στόμα and καρδία in his own argument. The two phrases, ὀμολογήσης ἐν τῷ στόματί σου and πιστεύσης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ in Rom 10:9 display this usage. Therefore, to ascertain the meaning of καρδία in Rom 10, its “partner,” στόμα, must also be considered. As shown below, the connotation of καρδία in Rom 10 is unique, and it deserves special attention.

In terms of the στόμα-καρδία motif, the two nouns can either be regarded as conceptually synonymous or deliberately contrastive. Unless Paul’s quotation of

66 In this passage, Paul’s own interpretation of the Deuteronomy is marked by τοῦτ᾿ ἐστιν, a phrase that occurs three times in 10:6–8. Dunn argues that Paul deliberately quotes from Deuteronomy instead of simply using the language. Dunn, Romans, 2:602. Barrett asserts that Paul uses the text in Deuteronomy, but provides a fresh interpretation, by attempting to link the text to Christ, an understanding that is not present in the mind of the Deuteronomic writer. Barrett, Romans, 185. Even though the original text in Deut 30 concerns the law, Cranfield argues that Paul does consider the Law and Christ as two closely related entities. Therefore, such a “new” interpretation of an OT text is not a mere arbitrary practice (Cranfield, 2:524). Robinson also repudiates the quotation of Deuteronomy as arbitrary, and argues that the salvific purpose of God is now accomplished despite the failure of people in obeying the law. John A. T. Robinson, Wrestling with Romans (London: SCM, 1979), 125. Regarding the failure of the Law, Stuhlmacher articulates that Christ has “put an end to the death-producing verdict of the Law.” Stuhlmacher, 155.

67 Cranfield considers that the two words interpret each other, denoting the same concept. Byrne holds the same view, and considers the contents of confessing and believing (“Jesus is Lord” and “God’s raising Jesus from the dead”) echo the early Christian creedal formulas. Cranfield, 2:527; Byrne, 321. However, Fitzmyer regards the two words as representing two different dimensions, depicting an antithesis between inward-outward. For Fitzmyer, στόμα denotes outward confession, and καρδία denotes inward faith. Fitzmyer, Romans, 592. Dunn also highlights this contrast, and argues that στόμα points to the recitation of creed, and καρδία, the affective belief. Dunn, Romans, 2:608–9. Moo shares a similar view, asserts that verbal confession is an outward manifestation of inner response. He also observes a nuance in the word order. στόμα-καρδία in 10:9 is a direct quotation of Deut. 30; but καρδία-στόμα in 10:10 is Paul’s conclusion set by Paul. For Moo, this word order indicates that Paul regards that believing in the heart is more crucial. Moo, Romans, 657.
Deuteronomy is considered totally disjunctive, as if Paul simply adopting the words in Deuteronomy without any intention of referring to their original meanings, one must assume the original text is of significant influence on Paul’s usage of καρδία in Rom 10. Hence, an investigation of καρδία in Deuteronomy must be conducted. This approach is not as diachronic as it seems to be. It would be a diachronic approach if the meaning of καρδία in any given Pauline epistle is ascertained by retrospectively examining the general Hebrew usage of בְּּ. However, καρδία in Rom 10 is a specific quotation from the OT text with a purpose (as this study assumes). Therefore, it is important to briefly investigate how the Deuteronomy texts are connected with Rom 10.

The στόμα-καρδία motif in Deut 30 is not unique, as it is also mentioned in 6:6–7 and 11:18–19. Although the word στόμα does not occur in the two texts, λαλέω (the action of speaking) is used to allude to στόμα. This motif appears in the context of the presentation of God’s Law. The ancient Israelites are urged to remember, to speak about, to recite, to teach, and to keep the commandments of God. Notably, the well-known ματ (6:5) precedes the teaching about the commandments: ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ σου (6:6, LXX). Therefore, the Law must be incorporated in their lifestyle, and putting God’s words into καρδία can be rendered as

---


69 According to Sanday and Headlam, Paul simply quotes the Deuteronomy text in a proverbial manner to express his message. In other words, the quotation is not Paul’s interpretation of the OT text. Sanday and Headlam, 289. However, Hays repudiates this view, and demonstrates by his analysis, showing that Paul uses Deut 30 as “a metaphor for Christian proclamation.” Hays, *Echoes*, 82.

70 Driver states this argument, and this study concurs with it. Driver, 92, 331.
remembering or internalising God’s commandments. Overall, Deut 30:14 has a summative purpose, and the articulated noun τὸ ῥῆμα refers to all the commandments in the book. τὸ ῥῆμα is not far from στόμα, nor from καρδία. Apparently, τὸ ῥῆμα is close to both στόμα and καρδία if the Israelites follow the instruction in Deut 6, wherein they become familiar with the word by talking about it and meditating upon it.

Given this brief analysis of Deuteronomy, στόμα and καρδία are seemingly not used synonymously. The two words or the concepts connoted are not equivalent, and instead are in contrast. The law must be verbalised and memorised as part of the lifestyle of the Israelites. By doing so, the law would be near to καρδία and στόμα, as concluded in Deut 30.

There are three main views to understand the purpose for Paul to quote Deut 30. First, Paul considers the close relationship between the Law and Christ, and thus καρδία and στόμα are synonymous (as suggested by both Cranfield and Byrne).

---

71 Christensen argues that the word ἔγγραφος in Deut 6 is used to urge the Israelites to “internalize” the law. Christensen, 1:143. Christensen seems to be stretching the point. However, Deuteronomy teaches the Israelites to memorise the commandments. Thus, it is reasonable to argue that the purpose of memorising the commandments is to internalise them, so that the law could be well-integrated into daily life. Nelson defines this internalisation as meditation. However, καρδία-στόμα can be understood as a “vocalized meditation.” Nelson, 91, 350.

72 This is Nelson’s argument. Nelson, 349. This study agrees with the view of Nelson. Since Deut 30:14 is clearly part of the summary of Deuteronomy, and it is a summary placed before the prologue.

73 According to Hays, the key theme of Deut 30:11–14 is “the nearness of the word.” The text teaches that the word is so close to you, simply in your mouth and in your heart. Hays, Echoes, 81. In light of this, the text in Rom 10, for Hays, should be understood as follows. Just as how the word of God being “present to Israel in Torah” in the past, the same word of God is “now present in the Christian gospel.” Hays, Echoes, 82–3.

74 It is more natural to interpret the notion of the word being close to both καρδία and στόμα is the result of talking and internalizing it. Driver also holds this view. Driver, 331.
Second, the motif of καρδία and στόμα in the well-known OT text is a good representation of the external confession and internal belief, which highlights the totality, both outward and inward aspects, of faith (as argued by Fitzmyer). Third, Deuteronomy is used as a metaphor to illustrate the notion that God’s word (in the gospel) is present in Christians, just as God’s word (in the Torah) is present in the Israelites (as suggested by Hays). If Paul does follow the original connotation of this motif, then it is likely that Paul adopts the external-internal contrast in Rom 10, highlighting the notion of totality.

More importantly, this study argues that the occurrences of καρδία in Rom 10 do not elucidate an individual. Just as the Israelites are addressed as a corporate entity in Deut 30, the Israelites are also addressed as a corporate body in need of salvation in Rom 10. The corporate reference is emphasised by the usage of καρδία.

5.1.2.1.4 Καρδία in Unit G

The last occurrence of καρδία occurs in Unit E. The term describes τῶν ἄκακων who are deceived by the false teachers. It is commonly held that καρδία is linked to the mind because of the word ἄκακος.75 There is no specific group that Paul focuses on in this usage of καρδία, as he simply points out the capability of these false teachers to deceive the simple-minded.

75 Various scholars, including Cranfield, Moo, Byrne, and Dunn, argue that ἄκακος refers to the “simple-minded” instead of the “innocent.” Therefore, καρδία is likely linked to the mind. Cranfield suggests that the word points to the simple-minded people in the Christian community. Cranfield, 2:801.
5.1.2.2 Sociolinguistic Aspect

In Romans, Paul first calls himself δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ and κλητὸς ἀπόστολος (1:1), before addressing the audience as ἀδελφοί. As previously mentioned, the self-designation, δοῦλος Χριστοῦ, denotes Paul’s leadership and his noble status. Referring to the context of the audience, Brown argues that this self-designation is the result of Paul’s contextualisation of the Roman congregation. This designation is a “technical term,” which highlights the high status enjoyed by imperial slaves, alluding to “Familia Caesaria” in the Roman congregation. Thus, Paul uses δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ to emphasise “the obligation and power that accompany apostleship.”

The purpose of Paul, according to Brown, is to create a “rhetorical tactic” to gain sympathy from the audience regarding his mission as an apostle to the Gentiles, and as a result, inviting the audience to participate in this mission. Brown’s insightful argument can further be supported by Paul’s intriguing proclamation: εἰμί ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος (11:13b). As previously discussed, the clause ἦμεν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἐθνεσίν (11:13a) indicates that the Christian community in Rome mainly consists of the Gentiles. Hence, the emphatic statement in 11:13b demonstrates the

---

76 For discussion of the sociolinguistic implications associated with ἀπόστολος and ἀδελφοί, see pages 153–6 in Chapter 3.

77 For the discussion of this self-designation, see pages 86–7 in Chapter 2.

78 Brown, “Paul’s Use,” 732.

79 Brown, “Paul’s Use,” 737.

80 Brown, “Paul’s Use,” 733.

81 Brown, “Paul’s Use,” 735–6.
authority claimed by Paul, who is a Jew, over his audience, the Gentile Christians in Rome. This illustrates that the Gentile Christians are an essential focus in this letter. This focus is also illustrated by various explicit statements made by Paul (1:13; 15:16, 18).

As an apostle, Paul comprises the role of teacher. As mentioned, in the discussion of the sociolinguistic aspect, there was a common loyalty displayed by students to their teachers in the first century. Given that the Christian community was not founded by Paul, it is quite probable that the letter is employed by him as a means to assert his apostolic authority to “earn” the loyalty and respect from the Romans, which is largely consisted of Gentile believers. His purpose, however, is to urge the Romans to offer him help to partake in his gospel mission to Spain, which would be their obligation as Paul being their apostle chosen by God for the Gentiles. As previously discussed in the section of discourse coherence, the faith community and the Gentiles are two focal points in Romans.

5.1.3 Thematic Meaning of Καρδία in Romans

From this analysis, the overall occurrences of καρδία in various semantic units indicate that the term is not randomly employed. Rather, it shows a particular pattern as shown in Table 5.3.

---

82 For a detailed discussion, see pages 153–4 in Chapter 3.
Table 5.3 Καρδία in Romans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Occurrences of καρδία</td>
<td>Letter-opening (1:1–7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐκκατοστηθή ἢ ἀνέστη σείτων καρδία (1:21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν (1:24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀμετανόητος καρδιά (2:5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ ἔκκεχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδιαῖς ἡμῶν (5:5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>οὐ περιέχεται δὲ ἐκ καρδιάς εἰς ἐν παρεσκήνῃ τύπου διδαχῆς (6:17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὁ δὲ ερωτῶ τὰς καρδιὰς οἱ συν πῦρ πυθμάτως (8:27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἱστό ἐάτι εἰς τῇ καρδίᾳ σου (9:2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τὸ μάθημα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου (10:8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ποταμὸς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου (10:9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>καρδία γὰρ ποταμῶν εἰς τεκνοθύμνην (10:10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Different colours indicate different community groups which καρδία denotes or is associated with in the text: red representing the Gentiles, green representing the Jews/Israelites, blue representing Christians; black representing none of the above groups.

In each of the three units, καρδία is associated with different communities as shown in Table 5.4: the Gentiles, the Christians, and the Jews.

Table 5.4 Pattern of Καρδία in Romans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit B (1:18–3:20)</th>
<th>Unit D (5–8)</th>
<th>Unit E (9–11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gentiles and Jews</td>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>Jews/Israelites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The terms elucidates the community’s response to God—the ignorance of the Gentiles and the rebellion of the Jews towards God (Unit B), the blessings of God received by the believers (Unit D), and the invitation to the Israelites to accept the salvific grace of God in Christ (Unit E). There is a subtle corporate aspect attached to
καρδία in highlighting the relationship between God and each of these communities. Despite the notion that the sentence meaning of individual occurrence of καρδία varies, the thematic meaning connoted by καρδία, as illustrated by its recurrent discourse pattern in various semantic units, points to different corporate entities regarding their response to God and his salvation in Christ.

5.1.3.1 The Flow of Discourse and Peak

As demonstrated in previous chapters, a discourse usually displays a flow of stages. In Romans, the letter-opening (1:1–7) is the aperture. Unit A is the stage that sets up the key theme, the gospel and its power, which is fully developed in the following episodes. Units B to D function as the developing episodes, in which the content and the power of the gospel are fully explained. Paul first explains the sinfulness of both the Jews and the Gentile, and their need of salvation. The thematic meaning of καρδία points to their negative response to God. Then, Paul discusses the blessings of the believers, both the Jews and the Gentiles. The thematic meaning of καρδία points to their positive relationship with God in Christ. In the pre-peak episode (Unit E), Paul discusses the salvific plan of Israel. The climax is situated in the peak (Unit F), which is followed by the post-peak (Unit G1), the closure (Unit G2), and finis (letter-closing) respectively. The discourse flow of Romans is shown in Figure 5.8.

As previously explained, a peak usually reveals the core message of a discourse. The discourse peak usually appears near the end of a discourse. It is a turbulent zone with the occurrence of a shift in the proportion of use of one or more particular grammatical device. As previously mentioned, there is a concentrated occurrence of imperatives in Rom 12. Normally, the use of imperative is not of
particular interest, since it usually signifies the expository nature of the text. However, the use of imperatives in Rom 12 is relatively unique. One of the most intriguing observations is the use of prohibitive imperative: μὴ plus imperative. There is an unusually frequent occurrence of this device in Chapter 12 as shown in Figure 5.7.

Figure 5.7 The Prohibitive Imperative Verbs in Romans

The peculiarity of this usage does not merely rest on the frequency. The syntax of these imperatives also captures a degree of interest. All four prohibitive imperative verbs in Rom 12 occur in four parallel constructions, and this phenomenon is absent elsewhere in Romans. These parallel constructions are as follows: μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε ... ἀλλὰ μεταμορφώσθε (12:2), εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε (12:14), μὴ τὰ ὕψηλά φρονοῦτες ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ’ ἑαυτοῖς (12:16), and μὴ νικῶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ ... ἀλλὰ νίκα ἐν τῷ ἁγαθῷ τὸ κακόν (12:21). Each individual prohibitive imperative is accompanied by a synonymous expression that is in the form of either an imperative or a verbal phrase as shown in Table 5.5.
Table 5.5 Synonymous Expression of the Prohibitive Imperatives in Rom 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prohibitive Imperative</th>
<th>Synonymous Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:2 μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε</td>
<td>μεταμορφούσθε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:14 μὴ καταράσθε</td>
<td>εὐλογεῖτε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:16 μὴ γίνεσθε φρονίμοι παρ’ έαυτοῖς</td>
<td>τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:21 μὴ νικᾶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ</td>
<td>νίκα ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακὸν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned in previous chapters, an author could employ extra words (including parallelism, paraphrase, and tautologies) in the discourse peak to draw the audience’s attention to the climactic point. The influx of imperatives, the use of prohibitive imperatives, and the use of parallelism indicate that Rom 12 is the peak of Romans.

Rom 12 does not merely contain a general exhortation. As shown in both the aperture and the finis, Paul mentions the obedience of the Gentiles to God through faith. The Gentiles, as a corporate entity, are of Paul’s concern, as indicated by the repetition of the word ἐθνη in both the aperture (1:5) and the finis (16:26). The pre-peak unit can be a rhetoric device, answering the possible challenge: why does Paul, a Jew, focus on his ministry to the Gentiles instead of the Jews? Paul argues that despite his concern for his own people, the salvation of the Israelites only comes when τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθη (11:25). With Paul’s overt intention to go to Spain through the Romans, this study confidently conjectures that Rom 12 is directed by Paul to the Roman Christians with a specific purpose. Paul urges the Romans to offer their bodies as a living sacrifice by serving one another in the Christ’s community, the one body. However, this is also Paul’s invitation to request them to partake in his
ministry—his intention to bring the gospel to the Gentiles in Spain through the “help” of the Romans.\(^3\)

**Figure 5.8 The Flow of Discourse of Romans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aperture</th>
<th>Stage (A)</th>
<th>Various Developing Episodes (B–C)</th>
<th>Pre-peak (D)</th>
<th>Peak (E)</th>
<th>Post-peak (F)</th>
<th>Closure (G)</th>
<th>Finis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to visit Rome</td>
<td>The Gospel of God for the Jews and the Gentiles</td>
<td>Salvation of Israel</td>
<td>Exhortation on Christian living in community</td>
<td>Various Teachings</td>
<td>Intention to visit Spain thru Rome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: - - - - - - - : Inclusio

\(^3\) As previously mentioned, this is the view held by Jewett.
5.1.4 Summary

From this analysis, the sentence meaning of καρδία in Romans denotes mind, the seat of emotion and volition, or even the whole person. Nonetheless, the thematic meaning of the term carries a corporate dimension. The term occurs in clustered pattern in the epistle, associating with different communities, including the Gentiles, the Jews, and the Christians. To conclude, the thematic meaning of καρδία, as illustrated by its recurrent discourse pattern, points to the corporate response of different groups to God and his salvation in Christ. This corporate aspect that is associated with the usage καρδία highlights the relationship between God and each of these communities.

5.2 Καρδία in 2 Cor 1–9 in Light of Discourse Analysis

The second part of this chapter focuses on καρδία in 2 Cor 1–9. The discourse structure of 2 Cor 1–9 will be initially identified, and then the thematic meaning of καρδία in this discourse will be ascertained.

5.2.1 Discourse Structure of 2 Cor 1–9

As previously mentioned, the application of discourse analysis assumes that each Pauline epistle is one single discourse. Since the unity of 2 Corinthians has been challenged, it is important to briefly review the issue of integrity.

5.2.1.1 The Unity of the Letter

The unity of 2 Corinthians has been challenged. For a detailed discussion of this issue, see Thrall, 1:3–49; Harris, 8–51.
Some commentators advocate a multi-letter theory, but others support the unity. The reasons for supporting a multi-letter theory include: a sharp change of tone between 2 Cor 9 and 2 Cor 10–13; Chapters 8 and 9 being inconsistent; 2:14–7:4 appearing as an interpolation, disconnected from the previous and the proceeding contexts; and the non-Pauline literal style in 6:14–7:1, illustrated by the high occurrences of *hapax legomena*. Conversely, the reasons for supporting the unity include: the absence of text tradition challenging the unity, the coherent flow of the letter, the connectedness of Chapters 8 and 9, and 2:14–7:4 being the result of Paul’s natural interruption during composition or digression.

The purpose of this study is not to address the issue of unity. It is important to

---


87 Thrall, 1:5; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 31; Lambrecht, 8; Barrett, *Second Corinthians*, 24; Héring, xi–xi.

88 Thrall, 1:36–43; Betz, *Corinthians*, 139–44.

89 Bornkamm and Weiss are proponents of this theory as noted by Furnish and Thrall respectively. Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 35; Thrall, 1:20–3.

90 Lambrecht, 8. Thrall provides a brief discussion of this argument proposed by various commentators. Thrall 1:29–30.

91 Lambrecht, 9; McCant, 23.


note that καρδία only occurs in 2 Cor 1–9. According to various multi-letter theories,
2 Cor 1–9 is usually considered to be a separate letter.\textsuperscript{95} On the other hand, for those
who consider the epistle a single letter, the topics discussed in 1–9 are distinctively
different from those in 10–13.\textsuperscript{96} Thus, this analysis focuses on the thematic meaning
of καρδία in 2 Cor 1–9, treating this section as a separate discourse. The following
part examines the discourse structure of 2 Cor 1–9, its semantic units, its coherence,
and then the thematic meaning of καρδία.

5.2.1.2 Discourse Markers

Two discourse markers are helpful in identifying the major semantic units in 2 Cor 1–
9: formulas and lexical cohesion.

5.2.1.2.1 Formulas

Two types of formulas are used in 2 Cor 1–9: formulaic praise and verb- ὑμᾶς-
ἀδελφοί. Most of these formulas demarcate a major semantic unit.

There are three formulaic praises in this discourse: Ἐλογιατός ὁ θεός (1:3);
Τῶ δὲ θεός χάρις (2:14); and Χάρις τῷ θεῷ (9:15). Each of them marks the
beginning or the end of a new topic of discussion. In 1:3 the formulaic praise marks
the beginning of the first discussion after the initial greeting. In 2:14 the formula
commences a discussion in which Paul articulates his apostolic ministry. Finally, the

\textsuperscript{95} For example, Furnish names 2 Cor 1–9 as Letter D. Furnish, \textit{II Corinthian}, xi.

\textsuperscript{96} For example, McCant divides the letter into three main parts: 1–7; 8–9; 10–13. McCant, 7.
Regarding the verb- ὑμᾶς-ἀδελφοί formula, there are two occurrences: 1:8 and 8:1. In 1:8 the formula ὃ γὰρ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγοεῖν, ἀδελφοί ⁹⁷ signifies a minor shift of the discussion: from the general suffering endured by all (1:3–7) to a more specific suffering endured by Paul (1:8–2:13). In 8:1 the formula Γνωρίζομεν δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί commences a new topic of collecting money from the Corinthians.

5.2.1.2.2 Lexical Cohesion

One particular proper name appears to be unusually frequent in 2 Cor 1–9: Τίτος. This is the most frequent proper name in the letter apart from Χριστός (see Appendix 4). This becomes obvious when its occurrences in the other Pauline epistles are examined.⁹⁸ Τίτος occurs seven times in 2 Cor 1–9.⁹⁹ The name occurs in clusters in 7:4–13, 8:6–23, and 12:28. In 7:2, Paul makes an emphatic call by using an imperative clause Χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς, and ends this segment by expressing his passion for the Corinthians (7:4). He then shifts the topic to the arrival of Τίτος (7:6),

---

⁹⁷ A similar formula also occurs in Rom 1:13; 11:25; 1 Cor 10:1; 12:1; and 1 Thess 4:13. The verb in Romans and 1 Corinthians is θέλω, the verb in 2 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians is θέλομεν.

⁹⁸ Amongst Paul’s ministry partners mentioned in the Pauline epistles (Ὑμάς, Λουκᾶς, Τίτος, and Σίλβανος), the proper name Τίτος has the highest occurrence rate in any given Pauline epistles. Τίτος occurs nine times in 2 Corinthians, seven times in 2 Cor 1–9 alone. The second highest rate is Υμάς, it only occurs three times in 1 Thessalonians. In other words, the name Τίτος occurs with unusual frequency in 2 Cor 1–9 when it is compared with the names of Paul’s companions.

⁹⁹ The occurrences of Τίτος in 2 Corinthians are as follows: 2:13; 7:6, 13, 14; 8:6, 16, 23; 12:18 (twice).
discussing the report brought by Τίτος concerning the Corinthians (7:5–16). The shift signifies a change in topic. On the other hand, the mentioning of Τίτος in Chapter 8 is related to the matter of money collection.

5.2.1.3 Semantic Units

Through the two identified discourse makers, there are four major semantic units in 2 Cor 1–9: Unit A (Paul’s ministry to the Corinthians), Unit B (Paul’s apostolic ministry), Unit C (Paul’s response to the report of Titus regarding the Corinthians), and Unit D (Money collection from the Corinthians).

Table 5.6 Semantic Units of 2 Cor 1–9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Units</td>
<td>A1 1:3–7</td>
<td>A2 1:8–2:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Markers</td>
<td>Εὐλογητός ὁ πατήρ (1:3)</td>
<td>Οὐ γὰρ θέλομεν ἤμας ἄγοιν, ἀδελφοί (1:8)</td>
<td>Τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις (2:14)</td>
<td>Γνωρίζομεν δὲ ἤμιν, ἀδελφοί (8:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI: Formulas</td>
<td>Letter-opening (1:1–2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Τίτος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI: Lexical Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Χάρις τῷ θεῷ (9:15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Topic</td>
<td>Paul’s ministry to the Corinthians</td>
<td>Paul’s apostolic ministry</td>
<td>Paul’s response to the report of Titus regarding the Corinthians</td>
<td>Money collection from the Corinthians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 The theory that considers 7:5–16 as a separate letter is problematic due to the following reasons. First, Καὶ γὰρ in 7:5 is a transitional conjunction that refers back to its antecedent. In addition, there is a pattern of lexical cohesion displayed by παρακαλέω (7:6, 7, 13), which is accompanied by occurrences of παρακαλέω (7:6, 7, 13). The theme of consolation is repeated, and is extended from 7:4 to 7:5–16. Hence, 7:5–16 is connected with the previous part instead of being an independent letter. DeSilva opposes the theory of 2 Cor 1–7 being a compilation of multiple letters, and provides a detailed account regarding its integrity by investigating the common vocabularies shared within 1–7. David A. DeSilva, The Credential of an Apostle: Paul’s Gospel in 2 Corinthians 1–7 (Bibal Monograph Series 4; N. Richland Hills; TX: Bibel, 1998), 3–6.
Table 5.7 compares the outline of this study and those suggested by other scholars.

Table 5.7 Outline of 2 Cor 1–9 by Scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td>Lambrecht</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witherinton</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrall</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Matera</td>
<td>Matera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matera</td>
<td>Lambrecht</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Thall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambrecht</td>
<td>Thrall</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Matera</td>
<td>Witherington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Matera</td>
<td>Witherington</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td>Roetzel</td>
<td>DeSilva</td>
<td>Witherington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed segmentation of this study is basically similar to the divisions proposed by various scholars. The following part examines the discourse coherence and macrostructure of 2 Cor 1–9 based on the identified major semantic units.

101 Barrett, Second Corinthians, 51–2; Bruce, Corinthians, 175–6; DeSilva, Credentials, vii; Furnish, II Corinthian, xi–xii; Harris, ix–xi; Hughes, vii–viii; Lambrecht, v–vi; Martin, 2 Corinthians, xxxvii–xxxviii; Matera, Corinthians, vii–viii; McCant, 7; Plummer, II Corinthian, xx–xxi; Thrall, 1:xiii–xiv, 2:ix–x; Watson, Second Corinthians, vii–viii; Witherington, Corinthians, viii–ix.

102 The scholars shown in this column commonly consider 2:13 as the end of a major division. However, they disagree on the key divisions of 1:1–2:13. The major divisions identified by various scholars are as follows: Bruce (1:1–2:13); Witherington (1:3–7 and 1:8–2:16); Thrall and Matera (1:1–11 and 1:12–2:13); Lambrecht and Barrett (1:3–11 and 1:12–23); Martin (1:3–11, 1:12–14, and 1:15–2:13); Barnett (1:1–11 and 1:12–2:13).

103 For Bruce, 2:14–7:1 and 7:2–16 are two major segments. For Roetzel, 2:14–7:4 is a separate letter.

104 For Witherington, Bruce, and Martin, this segment begins in 7:2 instead of 7:5. According to DeSilva, this segment commences in 7:4.
5.2.1.4 Discourse Coherence

Two forms of prominence, thematic prominence and lexical cohesion, are helpful in ascertaining the coherent message of 2 Cor 1–9. This examination will show that the letter has a relational focus, emphasizing the relationship between Paul and the Corinthian community.

5.2.1.4.1 Thematic prominence

Paul’s relationship with the Corinthians is a prominent theme conveyed in all three semantic units of 2 Cor 1–9.

In Unit A, Paul argues that he is sincere and has a pure motive towards the Corinthians. This is well illustrated by 1:12, in which Paul states: ὅτι ἐν ἀπλότητι καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν κόσμῳ, περισσοτέρως δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

In Unit B, Paul declares that his God-given ministry of reconciliation is for ministering to the Corinthians. As stated in 5:18–20, Paul receives from God τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς, and urges the Corinthians: δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ.

Unit C focuses on Paul’s response to Titus’ report concerning the Corinthians. The relational tone between Paul and the Corinthians is displayed by various expressions, including: εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ (7:8); νῦν χαίρω ... ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν (7:9); and εἰ τι αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κεκαύχημαι (7:14).

In Unit D, Paul requests the Corinthians to partake in monetary contribution, by appealing to them instead of commanding them (Ὅνοι κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν λέγω, in 8:8). He also expresses his affection for them (ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀγάπη, in 8:7) and his
boasting of them (τὴν προθυμίαν ὑμῶν ἦν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καυχῶμαι Μακεδόνιν, in 9:2).

5.2.1.4.2 Lexical Cohesion

There are two patterns of lexical cohesion in 2 Cor 1–9. Both demonstrate the relationship between Paul and the Corinthian community.

The first pattern is the repetition of διακονία. The word διακονία occurs 18 times in the Pauline epistles, and 11 of them occur in 2 Cor 1–9.\(^{105}\) In Chapters 1–7, the word portrays Paul’s ministry, such as ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος (3:8) and τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλαγῆς (5:18). The word reflects Paul’s emphasis on his apostolic ministry to the Corinthians. In 2 Cor 8–9, διακονία pinpoints the ministry of monetary contribution to other Christian communities (8:4; 9:1, 12–13), since Paul encourages the Corinthians to participate in this ministry. The word highlights the relationship between the apostle and the Corinthians.

The second pattern is the repetition of καυχάμαι and its cognates, καύχησις and καύχημα. These three words, which belong to the same lexical set, occur ten times when combined together.\(^{106}\) καύχησις is first introduced in 1:12, expressing Paul’s boasting of his pure conscience towards the Corinthians. These words are employed in the context in which the relationship between the apostle and the Corinthians is highlighted. For example, Paul invites the Corinthians to boast about

---

\(^{105}\) The occurrences of διακονία in 2 Cor 1–9 are as follows: 3:7, 8, 9 (twice); 4:1; 5:18; 6:3; 8:4; 9:1, 12, 13.

\(^{106}\) The occurrences of καυχάμαι in 2 Cor 1–9 are as follows: 5:12; 7:14; 9:2. The occurrences of καύχησις are as follows: 1:12; 7:4, 14; 8:24. The occurrences of καύχημα are as follows: 1:14; 5:12; 9:3.
him (5:12), and Paul boasts about the Corinthians (7:14, 9:2).

The third pattern is the repetition of χάρις. The word occurs 17 times in 2 Cor 1–9. The distribution of χάρις, however, demonstrates an unusual pattern as the word congregates in Chapters 8–9, with ten occurrences clustered in these two chapters. The word is related to the discussion of the collection.

5.2.1.5 Macrostructure

Based on the above findings, the macrostructure of 2 Cor 1–9 focuses on Paul’s relationship with the Corinthians, and can be explained as follows. Paul defends his apostolic ministry towards the Corinthians. He first makes known his pure motives towards them (Unit A) before laying out his apostolic ministry among them (Units B and C), a ministry of reconciliation given to him as Christ’s ambassador. The discourse then proceeds to a seemingly disjunctive segment in Unit D. Nonetheless, the topic of monetary contribution (Unit D) is expressed by alluding to his apostolic authority illustrated by the phrase, Οὐκ ἄντε κατ’ ἐπὶ τὰ γῆν λέγω (8:8a).

5.2.2 Καρδία in 2 Cor 1–9

Καρδία occurs 11 times in 2 Corinthians, with all occurrences in Chapters 1–9 as shown in the following figure. See 2 Cor 1:2, 12, 15; 2:14; 4:15; 6:1; 8:1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 16, 19; 9:8, 14, 15. The occurrences of χάρις are the second most frequent among the authentic Pauline epistles. The word occurs 24 times and ten times in Romans and 1 Corinthians respectively.

The occurrences of καρδία are as follows: 1:22; 2:4; 3:2, 3, 15; 4:6; 5:12; 6:11; 7:3; 8:16; 9:7.
Figure 5.9 The Occurrences of Καρδία in 2 Corinthians

Figure 5.10 shows the occurrences of καρδία in 2 Cor 1–9.

Figure 5.10 The Occurrences of Καρδία in 2 Cor 1–9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δοξα την ἄραμβανα του πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν (1:22)</td>
<td>ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν ἔμεις ἔστε, ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν (3:2)</td>
<td>ἐστε ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ ... ἐγγεγραμμένη ... ἐν πλαξίν καρδίαις σαρκίσεως (3:3)</td>
<td>ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ Τίτου (8:16)</td>
<td>προφητεύει τῇ καρδίᾳ (9:7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκ ... συνοχής καρδίαις ἔγραφα ἰμάτι (2:4)</td>
<td>ἀναγνώσκει· Ἑλληνική κάλλιμα ἐπὶ τῆ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν κέται (3:15)</td>
<td>ὁ θεός ... ὃς ἐλαμάθει ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν (4:6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοὺς ἐν προσώπῳ καυχώμενος καὶ μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ (5:12)</td>
<td>πρὸς ἵματι ... ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλατυνότα (6:11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἔστε (7:3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Paul’s ministry to the Corinthians</th>
<th>Paul’s apostolic ministry</th>
<th>Paul’s response to Titus’ report of the Corinthians</th>
<th>Money collection from the Corinthians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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5.2.2.1 *Karóía* in Semantic Units

To ascertain the thematic meaning of *karóía*, it is essential to understand the term by recognizing its occurrence as a *pattern* across different semantic units. In 2 Cor 1–9, *karóía* occurs in Units A, B, and D. The following analysis will show that its thematic meaning points to the corporate and communal aspect.

5.2.2.1.1 *Karóía* in Unit A

*Karóía* occurs twice in Unit A (1:22; 2:4). In 1:22, τὸν ἀρραβώνα τοῦ πνεύματος is to be given ἐν ταῖς καρδιάίς ἡμῶν. The genitive noun τοῦ πνεύματος is epexegetical, which is appositional to τὸν ἀρραβώνα. The Holy Spirit is the pledge. The phrase is conjoined by καί to another phrase: ὁ καί σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς. The act of sealing is commonly perceived as corresponding with the giving of the Holy Spirit as a pledge. *Karóía* can either denote the inner person or is a synonym of ἡμᾶς. The genitive construct ταῖς καρδιάίς ἡμῶν is a normal plural construct,

---

109 Various scholars attempt to identify the meaning of ἀρραβών. For example, Kwon discusses whether the connotation is figurative or literal (see the discussion of Kwon). Yon-Gyong Kwon, “Ἀρραβών as Pledge in Second Corinthians,” *NTS* 54 (2008): 526–9.

110 Ἀρραβών is frequently interpreted by considering another word σφραγίζω, since both words are commercial terms (Harris, 207; Martin, 2 Corinthians, 28; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 137; Barrett, *Second Corinthians*, 79–80). The analysis of the passage usually considers the occurrence of all four participles: ἐκβαίνω, χρίσας, σφραγισάμενος, and δοτός. ἐκβαίνω and σφραγίζω are compared and analysed. However, this study does not intend to investigate the participles, and only focuses on the two commercial terms that are joined by καί.

111 Furnish argues that ταῖς καρδιάῖς ἡμῶν is synonymous with ἡμᾶς, by referring to the same phrase found in Rom 5:5, ἡ ἁγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδιάῖς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δωθέντος ἡμῖν. Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 138. Conversely, Harris quotes BDAG and *TDNT*, and argues that *karóía* refers to the “indwelling-place of heavenly powers and beings” and the “centre in man to which God returns.” Harris, 208.
highlighting the individual hearts of the Corinthians.\footnote{There is no evidence in the context suggesting that \textit{kardia} denotes emotion, reason, and volition.} Regardless whether \textit{kardia} means the inner self or is synonymous with \textit{ymaz}, the important point is that the use of the plural pronoun \textit{ymow} emphasises the relational aspect, namely Paul and the Corinthian community that receives the Holy Spirit.\footnote{Both Barnett and Thrall point out its communal aspect. Barnett argues that this phrase is understood as the Holy Spirit dwelling within us “as individuals, and as congregation.” Barnett, 113. Thrall contends that the anointing described in 1:21–22 points to “the messianic community destined to reign with Christ.” Thrall, 1:158.}

In 2:4, Paul employs \textit{kardia} to describe his emotion. Paul informs the Corinthians that he writes this letter out of \textit{polllis thlizeous kai sinoxhis kardias ... dia pollou dakryov, oux iwa luptethe alla tihn agapin}. \textit{Kardia} is associated with or directly modified by \textit{sinoxhi}, \textit{dakryov}, \textit{luptew}, and \textit{agapin}, words depicting emotion. \textit{Kardia} is qualified by both \textit{thlizeous} and \textit{sinoxhis}. Both genitives link to the preposition \textit{ek}, portraying Paul’s emotion.\footnote{Martin concludes that this verse concerns the “inner life” of Paul who opens up to the Corinthians. Martin, 2 Corinthians, 36. However, this study agrees with Harris that 2:4 articulates the personal emotions that motivate Paul to write to the Corinthians. Harris, 221.} Nonetheless, the emotion portrayed by \textit{kardia} is directly associated with the love of Paul for the Corinthians. In other words, in this context, \textit{kardia} is employed in highlighting the relationship between Paul and the Corinthian community.\footnote{Thrall argues that this relationship reflects a “parental concern grounded in love.” Thrall, 1:170. Roetzel considers the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians as “a family.” Roetzel, 135. For Lambrecht, Paul places “extreme emphasis on “love”” in the context. Lambrecht, 31.}

5.2.2.1.2 \textit{Kardia} in Unit B

In 2 Cor 1–9, the occurrences of \textit{kardia} are concentrated in Unit B, with the term
appearing six times in this unit alone. Many of its occurrences occur in the context in which the contrast between the old covenant and the new covenant is underlined. In this unit, Paul defends his apostolicity against his opponents, and asserts his apostolic ministry to the Corinthian community. There is an on-going attempt in scholarship to identify the opponents. Although this analysis may shed light on the nature of the opponents, it is not the primary task to provide an exact identification. As explained below, the overall occurrences of καρδία in this unit carry a strong corporate reference.

καρδία first occurs twice in 3:2–3. The context is related to the comparison between the old covenant and the new covenant. Moses is the minister of the old covenant (3:7), and Paul is the minister of the new (3:8). In 3:2, Paul states that the community is his letter: ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν. He reiterates this idea by asserting that the community is Christ’s letter: ἐγγεγραμμένη ... ἐν πλαξίν καρδίαις σαρκίναις, in contrast to ἐν πλαξίν λιθίναις (3:3). The theme “stone” is

116 As previously mentioned, some scholars perceive 2:14–7:4 as a separate letter. There has been an attempt to reconstruct the historical setting of 2:14–7:4 in order to identify Paul’s opponents. For example, Jewett develops the view of G. Friedrich, identifying the opponents as the “divine-man-missionaries.” His argument is based on the criticism of F. C. Baur’s “Judaizers” and D. Georgi’s “Pneumatic Teachers.” Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 27–31. Jewett executes this reconstruction by applying mirror-reading. Sumney criticises this method, and develops a new method to analyse 2 Corinthians. Jerry L. Sumney, Identifying Paul’s Opponent. The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians, (JSNTSup 40; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990), 95–112. Blanton argues that the opponents are individuals “striving to mediate the renewed covenant between God and humans.” Thomas Blanton, “Spirit and Covenant Renewal: A Theologoumenon of Paul’s Opponents in 2 Corinthians,” JBL 129 (2010): 151.

117 There is a significant textual variant in 3:2, in which ἡμῶν is the variant form of ἡμῶν. The variant ἡμῶν is supported by s, 33, 1175, 1881, and πe; with the majority of the manuscripts having ἡμῖν. Both Barrett and Thrall believe that the variant form is possibly due to the assimilation of 7:3, in which the phrase ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν occurs (Barrett, Second Corinthians, 96; Thrall, 1:223). Since Paul does not need commendation, for Barrett, the context is in favour of ἡμῶν. Scholars are divided in their opinions. Some regard ἡμῶν as a better attested reading (Furnish, Corinthians, 181; Thrall, 1:224, and Martin, Corinthians, 51). Some accept ἡμῖν as the more appropriate one (Harris, 261; Lambrecht, 41). From the preceding sentence, Paul asks a rhetorical question, asking whether he needs a recommendation letter πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἢ εἴ τις ἡμῖν. From this context, it would be more logical to argue that the Corinthians is Paul’s letter—ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν ... ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῖν.
repeated in the following verses. In 3:7, Paul explains how the old covenant received by Moses on Mount Sinai (the covenant ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντευτωμένη λίθοις) is κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κεῖται (3:15), referring to the OT texts, including Exod 34 and Jer 31:31–34. The juxtapositions between καρδία and λίθος, as well as καρδίαις σαρκίναις and λίθιναις, elucidate a deliberate contrast between “outward” and “inward.” Hence, καρδία denotes the aspect of inwardsness. καρδία in this unit, including its two occurrences in 3:2–3, may connote the mind or inner self.\(^{118}\)

Importantly, this study argues that καρδία portrays the mind of the Corinthian community. Similar to the usage of καρδία in 1:22, the community under the new covenant is compared with the Israeli community in the old covenant. The usage in 3:2–3 is not concerned with the heart of an ‘individual.’ Rather, it denotes the hearts of people who belong to the same community.

In 3:15, καρδία occurs in the context in which Paul draws on the OT text to argue his point. He refers to the event at Mount Sinai where Moses receives the old covenant from God on behalf of the ancient Israelites. The phrase τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν refers to the Israelites.\(^{119}\) This phrase is written in the abnormal singular construct, with the singular καρδία combining with the plural αὐτῶν. Regarding the


\(^{119}\) Again, many commentators do not notice the abnormal combination of a singular καρδία and a plural αὐτῶν. Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, 329; Marin, *Corinthians*, 69; Furnish, *Corinthians*, 233; Thrall, 1:267; Lambrecht, 53.
combination of καρδία and possessive pronoun, as previously mentioned, this
abnormal singular construct is extremely rare in the Pauline epistles. It must not be
automatically assumed that the distributive singular is the explanation to the abnormal
construct. Based on the context, the most natural explanation for the singular καρδία
in 3:15 is that the Israelites are regarded as having one heart, highlighting their
corporate identity and their common mindset of rebellion. Paul argues that a veil lies
over their heart, which points to their stubborn mind as a nation which disables their
ability to see the glory of the Lord (3:16–18). This corporate identity illustrated by the
singular καρδία is further exemplified by the contrast between αὐτῶν (3:15), the
Israelites, and ἡμεῖς (3:18), the Christian community. In the establishment of the old
covenant, the Israelites are treated as one nation, one entity. Therefore, the corporate
entity is highlighted by the use of a singular καρδία despite the plural αὐτῶν.

In 2 Cor 4, Paul continues to defend his apostolic ministry. The light of the
gospel is described as ἐλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς
γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (4:6). The genitive
tῆς γνώσεως is probably an epexegetical genitive. Hence, φωτισμὸν is τὴν γνώσιν
(τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ). The two phrases, ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν and ἐν προσώπῳ
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, is of interest. Although καρδία and πρόσωπον are not set in
opposition, the existence of the two words may well be set up for their later
reappearance in 5:12. The genitive possessive pronoun ἡμῶν points to the Christian
community upon which Christ’s light shines. The inwardness of καρδία is emphasised,

120 Moule argues that ἐν προσώπῳ is a translation of a Hebrew prepositional phrase, and in the
case of 2 Cor. 4:6, the phrase means “in the face (countenance) or person. Moule, *Idiom*, 184. Nguyen
argues that πρόσωπον can mean “mask,” portraying the “social authority” of Moses. Nguyen, *Christian*,
160.
as the light shines into the inner and invisible notion of humans, and importantly into the community of Christ under the ministry of Paul. 121

In 4:18, Paul concludes his argument: μή σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα. The contrast between “seen” and “unseen” is emphasised. Paul then accuses his opponents: τοῖς ἐν προσώπῳ καυχομένους καὶ μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ (5:12). The juxtaposition between outward (seen) and inward (unseen) is fully manifested in Paul’s usage of καρδία in 5:12 after developing this concept in the previous context. The concept of “seen” alludes to the old Mosaic covenant in which the external glory and credential is accentuated; and the concept of “unseen” points to the new covenant in which the Spirit operates within humans. Most importantly, the antithesis of καρδία—πρόσωπον is clearly expressed, with the word καρδία appearing in its singular form. In other words, the antithesis of the outward and inward is exemplified by the occurrence of the singular καρδία in 5:12. Behm also notes this contrast. 122 In his recent work, Nguyen argues that the interplay between πρόσωπον and καρδία is of great significance in Paul’s argument in the wider context of 2:14–7:4. As previously mentioned, he contends that the occurrences of καρδία in this segment (3:2, 3, 15; 4:6; 5:12) denote the “inward spiritual dimension of a Christian

121 Jewett argues for the polemical usage of καρδία, and suggests that the “divine-man-missionaries” only concern about the “face,” the external. Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 329. Regardless of the legitimacy of Jewett’s “divine-man-missionaries,” the polemical use of the contrast between πρόσωπον and καρδία is evident in 2 Cor 4–5. Lambrecht regards the expression ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν is equivalent to ἐν ἡμῖν in Gal 1:16. Lambrecht, 66. Although Lambrecht’s assertion appears to be sound (which may well be the case), one must not overlook the emphasis on the outward-inward juxtaposition. Contextually, the juxtaposition is so prominent that it could overshadow the suggested synonymy. Thrall ties 3:3 and 5:12 together, and argues that πρόσωπον (as attested with the old covenant) is set in contrast to καρδία (as related to the gospel in the new covenant). The association is strong and persuasive, given that Paul’s entire defence centres on his apostolicity in 2:14–7:4.

identity” as opposed to the “outward identity marked by superficial values” in the Corinthian society. This Christian identity, for Nguyen, is the social identity of the church communities. This study concurs with Nguyen; and further argues that this singular καρδία portrays this common communal identity: the Christian community in which the inward identity instead the outward appearance is of central importance. Furthermore, the recent work by Vegge indicates that 2:14–7:4 is a key part for Paul to present his argument for achieving “full reconciliation between the Corinthians and himself.” As such, the communal aspect is fully emphasised in this semantic unit, with the singular καρδία emphasising the corporate identity of the church community.

In Paul’s final plea in this semantic unit, there is a common understanding regarding the link between 6:11 and 7:3. In both verses, καρδία is related to emotion. As defending his apostolicity, Paul expresses: Τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν ἀνέφγεν πρὸς υἱὸς, Κορινθιοῖς, ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτυνται (6:11). As previously discussed, there are only three out of 21 cases in Paul’s letters in which καρδία occurs in an abnormal singular construct. ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν in 6:11 is one of the three cases. Paul expresses his affection towards the Corinthians through the clause ἡ καρδία

123 Nguyen, Christian, 1–2. Matera interprets καρδία in 5:12 as “reality” instead of “appearance.” Matera, Corinthians, 131. Lambrecht argues that καρδία denotes “honesty” instead of “insincerity.” Lambrecht, 93. Notably, Thrall suggests that Paul is responding to the opponents who are criticising him for the lacking of “Mosaic glory,” since they fail to recognise the credentials of the apostle “in the form of the community he has founded.” Thrall, 1:405. Although Thrall does not directly define καρδία as pointing to the church community, his explanation does carry this allusion.


126 Furnish, Corinthians, 360; Martin, 2 Corinthians, 219; Thrall, 1:484; Lambrecht, 119; Barrett, Second Corinthians, 204.
The word σπλάγχνον portrays affection and love.127 There is a close association between σπλάγχνον and καρδία. Thus, the affection demonstrated by the word σπλάγχνον reveals the emphasis on emotion underlined by καρδία.

Regarding ἡμῶν, the plural pronoun does not necessarily denote a plural reality because Paul may use the epistolary plural. Paul depicts his own heart rather than a group of people as connoted by ἡμῶν.128 6:11 is located in 2:14–7:4, a segment in which Paul defends his apostolic ministry among the Corinthians. Paul appeals to the Corinthians by expressing his affection towards them.129 Hence, ἡμῶν logically refers to Paul—his heart is wide open to the Corinthians as he emphatically addresses them as Ἐφεζούς in the same verse.130 Hence, it is reasonable to conclude that καρδία in 6:11 is not a distributive singular. Rather, it refers to the heart of Paul alone.

127 BDAG, 763.
128 Blass and Debrunner call it the “literary plural,” a widespread usage amongst contemporary Greek authors. BDF, 146–7. However, Robertson argues that this kind of editorial plural is not common in the Pauline epistles, since Paul sometimes associates himself with others in addressing to an audience. Robertson, Grammar, 677–8. Moule is cautious about the epistolary plural as he states that it is not as common as some claim, and each passage must be examined individually. Moule, Idiom, 118. Wallace distinguishes the two terms, epistolary plural and literary plural, and argues that latter is a better terminology. Wallace, Grammar, 394.
129 Although Paul includes Timothy at the beginning of the epistles (Παῦλος ... καὶ Τιμόθεος, in 1:1), the ἡμῶν in 6:11 does not automatically include Timothy who is not the key character in this segment.
130 This is the only occasion in 2 Corinthians on which they are called.
This view is also common held by various commentators, with ἡμῶν considered as an epistolary plural. Nonetheless, it is more important to note that καρδία portrays the communal relationship between Paul and the Corinthians in this context. The word does not simply connote emotion. Rather, it is used to describe the relationship between Paul and the community. The invitation to this relational reconciliation is accentuated by the use of the vocative Κορίνθιοι.

In 7:3, Paul continues his argument by disclosing to the Corinthians that they are ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἔστε εἰς τὸ συναποθανεῖν καὶ συζήν. The connotation of καρδία as inward affection is evident. καρδία, in both 6:11 and 7:3, is linked to emotion. Similar to 6:11, καρδία in this context highlights the communal relationship between the apostle and the Corinthian community.

In summary, the overall occurrences of καρδία in this semantic unit point to the community, instead of individual, under the new covenant. This coherent usage of καρδία is extended from its usage in Unit A, 1:22 in particular, in which the phrase τὸν ἄρραβωνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν denotes the work of God in a

131 Harris, Martin, Thrall, Barrett, Lambrecht, Matera, McCant, Witherington, Plummer, Hughes, Keener, Roetzel, and Barnett consider the phrase ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν as the portrayal of Paul alone, although they do not define the plural pronoun as an epistolary plural. Harris, 488–9; Martin, 2 Corinthians, 185–6; Thrall, 1:468–9; Barrett, Second Corinthians, 191; Lambrecht, 120; Matera, Corinthians, 161; DeSilva, Credentials, 32; McCant, 61; Witherington, Corinthians, 400; Plummer, 203; Hughes, 239; Keener, 191; Roetzel, 87; Barnett, 335. Apart from commentators, Kijne also considers that the first person plural pronoun in 2 Cor 6:10–12 depicts Paul himself. J. J. Kijne, “We, Us and Our in I and II Corinthians,” NovT 8 (1966): 174.

132 Without specifying 6:11, Verhoef argues that an epistolary plural can explain some of the occurrences of the plural pronoun in 2 Corinthians, but he contends that each occurrence must be judged individually based on the context. Eduard Verhoef, “The Senders of the Letters to the Corinthians and the Use of “I” and “We”,” in The Corinthian Correspondence (ed. R. Bieringer, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 125; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), 423.
new dispensation. The comparison between the old dispensation and the new dispensation illustrated by the occurrences of \( \kappa \alpha \delta \iota \alpha \) in 2 Cor 3–4, combined with the antithesis of \( \kappa \alpha \delta \iota \alpha - \pi \rho \sigma \omega \pi \omicron \) in 5:12, dominates Unit B. Therefore, the thematic meaning of \( \kappa \alpha \delta \iota \alpha \) elucidates a community that operates under the new dispensation. As such, the cry of Paul in 6:11 should not be merely regarded as his emotional cry to the Corinthians, as if the apostle craves their acceptance. Rather, \( \kappa \alpha \delta \iota \alpha \) is employed to convey a subtle message: the Corinthian community, which is a corporate entity under the new dispensation, should accept Paul’s apostolic ministry. This ministry of reconciliation is ordained by God and operated under the new covenant. Accordingly, the corporate identity is the thematic meaning carried by \( \kappa \alpha \delta \iota \alpha \) in Unit B.

5.2.2.1.3 \( \kappa \alpha \delta \iota \alpha \) in Unit D

In Unit D, Paul commences a new discussion, focusing on the collection. In this semantic unit, \( \kappa \alpha \delta \iota \alpha \) only occurs twice: 8:16 and 9:7.

The phrase \( \tau \eta \ \kappa \alpha \delta \iota \alpha \ \Theta \iota \tau \omicron \) (8:16) conveys the zeal (\( \sigma \pi \omicron \upsilon \delta \iota \) \( \omicron \)) of Titus, the same \( \sigma \pi \omicron \upsilon \delta \iota \) shared by Paul. \( \sigma \pi \omicron \upsilon \delta \iota \) occurs five times in this epistle. Three of them occur in 2 Cor 8, depicting the zeal of the Corinthians (8:7), the zeal of others (possibly the Macedonians in 8:8), and the zeal of Titus (8:16). \( \Sigma \pi \omicron \upsilon \delta \iota \) in this unit probably connotes the eagerness and the zeal, with reference to a relationship. Thus,

133 \( \sigma \pi \omicron \upsilon \delta \iota \) also occurs in 7:11–12, in which Paul praises the Corinthians for their \( \sigma \pi \omicron \upsilon \delta \iota \) in response to his confrontation. It may not be a coincidence for Paul to reiterate \( \sigma \pi \omicron \upsilon \delta \iota \) in Chapter 8 for rhetorical reasons, urging the Corinthians to contribute to the offering for those who are in need in Jerusalem.

134 The word is used in contemporary Greek literature to denote a civil or a religious responsibility, as well as personal devotion to other’s welfare. BDAG, 763.
the word exemplifies an underlying notion of both emotion and volition. The use of καρδία in this verse concerns the relationship between Titus and the Corinthians. More importantly, Paul uses the phrase τὴν αὐτὴν σπουδὴν to suggest that he shares the same zeal. This indirectly elucidates Paul relational zeal for the Corinthians. A relational aspect is highlighted by the use of καρδία in this context.

In 9:7, Paul reminds the Corinthians that they should προήρηται τῇ καρδίᾳ, μὴ ἐκ λύπης ἢ ἔξ ἀνάγκης. The dative of καρδία serves as an indirect object of the verb προαιρέω, a word carrying a sense of volition. Paul informs the Corinthians to make their own decision. He elaborates that the decision must be μὴ ἐκ λύπης ἢ ἔξ ἀνάγκης (9:7b). Syntactically, the sentence can be rendered as προήρηται τῇ καρδίᾳ, μὴ (προήρηται) ἐκ λύπης ἢ ἔξ ἀνάγκης. The emotional notion connoted by λύπη and ἀνάγκη is in parallel with καρδία. καρδία is certainly connected with an infinitive that denotes volition, but it can also be regarded as in parallel with the two

135 However, Betz interprets σπουδή as speediness and efficiency. Betz, Corinthians, 58; BDAG, 763. Betz argues that σπουδή is found in many administrative letters in the Greco–Roman era. Hence, σπουδή in 8:16 refers to Paul’s authorisation and commendation of Titus as an efficient administrator of the envoys of the church, overseeing the collection and delivery of the offering to the designated group. Betz, Corinthians, 70. However, the previous mentioning of σπουδή in Chapter 7 probably negates his definition. Σπουδή in Chapter 7 reflects the emotional state of both Paul and the Corinthians, and has nothing to do with administration. Thrall also argues against Betz’s view for a similar reason—σπουδή has been used in 8:7, 8 where the word does not refer to Titus but the Corinthians and the Macedonians. Thrall, 2:545.

136 The reference of “τὴν αὐτὴν σπουδὴν” is not explicit in the sentence. According to Thrall, it can refer to the Macedonians, Paul, or even the Corinthians themselves. However, the wider context suggests that it probably refers to Paul. Thrall, 2:544–5. Many commentators argue that the phrase refers to Paul. Martin, Corinthians, 273; Barrett, Second Corinthians, 227; Plummer, 247; Roetzel, 50; Furnish, Corinthians 421; Harris, 595; Barnett, 418. However, Matera asserts that it is a God-given zeal, without referring to Paul or the Macedonians. Matera, Corinthians, 196. Lambrecht is indecisive in determining what the phrase refers to. Lambrecht, 139.

137 Harris notes the commonality of all three words: καρδία, λύπη, and ἀνάγκη. Harris, 635. Thrall argues for the parallel between 2 Cor 9:7 and Deut 15:10 (LXX), the phrase ὁ λαυτηθησάς τῇ καρδίᾳ is found in both texts. Thrall’s argument further confirms that καρδία is in 9:7 is related to emotion. Thrall, 2:576. Bruce regards καρδία as pointing to the mind, but he does not provide sufficient evidence to support his view. Bruce, Corinthians, 227.
nouns that represent emotion. In either case, the association between \( \kappa \rho \delta \iota \alpha \) and volition or emotion is obvious. Nonetheless, the use of the singular \( \kappa \rho \delta \iota \alpha \) is intriguing. The singular \( \kappa \rho \delta \iota \alpha \) is clearly employed to point to the heart of the Corinthians. The singular form points to the single heart, single mind or common emotion, of the Corinthian community. In other words, the corporate unity is noticeably carried by the \( \kappa \rho \delta \iota \alpha \) in 9:7.

5.2.2.2 Sociolinguistic Aspect

Paul calls himself \( \alpha \pi \sigma \tau o\lambda \varsigma \chi r\iota \sigma\tau\omicron \omega \ 'I\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon \) at the beginning of the epistle, and he defends his apostolic ministry in 2 Cor 1–9.\(^{138}\) However, his utterance in 6:13 is particularly intriguing. Paul affirms his parental love to the Corinthians: \( \omega \varsigma \tau \epsilon \kappa \nu o\varsigma \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega \). In other words, he appeals to them like a loving parent to his children instead of affirming his apostolic authority among the Corinthians.\(^{139}\) As such, relational reconciliation is the key theme in 2 Cor 1–9. As much as Paul attempts to defend his apostolicity, he desires to strengthen a relational bond with the Corinthians by using the language of a family.

5.2.3 Thematic Meaning of \( \kappa \rho \delta \iota \alpha \)

As indicated by the analysis of 2 Cor 1–9 thus far, the overall occurrences of \( \kappa \rho \delta \iota \alpha \) in all the major semantic units show a strong corporate reference. In Unit A, \( \kappa \rho \delta \iota \alpha \) is

\(^{138}\) For a discussion of the sociolinguistic aspect associated with the use of \( \alpha \pi \sigma \tau o\lambda \varsigma \), see pages 153–4 in Chapter 3.

\(^{139}\) For a discussion of the sociolinguistic implication of the parent-child language, see pages 154–5 in Chapter 3.
used to depict the corporate identity of the Corinthian community (1:22) and the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians (2:4). In Unit B, the occurrences of καρδία (in 2 Cor 3–7), including the καρδία—πρόσωπον antithesis, highlight the Christian identity of the Corinthian community under a new dispensation in which Paul is its minister. In Unit D, καρδία indirectly highlights the relationship between Paul and the community (8:16) and the corporate unity of the community (9:7). Furthermore, through studying the discourse structure, the macrostructure of 2 Cor 1–9 centres on Paul’s relationship with the Corinthians. In particular, the discourse concerns the defence of his apostolic ministry among the Corinthians community. This is further confirmed by a brief review of the sociolinguistic aspect, since the parent-children relationship is portrayed in the letter. In conclusion, the thematic meaning of καρδία in 2 Cor 1–9 carries a relational and corporate connotation.

### 5.2.3.1 The Flow of Discourse and Peak

The discourse peak is usually located near the end of a discourse, showing a shift in the proportion of use of one or more particular grammatical device (including an increase in parallelism or tautologies) to highlight the climax. In Unit C, there is an influx of words that portray emotions, including nouns (φόβος, in 7:5, 11, 15; ἐπιπόθησις, in 7:7, 11; ὀφρυμός, in 7:7; ζῆλος, in 7:7, 11, λύπη, in 7:10; σπουδή, in 7:11, 12; χαρά, in 7:3, 13; σπλάγχνον, in 7:15; τρόμος, in 7:15;) and verbs (χαίρω, in 7:7, 9, 16; λυπέω, in 7:8 (twice), 9 (trice), 11; μεταμελομαι, in 7:8; θαρρω, in 7:16). As shown above, some of these words are repeated in this semantic unit. Although Unit C is related to the Corinthians’ response to Paul’s earlier letter, the influx of words, with some appearing in parallel, shows that this is the climax of 2 Cor 1–9.
unit begins with the portrayal of Paul’s φόβος (7:4), but ends with the depiction of his joy (χαίρω ὅτι ἐν πάντι θαρρῶ ἐν ὑμῖν 7:16). Paul affectionately calls for a relational reconciliation between him and the community in the peak episode. Figure 5.11 shows the flow of discourse of 2 Cor 1–9.

Figure 5.11 The Flow of Discourse of 2 Cor 1–9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aperture</th>
<th>Stage (A1)</th>
<th>Various Developing Episodes (A2–B)</th>
<th>Peak (D)</th>
<th>Post-peak (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recurrent themes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 1: καυχάμαι, καύχημα, καύχησις</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 2: διακοινα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:8 ἡ διακοινα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τοῦ πνεύματος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:18 τῆς διακοινα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>καταλλαγής</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:3 μὴ μομηθῇ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἡ διακοινα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:12 Ἡ γὰρ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>καύχησις</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:12 καυχῆματος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:14 ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>κεκαύχημαι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:1 τῆς διακοινα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἄγιους</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Influx of words relating to emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:2 ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>καυχώμαι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ––––: Development of prominent themes

5.2.4 Summary

The sentence meaning of various occurrences of καρδία in 2 Cor 1–9 denotes mind, the seat of emotion and volition, or the inner person. Nonetheless, the thematic
meaning of the term denotes the corporate entity of the Corinthians, and the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians. Of interest, Paul defends his apostleship, and uses καρδία in the καρδία—πρόσωπον antithesis to highlight the corporate identity of the Corinthians under a new dispensation in which Paul is its minister ordained by God.

5.3 Καρδία in Other Pauline Epistles

Although Romans and 2 Corinthians are the focus in this chapter, a brief analysis of καρδία in other Pauline epistles is also provided. The word occurs one time in both 1 Thessalonians and Galatians, twice in Philippians, and four times in 1 Corinthians. Given that καρδία in Philippians has already been discussed, its occurrences in other epistles will be addressed.

5.3.1 Καρδία in 1 Corinthians

Καρδία occurs in 1 Cor 4:5; 7:37 (twice); 14:25. As explained below, there is no evidence that the term carries any communal or corporate connotation.

The first occurrence is located in Unit A that discusses church division. In 4:5, Paul urges the Corinthians to refrain from being judgmental, by teaching them that the Lord φωτίσει τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους καὶ φανερώσει τὰς βουλὰς τῶν καρδιῶν. The word βουλή means intention or decision. Of interest, the metaphor

---

140 The occurrences of καρδία are as follows: 1 Thess 2:4; Gal 4:6; Phil 1:7; 4:7; 1 Cor 4:5, 7:37 (twice); 14:25.

141 For an explanation of discourse structure, including the major semantic units in 1 Corinthians, refer to Chapter 3.
of light shining into σκότος is employed. It is logical to deduce that καρδία illustrates the “inner” notion of a human. In other words, although there is an association between καρδία and intention, the phrase τὰς βουλὰς τῶν καρδιῶν can simply be rendered as “inner thoughts” of humans. There is no particular communal or corporate reference connoted by καρδία here.

In discussing marriage, in Unit C, Paul uses καρδία twice in 7:37, possibly alluding to mind and decision. Words like θέλημα and κρίνω show that the passage is related to decision and will. καρδία is strongly associated with violation, if not directly connotes this, as Paul informs the concerning party to make their own decision. Nonetheless, καρδία does not have any communal or corporate connotation.

In Unit G, Paul discusses different spiritual gifts operating in a Christian community. Paul reiterates the same idea in 14:25 by saying that τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται. Although καρδία is not overtly related to any words that depict emotion or volition, based on the striking parallel between 14:25 and 4:5, this study argues that καρδία points to the “inner” aspect of a human. It is reasonable to conjecture that κρύπτη may denote “thoughts and intention” as suggested in 4:5. In this context, καρδία depicts the heart of an unbeliever who visits the community. Hence, the term is used in describing an individual instead of a community.

---

142 Fee interprets the phrase as the “inner recesses of one’s own thoughts.” Barrett renders it as “inward thought.” Fee, Corinthians, 164; Barrett, First Corinthians, 103.

143 Both Barrett and Fee interpret καρδία in 7:37 as “mind.” Barrett, First Corinthians, 184; Fee, Corinthians, 353.
In summary, all of the occurrences of καρδία in 1 Corinthians do not connote any corporate and relational reference. As shown in the discourse analysis of 1 Corinthians in Chapter 3, corporate unity is the focus of the epistle and is vividly highlighted by the occurrences of σῶμα. The brief analysis of καρδία seems to indicate that Paul uses σῶμα instead of καρδία to highlight the social and corporate reference in 1 Corinthians.

5.3.2 Καρδία in 1 Thessalonians

Καρδία occurs three times in 1 Thessalonians (2:4, 2:17, and 3:13). All of the three occurrences occur in Unit A. 144 In this unit, Paul encourages the Thessalonians to stand firm in their faith as they are waiting for the Lord’s coming.

Καρδία first appears in 2:4. 145 In this context, Paul recollects his suffering during his time in Philippi (2:2). He denies that his ministry is out of a pure motive (2:2), since he has been approved by God. The word δοκιμάζω appears twice in 2:4, as a perfect indicative verb (δεδοκιμάσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ), and as a present participle with an adjectival function to portray the character of God (θεῶ τῷ δοκιμάζοντι).

144 The discourse structure of 1 Thessalonians will be presented in Chapter 6. For detailed account of various semantic units, see pages 284–6 in Chapter 6.

145 Marshall argues that the meaning of καρδία is derived from the Hebraic understanding, and thus the term should be understood as “the centre of the personality, the seat of thinking, feeling and willing,” and he suggests that καρδία is the inner motive in 2:4 and inner character in 3:13. Marshall, Thessalonians, 65, 85, 101. Williams adopts the all-in-one definition, καρδία is the “comprehensive self with emotion, volition and ration.” Williams, Thessalonians, 39, 55, & 67. Witherington adopts the same approach, and defines καρδία as “the seat of thought, feeling, and will.” Witherington, Thessalonians, 79. These scholars seem to adopt a diachronic approach in their interpretation of καρδία. They draw on the so-called OT equivalent of καρδία, and then apply the definition universally for all the occurrences of καρδία without considering its context. This is a flawed approach as discussed in Chapter 2. Other scholars seem to consider the meaning of καρδία as the same in all three occurrences. Richard, 80; Morris, Thessalonians, 64. Again, their lack of examining the context is problematic.
Hence, καρδία probably points to Paul’s mind (with a pure motive), which has been examined and approved by God. The word καρδία does not denote a communal aspect, and instead is used to indicate the heart of Paul.

In 2:17, καρδία is an antithesis of καρδία—πρόσωπον. Despite his desire to visit the Thessalonians in person, Paul is unable to do so. Paul emphasises that he is not separated from them in καρδία. Based on the context, the term illustrates the relationship between Paul and the Thessalonians, pointing to a shared emotional bond.¹⁴⁷

The last occurrence of καρδία occurs in 3:13. 3:11–13 is a benediction.¹⁴⁸ 3:13 depicts Paul’s benediction for the Thessalonians: εἰς τὸ στηρίζει τῷ καρδίας ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἁγιωσύνῃ ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ. The phrase ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας is synonymous with ὑμᾶς,¹⁴⁹ emphasizing the inwardness of the inner being strengthened by God. Καρδία occurs in its plural form, combined with the plural ὑμῶν. Unlike the case of a singular καρδία combined with ὑμᾶς, which elucidates the connotation of corporate entity or corporate unity, the plural καρδία does not directly carry a corporate reference. However, based on the context of this benediction, Paul

---

¹⁴⁶ Fee observes the parallel between 1 Thess 2:4 and Jer 11:20 (LXX), in both cases the plural form of καρδία is linked with δοκιμάζω. Then, he argues that καρδία is “the centre and source of the whole inner life.” Fee, Thessalonians, 62. Frame also suggests a similar parallel, by indicating the parallel between 1 Thess 2:4 and Ps 16:3. Frame, 97.

¹⁴⁷ Jones defines καρδία in 2:17 as equivalent to the mind. Jones, Thessalonians, 35.

¹⁴⁸ A detailed analysis of 3:11–13, and explanation of its connection with and 5:23, will be presented in Chapter 6.

¹⁴⁹ Morris argues that καρδία means the “whole inner life.” Bruce renders it as the “inner motives.” Both of them repudiate any nuance of emotion in the word. Morris, Thessalonians, 110; Bruce, Thessalonians, 72. Richard considers ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας as a substitution of ὑμᾶς, with an emphasis on the inner being of a human. This view is adopted by this study. Richard, 166.
articulates 3:13 to a Christian community instead of an individual. Therefore, καρδία is used in the context of portraying the Thessalonian community.

5.3.3 Καρδία in Galatians

Καρδία only occurs one time in Galatians, in Unit B. In this semantic unit, Paul argues that both the Gentiles and the Jews are justified by faith of Christ and are one in Christ.

In 4:6, Paul portrays the Galatians as children. Various scholars consider the phrase καρδίας ἔμων as either synonymous as ἔμων or the depiction of the centre of will and emotion of a person. It is obvious that the καρδία is not associated with any words that are related to emotion, volition, and reason. However, the preposition εἰς alludes to the “inner” essence of a human. Hence, it is likely that καρδία connotes “inwardness,” whilst bearing the synonymous nuance of ἔμων. Καρδία occurs in its plural form, combined with ἔμων. Unlike the case of a singular καρδία combined with ἔμων, which elucidates the connotation of corporate entity or corporate identity, the plural of καρδία in 4:6 does not directly carry a corporate reference. However, the word occurs in the context that points to a corporate reference as explained below.

The macrostructure of Galatians highlights a new corporate identity of the Galatians

150 The discourse structure of Galatians will be presented in Chapter 6. For detailed account of various semantic units in Galatians, see pages 311–3 in Chapter 6.

151 Longenecker, 174; Matera, Galatians, 151.

152 Dunn, Galatians, 220; Fung, 184; Bruce, Galatians, 198; Tarazi, 211. The most problematic issue of their argument is that they directly derived καρδία from σε in the OT. This derivation is overly diachronic, and the approach becomes problematic when the consideration of the textual context is absent.
in a new dispensation, in which the Jews and the Gentiles are one in Christ. In 4:6, \( \kappa \alpha \rho \delta \iota \alpha \varsigma \ \eta \mu \omega \nu \) is employed in the context in which believers are compared with their former state as non-believers (4:8–9). Therefore, the contrast of believers and non-believers is emphasised. As such, the usage of \( \kappa \alpha \rho \delta \iota \alpha \) in 4:6 alludes to a new corporate identity, pointing to the believers who are blessed by God. This corporate identity is further illustrated by the following verse: \( \varepsilon \iota \ldots \upsilon \dot{o} \varsigma \) (4:7). In 4:6, Paul uses the clause \( \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \ \upsilon \dot{\iota} \iota \) to address the Galatians, and then he shifts to the second person singular verb \( \varepsilon \iota \) and the singular noun \( \upsilon \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota} \varsigma \) in 4:7 to address the Galatian Christians. Thus, based on this context, the Galatians are depicted as having one corporate identity and the Holy Spirit dwells in the members (\( \kappa \alpha \rho \delta \iota \alpha \varsigma \ \eta \mu \omega \nu \)) of this community.

5.3.4 Summary

A brief examination of the occurrences of \( \kappa \alpha \rho \delta \iota \alpha \) in other Pauline epistles demonstrated that the communal and corporate connotation is attached to some of the occurrences, including 1 Thess 2:17, 3:13, and Gal 4:6.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the occurrences of \( \kappa \alpha \rho \delta \iota \alpha \) in Romans and 2 Corinthians applying discourse analysis. The thematic meaning of \( \kappa \alpha \rho \delta \iota \alpha \) in both epistles carries communal and corporate connotations. In Romans, \( \kappa \alpha \rho \delta \iota \alpha \) appears in clustered patterns that are associated with different communities: Gentiles, Jews, and Christians. The term points to the corporate response of these communities to God and his

\[153\] For the discussion of the macrostructure of Galatians, see pages 317–8 in Chapter 6.
salvation in Christ. In 2 Corinthians, καρδία depicts the corporate identity of the Corinthian community and the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians. In the καρδία—πρόσωπον antithesis, καρδία highlights the Christian identity of the community under the new dispensation in which Paul is the minister.
CHAPTER 6

ANTHROPOLOGICAL TERMS IN PAULINE BENEDICTIONS IN LIGHT OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

6.0 Introduction

This chapter addresses Stage IV of this study — multiple anthropological terms within multiple discourses. It focuses on the occurrences of πνεῦμα, σῶμα, and ψυχή in the Pauline benedictions. One or more of these key anthropological terms occur in two types of Pauline benedictions: καὶ ὀλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ή ψυχή καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ... τηρηθείη (1 Thess 5:23); and Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν (Gal 6:18; Phlm 1:25; Phil 4:23).

In these benedictions, the terms occur in the abnormal singular construct. As argued in previous chapters, the abnormal construct must not be explained by automatically defining the singular term as a distributive singular. Instead, previous analyses have shown that a singular anthropological term can be a normal singular, which carries social and corporate and connotations that point to communal relationship or unity. As such, this chapter aims to ascertain if these connotations are also present in the
benedictions. This chapter will initially consider 1 Thess 5:23 and will then examine the identical benediction in Gal 6:18, Phlm 1:25, and Phil 4:23.

6.1 The Tripartite Formula in 1 Thess 5:23 in Light of Discourse Analysis
This part discusses the benediction in 1 Thess 5:23, by initially identifying the discourse structure of 1 Thessalonians. Then it reviews previous explanations of the phrase καὶ ὅλοκληρον ὕμων τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα (also known as the tripartite formula) before analysing its grammatical and syntactical features. The findings will indicate the meaning of the anthropological terms.

6.1.1 Discourse Structure of 1 Thessalonians
As with the previous chapters, an analysis of the discourse structure elucidates the major semantic units in 1 Thessalonians by investigating the discourse markers, examining the discourse coherence, and ascertaining the macrostructure.

6.1.1.1 Discourse Markers
Three discourse markers demarcate the semantic units in 1 Thessalonians: change of verb mood, formulas, and use of the vocative.

6.1.1.1.1 Change of verb mood
The concentrated use of the imperative verbs usually signifies a hortatory section. There are 20 imperative verbs in 1 Thessalonians. Figure 6.1 shows that 19 of them
occur in 5:11–26.¹ From the usage of the imperative, a major semantic unit, an exhortatory segment, may well be situated in latter part of Chapter 5.

Figure 6.1 The Imperative Verbs in 1 Thessalonians

6.1.1.1.2 Formulas

There are four types of formulas in Thessalonians, which function as discourse markers: benediction, formulaic praise, verb-conjunction-ὑμᾶς, and the conjunctive formula περὶ δὲ.

Two optative clauses in 3:11–13 (as indicated by two aorist optatives: κατευθύνατε, in 3:11; and πλεονάσατε, in 3:12) and 5:23 (as indicated by the optative τῆς θείη, in 5:23) are two prayers of blessing,² which can also be considered as two

---

¹ The imperatives occur in 4:18; 5:11 (twice), 13, 14 (four times), 15 (twice), 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 (twice), 22, 25, 26.

² An optative can elucidate either a wish or a prayer; it is normally employed to denote a wish especially in the presence of ἄν. Since 3:11–13 and 5:23 are two independent clauses without ἄν, the optatives are best understood as volitive optatives denoting prayer. Wallace calls this kind of optative “voluntative optative” or “volitive optative,” and Moulton calls this “optative of wish.” Wallace, Grammar, 481; James Hope Moulton, Prolegomena (vol. 1 of A Grammar of New Testament Greek; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906), 196.
benedictions. The two benedictions carry a parenthetical function, and delineate the boundary of 4:1–5:22, by highlighting the exhortatory segment within. 4:1–5:22 contains various exhortations.

The formulaic praise Ἐὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε occurs in 1:2 following the initial greeting. This formula marks Paul’s first topic, discussing his relationship with the Thessalonians (1:2–3:13).

There are three occurrences of the verb-conjunction-ὁμᾶς-ἀδελφοί formula. First, Paul uses the formula ἐρωτῶμεν ὁμᾶς καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν (4:1) after the benediction (3:11–13) to commence the parenthetical exhortation in 4:1–5:22. Second, the formula οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὁμᾶς ἁγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί (4:13) begins the discussion of the death of loved ones (4:13–18). Since it occurs within the parenthetical segment, this formula marks the beginning of a minor segment. Third, the formula Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὁμᾶς, ἀδελφοί occurs in 5:12. As previously mentioned, there is an influx of the imperatives in the second half of Chapter 5. Thus, the formula marks the general exhortations near the end of the epistle. Since it occurs in the parenthetical segment, it begins a minor semantic unit.

The conjunctive formula περί δὲ (5:1) occurs within the parenthetical segment. Thus, it marks a minor semantic unit, in which Paul discusses the expectation of the Parousia (5:1–12).

---

3 For example, Jewett regards 5:23 as a “benediction.” Bruce and Furnish call it a “wish-prayer” and a “benedictory prayer” respectively. Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 175; Bruce, Thessalonians, 128; Furnish, Thessalonians, 122–3. In this chapter, this kind of prayer of blessing is called benediction or benedictory prayer.

4 Both Wanamaker and Bruce favour this view. Wanamaker, 205–6; Bruce, Thessalonians, 128. This will be further discussed in this chapter.
6.1.1.1.3 Vocative

There are 14 occurrences of ἄδελφοί.\textsuperscript{5} The frequent occurrences of this vocative are striking when comparing with its occurrences in the other Pauline epistles. This will be further discussed in the section of prominence. Most of its occurrences do not function as discourse marker. Nonetheless, two occurrences are worth mentioning.

The vocative ἄδελφοί in 4:1 is combined with the adverb λογίαν and the conjunction ὥστε to begin the parenthetical segment.\textsuperscript{6} In other words, the beginning of the parenthetical segment is marked by three different discourse markers: the benediction in 3:11–13, the verb-conjunction-ήματι formula in 4:1, and the vocative ἄδελφοι combined with λογίαν in 4:1.

Finally, the ἄδελφοι in 5:25 marks Paul’s closing remark in the epistle.

\subsection*{6.1.1.2 Semantic Units}

Through the four identified discourse makers, 1 Thessalonians can be divided into:

the letter-opening, two major semantic units, and the letter-closing.

\textsuperscript{5} The occurrences of ἄδελφοι in 1 Thessalonians: 1:4; 2:1, 9, 14, 17; 3:7; 4:1, 10, 13; 5:1, 4, 12, 14, 25.

\textsuperscript{6} The analysis of Philippians shows that the combination of λογίαν and ἄδελφοι is a discourse marker. For a detailed discussion of this, see pages 166–8 in Chapter 4.
Table 6.1 Semantic Units of 1 Thessalonians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Markers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM1: Change of Verb Mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM2: Formulas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM3: Vocative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter-opening (1:1–2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter-closing (5:25–28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benediction: "Χάριτον σοι και πλούσιον (1:2)

Exhortations in light of the Parousia

Table 6.2 outlines the perspectives of other scholars, regarding the major semantic units in 1 Thessalonians.
Table 6.2 Outline of 1 Thessalonians by Scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline of this Study</th>
<th>Semantic Unit A 1:2–3:13</th>
<th>Semantic Unit B 4:1–5:22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outline of Scholars</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Witherington</td>
<td>Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furnish</td>
<td>Malherbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malherbe</td>
<td>Wanamaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sterner</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Furnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sterner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6.2, the semantic units outlined by this study are similar to those proposed by various scholars.

6.1.1.3 Discourse Coherence

Thematic prominence and lexical cohesion are useful in ascertaining the coherent message of 1 Thessalonians. This examination will show that relationship is a prominent theme in this epistle.

6.1.1.3.1 Thematic prominence

Relationship is a prominent theme. In the first semantic unit, Paul discusses his relationship with the Thessalonian community (1:3–6; 2:6–12, 17–19; 3:6–10). His

---

7 Malherbe, viii; Wanamaker, viii; Richard, v–vi; Best, Thessalonians, 153; Bruce, Thessalonians, 3; Jones, Thessalonians, vi–vii; Frame, Thessalonians, 17; Morris, Thessalonians, vi–vii; Furnish, Thessalonians, 7–8; Witherington, Thessalonians, vii–ix; Marshall, Thessalonians, 10–11; Moore, v; Sterner, Thessalonians, 7.

8 Fee considers 1:1–3:13 a major segment. Both Frame and Witherington consider the prayer in 3:11–13 a separate segment (apart from 1:2–3:10).

9 Best, Frame, Moore, and Wanamaker consider 4:1–5:22 a major segment, containing many sub-segments in it. For Bruce and Furnish, 4:1–5:24 is a major unit, containing many sub-segments. For Richard, 5:12–22 is one of the sub-segments under the major segment 4:3–5:28.
language is full of affection and kinship, as illustrated by the following examples:

μημονεύοντες ύμων (1:3); ώς ἐὰν τροφὸς θάλπη τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα (2:7); οὕτως ὁμειρόμενοι ύμων (2:8); ἀπορφαίησθεν ἄφι ύμων (2:17); ἱαίρομεν δι’ ύμᾶς (3:9).

In the second and last major semantic unit, Paul discusses the communal relationship among the Thessalonians (4:6–13, 5:13–15). In Unit B1 (4:1–12), Paul is concerned about sexual immorality and exploitation (4:3–8). The noun τὸν ἀδελφόν (4:6) points out that sexual immorality occurs among the Thessalonians. As well argued by Wanamaker, this kind of action “could threaten the very existence of the community.” In Unit B2 (4:13–5:11), Paul explains to the Thessalonians about the fate of those who died in Christ (οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ, in 4:16), and teaches them not to engage in excessive grief. Obviously, this discussion centres on the death of believers, alluding to those who belong to the community. In Unit B3 (5:12–23), the apostle discusses life in a community, as illustrated by the following examples:

εἰδέναι τοὺς κοπιῶντας ἐν ύμῖν (5:12); ἀντέχεσθε τῶν ἁθένων, μακροθυμεῖτε πρὸς πάντας (5:14); τὸ ἄγαθον διώκετε [καὶ] εἰς ἀλλήλους (5:15).

6.1.1.3.2 Lexical cohesion

There are several patterns of lexical cohesion (see Appendix 5). The first pattern is the

---

10 Ἀπορφαίησθεν means “make an orphan of someone.” BDAG, 98.

11 Wanamaker, 155. According to Wanamaker, sexual immorality could destroy the community by breaking down the ethical boundary that separates believers from pagans and by destroying the kinship within the Thessalonian community. Wanamaker, 155–6.

12 Fee also holds this view, arguing that the “concern … is not for people in general … but only for those who were a part of the believing community.” Fee, Thessalonians, 166.
repetition of παρουσία. Παρουσία only occurs 11 times in the Pauline letters, four of which occur in 1 Thessalonians.¹³ Its occurrences distribute throughout the epistle (2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23). In all four cases, the noun portrays the coming of Christ, παρουσία.¹⁴ The second pattern is the repetition of ἐλπίς, indicating the motif of hope. It occurs four times throughout the epistle (1:3; 2:19; 4:13; and 5:8).¹⁵ These two motifs intertwine with each other, forming a key message: the coming of the Lord would bring hope to the Thessalonians who face various challenges, including tribulation (θλίψις, in 1:6; 3:3, 7) and impurity (ἀκαθαρσία, in 2:3; 4:7).

However, the third pattern strongly indicates the relational reference in this epistle. The vocative ἀδελφοί has an unusually high frequency in 1 Thessalonians.¹⁶ The word is the third most frequent noun in the letter (see Appendix 5). Figure 6.2 shows that the occurrences of ἀδελφοί are distributed throughout the whole epistle. The unusually frequent occurrences of ἀδελφοί highlight the relationship between Paul and the Thessalonian community.

---

¹³ The occurrences of παρουσία in Paul’s letters: Romans: 0, 1 Corinthians: 2, 2 Corinthians: 3, Galatians: 0, Philippians: 2, 1 Thessalonians: 4, Philemon: 0.

¹⁴ Παρουσία is modified by either τοῦ κυρίου (3:13; 4:15; 5:23) or αὐτοῦ (2:19).

¹⁵ Ἐλπίς occurs 25 times in all of the Pauline epistles. Its occurrence usually concentrates in a few chapters within a letter instead of displaying an even distribution. For example, in 1 Corinthians, Ἐλπίς only occurs in Chapters 9 (twice) and 13 (once). In Galatians and Philippians (the length of both epistles is similar to that of 1 Thessalonians), Ἐλπίς only occurs once in each epistle.

¹⁶ When counting all the occurrences of ἀδελφοί in all of the Pauline epistles, 23% of them occur in 1 Thessalonians. The epistle displays the highest ratio of occurrences if the length of each Pauline epistle is taken into consideration. The ratio of the occurrences of ἀδελφοί divided by the number of chapters in each epistle is as follows: Romans: 0.63; 1 Corinthians: 1.25; 2 Corinthians: 0.23; Galatians: 1.5; Philippians: 1.5; 1 Thessalonians: 2.8; Philemon: 2.1.
6.1.1.4 Macrostructure and Sociolinguistic Aspect

From the topic in each semantic unit and the findings of the discourse coherence, this study argues that the macrostructure of 1 Thessalonians can be understood as follows. Paul reminds the Thessalonian community of the kinship and loving relationship shared between himself and the community, and encourages the community to live in love and hope whilst waiting for the coming of the Lord.

As previously discussed, Paul’s expression in this epistles is full of affection. This affection is further illustrated by taking the sociolinguistic aspect into consideration. Paul does not call himself an apostle in the letter-opening. The phrase Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι (2:7) is the only instance that Paul mentions his apostleship.

---

17 The vocative ἀδελφοί occurs in 1:4; 2:1, 9, 14, 17; 3:7; 4:1, 10, 13; 5:1, 4, 12, 14, 25.
However, Paul immediately compares himself as νήπιος and τροφός in 2:7. The humility displayed by νήπιος and the parental care depicted by τροφός are further accentuated by the proceeding phrase ὥς πατήρ τέκνα ἐαυτοῦ (2:11) and the extraordinary frequent occurrence of ἀδελφοί in the whole epistle. Instead of asserting his authority, Paul compares his relationship with the community as a caring family.  

6.1.1.5 The Flow of Discourse and Peak

The peak of 1 Thessalonians is located in Unit B2 (4:13–5:11), which is indicated by the following linguistic phenomena: the re-emergence of key prominent themes (παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου and ἐλπίς), rare grammatical devices (οὐ μὴ and λόγῳ κυρίου), multiple parallelisms (formed by words relating to καθεύδω and the repetition of παρθακαλεῖτε ἀλλαήλους), and B2 being the centre of a seemingly chiastic structure.

First, παρουσία and ἐλπίς are the two prominent themes that reappear in B2 (παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου, in 4:15; and ἐλπίς, in 4:13; 5:8). Notably, the concept of having hope in light of the παρουσία, which is first mentioned in 2:19, re-emerges in 4:13–15.

---

18 There is a textual variant in 2:7. The manuscripts that support the reading of νήπιος includes B, D*, 6, 33, 104, 81, and 1739, and 1881. However, νήπιος is replaced by τύπος in the following manuscripts: K, A, C, D2, F, G, and Ψ. τύπος means example (BDAG, 830). It would be a “smoother” reading to describe Paul as an example amongst the Thessalonians than to depict him as a child. Thus, τύπος would likely be a “correction” intended by some scribes, whereas νήπιος is the original reading.

19 See pages 154–5 in Chapter 3 for the discussion of sociolinguistic implication concerning the parent-child language. Burke argues that Paul uses this parent-child relationship to emphasise his leadership role, an apostle who “regards himself as being at the apex of the familial pyramid.” Burke also argues that the roles depicted by νήπιος and τροφός “remain contentious.” However, Burke fails to explain the unusually frequent occurrences of ἀδελφοί, the vocative used by Paul to address the Thessalonians. Trevor J. Burke, “Paul’s New Family in Thessalonica,” NovT 54 (2012): 286.
Second, two grammatical devices that rarely occur in the Pauline epistles are found in B2. The first device is the emphatic negation οὐ μὴ. The occurrence of οὐ μὴ is rare in Paul’s work, it only occurs five times in all of the Paul epistles.20 However, οὐ μὴ occurs twice in 1 Thessalonians in a close proximity, only five verses apart (4:15b and 5:3). Both of them are related to the coming of the Lord:

οἱ ζωῖτες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τούς κοιμηθέντας (4:15b); and ὅταν λέγωσιν εἰρήνη καὶ ἀσφάλεια, τότε ἀμφίπλοος αὐτοῖς ἐφίσταται ὁλέθρος ... καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐκφύγωσιν (5:3). The first usage is directed to the believers, and the second usage, non-believers. The second rare device is the occurrences of this peculiar clause: Τούτῳ γὰρ ύμῖν λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου (4:15a). This clause is placed in front of the first emphatic negation. The anarthrous phrase λόγῳ κυρίου is a hapax legomenon in Paul’s work.21 A similar articulation is also found in 1:8: ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου.22

Third, repeated words also appear in the form of parallelism, in three sets nonetheless.. The first set, as previously mentioned, is the repetition of οὐ μὴ. The emphatic negation is directed to two groups: believers and non-believers. The second is the repetition of the substantival participle of κοιμᾶω. The word is recurrent in 4:13, 14, and 15, denoting those who died in Christ. Another verb with a similar meaning, καθεύδω, is also recurrent in 5:6, 7, and 10; with its substantival participle denoting the non-believers (οἱ καθεύδοντες, in 5:7). The striking contrast between believers

---

20 The occurrences of οὐ μὴ: once in Romans; once in 1 Corinthians; and once in Galatians.

21 The suspected pseudepigrapha have also been considered.

22 As well as 1 Thessalonians, this phrase only occurs in 2 Thess 3:1.
and non-believers is again highlighted by this parallel. Third, the imperative clause \( \pi\alpha\rho\sigma\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\varepsilon\iota\tau\varepsilon \) \( \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\iota\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \) is repeated in 4:18 and 5:11. The clause in 4:18 immediately follows the discussion of the resurrection of believers in Christ’s \( \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\alpha \); and the clause in 5:11 concludes the discussion of the \( \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\alpha \) of the Lord. Most fascinatingly, \( \pi\alpha\rho\sigma\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\varepsilon\iota\tau\varepsilon \) is the very first imperative verb that occurs in this epistle.

Finally, B2 is set in the centre of the parenthetical exhortation, appearing in the centre of a seemingly chiastic structure. The phrase \( \theta\epsilon\lambda\iota\mu\alpha \ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \) is found in both the previous unit (4:3, in Unit B1) and the following unit (5:18, in Unit B3). In both minor semantic units, the Thessalonians are urged to live a holy and godly life. However, the discussion of \( \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\alpha \) in B2 is set in the middle of B1 and B3.

The occurrences of rare grammatical devices, multiple parallels, re-emergence of prominent themes, and being the centre of a chiasm indicate that B2 is the discourse peak. In this peak, the Thessalonians are treated as a group that is in contrast with the non-believers. The contrastive fate of the two groups during the \( \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\alpha \) is emphasised. Thus, the corporate aspect is highlighted. As a faith community that would receive the ultimate blessing (including both the living and the dead members), the Thessalonian community is distinct from the non-believers.

The benediction, which is the centre of this analysis, occurs after the peak. Thus, it belongs to the post-peak episode. Figure 6.3 shows the discourse flow.
6.1.2 Previous Explanations of the Tripartite Formula

The phrase ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα is part of the benediction in 1 Thess 5:23. The benediction is located in close proximity with another benediction at the end of the epistle, Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ’ ὑμῶν (5:28). In the tripartite formula, the three anthropological terms are combined with the plural pronoun ὑμῶν, forming the abnormal singular construct. In previous scholarship, there are four main explanations of the meaning of these anthropological terms.

First, some suggests that Paul employs Hellenistic anthropology to depict the trichotomic nature of a human being, a human with three ontological parts: spirit, soul,
and body. This view was once strongly upheld. For example, Heard asserts that “It [1 Thess 5:23] teaches us in the first place, that there are three parts in man.”\(^\text{23}\)

Schweizer is another proponent of this view. He argues that the three terms denote the “constituent parts of man.”\(^\text{24}\) However, a number of modern scholars repudiate this view, by arguing that Paul does not make a precise anthropological definition of different constituents of a human being.\(^\text{25}\)

The second explanation is a variation of the first one. Although the three terms do not denote three constituent parts of a human being, they denote different elements in human personality. For example, Marshall argues that the three terms should be understood as follows: \(\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\) depicts a believer’s life “in relationship with God,” \(\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\) denotes human personality, and through \(\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\) a believer “expresses himself and acts”.\(^\text{26}\) Frame similarly argues that \(\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\) and \(\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\) denote human elements, human personality in particular.\(^\text{27}\) However, this explanation is not widely accepted in modern scholarship.\(^\text{28}\)

The third explanation is proposed by Jewett. He contends that Paul employs

---


\(^\text{24}\) Schweizer, “\(\Pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\),” *TDNT* 6:435.

\(^\text{25}\) Malherbe, 339; Morris, *Thessalonians*, 182; Bruce, *Thessalonians*, 130; Wanamaker, 207; and Fee, *Thessalonians*, 228, Witherington, *Thessalonians*, 173.

\(^\text{26}\) Marshall, *Thessalonians*, 163. Likewise, Jones argues that the Thessalonians might embrace a Hellenistic Jewish understanding that considers a human as a living being (\(\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\)), having a physical body (\(\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\)) and capacity to connect with God (\(\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\)). His view assumes that the audience understand a human being according to contemporary Hellenistic Judaism, for example, Philo’s philosophy. Jones, *Thessalonians*, 77.

\(^\text{27}\) Frame, 209. For Frame, \(\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\) points to the divine element.

\(^\text{28}\) For example, Witherington rejects Marshall’s understanding, arguing that \(\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\) does not depict the immaterial part of human in 1 Cor 15:44–46. Rather, it connotes the natural and physical aspect (Witherington, *Thessalonians*, 173).
the terms for an anti-Gnostic polemical purpose. The summary of Jewett’s argument is that the Thessalonians are confronted by the Gnostic polemic that emphasises the superiority of spirit over body. Hence, sexual immorality is considered to be unimportant, which leads to the indulgence of physical pleasure and abandonment of daily physical labour (as indicated in 1 Thess 4:6, 11). Since the tripartite formula is originally a Gnostic usage, Paul adapts his opponents’ ideas, and employs the terms in a rhetorical manner to repudiate the superiority of spirit over body by emphasising the equal importance of body and spirit. Jewett’s proposal is problematic on two grounds. First, there is little evidence in the epistle suggesting that Paul tackles the Gnostic teaching. For example, \( \sigma\omega\mu\alpha \) is never mentioned once in the whole epistle except in the tripartite formula, let alone mentioning its connection with \( \pi\nu\varepsilon\dot{\eta}\mu\alpha \). Second, if Gnostic polemic is in Paul’s mind, then solely using a benediction to address such an important issue would be totally inadequate. Jewett’s explanation is rejected by a number of modern scholars. In addition, it is doubtful whether Gnostic influence was prominent in the first century, since 1 Thessalonians is possibly one of


30 Jewett argues that the “Libertinists” among the Thessalonians place the importance of human spirit over physical body. Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, 250-1.

31 Jewett suggests that “\( \pi\nu\varepsilon\dot{\eta}\mu\alpha-\phi\nu\chi\dot{h}-\sigma\omega\mu\alpha \) triad itself was most popular in gnostic circles.” Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, 181.

32 Furnish repudiates Jewett’s proposal by arguing that the issue of Gnostic influence is nowhere mentioned in the letter, including the absence of the word \( \sigma\omega\mu\alpha \) in the letter except its sole occurrence in the tripartite formula. Furnish, *Thessalonians*, 123. Marshall also argues that there is no evidence in the epistle referring to any Gnostic type of anthropology. Marshall, *Thessalonians*, 163.

33 Wanamaker argues that it “seems doubtful that a wish-prayer was either an appropriate or an adequate place” for Paul to address the Gnostic teaching. Wanamaker, 206.

the earliest Pauline epistles.\textsuperscript{35}

The fourth explanation argues that Paul does not provide a precise anthropological definition of a human being. Rather, the three terms exemplify different ‘parts’ of a human person, and the phrase emphasises the wholeness of a human person. In other words, Paul arbitrarily chooses the three terms to illustrate that all of the different parts of a person are kept blameless.\textsuperscript{36} A number of modern scholars adopt this explanation.\textsuperscript{37} Two detailed aspects of this view are worth mentioning.

First, Fee further argues that the tripartite formula, which is in the second part of 5:23, is in parallel with the first part of the verse. There is shift within the same verse, by focusing on the community in the first half (by using \(\text{Ε}Χ\u03b1}\)), and then focusing on each individual person in the second half. In other words, the phrase \(\text{Ε}Χ\u03b1}\) \(\text{Ε}\) \(\text{Α}λ}\) \(\text{Β}\) \(\text{Β}\) \(\text{Θ}\) (23b) denotes a single human person,

\textsuperscript{35} Following the discovery of the Nag Hammadi, an international congress, which convened in Messina in 1966, defined Gnosticism as “a certain group of systems” which could be dated in the second century. Karen L. King, \textit{What is Gnosticism?} (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003), 169. Thus, it is highly doubtful if Paul addressed the Gnostic polemic when he wrote 1 Thessalonians in the first century. If people assume the presence of any anti-Gnostic components in Paul’s work, according to King, they must be aware of the fact that the “extant materials simply do not support a pre-Christian dating of Gnosticism, however it is defined.” King, \textit{Gnosticism}, 174.

\textsuperscript{36} Fee, \textit{Thessalonians}, 227. This arbitrary description of a human being is also adopted by Bruce who argues that it is difficult to pinpoint the exact meaning of the terms. Rather, the clause basically means “May every part of you be kept entirely without fault.” In addition, Bruce also notes the phrase \(\text{Ε}Χ\u03b1}\) \(\text{Α}\) \(\text{Χ}\) \(\text{Χ}\) \(\text{δ}\) \(\text{ε}\) in 3:13. Bruce, \textit{Thessalonians}, 130.

\textsuperscript{37} Witherington, \textit{Thessalonians}, 173; Fee, \textit{Thessalonians}, 227; Bruce, \textit{Thessalonians}, 130. Some commentators who hold this view further argue that the emphasis of the tripartite formula is as follows: “in every particular, in their wholeness as human beings” (Moore, 86); “complete human beings” (Wanamaker, 207); “the entire person” (Malherbe, 339; Morris, \textit{Thessalonians}, 182); “whole” (Best, \textit{Thessalonians}, 244). Donfried similarly contends that the phrase highlights the “totality of their existence.” Karl Paul Donfried, \textit{Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity} (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 48.
but the pronoun ὑμᾶς (23a) denotes a community. However, this study argues that this shift is contextually incoherent.

Second, some scholars further argue that there is an intertextual parallel between Deut 6:5 and 1 Thess 5:23. According to Richard and Malherbe, Deut 6:5, which is quoted in Matt 22:37 and Mark 12:30, can be used to explain 1 Thess 5:23. Their argument is summarised as follows. The two benedictions (1 Thess 3:11–13 and 5:23) are considered parallel. Together their anthropological terms (ὑμῶν τὰς καρδιάς, in 3:13; and ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα, in 5:23) resemble those in Deut 6:5 (with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind). Since the Jewish mindset regards a human person as a whole being, “heart,” “soul,” and “mind” are used metaphorically to emphasise the “whole” human person by combining different hypothetical “parts.” Thus, 1 Thess 3:13 and 5:23 should be understood in the same way: καρδία, πνεῦμα, ψυχὴ, and σῶμα are different hypothetical parts for portraying a whole human person. Despite this insightful suggestion, this argument does not explain a major difference between Deut 6:5 and the tripartite formula. In Deut 6:5, the pronoun is singular (in the form of the suffix η). Conversely, the pronoun in 1 Thess 5:23 is plural (ὑμῶν).

---

38 Fee, Thessalonians, 227. Richard similarly argues that the tripartite formula in the second part of the prayer is synonymously parallel to the first part of the prayer, thus equating the three terms with “you,” pointing to “the unity of the person in all aspects.” Richard, 285–6.

39 Richard, 285; Malherbe, 339.

40 The wishes articulated in both benedictions are similar: the Thessalonians would be blameless at the coming of the Lord.

41 In both Matthew and Mark, a second singular pronoun σοῦ is employed to reflect its Hebrew equivalent.

42 This difference will be discussed later in this chapter.
Out of these four explanations, the fourth one is the predominant view in modern scholarship. Nonetheless, the explanation fails to address the abnormal singular construct: the combination of three articulated singular anthropological terms and a plural possessive pronoun. Regarding the two detailed aspects of the fourth explanation, the suggestion of a shift from community to individual is contextually inconsistent, and the explanation of an intertextual parallel between Deut 6:5 and 1 Thess 5:23, do not account for the difference in pronoun.

6.1.3 Textual Analysis of 1 Thess 5:23

6.1.3.1 Syntactical Analysis of 1 Thess 5:23a

The clause ἀυτός δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἁγιάσαι ύμᾶς ὀλοτελεῖς (5:23a) forms the first half of the sentence. Δὲ is a transitional conjunction, introducing the concluding remark of the epistle. The optative ἁγιάσαι is the main verb in this clause. As previously discussed, it denotes a prayer of blessing as Paul prays for the Thessalonians to be ὀλοτελεῖς (a hapax legomenon in the NT). The adjective is derived from ὀλος (by combining ὀλος and τέλος) to create an intensive form, illustrating completion or end, pointing to the meaning of wholeness.

Since the two benedictory prayers, 3:11–13 and 5:23, are in parallel, together they carry a parenthetical function, highlighting the exhortation (4:1–5:22) between them. This parenthetic exhortation, as indicated by words relating to holiness (ἁγιασμός, in 4:3, 4, 7; and ἁγιος, in 4:8), encourages the Thessalonians to live a holy life and not be defiled by sexual immorality in light of the coming of the Lord. As such, 5:23a can be interpreted as a benedictory prayer that concludes the
parenthetical exhortation—“I pray that the God of peace would sanctify.”

6.1.3.2 Syntactical Analysis of 1 Thess 5:23b

The connective conjunction καὶ begins the second half of the sentence: καὶ ὀλόκληρον ύμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ... τηρηθείη.

This is another independent clause, in which the optative τηρηθείη acts as the main verb. A predicate adjective ὀλόκληρον precedes the nouns in this clause, and it means complete or sound in an ethical or moral sense.43 Its meaning is very close to that of ὀλοπελεῖς in the previous clause, suggesting a strong parallel between the two.44 ὀλόκληρον appears before the tripartite formula, though this is not grammatically required. The word order strongly suggests that the adjective is deliberately placed. Thus, the emphasis on wholeness is reiterated, which points to ὀμᾶς in 5:23a. However, in 5:23b, the subject of wholeness points to a more elaborated description: the tripartite formula (ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα). The parallel between ὀμᾶς and ύμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα in these two consecutive clauses becomes obvious. Of interest, the two clauses form a parallel with one another as shown below.

43 Both Bauer and Foerster disagree on the semantic nature of ὀλόκληρος. Bauer defines the adjective as a qualitative term, suggesting an ethical sense. Foerster classifies it as a quantitative term, denoting extent or compass. However, Foerster argues that the adjective in 1 Thess 5:23 expresses a specific idea that τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα would not be affected by “evil.” Foerster’s interpretation apparently alludes to a qualitative sense. Despite the two different views (quantitative vs. qualitative), the connotation behind the word carries an ethical sense according to both scholars. BDAG, 564; Foerster, “Ὀλοκληρία,” TDNT 3:767.

44 This parallel extends beyond the use of two similar adjectives. As previously mentioned, both Fee and Richard also argue that the first half and the second half of 5:23 form a parallel (Fee, Thessalonians, 227; Richard, 285–6).
Table 6.3 Comparison of 1 Thess 5:23a and 5:23b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5:23a</th>
<th>5:23b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης</td>
<td>ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>ἁγιάσαι</td>
<td>τηρηθείη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>ὑμᾶς</td>
<td>ἡμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχή καὶ τὸ σῶμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>ὀλοτελεῖς</td>
<td>καὶ ὅλοκληρον (5) ... ἀμέμπτως</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only is the overall meaning of both clauses in parallel, the individual elements in both clauses are also in parallel. There are three elements clearly in parallel: the two adjectives ὑμᾶς and ὅλοκληρον, the two optatives ἁγιάσαι and τηρηθείη, and the nouns ὁ θεὸς and Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. As such, it is logical to view ὑμᾶς as parallel with ἡμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχή καὶ τὸ σῶμα, which will be further discussed in the following section.

An adverbial phrase ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ concludes this benedictory prayer. Paul prays that the Thessalonians would be kept whole and blameless when Christ returns. This prayer echoes with the previous prayer in 3:11–13, in which Paul prays that the Thessalonians would be blameless and holy when the Lord returns.

---

45 Elements that are parallel are marked by the same colour. The number in parenthesis represents the word order in the sentence.

46 Richard suggests a different view. He argues that ἡμῶν is connected to ὅλοκληρον, meaning “your whole being.” The anthropological terms are then appositional to “your whole being.” Richard, 286.
6.1.3.3 Grammatical and Syntactical Features of the Tripartite Formula

One of the challenges in interpreting the tripartite formula is that it is not found elsewhere in the Pauline epistles.47 Identifying the exact meanings of πνεûμα, ψυχή, and σώμα proves to be difficult. As previously mentioned, modern scholars widely agree that Paul does not write this formula to provide a consistent and theological definition for each anthropological term.

To understand the meaning of the terms, it is essential to discuss its peculiar syntax. There are three problems concerning its grammatical construction. First, the three articulated nouns (πνεûμα, ψυχή, σώμα) are combined with a personal plural pronoun ύμων — the abnormal singular construct. Of interest, none of the scholarly works reviewed in this chapter, though far from exhaustive, mentions this unusual construct. It is very likely that focus has always been on the identification and interpretation of the three terms. Second, the aorist passive optative verb θηρηθείη is singular, although the subject of this verb consists of three definite nouns. Both observations thus far go against the normal rule of accordance. Third, the predicative adjective όλόκληρον only agrees with πνεûμα and σώμα in terms of gender, case and number. However, ψυχή does not agree with όλόκληρον in gender. These three problems will be dealt with as follows.

With the first problem, as repeatedly argued, the abnormal construct must not be explained by automatically defining the singular term as the distributive singular. In the tripartite formula, the use of a plural possessive pronoun, despite being at odds

---

47 Witherington asserts that the tripartite phrase (in this exact form) is not found elsewhere, including in contemporary Greek literature. This phase is believed to be adopted in some early Church Fathers’ work. Witherington, Thessalonians, 172–3.
with the singular nouns, is possible if the construct elucidates the whole community. Paul does not teach about individual spirit, soul, or body. Rather, he focuses on the Christian community in Thessalonica.48 The church in Thessalonica consists of different people (as illustrated by a plural ὑμῶν), and they belong to a single community in Christ (as illustrated by the singular πνεῦμα, ψυχή, and σῶμα). The above-mentioned parallel, ὑμᾶς (5:23a) and ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχή καὶ τὸ σῶμα (5:23b), supports this view. In addition, this explanation can provide an account for the second and the third peculiar grammatical problems.

The second problem, use of the singular aorist optative τηρηθείῃ, can be explained as follows. First, the tripartite formula denotes a single community. Thus, the singular optative τηρηθείῃ refers to this community, highlighting the corporate entity as denoted by πνεῦμα, ψυχή, and σῶμα. Second, the structure emphasises the “wholeness” depicted in the context. Although there are three articulated nouns, the wholeness of a single community is emphasised by the use of a singular verb.

The third problem with the combination of the singular predicate adjective ὅλοκληρον and the subject phrase τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχή καὶ τὸ σῶμα can be explained by a focus on a single community. Grammatically, the adjective ὅλοκληρον is supposedly to be in plural form, since there are three subjects to be modified. However, ὅλοκληρον is a singular predicate adjective. Thus, one could argue that the adjective modifies the noun that follows: πνεῦμα. According to this understanding, πνεῦμα might represent the entire person, with ψυχή and σῶμα elaborating what this

person consists of. This view upholds a dichotomous view of the human person with an immaterial part (ψυχή) and a material part (σῶμα). In other words, the text should be understood as: “May your entire person, the soul and the body, be kept whole.” However, this understanding is problematic on three grounds. First, a singular adjective modifying a series of noun is not uncommon in the NT. Second, this understanding undermines the essence of “totality,” illustrated by the repeated use of words relating to ὁλός in the context. Third, it also undermines the significance of placing ὑμῶν at the front of this clause, which possibly emphasises the single community as a whole. As such, the singular predicate adjective ὁλόκληρον is best understood as modifying a single entity: the community as illustrated by the tripartite formula.

Besides these three grammatical problems, it is important to discuss the intertextual echo between Deut 6:5 and 1 Thess 5:23. As previously mentioned, some scholars argue that the benediction in 5:23 carries an intertextual echo of Deut 6:5. In Deut 6:5 a second person singular pronoun, in the form of the suffix τι, is used. The

49 Hendriksen holds a different view based on a similar grammatical understanding. He argues that the text should be interpreted as “May the whole person, the soul and the body, be kept blameless.” His argument is problematic, since ὁλόκληρον is treated as attributive. However, ὁλόκληρον is clearly a predicate adjective, and thus should be interpreted as “May … be kept whole.” Hendriksen, Thessalonians, 148–50.

50 Various examples can be found in the NT, including Acts 7:11; Rom 1:29; Eph 1:21; 4:31. There are cases in which a singular adjective modifies a series of nouns, and only the case and number of both groups agree. For example, in Eph 4:31 (πᾶσα πικρία καὶ θυμός καὶ ὀργή καὶ κραυγή), the feminine singular adjective πᾶσα modifies several proceeding nouns, including the feminine singular πικρία, the masculine singular θυμός, the feminine singular ὀργή, the feminine singular κραυγή. It is unimaginable (from the perspectives of syntax and context) to suggest that πᾶσα only modifies πικρία, and the rest of the group (θυμός, ὀργή, and κραυγή) simply elaborates πικρία.

51 Morris opposes the view of Hendriksen. Morris considers the possessive pronoun ὑμῶν as non-emphatic, and so should the adjective ὁλόκληρον. ὁλόκληρον refers to all three nouns, not just πικρία. Thus, all three nouns indicate one whole person who is to be kept whole and blameless. This study agrees with Morris, since his grammatical analysis is sound, supported by the contextual evidence. Morris, Thessalonians, 182.
LXX also has the singular pronoun σου. The singular pronoun in Deuteronomy obviously depicts the nation of Israel as a singular entity according to the context. Conversely, the pronoun in 1 Thess 5:23 is in plural form, ἴμων. This study proposes that Paul uses the anthropological terms in their singular form to depict the singular entity of the Thessalonian community, whilst using the plural pronoun ἴμων to indicate the multiplicity of the members in this community. In other words, although the singularity of the community is emphasised in both texts, Deut 6:5 and 1 Thess 5:23 use different grammatical devices to achieve this emphasis.

Thus, the key to understanding the tripartite formula is that Paul prays that the whole community would be sanctified by God in all its totality. This understanding of the tripartite formula and the meaning of the anthropological terms will be further examined by considering the findings of the discourse structure.

6.1.4 The Tripartite Formula in Light of Discourse Analysis

In light of the discourse structure and the discourse flow, the tripartite formula in the benediction should be understood as follows. The benediction in 5:23 is part of the prominent theme of communal relationship. The teaching of παρουσία does not solicit an individual response. Instead, the Thessalonians are exhorted to respond to the παρουσία as a corporate entity. Hence, the tripartite formula is used to highlight this “wholeness” and “singleness” of this faith community. In the παρουσία, the community will be made whole and blameless, including the members who have died and those who are alive. Paul does not aim to provide an account of the individual human person through the tripartite formula. Instead, the anthropological terms are used to heighten the essence of wholeness. The singularity elucidates one corporate
entity of this faith community, a community that resembles a human being, having different “parts” as exemplified by τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ φύση καὶ τὸ σῶμα. In other words, the anthropological terms are used as a metaphor to portray the community as a corporate entity, a single communal being, which would receive the ultimate blessing during the παρουσία. This community is portrayed as in contrast to another group, the non-believers, which would face a doomed fate.

6.2 Πνεῦμα in the Grace Benediction in Light of Discourse Analysis

The second part of this chapter examines the meaning of πνεῦμα in the Pauline benedictions in Gal 6:18, Phil 4:23, and Phlm 1:25. This study initially identifies the discourse structures of Galatians and Philemon, before focusing on the benedictions. Since the three benedictions are identical in form, the textual analysis will treat them as a single benediction, by examining its form and function, reviewing the explanation of πνεῦμα in previous scholarship, and conducting syntactical analysis. The findings of both the discourse structure of each epistle and the textual analysis of the benediction will be referred to in order to ascertain the meaning of πνεῦμα in each of the three epistles.

52 This chapter will refer to the findings of the discourse structure of Philippians presented in Chapter 4.
6.2.1 Discourse Structures of Galatians and Philemon

6.2.1.1 Discourse Structure of Galatians

An analysis of the discourse structure elucidates the major semantic units in Galatians, by investigating the discourse markers, examining the discourse coherence, and ascertaining the macrostructure.

6.2.1.1 Discourse markers

Three discourse markers demarcate the semantic units in Galatians: formulas, use of the vocative, and lexical cohesion.

6.2.1.1.1 Formulas. There is only one occurrence of the verb-conjunction-\( \dot{\upsilon} \mu \dot{\alpha} \varsigma \) formula in Galatians. The formula \( \Gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota \zeta \omega \ \gamma \alpha \rho \ \dot{\upsilon} \mu \iota \iota \nu \), \( \dot{\alpha} \dot{\delta} \epsilon \lambda \phi \iota \) (1:11) begins the first discussion of Paul who rebukes the Galatians for abandoning the gospel truth and following the teaching of \( \dot{o} \iota \ \tau \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \sigma \omicron \omicron \tau e \varsigma \) (1:7), the Judaizers.\(^{53}\)

6.2.1.1.2 Vocative. Two vocatives, \( \Gamma \alpha \lambda \tau \alpha i \) and \( \dot{\alpha} \dot{\delta} \epsilon \lambda \phi \iota \), are discourse markers in Galatians. Paul addresses the Galatians emphatically in 3:1 (\( \acute{\Omega} \ \acute{\alpha} \nu \acute{\omicron} \acute{\nu} \tau o i \ \Gamma \alpha \lambda \tau \alpha i \)), and explains the concept of justification in 3:1–4:31. Thus, \( \Gamma \alpha \lambda \tau \alpha i \) begins a new discussion.

\(^{53}\) Fee explains that the term “Judaizers” is derived from \( \lambda \omicron \upsilon \delta \alpha \iota \kappa \omicron \omicron \varsigma \) \( \zeta \omicron \varsigma \) in 2:14, pointing to those who force the Gentiles to follow the Jewish Law. Fee prefers to call them “agitators” due to the misleading “overtones of being legalistic.” Fee, Galatians, 6. However, this study uses the term Judaizers to denote those who force the Gentile Christian to observe the Jewish Law. The Judaizers are commonly believed to be Paul’s opponents in Galatians. Dunn, Galatians, 9; Fung, 7; Matera, Galatians, 5–6.
The vocative ἀδελφοί occurs nine times.\textsuperscript{54} Most of the occurrences demarcate a major topic of discussion. The first occurrence of ἀδελφοί in 1:11 is combined with a formula as mentioned above. In 3:1–4:31, Paul explains the justification of both Jews and Gentiles. This discussion ends with two occurrences of ἀδελφοί (4:28 and 4:31). In 5:11, ἀδελφοί ends another discussion in which the Galatians are warned against practising circumcision for the purpose of justification (5:1–12). In 5:13, ἀδελφοί begins a new topic in which the Galatians are urged to live by the Spirit (5:13–26). In 6:1, ἀδελφοί begins the general exhortation (6:1–10). In 6:18, ἀδελφοί ends the benediction at the end of the epistle.

On the other hand, the occurrences of ἀδελφοί in 3:15 and 4:12 begin two minor semantic units. In his discussion of justification, Paul explains the relation between the Law and justification (3:15–4:11), which is marked by ἀδελφοί (3:15). In 4:12, Paul concludes his major discussion of justification (4:12–31) by appealing to the Galatians.

6.2.1.1.3 Lexical cohesion. There are five patterns of lexical cohesion: νόμος (the second most frequent noun), δικαιόω and its cognate, περιτέμνω and its cognate, σάρξ, and πνεύμα (see Appendix 6), illustrating different discussion topics.

First, the occurrences of νόμος are concentrated in Gal 2–4, 25 out of 32 occurrences of νόμος occur in this segment.\textsuperscript{55} This indicates that the Law is the

\textsuperscript{54} The occurrences of the vocative ἀδελφοί: 1:11; 3:15; 4:12, 28, 31; 5:11, 13; 6:1, 18.

\textsuperscript{55} The occurrences of νόμος in Gal 3 are as follows: verses 2, 5, 10 (twice), 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21 (thrice), 23, 24.
central point of discussion in these three chapters as shown in Figure 6.4

Figure 6.4 The Occurrences of Νόμος in Galatians

Second, the occurrences of δικαίω and δικαίουνη indicate the discussion of justification. The two words largely congregate in Gal 2–3 as shown in Figure 6.5.56

Figure 6.5 The Occurrences of Δικαίω and Δικαίουνη in Galatians

Third, the occurrences of περιτομή and its corresponding verb περιτέμνω indicate the discussion of circumcision.57 The two words, which illustrate the discussion of circumcision, congregate in Gal 2 and Gal 5 respectively (see Figure

---

56 The occurrences of δικαίουνη are as follows: 2:21; 3:6, 21; 5:5. The occurrences of δικαίω are as follows: 2:16 (thrice), 17; 3:8, 11, 24; 5:4.

57 The occurrences of περιτομή are as follows: 2:7, 8, 9, 12; 5:6, 11; 6:15. The occurrences of περιτέμνω are as follows: 2:3; 5:2, 3; 6:12, 13 (twice).
6.6). In Gal 5, they only occur in 5:1–12, with zero occurrences in 5:13–26. This suggests that the discussion of circumcision is only confined to 5:1–12 (see Figure 6.7).

**Figure 6.6 The Occurrences of Περιτομή and Περιτέμω in Galatians**

![Figure 6.6](image)

**Figure 6.7 The Occurrences of Περιτομή and Περιτέμω in Gal 5**

![Figure 6.7](image)

Fourth, the occurrences of σάρξ indicate the discussion of the flesh. σάρξ occurs 18 times, mainly congregating in Gal 2–6 (see Figure 6.8). However, its occurrence is absent in 5:1–12 (see Figure 6.9). The following figures show these observations.

---

58 The occurrences of σάρξ are as follows: 1:16; 2:16, 20; 3:3; 4:13, 14, 23, 29; 5:13, 16, 17 (twice); 19, 24; 6:8 (twice), 12, 13.
The last pattern is the occurrence of πνεῦμα. πνεῦμα occurs 18 times in the letter, mainly congregating in Gal 5 in particular (see Figure 10). Resembling the occurrence of σάρξ, πνεῦμα is nearly absent in 5:1–12 (see Figure 11).

---

59 The occurrences of πνεῦμα are as follows: 3:2, 3, 5, 14; 4:6, 29; 5:5, 16, 17 (twice), 18, 22, 25 (twice); 6:1, 8 (twice), 18.
6.2.1.1.2 Semantic units

Through the three identified discourse makers, Galatians can be divided into: the letter-opening, five major semantic units, and the letter-closing.
### Table 6.4 Semantic Units of Galatians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Makers</td>
<td>DM1: Formulas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Γενομενων σωματων, αδελφοι (1:11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Γαλαται (3:1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>αδελφοι (4:28, 31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM2: Vocatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>περιτομη and περιτέμυρ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>νομος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δικαιωμα and δικαιωσυνη</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πνευμα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM2: Lexical Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Topic</td>
<td>The deviation of the Galatians</td>
<td>Justified by faith for Jews and Gentiles</td>
<td>Circumcision and Justification</td>
<td>Spirit-led Life</td>
<td>General Exhortations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6.4, each major semantic unit contains a specific topic:

- **Unit A**: The deviation of the Galatians (1:11–2:21), **Unit B**: Justification by faith for Jews and Gentiles (3:1–4:31), **Unit C**: Circumcision and Justification (5:1–12), **Unit D**: Spirit-led Life (5:13–26), and **Unit E**: General Exhortations (6:1–10). Table 6.5 outlines the perspectives of other scholars, regarding the major semantic units in Galatians.
Table 6.5 Outline of Galatians by Scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline of this Study</th>
<th>Unit A 1:11–2:21</th>
<th>Unit B 3:1–4:31</th>
<th>Unit C 5:1–12</th>
<th>Unit D 5:13–26</th>
<th>Unit E 6:1–10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outline of Scholars</td>
<td>Guthrie Dunn</td>
<td>Betz Morris</td>
<td>Betz Bruce</td>
<td>Betz Bruce</td>
<td>Betz Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyn Burton</td>
<td>Burton Ebeling</td>
<td>Burton Ebeling</td>
<td>Burton Ebeling</td>
<td>Burton Ebeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Findlay Lightfoot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fee Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce Bligh</td>
<td>Bruce Martin</td>
<td>Bruce Longenecker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Longenecker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Longenecker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dunn Matera</td>
<td>Fung Dunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dunn Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cousar Findlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matera Matera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fung Matera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cousar Cousar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Findlay Findlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fee Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rogers Rogers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6.5, the semantic units outlined in this study are similar to those proposed by various scholars.

6.2.1.1.3 Discourse coherence

In terms of discourse coherence, there are two particular patterns of lexical cohesion worth noting. These patterns elucidate the relationship between Paul and the Galatians.

---

60 Betz, Galatians, vii–viii; Bruce, Galatians, viii–ix; Dunn, Galatians, 21–2; Fung, v–viii; Matera, Galatians, v–vi; Bligh, xiii–xiv; Guthrie, Galatians, v; Cousar, Galatians, ix; Morris, Galatians, 30; Martyn, 24–7; Burton, lxii–lxiv; Findlay, Galatians, v–viii; Ebeling, v–vi; Fee, Galatians, v–vi; Lightfoot, Galatians, 65–7; Longenecker, vii–viii; Rogers, Galatians, 8–9.


62 For Burton, 5:13–26 is a sub-division of a major segment 5:1–6:10.

As previously mentioned, the key motifs in Galatians, including justification, the Law, circumcision, flesh, and the Spirit, are illustrated by the lexical cohesion of νόμος, δικαιόω and its corresponding noun, περιτέμνω and its corresponding noun, σάρξ, and πνεῦμα respectively. However, two patterns of lexical cohesion, the occurrences of ἀδελφοί and πνεῦμα, signify a strong social reference in Galatians.64

As for ἀδελφοί, the vocative occurs nine times in Galatians. As previously shown, most of them are discourse markers. However, many of them are also employed to highlight the relationship between Paul and the Galatians.

First, a problem is mentioned in the letter-opening (1:6–7a): the relationship between Paul and the Galatians is at stake. Then, in Unit A, Paul uses ἀδελφοί (1:11) to remind them of the gospel that is preached by him (ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ). The vocative portrays the relationship between Paul and the community.65

In Unit B, there are three occurrences of ἀδελφοί (4:12, 28, 31). The first occurrence of vocative occurs in 4:12. The vocative is then followed by Paul’s emphatic call, δέομαι ὑμῶν (4:12),66 and an emotional exclamation of his personal agony, ἀφες ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν; (4:16). Then, two occurrences of

---

64 Of interest, Martyn analyses Gal 5, and argues that the epistle illustrates a communal discord. This discord is caused by some people who attempt to teach the Galatian community the formula of combining Christ and the Sinaitic Law. J. Louis Martyn, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (London: T. & T. Clark, 1997), 267–78. This argument sheds light on the purpose of Galatians. Paul does not merely address a theological issue, he also addresses a communal problem.

65 Dunn argues that the occurrence of ἀδελφοί “strikes a conciliatory note” given the “departure from his usual etiquette in i.6–10.” Dunn, *Galatians*, 52.

66 Fee comments on the strong intensity of this personal appeal, and argues that it “tell us much about the personal struggle Paul himself is going through … [this] is a Paul we simply not used to.” Fee, *Galatians*, 160–1. For Martyn, this vocative reflects Paul’s “close and affectionate relationship” with the Galatians, and the adverb ὁς reflects “a mutual friendship” between them. Martyn, *Theological*, 419–20.
vocative are found in 4:29 and 4:31, the ending of this unit. The use of vocative is to emphasise the relationship between Paul and the Galatians.\footnote{67}

In the two subsequent major semantic units, two vocatives appear in close proximity: 5:11 (Unit C), and 5:13 (Unit D). In the middle of them, there is an exceptionally passionate expression: Ὁφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ὑμᾶς (5:12). This illustrates Paul’s passion for the Galatians who are disturbed by the Judaizers.\footnote{68} Thus, the two vocatives elucidate this deep passion.\footnote{69} Furthermore, each vocative is accompanied with an emphatic personal pronoun: Ἐγὼ δέ, ἀδελφοί (5:11) and Ὅμεῖσί γὰρ ... ἀδελφοί (5:13).\footnote{70}

In 6:18, ἀδελφοί occurs the last time in Galatians. Amongst all the Pauline epistles, this is the only occurrence, in which of ἀδελφοί appears adjacent to the benediction. Longenecker, joining a list of scholars, notes this unusual occurrence.\footnote{71} He argues that the vocative is an expression of Paul’s affection towards the converts despite his stern message. Whilst summarising his argument, οὕτε γὰρ περιτομή τί ἐστιν οὕτε ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ καυνή κτίστις (6:15), Paul reminds the Galatians of the shared kinship by using ἀδελφοί one last time. Paul and the Galatians are ἀδελφοί

\footnote{67}{As well argued by Matera, these verses carry a “strong personal and emotional appeal” as Paul unexpectedly “appeals to the strong ties which once united him and the Galatians.” Matera, \textit{Galatians}, 162.}

\footnote{68}{For Longenecker, this expression is “the crudest and rudest of all Paul’s extant statements.” Longenecker, 234.}

\footnote{69}{For Martyn, the ἀδελφοί in 5:11 shows the “affectionate address” made by Paul to the Galatians. Martyn, \textit{Galatians}, 476.}

\footnote{70}{Dunn suggests that Paul uses the emphatic personal pronoun in 5:11 for “distancing himself from ‘the trouble maker.’” Dunn, \textit{Galatians}, 278. Fung argues that Paul uses the emphatic personal pronoun in 5:13 to “forcefully distinguish[es] his Galatian converts from the agitators.” Fung, 244.}

\footnote{71}{Longenecker, 300; Morris, 191; Dunn, \textit{Galatians}, 347–8; Fung, 315; Fee, \textit{Galatians}, 254; Martyn, 569; Betz, \textit{Galatians}, 325; Guthrie, \textit{Galatians}, 153; Matera, \textit{Galatians}, 227.}
in this new creation.

Concerning πνεῦμα, the term occurs 18 times in Galatians. Although it does not occur throughout the epistle, it is a prominent term in Gal 3–6, Unit D in particular. Putting aside πνεῦμα in the benediction (6:18), all of them denote the Holy Spirit. In other words, the Holy Spirit is the sentential meaning in all of its occurrences. However, the thematic meaning of πνεῦμα in Galatians is different, which will be discussed below.

In Unit B, πνεῦμα occurs six times. Paul argues that the Galatians are no longer under the Law. They have received the Holy Spirit (3:2, 3, 5, 14) and are God’s children according to the Holy Spirit (4:6, 29). In other words, the context of πνεῦμα points to a new dispensation in which the Galatian community belong to, and they are different from those who are under the Law (4:29).

In Unit C, πνεῦμα occurs once. Paul argues that the Galatians belong to Christ, instead of being justified by the Law (5:4). Through the Holy Spirit (5:5), the Galatians wait for the future hope. Again, a new dispensation is highlighted through the usage of πνεῦμα.

In Unit D, πνεῦμα occurs seven times. Paul urges them to be led by the Holy Spirit instead of following the flesh (5:16, 17, 18) and to live by the Spirit (5:22, 25). The term is used in contrast to σάρξ, pointing to a new dispensation in which the Galatians are in Christ and not longer under the Law.

In Unit E, Paul reminds the Galatians of their Christian identity that is marked

---

72 The occurrences of πνεῦμα in Galatians: 3:2, 3, 5, 14; 4:6, 29; 5:5, 16, 17 (twice), 18, 22, 25 (twice); 6:1, 8 (twice), 18.

73 The first occurrence of πνεῦμα in Galatians appears in 3:2.
by the Holy Spirit (6:1). Thus, they should follow the Spirit instead of the flesh (6:8).

Some scholars also note the significance of this usage. For example, Matera comments on the occurrence of πνεῦμα in 5:16–18, and argues that the Spirit signifies those “who have been incorporated into Christ.” Longenecker considers the overall usage of πνεῦμα in Gal 5, and contends that the occurrences of πνεῦμα remind the Galatians of their new life (a life that is contrast to the teaching of the Judaizers). Fung points πνεῦμα to a new dispensation prophesised in Jer 31:31–34. This study agrees with their arguments. Although the sentential meaning of πνεῦμα is the Holy Spirit, its thematic meaning in Galatians elucidates a key topic: the Galatian community belongs to Christ under a new dispensation, and is no longer under the Law in the old dispensation. The strong corporate reference of a Christian community with a new corporate identity (in this new dispensation) is highlighted by the overall occurrences of πνεῦμα.

6.2.1.4 Macrostructure and sociolinguistic aspect

From the identified semantic units and the analysis of discourse coherence, the macrostructure of Galatians can be understood as follows. Paul emphatically warns the Galatians against the necessity of circumcision. He expresses his affection to the Galatians, and reiterates that they are justified by God through faith instead of

74 Matera, Galatians, 206.
75 Longenecker, 246.
76 Fung, 248. Fee similarly argues that walking by the Spirit is “the primary new covenant imperative.” Fee, Galatians, 208. Dunn suggests that the Spirit is employed in contrast to “the living by the Law.” Dunn, Galatians, 296. For Bruce, “led by the Spirit” is made antithetical to “under law.” Bruce, Galatians, 245.
observing the Law, particularly practising circumcision. In Christ, Jews and Gentiles are one, a new creation in a new dispensation. Therefore, the community that has received the Spirit should live by the Spirit under this new dispensation.

In terms of sociolinguistic aspect, Paul invokes his apostleship to amplify the magnitude of his warning and teaching. In 1:1, he uses the self-designation, ἀπόστολος ... διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Agosto argues that this self-designation is employed to “re-establish his authority.” Although Paul also calls himself Χριστοῦ δοῦλος in 1:10, it must not be mistaken as a mere expression of humility. As previously discussed, this self-designation carries a specific connotation, pointing to Paul’s leadership by alluding to the noble status of an imperial slave or the power possessed by a slave agent.

6.2.1.15 The flow of discourse and peak
In the stage (1:1–10), Paul renounces the Galatians for their abandonment of the gospel truth (1:6) that he has preached. Various themes, including the Law, circumcision, and justification, are being developed in the following episodes (Units A and B) to form an argument: the Galatians are justified through faith in Christ, instead of through observing the Law. In the pre-peak episode (Unit B3), the Galatians are portrayed as the children of promise, who are no longer under the Law.

---

77 Agosto, Servant, 102.

78 As previously mentioned, Martin further argues that this self-designation depicts Paul as a “slave agent,” leading and managing other Christians who are the slaves of Christ. Martin, Slavery, 75–6. The use of slavery language seems to be a paradox, since Gal 5:1 teaches about freedom from slavery. However, Martin argues that Paul, resembling a slave agent who is an “authoritative representative(s) of the power owner,” uses this self-designation to imply his power and authority in his address to the the Galatians. Martin, Slavery, 60.
Meanwhile, Paul provides a strong summative argument in the peak episode (Unit C), in which the climax of the discourse is located.

Several features demonstrate that 5:1–12 is the peak of Galatians (and 5:1–6 is the climax within). Not only is the semantic unit located near the end of the letter, the unit is also a zone of grammatical turbulence that exhibits many intriguing grammatical phenomena.

First, the two imperative verbs in 5:1b are grammatically unique. In 5:1b, Paul exhorts the Galatians: στήκετε οὖν καὶ μὴ πάλιν ζυλὸ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε. This is the only occasion in Galatians, where both a positive imperative verb and a negative one co-exist in the same clause: στήκετε ... μὴ ... ἐνέχεσθε. The two imperatives are in a parallel, elucidating the same concept. Most intriguingly, one imperative is placed at the beginning of the clause, whilst the other, the end of it. In other words, the parallel is also constructed in a unique word order, possibly capturing attention and providing emphasis.

Second, in 5:2, Paul employs an expression to draw the attention of the Galatians: ἵδε ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ύμῖν. This expression also occurs in 2 Cor 10:1, 1 Thess 2:18, and Phlm 1:19. In all three cases, Paul makes an emphatic expression.79 The relationship between Paul and the Galatians is clearly highlighted.

Third, parallelism is a prominent device in 5:2–4, 5:2–3 in particular. Not only are 5:2 and 5:3 in parallel, they also contain the re-emergence of some key themes in Galatians. The message conveyed in 5:2(’’ίδε ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ύμῖν ἐὰν

79 In 2 Cor 10:1, Paul defends his apostleship: δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς. In 1 Thess 2:18, Paul expresses his genuine desire to visit the Thessalonians: διότι ἤλθεν τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ θεοῦ σαλβήσεως ὑμῶν. In Phlm 1:19, Paul makes a personal emphatic plea to Philemon: ἐγὼ Παῦλος ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί, ἐγὼ ἀποστόλος. As well as the clause in Galatians 5:2, all of these expressions follow the pattern of ἐγὼ Παῦλος.
περιτέμνησθε, Χριστός ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὀφελήσει) is immediately reiterated in 5:3 (μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὧτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλων τῶν νόμων ποιήσαι). Four elements are in parallel between these two verses. The clause Ἰδε ἐγὼ Παύλος λέγω ὑμῖν (5:2a) is synonymous with the clause μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν (5:3a). The concept expressed in the clause Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὀφελήσει (5:2b) is in parallel with ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλων τῶν νόμων ποιήσαι (5:3b), by employing the antithetical themes: Χριστὸς and νόμος. The word περιτέμνω is repeated in both verses. The two words, ὀφελήσει (5:2b) and ὀφειλέτης (5:3b), share the same semantic root, since ὀφειλέτης is the corresponding noun of ὀφείλω. In addition to the parallel, the two key themes in Galatians, circumcision and the Law, join together in 5:3. Of interest, this is the first occasion in this epistle that the concept of circumcision (denoted by περιτέμνω) and the concept of the Law (denoted by νόμος) appear in the same clause. Then, 5:2–3 is followed by a summative statement that again mentions the two antithetical themes: κατηρύθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ ὡτινές ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε (4a). As such, the use of parallelism is extremely prominent in 5:2–4.

Finally, Paul introduces a resolution in 5:5, ἢμεῖς γὰρ πνεῦματε ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. Then, he employs the contrast of περιτομή and ἀκροβυστία (5:6) to summarise his argument: ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὕτω περιτομή τι ἵσχυε οὕτω ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ πίστεις δι’ ἀγάπης ἐνεργοῦμεν. A similar expression also occurs near the end of the letter: οὕτω γὰρ περιτομή τι ἐστιν οὕτω ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ καὶνή κτίσις (6:15). This reflects the significance of the argument in 5:6. In 5:1–6, all the key words representing the key themes of this epistle occur: περιτομή, νόμος, δικαιώμα, Χριστός, and πνεῦμα. They
simultaneously appear within six verses, congruently forming a core message of Galatians (as shown in the discussion of macrostructure).

In summary, the influx of many intriguing grammatical devices within six verses, including both positive and negative imperative verbs in the same clause, an emphatic expression (ἐγὼ Παῦλος), multiple parallels; and key thematic words of the epistle, demonstrates that 5:1–12 is the discourse peak, in which 5:1–6 is the climax. Figure 6.12 shows the discourse flow of Galatians.

Figure 6.12 The Flow of Discourse of Galatians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aperture &amp; Stage (Letter-opening)</th>
<th>Various Developing Episodes (A-B)</th>
<th>Peak (C)</th>
<th>Post-peak (D)</th>
<th>Closure and Finis (E and letter-closing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>άδελφοι* 4:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>άδελφοι* 5:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>άδελφοι* 6:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ψίνημα 5:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unusual grammatical devices:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>στήριστε και μὴ ἐνέχεσθε 5:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐγὼ ἤμεν 5:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἡγησίας 5:11, 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>άδελφοι* 5:16, 17, 18, 22, 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οὕτε γὰρ άδελφοι τε ἐστίν ὑμῖν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οὕτε ἀκροβατεῖ αἱλά καίνη κτίσις 6:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Μετατίθεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν καλόντως ἐμάς εἰς θέρατον [Χριστοῦ] εἰς ἐκείνου εὐαγγέλιον 1:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>έν κατεξοριστῇ ιμᾷ ἐν χάριτι 5:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>έν ἔριοι 5:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dénouement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of themes,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contrastive themes; *: 'Αδελφοί, which emphasises the relational bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.1.2 Discourse Structure of Philemon

Philemon is the shortest of all the Pauline epistles. Despite its shortness, the epistle can still be analysed by adopting the same method based on discourse analysis.

6.2.1.2.1 Discourse markers

Four discourse markers demarcate the semantic units in Philemon: use of the vocative, change of verb mood, formulas, and lexical cohesion.

6.2.1.2.1.1 Vocative. Paul addresses two target audiences in Philemon: Φιλήμων (1:1); and several recipients including τῇ κατ’ οἶκόν σου ἐκκλησία (1:2). However, Φιλήμων is the primary addressee. Hence, the vocative ἄδειλφε is employed, and it occurs twice in Philemon (1:7 and 1:20). The first vocative ends the discussion in which Paul recalls his relationship and passion towards Philemon before the emergence of a new discussion in 1:8. The second vocative ends a major discussion of Onesimus. Thus, both vocatives demarcate two major semantic units: 1:4–7 and 1:8–20.

6.2.1.2.1.2 Change of verb mood. There are four imperative verbs (1:17, 18, 20, 22). All of them occur near the end of the epistle, signifying the boundary of 1:17–20. Although this segment is in the middle of the discussion of Onesimus, Paul shifts to articulate the actions that Philemon should take for Onesimus, as indicated by the

---

80 This is demonstrated by the frequent occurrences of the second person singular personal pronouns throughout the whole letter (20 in total). Although Ἀπφία, Ἀρχίππος, and τῇ κατ’ οἶκόν σου ἐκκλησία are mentioned in 1:2, there are only four second person plural personal pronouns (1:3, 22 (twice), 25).
influx of imperative verbs. Thus, 1:17–20 is a minor semantic unit within the major
discussion of Onesimus (1:8–20).

6.2.1.2.1.3 Formulas. The only formula in Philemon is the formulaic praise
Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου (1:4). It begins the first topic of this epistle following the
initial greeting (1:1–3).

6.2.1.2.1.4 Lexical cohesion. There are two patterns of lexical cohesion in
Philemon: the recurrence of δέσμιος and its cognate δεσμός, and the repetition of
παρακαλέω (see Appendix 7). Both patterns occur in the major discussion of
Onesimus. Thus, they both indicate a minor unit within 1:8–20.

First, δέσμιος and δεσμός occur four times (δέσμιος, in 1:1, 9; δεσμός, in
1:10, 13). They indicate that imprisonment is the topic in 1:8–16, discussing the
imprisonment of both Paul (Παῦλος, δέσμιος Χριστοῦ, in 1:1) and Onesimus
(ἐμοῦ τεκνοῦ ... ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς, Ὄνησιμον, in 1:10)

Second, in the discussion of imprisonment, παρακαλέω is repeated twice in
close proximity (1:9, 10). Both occurrences depict Paul’s plea to Philemon concerning
Onesimus.

6.2.1.2.2 Semantic units
Through the four identified discourse markers, the epistle can be divided into: the
The two major units are Unit A (Paul’s affection for Philemon, in 1:4–7) and Unit B
(Paul’s plea to Philemon for Onesimus, in 1:8–20). Table 6.6 shows the major semantic units of Philemon.

Table 6.6 Semantic Units of Philemon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Units</th>
<th>A 1:4–7</th>
<th>B 1:8–20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Markers</td>
<td>δελεφε (1:7)</td>
<td>δελεφε (1:20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM1: Vocative</td>
<td>Ευχαριστο τω δεσμον (1:4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM2: Change of Verb Mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM3: Imperatives: 3/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM4: Lexical Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Topic</td>
<td>Paul’s affection for Philemon</td>
<td>Paul’s plea to Philemon for Onesimus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7 outlines the perspectives of other scholars, regarding the major semantic units in Philemon. As shown in the table, the semantic units outlined in this study are similar to those proposed by various scholars.
Table 6.7 Outline of Philemon by Scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline of this Study</th>
<th>Opening 1:1–3</th>
<th>Semantic Unit A 1:4–7</th>
<th>Semantic Unit B 1:8–20</th>
<th>Closing 1:21–25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outline of Scholars</td>
<td>Barth</td>
<td>Barth</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Barth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Fitzmyer</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Lohse</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitzmyer</td>
<td>Fitzmyer</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Fitzmyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lohse</td>
<td>Lohse</td>
<td>Moo</td>
<td>Lohse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moo</td>
<td>Moo</td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>Moo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>O’Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>Nordling</td>
<td>Thurston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.1.2.3 Discourse coherence

Although Paul primarily addresses Philemon in this letter, communal relationship is a coherent theme.

Philemon is not a private letter per se. The major issue in the epistle is also the concern of Christian community gathered in Philemon’s house. As previously mentioned, the recipients of this epistle include τῆς κατ’ οἶκόν σου ἐκκλησίας (1:2), as indicated by plural pronoun ὑμῖν in the initial greeting, χάρις ὑμῖν (1:3).

In Unit A, Paul praises Philemon for his love. Philemon shows his love to πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους (1:5), and refreshes τῶν ἁγίων (1:7). The saints refer to believers, possibly including those who gather in Philemon’s house. Thus, instead of depicting Philemon’s love in a general sense, the repetition of οἱ ἁγίοι could be a

---

81 Barth and Blanke, vii–ix; Bruce, Philemon, 203; Dunn, Colossians, vii; Fitzmyer, Philemon, vii; Lohse, vii; Martin, Philemon, 155; Moo, Philemon, vii; O’Brien, Colossians, viii; Thurston and Ryan, vii; Nordling, vii-vii. Barth is the abbreviation for Barth and Blanke; and Thurston is an abbreviation for Thurston and Ryan.
subtle reference to the worship community at Philemon’s house.\textsuperscript{82}

In Unit B, the topic is about Paul’s plea to Philemon for Onesimus. However, several observations show that this issue is also a concern of the Christian community. First, Paul appeals to Philemon to receive Onesimus διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην (1:9). The word ἀγάπη mentioned in 1:5 and 1:7 is now reiterated in 1:9. This pattern of lexical cohesion indicates that the appeal is not merely a private matter. Rather, it is related to Philemon’s love, his love for the Christian community in particular. Upon his return to Philemon, Onesimus, a new Christian convert, would likely be joining the community that is described by Paul as τῇ κατ’ οἰκόν σου ἐκκλησία. Not only would his return affect Philemon, it would also impact the Christian community gathered in Philemon’s house. As noted by Wilson, Philemon has now become a “valuable member of the community.”\textsuperscript{83}

In the letter-closing, the request and the final greeting involve two communities: Philemon and his house church, and the prison community (Ἐπαφρᾶς, Μᾶρκος, Ἀρίσταρχος, Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς, in 1:24–25). Although Paul portrays Μᾶρκος, Ἀρίσταρχος, Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς as his co-workers, mentioning their names may allude to their regular visit to the prison where Paul and Ἐπαφρᾶς are. Thus, the fate of Onesimus would be witnessed by both communities.

Notably, when Paul makes a request for a guest room, instead of using a second person personal singular pronoun (as in the case of 1:4–21), he uses two plural

\textsuperscript{82} Barth and Blanke argue that the phrase πάντας τὸς ἀγίος refers to both the believers assembled in Philemon’s house and the believers visiting Colossae. Barth and Blanke, 280. Nordling suggests that “the church” and “the saints” are two interchangeable terms. Nordling, 202–3.

pronouns to indicate his wish: τῶν προσευχῶν ὑμῶν χαρισθήσομαι ὑμῖν (1:22).

This indicates that Paul addresses both Philemon and the members of his house church.84 This reinforces our theory that the issue of Onesimus is also the concern of the community.

Onesimus is a slave of Philemon (1:16) and a fellow prisoner of Paul (1:10). Although his name is not mentioned in both the initial greeting (1:1–3) and the letter-closing (1:21–25), he belongs to two communities. As such, his return would definitely not be a private matter between Paul and Philemon. Rather, it would be the concern of both prison community and Christian community worshipped in Philemon’s house. As well argued by Barth and Blake, Paul makes this letter “a matter of the church, so that Philemon must respond for his good or bad behaviour before the community.”85 According to Fitzmyer, Paul’s concern for the Christian community that would be “involved in the way Onesimus is to be welcomed back by Philemon.”86

6.2.1.2.4 Macrostructure and sociolinguistic aspect
The macrostructure of Philemon can be understood as follows. Paul makes known his desire to Philemon that he would like to keep Onesimus (a slave of Philemon), but he also urges Philemon to welcome Onesimus back, as if welcoming Paul himself. This

84 A number of commentators hold this view. Nordling, 285; Dunn, Colossians, 346; Thurston and Ryan, 256; Lohse, 207; Fitzmyer, Philemon, 123.

85 Barth and Blanke, 493–4.

86 Fitzmyer, Philemon, 81.
issue is the concern of two communities: the prison community, and the Christian community gathered in Philemon’s house.

6.2.1.2.5 The flow of discourse and peak
Paul develops his argument in various developing episodes, focusing on his relationship with Philemon: χαράν γὰρ πολλὴν ἔσχον καὶ παράκλησιν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου (1:7); διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην μᾶλλον παρακαλῶ (1:9); and εἰ οὖν με ἔχεις κοινωνῶν (1:17). The peak of this epistle is located in Unit B2 (1:17–20). This is demonstrated by the influx of imperative verbs and the occurrences of several grammatical devices in B2.

There are four imperative verbs in this epistle, and three of them occur in B2. Of interest, these three imperatives reflect the macrostructure of this epistle. The first imperative clause προσλαβοῦ αὐτὸν ὡς ἐμέ (1:17) expresses Paul’s desire: Onesimus could be welcomed by Philemon. The second imperative clause τὸῦτο ἐμοὶ ἐλλόγα (1:18) is Paul’s rhetorical strategy, emphasising the seriousness of Paul’s desire. Although Paul informs Philemon to charge his account for what Onesimus owes Philemon, Paul immediately reminds Philemon of what he owes Paul: σεαυτὸν μοι προσφέιλεις (1:19). The third imperative clause ἀνάπαυσον μοι τὰ σπλάγχνα (1:20) summarises Paul’s desire stated in 1:17. According to the context, Philemon could refresh Paul if he follows Paul’s command stated in 1:17, προσλαβοῦ αὐτὸν ὡς ἐμέ. The imperative ἀνάπαυσον also echoes with its previous occurrence in 1:7 (ἀναπέπαυσα), in which Philemon is praised for refreshing the saints. In summary, all three imperatives do not signify general exhortation. Rather, they are specific, personal, and related to the same issue.
Unit B2 also displays some captivating grammatical devices. First, two first class conditional sentences occur in adjacent verses: εἰ οὖν μὲ ἔχεις κοινωνίαν (1:17a); and εἰ δέ τι ηδίκησέν σε ἣ ὑφείλει (1:18a). Of interest, they are the only conditional clauses in this epistle. Second, two emphatic expressions occur in the same verse in which Paul uses two emphatic expressions: ἐγὼ Παῦλος (1:19a); and ἐγὼ ἀποτίσω (19b). The pronoun ἐγὼ is not redundant. Rather, it illustrates emphasis. Third, there are 17 first personal singular pronouns in this epistle. Approximately half of them occur in 1:17–20: με and ἐμέ (17); ἐμοί (18); ἐγὼ (twice in 19) and μοι (19); ἐγὼ and μοι (20).

In summary, B2 exhibits a zone of grammatical turbulence as indicated by the influx of imperative verbs (which point to the same issue) and the occurrences of several grammatical devices (the adjacent conditional sentences, the emphatic expressions, and the concentrated occurrence of first personal singular pronouns). As such, this study proposes that B2 is the peak of this epistle.

The clause in 1:21, Πεποιθῶς τῇ ὑπακοῆ σου ἐγραψά σοι, has a summative purpose as Paul expresses his confidence in Philemon’s favourable response. This can be considered as the dénouement in the post-peak episode. Figure 6.13 shows the discourse flow of Philemon.
6.2.2 Textual Analysis of the Grace Benediction

6.2.2.1 Form and Function

Paul always ends his epistles with a “grace benediction,” using the phrase ἡ χάρις τοῦ κύριου. This phrase is followed by different variants: μέθ’ ἵματιν (Rom 16:20; 1

---

87 This is a term used by Weima, and this study adopts this term. Jeffrey A. D. Weima, *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings* (JSNTSup 101; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 78.
Cor 16:23; 1 Thess 5:28); μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν (2 Cor 12:14); and μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν (Gal 6:18; Phil 4:23; Phlm 1:25).\(^{88}\) The form of this grace benediction has two different explanations of its origin. First, Jewett argues that all the benedictions in the NT are derived from a single formula, which is a free variation of the basic Hebraic form of Aaronic Blessing (Num 6:24–6).\(^{89}\) Since the form of the grace benediction is absent in contemporary Greek literature, Jewett contends that it must be derived from the OT. Mullins holds a similar view, and argues that the NT benedictions, including Paul’s, follow a basic form that is derived from several texts in the LXX, including 2 Kgs 24:23; Ruth 2:4; and Num 6:24.\(^{90}\) For Mullin, these passages consist of “three basic elements—wish, divine source, and recipient”.\(^{91}\)

On the other hand, Stirewalt, White, and Weima adopt the second explanation. Stirewalt and White compare the Pauline epistles with ancient Greek official letters, and argue that the farewell section in those letters is replaced by a benediction in Pauline epistles.\(^{92}\) Weima similarly contends that Paul uses the “health wishes” in the standard closing formula of contemporary Greco-Roman letters as a template to create

---

\(^{88}\) The benedictions in the suspected pseudepigrapha follow a similar pattern: ἡ χάρις is employed with μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν (2 Thessalonians and Titus), μὲθ’ ὑμῶν (1 and 2 Timothy), or μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπῶντων (Ephesians). None of the suspected pseudepigrapha uses the phrase μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. In other words, anthropological terms are absent in all the benedictions in the suspected pseudepigrapha.


\(^{91}\) Mullins, “Benediction,” 61.

a unique grace benediction that is absent in contemporary letters.\(^{93}\)

Both explanations should not be regarded as mutually exclusive, since they can be combined to explain the form of Paul’s grace benediction. Whilst adopting the Greco-Roman letter-closings to address a community with a partial Gentile audience, Paul uses the basic elements in the Hebraic Blessing to compose his grace benediction with three variations (μεθ’ ὑμῶν; μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν; and μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν.\(^{94}\)

As for the function, there are two contrastive views. First, the benediction is simply a formula that is alienated from the letter body that Champion claims can easily be separated from its wider context, since it may not even have originated with Paul and could just be comprised of some well-known phrases circulated among Christians.\(^{95}\) Conversely, some scholars argue that there is a connection between a benediction and the letter content. Jewett contends that the NT benedictions, including the Pauline benedictions, aim to summarise the arguments presented in the main body of a letter.\(^{96}\) By examining the usage of εἰρήνη in the benedictions of 1 Thessalonians and Galatians, Weima explains how the concept of peace is central to the purpose of these two epistles.\(^{97}\)


\(^{94}\) Regardless of the possibility of this theory, Roetzel argues that the grace benediction is the “most stable” element in the Pauline letter-closings, with only minor variations. Calvin J. Roetzel, *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context* (5th ed.; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2009), 70.


\(^{96}\) However, Jewett does not investigate this benedictory phrase and its variants in his study. Jewett, “Form,” 24–5; 34.

According to Bahr, an ancient author would usually employ a scribe to write the letter body, but the author would write the last closing remarks to signify his or her signature, which Bahr calls subscription.98 If Bahr is correct, then the closing remarks of all the Pauline epistles, including the benedictions, essentially reflect what Paul desires to convey. Based on the findings of Bahr and White, it can be assumed that the variant form, μετὰ τοῦ πνεῦματος ὑμῶν, in the grace benedictions of Galatians, Philippians, and Philemon, is not random but rather is closely related to the letters’ content as Paul deliberately chooses to depart from the usual formula: μεθ’ ὑμῶν.

Given the close connection between the letter content and the benediction, discourse analysis is an effective method to ascertain the meaning of πνεῦμα in the grace benediction. The following parts initially review the explanations of πνεῦμα in previous scholarship, then investigates its abnormal singular construct, and finally apply the previous findings of discourse structure to ascertain the meaning of πνεῦμα in Gal 6:18, Phil 4:23, and Phlm 1:25. This study will show that πνεῦμα carries a social and corporate connotation by indicating the connection between the chosen variant form and the core message of each letter.

6.2.2.2 Explanations of Πνεῦμα in Previous Scholarship

The most problematic element in the grace benediction is arguably the definite singular genitive noun τοῦ πνεῦματος. In previous scholarship, there are three major interpretations of the meaning of πνεῦμα: 1) it denotes the Holy Spirit; 2) it carries an...

---

ontological sense, describing a human spirit; 3) the phrase τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν is considered as synonymous with ὑμῶν. Some scholars adopt one interpretation; others hold a combination of different interpretations. However, some scholars simply ignore or provide little analytical comment of the grace benediction.99

According to the first explanation, πνεῦμα is treated as a normal singular noun, denoting the Holy Spirit. Jewett is a proponent of this view.100 In interpreting πνεῦμα in Gal 6:18 and Phil 4:23, he argues that the reference of πνεῦμα “is clearly being made to the single divine spirit.”101 For Jewett, there is no such distinction between the divine spirit and the human spirit in Paul’s work, since πνεῦμα means “the apportionment of the divine spirit given to each Christian.”102 This view does not receive wide support in scholarship. Fee argues that it is a futile attempt to link the πνεῦμα in Gal 6:18 to the Holy Spirit as Jewett’s assumption is not as “clear” as he states.103 This study also repudiates this explanation. If the singular πνεῦμα is a normal singular noun, denoting the Holy Spirit, it would be theologically absurd to interpret that Paul wishes Christ’s grace to be in company with the Holy Spirit.

The second explanation is a common view. πνεῦμα connotes the human

99 For example, some commentators either ignore or mention little about the grace benediction in Phil 4:23. Johnstone, 477–8; Synge, 48; Cousar, Philippians, 90–1.

100 Reumann also shares Jewett’s view. In commenting the πνεῦμα in Phil 4:23, Reumann defines the term as God’s Spirit that is apportioned to one and all. Reumann, 732.

101 Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 184.

102 Jewett, Anthropological Terms, 197. Bauer also argues that in some contemporary Greek literature, πνεῦμα connotes a divine spirit actually in the soul (τὸ πνεῦμα τῇ ψυχῇ). BDAG, 675.

103 Referring to the singular use of πνεῦμα, Jewett argues the “reference is clearly being made to the single divine spirit.” Apparently, Fee responds to Jewett’s word “clearly.” Fee, Empowering, 469.
spirit, denoting: the “anthropological πνεῦμα,” depicting the psychical functions of humans; “inner personality,” functioning as a contact point between humans and God; the individual human spirits of the readers; or the “whole personality,” emphasising its mental and spiritual aspects. Amongst the scholars who advocate this explanation, some also argue that the singular πνεῦμα is a distributive singular noun, pointing to each spirit of the reader. However, most of these interpreters provide very little evidence of how this kind of ontological connotation is derived from the text. The most problematic issue of all, they, with only a few exceptions, usually analyse the benediction by singling it out the context of an

---

104 A number of scholars hold this view, including Schweizer, Betz, Fung, Ellicott, Hendriksen, Matera, Bockmuehl, Collange, Müller, Dunn, Bockmuehl, Fee, Hansen, Hawthorne, and O’Brien. Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα,” TDNT, 6:435; Betz, Galatians, 325; Fung, 315; Ellicott, 140; Matera, Galatians, 227; Collange, 155; Müller, 211; Dunn, Colossians, 349; Moo, Philemon, 442; Bockmuehl, 271; Fee, Philippians, 461, Hansen, 332; O’Brien, Philippians, 554–5, Hawthorne, 215–6. Some of these scholars hold a combination of several views. For example, Fung argues that the πνεῦμα in Gal 6:18 denotes the human spirit, referring to “God conscious aspect” of a human. However, Fung also supports the view in which μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὕμων and μεθ’ ὕμων are synonymous. Fung, 315.


106 Hendriksen, Galatians, 249.

107 Dunn, Colossians, 349.

108 Collange, 155.

109 Bockmuehl, Fee, Hansen, Hawthorne, and O’Brien define the πνεῦμα in Phil 4:23 as a distributive singular. For instance, Bockmuehl asserts that the benediction should be interpreted as follows: “God’s grace to be with the people’s individual human spirits as united in Christ’s fellowship.” Bockmuehl, 271; Fee, Philippians, 461, Hansen, 332; O’Brien, Philippians, 554–5, Hawthorne, 215–6.

110 For instance, Betz notes that πνεῦμα throughout Galatians denotes the Holy Spirit. Without providing further explanation, he then argues that only the πνεῦμα in 6:18 connotes the human spirit. See Betz, Galatians, 325.

111 In interpreting the πνεῦμα in Gal 6:18, Dunn argues that the term denotes the human spirit that is bonded with the Holy Spirit, a bonding that elucidates the new identity of the Christian community that should not be defined by ethnicity. His interpretation seems to the take the context of the epistle into consideration. Dunn, Galatians, 347.
epistle, as if the benediction is a separate piece of work that is totally disconnected from the rest of the letter. As previously argued, a benediction is closely associated with the letter content. As such, this study also repudiates this explanation. The problem of this explanation can be demonstrated by the following example. In Galatians, the concept of the human spirit is nowhere found in Galatians. The core message of the epistle is totally unrelated to the discussion of the human spirit. Thus, the emergence of πνεῦμα as the human spirit in Gal 6:18 is incoherent with the entire epistle.112

The third explanation is that the phrase μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν is synonymous with the phrase μεθ’ ὑμῶν. This view can be traced back to an early Church Father in the 4th century AD, John Chrysostom,113 who argues that Paul deliberately uses μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν instead of μεθ’ ὑμῶν for the purpose of redirecting the Galatians away from “carnal things” that sprung from their “judaizing error.”114 The interpretation of Chrysostom indicates that the benediction is of two natures: both a benediction and an exhortation. Centuries later, some scholars adopt this explanation, suggesting that μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν is simply an

112 A detailed discussion of πνεῦμα in Gal 6:18 will later be presented in this chapter.

113 This study does not suggest that this view was originated by John Chrysostom. His argument only serves as an example to illustrate how early the discussion of μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν was. Chrysostom’s view is mentioned by scholars in the last two centuries, including Schlier and Lightfoot. Lightfoot, Galatians, 226. Schlier, Galater, 285.

114 Chrysostom subtly points out the synonymous nature of τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν and μεθ’ ὑμῶν, although his focus is to highlight the connection between the word πνεῦμα and the issues faced by the Galatians. This subtle allusion has probably inspired many contemporary commentators. John Chrysostom, Galatians 6:18 (NPNF 13:47–8).
abbreviation of μεθ’ ὑμῶν or μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.\textsuperscript{115} This study argues that the synonymy suggested by Chrysostom is sound. Since the phrase ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου is followed by μεθ’ ὑμῶν, μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν, or μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, it is logical to consider μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν as synonymous with μεθ’ ὑμῶν. In addition, despite his problematic conclusion (the “judaizing error”), Chrysostom’s attempt of connecting the benediction with the letter content is admirable. The meaning of the variant form, μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, should be ascertained by referring to the letter content, an approach adopted by this study. However, this explanation does not account for the abnormal singular construct.

Although there is an attempt to define πνεύμα in the grace benediction, most scholars fail to assert their view by providing a clear and persuasive argument. Furthermore, there is a common failure in explaining the singular πνεύμα in the abnormal singular construct. Many scholars ignore this abnormal construction. For those who attempt to address it, the singular form is simply interpreted as the

\textsuperscript{115} McDonald, Bruce, and Burton adopt this view in their comments of Gal 6:18. McDonald, 157; Bruce, \textit{Galatians}, 277; Burton, 362. Burton further argues that the phrase denotes the “spiritual fellowship” among the Galatians. Likewise, Martin, Lohse, O’Brien, Bruce and Fee adopt this view in their comments of Phlm 1: 25. However, most of them do not provide any detailed explanations. For example, Lohse does not explain why he holds this view. Lohse, 208. Martin simply quotes the work of Schweizer, arguing that τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν is equivalent to ὑμεῖς. O’Brien indicates the synonymous nature of μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν and μεθ’ ὑμῶν without providing further explanation. Martin, \textit{Philemon}, 170; O’Brien, \textit{Colossians}, 308; Bruce, \textit{Philemon}, 225; Fee, \textit{Empowering}, 635.
distributive singular.\textsuperscript{116} As previously argued, it must not be assumed that the distributive singular always explains the abnormal singular construct in the Pauline epistles. Fee sharply points out that the attempt by scholarship to explain this abnormal singular construct in the grace benediction “has tended to draw blanks.”\textsuperscript{117} Weima provides a good reason for this failure, by arguing that there is a common disinterest in the closing sections of the Pauline epistles.\textsuperscript{118}

In summary, many scholars either ignore the connection between the grace benediction and the letter content, or overlook the peculiar abnormal singular construct. Some scholars do not provide a persuasive reason, and simply suggest that πνεῦμα denotes the Holy Spirit, the human spirit, or a hybrid formed by the combination of the Holy Spirit and the human spirit.

\textbf{6.2.2.3 The Abnormal Singular Construct in the Grace Benediction}

To accurately ascertain the meaning of πνεῦμα in the grace benediction, it is crucial to explain the abnormal singular construct. In the grace benediction, the singular form of πνεῦμα is combined with the second person plural possessive pronoun ὑμῶν. This

\textsuperscript{116} There is one notable observation. This peculiar grammatical construct is rarely mentioned in the commentaries of Gal 6:18 as very few scholars notice the singular form of πνεῦμα modified by the plural pronoun, ὑμῶν. Conversely, there is a sudden swarm of works interpreting the πνεῦμα in Phil 4:23 as the distributive singular. Regarding Phlm 1:25, the benediction does not interest some commentators, let alone the abnormal singular construct. For example, Muller does not include any analysis of the benediction in his work; and Vincent only briefly mentions the text. Lightfoot simply mentions that the benediction in Philemon is the same as in Galatians without any elaboration. Thompson regards ὑμῶν as pointing to the church that congregates at Philemon’s house. Nothing is mentioned regarding πνεῦμα. Williams simply argues that this benediction is a prayer. Muller, 193; Vincent, 192–3; Lightfoot, \textit{Philemon}, 344; Thompson, 227; Williams, \textit{Philemon}, 191.

\textsuperscript{117} This is Fee’s conclusion in commenting the benediction in Gal 6:18, Fee, \textit{Empowering}, 469.

\textsuperscript{118} Weima, “Pauline Letter Closing,” 180–2. Some commentators do not provide any interpretation of μετὰ τοῦ πνεῦματος ὑμῶν.
combination is not found in the NT except in the Pauline Epistles,\textsuperscript{119} and only occurs four times in Paul’s letters. Three out of the four occurrences appear as the identical benedictions in Gal 6:18, Phil 4:23, and Phlm 1:25.\textsuperscript{120}

This study proposes that the variant form \(\mu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\;\tau\omicron\upsilon\;\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\) is not a random insertion. It is a purposefully chosen alternative that is connected with the coherent message in the context of the relevant epistle. The singular \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsigma\mu\alpha\) in the grace benediction denotes neither the human spirits (as the distributive singular) nor the Holy Spirit. Rather, the singular \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsigma\mu\alpha\) is a normal singular noun, metaphorically employed to denote the corporate entity of a faith community. This explanation becomes evident when the discourse structure of each epistle is considered, whereas corporate entity or communal unity is a prominent theme in Galatians, Philippians, and Philemon. This explanation also accounts for the synonymous nature of \(\mu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\;\tau\omicron\upsilon\;\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\;\upsilon\mu\omega\upsilon\) and \(\mu\varepsilon\theta\;\upsilon\mu\omega\upsilon\). Instead of using \(\upsilon\mu\omega\upsilon\), Paul uses the variant form with the singular \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsigma\mu\alpha\) to highlight the corporate and communal unity.

Several scholars advocate this view, including Beare, Reed, Martin, Thurston and Ryan. Although Beare and Reed advocate this view, they do not explain the

\textsuperscript{119} In addition, the combination of the second person plural possessive pronoun and the plural form of \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsigma\mu\alpha\) is entirely absent in the NT.

\textsuperscript{120} The fourth occurrence is located near the end of 1 Cor 16:18, \(\acute{\alpha}i\nu\varepsilon\pi\alpha\nu\varsigma\alpha\nu\;\gamma\acute{\alpha}ρ\;\tau\omicron\;\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\nu\;\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsigma\mu\alpha\;\kappa\alpha\iota\;\tau\omicron\;\upsilon\mu\omega\upsilon\). \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsigma\mu\alpha\) is connected to two possessive pronouns, \(\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\nu\) (referring to Paul) and \(\upsilon\mu\omega\upsilon\) (denoting the Corinthians). It is highly unlikely that the word denotes the Holy Spirit, since Paul portrays that his \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsigma\mu\alpha\) and the \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\upsigma\mu\alpha\) of the Corinthians are refreshed by Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus (16:17). However, this clause is not the subject of this analysis, since it is not a benediction.
rationale behind it. Thurston and Ryan support this view in their analysis of Phil 4:23. They first pinpoint the synonymous nature of μετὰ τοῦ πνεῦματος ὑμῶν and μεθ’ ὑμῶν, and then propose the communal connotation of πνεῦμα. They argue that the term denotes the community resembling an entire “person,” echoing the emphasis of one-mindedness of the church in the epistle. Since they examine the wider textual context of the epistle and connect the benediction with another text in the letter body: ἐν ἑνὶ πνεῦματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ (1:27), their argument is persuasive. Martin similarly considers that πνεῦμα refers to “the unity of the body of believers in which one spirit to be found,” pointing to the entire person of the believers assembled as a congregation, as indicated by the singular use of the noun.

6.2.3 The Meaning of Πνεῦμα in Light of Discourse Analysis

As previously argued, defining πνεῦμα as the Holy Spirit (as a normal singular noun) or the human spirit (as a distributive singular noun) in the grace benediction is problematic. The meaning of πνεῦμα in Gal 6:18, Phil 4:23, and Phlm 1:25 must satisfy the following three criteria: to account for the abnormal singular construct, to

---

121 For Beare, the singular form of πνεῦμα in Phil 4:23 elucidates that the Philippians are all animated by the “one spirit.” However, he does not explain his argument. Beare, 158. Reed defines πνεῦμα in 4:23 as the “collective spirit” of the Philippians. Likewise, he does not provide further elaboration. Reed, Discourse, 306. Of interest, although Moo interprets πνεῦμα in Phlm 1:25 as the human spirit, he does suggest that this grammatical construction reinforces the oneness in spirit of the congregation. Moo, Philemon, 442.

122 Thurston and Ryan, 161.

123 Martin, Philippians, 171.

124 However, this view is not popular in modern scholarship. For example, O’Brien repudiates this view. He asserts that πνεῦμα carries an anthropological significance in Phil 4:23, arguing that there is no difference between τοῦ πνεῦματος ὑμῶν and ὑμῶν. O’Brien, Philippians, 555.
be coherent with the discourse structure of the respective epistle; to explain the reason behind adopting this particular variant form.

6.2.3.1 Πνεῦμα in Gal 6:18 in Light of Discourse Analysis

Through our discourse analysis of Galatians, 6:18 (‘Η χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἡμῶν, ἀδελφοί· ἀμήν) is connected with the entire epistle in the following ways.

First, ἀδελφοί indicates Paul’s affection towards the Galatians, which is expressed through the lexical cohesion of ἀδελφοί throughout the epistle. The last occurrence of ἀδελφοί in 6:18 immediately follows the grace benediction. Hence, the benediction does not serve as a mere benediction. Paul employs the vocative to refer to the previous context, and reminds the Galatians of the relational bond between Paul and them, highlighting the Pauline gospel that they once received.

Second, as previously discussed, the thematic meaning of πνεῦμα points to the Galatian community under a new dispensation in which the community is incorporated in Christ. The singular πνεῦμα in the benediction highlights this corporate reference, since the term denotes the corporate entity of this community as a new single creation. This connotation is also expressed in the preceding context of the benediction. In 6:15, Paul reiterates the contrast between circumcision and new creation by providing a summative statement: οὗτε γὰρ περιτομή τί ἐστιν οὔτε ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ καὶ καὶ κτίσις. Notably, the clause is almost identical to the summative statement in the climax: ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὗτε περιτομή τί ἴσχύει οὔτε ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ πίστις δι’ ἀγάπη ἐνεργουμένη (5:6). The οὗτε … οὗτε expression resembles a statement in 3:28: οὐκ ἐν Ἰουδαίος οὔδε
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Similarly, one may ask what criteria determine when this use of the Greek word for the Holy Spirit should be understood as referring to the Holy Spirit, and when it should
be understood as referring to the human spirit. In the context of Philemon 1:25, the Greek word πνεῦμα is used in a way that
illustrates the members of the Galatian community, and the singular πνεῦμα represent
the corporate entity, depicting the community in Christ as a single person, a new
creation in a new dispensation. The term does not point to the Holy Spirit, nor does it
denote the human spirit. In summary, not only is the variant form μετὰ τοῦ
πνεύματος ύμων synonymous with μεθ’ ύμων, it also highlights the corporate entity
of the Galatian community.125

6.2.3.1 Πνεῦμα in Phlm 1:25 in Light of Discourse Analysis

Although the letter primarily addresses Philemon, the discourse coherence illustrates
that the letter is of concern to two communities: the prison community and the
Christian community gathered at Philemon’s house. If Paul sends Onesimus back to
Philemon accompanying this letter; then the epistle would probably be read in front of
the community in the presence of Onesimus.126 Hence, Onesimus is not a private
matter between Paul and Philemon. Rather, Onesimus is about to shift from the prison
community to Philemon’s house church, since Onesimus now belongs to a part of the

125 Burton does not indicate that πνεῦμα in 6:18 carries a corporate dimension, but he does
highlight the communal aspect of the term by interpreting it as “spiritual fellowship.” Burton, 362.

126 This is an argument expressed by O’Brien. O’Brien, Colossians, 267.
community that is ἐν Χριστῷ (1:20). Paul uses this subtle but logical emphasis of community to persuade Philemon who has the authority to treat Onesimus otherwise.

As such, the benediction χάρις … μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν is not a mere benediction. Rather, the singular πνεῦμα points to the corporate unity of a community in which both Philemon and Onesimus are tied together ἐν Χριστῷ. Paul metaphorically employs the singular πνεῦμα to denote the Christian community in which Philemon is now part of it. The term also highlights the communal relationship shared by Philemon and Onesimus (a new convert) under the grace of Christ. Had Paul employed μεθ’ ὑμῶν, the subtle message would not have been as effective as μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν.

6.2.4.3 Πνεῦμα in Phil 4:23 in Light of Discourse Analysis

From the discourse analysis presented in Chapter 4, the coherent theme displayed in Philippians focuses on the corporate unity and communal relationship (among the Philippians, and between Paul and the Philippians). The analysis of the anthropological terms shows that the corporate and social aspect is illustrated by the use of various anthropological terms, including καρδία, ψυχή (σύμψυχοι and ἵσοψυχοι), πνεῦμα, and σῶμα. Although each of the anthropological terms carries a specific meaning in its sentence, their overall occurrences share a common thematic meaning. This is indicated by the coherent pattern displayed by the following expression: διὰ τὸ ἔχειν μὲ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς (1:7b); στήκετε ἐν ἐνι πνεύματι (1:27); μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες (1:27); κοινωνία πνεύματος (2:1); ἵσοψυχον (2:20); ἤγγισεν παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ (2:30); τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν (3:21); σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι (3:21); and τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν (4:6). The common
thematic meaning points to the corporate unity and communal relationship of the Philippians.

In terms of πνεῦμα in Philippians, there are three occurrences (1:27; 2:1; 4:23). The following summarises the key findings presented in Chapter 4. In 1:27, the terms πνεῦμα and ψυχή denote the Christian community, and do not connote the human soul and the human spirit with an ontological reference. Rather, they carry a metaphorical sense, and are parallel in meaning. The adjacent clauses, στήκετε ἐνί πνεύματι, συναθλοῦντες μιᾶ ψυχῇ, mean “Stand unitedly (as if one corporate being) by fighting unitedly (as if one corporate being).” Regarding 2:1, this study demonstrates that the anarthrous genitive term πνεύματος in κοινωνία πνεύματος does not denote the Holy Spirit. Rather, the phrase means “spiritual fellowship.”

From the findings of the discourse flow, the coherent theme is corporate unity. The Philippian community is metaphorically portrayed as a single corporate being, being depicted as having a πνεῦμα or a ψυχή, and having a mind with the capacity of τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν. Paul regards the members of this corporate being as Paul’s συνεργοί and συγκοινωνοί. As being his σύμψυχοι, Paul calls this community, σύζυγε; and he urges its members with this exhortation: συγχαίρετε. Furthermore, Paul considers himself part of this community as indicated by the usage of words with a συν- prefix, highlighting the partnership between Paul and the community.

Since the benediction is part of the epistle, the departure from the variant form μεθ’ ύμων is not random. Based on the findings summarised above, the phrase μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ύμων is closely connected to the entire epistle. πνεῦμα in the grace benediction does not denote the Holy Spirit, nor does it point to the human spirit as a distributive singular. The term echoes ἐνί πνεύματι (1:27) and κοινωνία.
πνεύματος (2:1), signifying a corporate entity. In other words the corporate unity is reiterated in μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ύμων—the singular πνεῦμα points to a united community, a corporate entity, and the plural ύμων indicates different members it.

6.3 Conclusion

This chapter has shown the corporate and relational dimensions of the anthropological terms within the tripartite formula (1 Thess 5:23) and the grace benediction (Gal 6:18; Phlm 1:25; Phil 4:23) by examining the discourse structure, analysing the key terms in various semantic units, exploring the sociolinguistic aspect, and identifying the flow of discourse. In Thess 5:23, the anthropological terms in the tripartite formula denote the corporate entity of the Thessalonian community, highlighting “wholeness” and “oneness.” In Gal 6:18, Phlm 1:25, and Phil 4:23, πνεῦμα is used in a metaphorical sense to indicate a social and corporate reference.

Further research is required to explore the use of other variant forms, μεθ’ ύμων and μετὰ πάντων ύμων, in other Pauline benedictions. As previously discussed, μεθ’ ύμων is used in Rom 16:20, 1 Cor 16:23, 1 Thess 5:28, and μετὰ πάντων ύμων is used in 2 Cor 12:14. Based on a brief analysis of these Pauline texts, the argument of this study is as follows. Whilst Paul addresses various communities in Romans, particularly the Gentiles, communal unity is not a concern. Therefore, using μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ύμων to illustrate unity would be unnecessary. Likewise, community schism is not a concern of 1 Thessalonians. Instead, the focus is the corporate entity, in contrast with the non-believers. The tripartite formula in the benediction illustrates this aspect, and Paul resorts to μεθ’ ύμων to conclude the epistle. Similarly, 2 Corinthians focuses on the relationship between Paul and the
Corinthians. There is no need for Paul to emphasise unity among the Corinthians by employing μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. However, in 1 Corinthians, corporate unity is the focus and is vividly highlighted throughout the whole epistle by the occurrences of σῶμα. Whilst it would seem more appropriate for Paul to use μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, σῶμα instead of πνεῦμα is the key term used by Paul. It is possible that Paul avoids using πνεῦμα in the benediction. Nevertheless, the above arguments are not specifically addressed in this study and are only conjectures. Further research is needed to verify these speculative arguments.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

7.1 The Purpose of the Study

A solid understanding of Paul’s anthropology inevitably requires an investigation of the apostle’s key anthropological terms. Such analysis provides an important resource for reflecting on and understanding Christian theological anthropology. This study has revisited and investigated Paul’s anthropological terms with particular focus on their corporate, relational, and thus ecclesiological connotations. This study has focused on four key terms, πνεῦμα (τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), ψυχή, σῶμα, and καρδία, as they occur in seven epistles that are commonly considered authentic: Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon.

7.2 The Findings of the Study

As initially raised in Chapter 1, this study has explored the following questions. First, what are the social and corporate connotations of Paul’s anthropological terms, and what are the implications of this for understanding of Paul’s anthropology? Second,
how are the key anthropological terms understood given Paul’s wider thought about the person of Christ and the identity of the church? Based on the findings in this study, the responses are as follows. First, Paul’s anthropological terms are principally concerned with community, and person to person relationship in community. Relationship and unity, both between Paul and the community, and among the community, is highlighted. As such, Paul does not use anthropological terms to identify and denote the ontology of a human person. Second, the nature of communal identity is grounded on Christ and his work. Therefore, the corporate and social connotations of the key anthropological terms are intertwined with Paul’s Christological and ecclesiological vision. The details of the findings are as follows.

In Chapter 2, scholarship examining Paul’s anthropological terms over the last 40 years was reviewed. This review showed that previous work failed to fully attend to the key comments of James Barr, in *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, which prioritised the textual context of a word, including its place in the whole discourse. In addition, the abnormal singular construct, combining a singular anthropological term and a personal plural possessive pronoun, is overlooked or not properly addressed in the literature. This study argued that explaining the abnormal singular construct by appealing to the grammatical construct of the distributive singular is inadequate. Thus, this study proposed a method that seriously attends to the synchronic dimension of semantic study. Basic principles of discourse analysis were identified and employed to examine Paul’s anthropological terms. Four research stages were devised: a single anthropological term within a single discourse, multiple anthropological terms within a single discourse, a single anthropological term within multiple discourses, and multiple anthropological terms within multiple discourses. Furthermore, to provide a
synchronic linguistic context for this research, an overview of the semantic range of
the key terms in the first century Koiné Greek literature was given.

In Chapter 3, Stage I was conducted — a single anthropological term within a
single discourse: the corporate dimension of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians. This examined
the discourse structure, the overall occurrences of clustered σῶμα in various semantic
units in 1 Corinthians, and the sociolinguistic aspect. This analysis concluded that a
corporate and communal connotation is present in the meaning of σῶμα. In particular,
the phrase ἐν σῶμα is used by Paul to remind the Corinthians of their ecclesiological
identity, as a single community because of Christ. In the epistle, this community is
called τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The use of the anthropological term σῶμα intertwines
with the apostle’s Christology and ecclesiology. However, Paul’s anthropology cannot
be delineated from his Christology and ecclesiology. This corporate and communal
connotation, imbued in the phrases τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ and ἐν σῶμα, is widely
accepted in Pauline scholarship. As such, this examination demonstrated the value of
discourse analysis by verifying the connotation of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians.

In Chapter 4, Stage II was conducted — multiple anthropological terms within
one discourse: the key anthropological terms in Philippians. The terms analysed were
ψυχή, πνεῦμα, καρδία, and σῶμα. This investigated the discourse structure, the
anthropological terms in various semantic units, the sociolinguistic aspect, and the
flow of discourse. This examination concluded that a common thematic meaning is
connoted by καρδία, ψυχή, πνεῦμα, and σῶμα. Many occurrences of the key terms,
combined with εἴς, μία, and the συ- prefix, highlight the communal relationship and
corporate unity among the Philippians, and the friendship between Paul and the
Philippians. In particular, Paul responds to the conflict among the Philippians, and the
relational crisis between himself and the Philippians. He exhorts the Philippians by employing the anthropological terms in phrases, such as ἑνὶ πνεῦματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ (1:27) and μετὰ τοῦ πνεῦματος ὕμων (4:23). The key terms are employed metaphorically to depict the ecclesial community. This community is grounded on the gospel of Christ, which is evident in the clauses preceding and proceeding 1:27: τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύουσθε and συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. This examination of the key anthropological terms in the Philippians revealed a profound correlation between three aspects of Paul’s theology, his anthropology, ecclesiology, and Christology.

In Chapter 5, Stage III was conducted — a single anthropological term within multiple discourses: καρδία in Romans, 2 Corinthians, Philippians, and 1 Thessalonians. Given that 71% of occurrences of καρδία are found in Romans and 2 Cor 1–9, this analysis focused on these discourses. This examination concluded that the thematic meaning of καρδία in both epistles carries communal and corporate connotations. In Romans, καρδία occurs in clustered patterns that are associated with different communities in Rome: Gentiles, Jews, and Christians. The term points to the corporate response of these communities to God and his salvation in Christ. In 2 Cor 1–9, καρδία depicts the identity of the Corinthian community, and also the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians. In particular, the term elucidates the community under, a new dispensation, a new covenant in which Paul is chosen as the minister of Christ. The καρδία—πρόσωπον antithesis, and the juxtaposition of καρδία and λίθος are employed to contrast the old covenant and the new covenant, the gospel. Therefore, as well as denoting the community under a new dispensation, καρδία also highlights that the community is under the ministry of Christ through the apostle.
interconnection of Paul’s anthropology, Christology, and ecclesiology is prominent through the use of καρδία.

In Chapter 6, Stage IV was conducted — multiple anthropological terms within multiple discourses: a focus on Pauline benedictions. The terms analysed were πνεῦμα, σῶμα, and ψυχή in the benediction in 1 Thessalonians, and πνεῦμα in the benedictions in Galatians, Philippians, and Philemon. This investigation concluded that corporate and relational connotations are present in the anthropological terms in the tripartite formula (1 Thess 5:23) and the grace benediction (Gal 6:18; Phlm 1:25; Phil 4:23). The terms, πνεῦμα, ψυχή, and σῶμα, are used metaphorically to portray the corporate entity of a faith community. In 1 Thess 5:23, the tripartite formula highlights the wholeness of the faith community. However, this wholeness hinges upon the truth in the following formula: ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The interconnection of Paul’s anthropology, Christology, and ecclesiology is clearly marked by these chosen anthropological terms. In the grace benediction (Gal 6:18; Phlm 1:25; Phil 4:23), the use of πνεῦμα highlights corporate unity, whereby the phrase μετὰ τοῦ πνεῦματος ὑμῶν conveys the oneness of the Christian community. This phrase is also attached to the preceding noun clause: χάρις τῷ κυρίου. Thus, there is an undeniable correlation between Paul’s anthropology, Christology, and ecclesiology.

7.3 The Verification of the Hypotheses

The examination of Paul’s anthropological terms in light of discourse analysis has verified that many occurrences of the terms have corporate and relational dimensions. Whilst not all occurrences have social and corporate connotations, many occurrences
do, which indicates a coherent thematic meaning. In other words, not only do some occurrences have corporate and relational dimensions in their immediate context (sentential and paragraphic), some overall occurrences also have social and corporate connotations, which form a pattern within a discourse.

Therefore, through the use of key anthropological terms, Paul encourages the Christian community to be united as a single entity because of Christ. This communal entity operates under the new dispensation of Christ’s grace. Although facing various challenges, this communal entity should: stand together for the sake of the gospel of Christ, wait for the *eschaton* in which God will educe the perfection and wholeness of the community through Christ, and share the same mind with Paul who is an apostle of Christ.

### 7.4 The Implications of the Study

Based on the findings, a pragmatic implication is that Christian practice should not be understood as an individualistic endeavour. Rather, it must be accomplished in and through community. Most importantly, this study concludes that the three aspects of Paul’s theology, his anthropology, ecclesiology, and Christology, are inseparable.

Although this study has focussed on Paul's anthropology, an ancient theology, the findings could provide some theological insights for the contemporary Christian church as it considers and addresses some controversial issues. As such, how might a better understanding of Paul’s anthropological terms assist Christian reflection on the nature of the human person? The church is currently examining and debating the topic of bioethics, and needs to articulate a coherent theology regarding the nature of the
human person.\textsuperscript{1} For example, issues of human cloning and stem cell research involve a discussion about the human person.\textsuperscript{2} Any theological account will inevitably draw on biblical resources, especially those examining Paul’s anthropology, Paul’s anthropological term in particular. This study has shown that Paul does not use the terms to provide a precise description of the ontology of a human person. Rather, Paul uses the anthropological terms to elucidate his ecclesiology, which is a theme that is inseparable from his Christology. Some theologians, in response to the issue of human cloning, debate whether a cloned human person has a “soul” based on an analysis of \(\psi\nu\chi\dot{\eta}\) in the Pauline epistles.\textsuperscript{3} However, given the findings in this study, this kind of analysis may be in vain. The identity of a cloned human person in light of this study must take into account the significance of relationship. Karen Lebacqz articulates the various questions raised regarding the identity of a cloned human person, stating that the “secular way of putting the questions is to ask whether clones will have sufficient personality or distinctiveness or individuality to qualify as fully human … [the]
theological way … is to ask whether clones will have that elusive quality that we know as ‘soul.’”  

Lebacqz argues that the notion of soul “is not an individual possession but a statement about relationship. Soul has to do with our standing before God.” She concludes by highlighting the communal aspect, stating that “the real question is not whether a clone will be unique, or whether it will have soul … [t]he question is why we would choose to do this in the human community.”  

Although Lebacqz’s response does not draw on an analysis of Paul’s anthropological terms, her attempt to articulate a theological anthropology and consider the question of human identity from the perspective of community and relationship with God is more appropriate than analysing whether Paul’s anthropological term, ψυχή, has any ontological connotation.

7.5 Areas for Further Research

There are several areas for further research due to the limitations of this study. First, this study has not examined every occurrence of σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα, and καρδία in the Pauline epistles. Second, the following Pauline anthropological terms have not been investigated: σάρξ, νοῦς, σώματος, and ἔσω ἄνθρωπος. Third, the disputed

---


6 Lebacqz, “Cloning,” 5. Peters also highlights the communal aspect of human identity in his discussion of human of cloning. He argues that our identities “come from God’s continuing grace and from our desire or lack of desire to live in close communion with God. Souls do not come in any final form with our DNA.” Peters, *Science*, 169. Likewise, in the bioethical debate about stem cell research some theologians describe the notion of soul as “centered selves [which] are formed by and developed in spiritual relationship,” with this relationship realised “in relationship to community and to God.” Peters, Labacqz and Bennett, *Sacred*, 207.
Pauline epistles have not been included: Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus. Fourth, a synchronic study should consider contemporary literature, including biblical and non-biblical literature. Although the usage of the keys anthropological terms in non-biblical literature has been studied, further research on the usage of these terms in non-Pauline biblical literature should also be conducted. Therefore, these areas should be addressed in future research in order to elaborate and provide a more holistic understanding of Paul’s anthropological terms.
APPENDIX 1: NOUNS IN 1 CORINTHIANS

There are 1368 nouns in the letter. The following lists the nouns that occur more than once in 1 Corinthians (Noun Occurrence). Σῶμα is the fourth most frequent noun in the letter, ranking only behind θεός, κύριος, and Χριστός. This demonstrates a very strong pattern of lexical cohesion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστός</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σῶμα</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυνή</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πνεῦμα</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνήρ</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθρώπους</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἱησοῦς</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκκλησία</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γλώσσα</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κάσιμος</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σοφία</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέλος</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δύναμις</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄνθρωπος</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστός</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σῶμα</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυνή</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πνεῦμα</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνήρ</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθρώπους</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἱησοῦς</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκκλησία</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γλώσσα</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κάσιμος</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σοφία</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέλος</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δύναμις</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄνθρωπος</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστός</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σῶμα</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυνή</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πνεῦμα</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνήρ</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθρώπους</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἱησοῦς</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκκλησία</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γλώσσα</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κάσιμος</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σοφία</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέλος</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δύναμις</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄνθρωπος</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

356
APPENDIX 2: VERBS IN PHILIPPIANS

There are 256 verbs in the letter, 212 of them only occur once. The following lists the verbs that occur more than once in Philippians (Verb Occurrence). Among all the verbs, φρονέω and χαίρω are the third and the fourth most frequent verbs respectively. Apart from the common verbs, εἰμί and ἔχω, the occurrence of χαίρω surpasses 252 verbs in Philippians, demonstrating a very strong pattern of lexical cohesion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰμί</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔχω</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φρονέω</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαίρω</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γίνομαι</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰδια</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πεθῶ</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γινώσκω</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πέμπω</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περισσεύω</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άκούω</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγω</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὠ ῥάω</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πληρῶ</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσπάζομαι</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλέπω</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διώκω</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔρχομαι</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταλαμβάνω</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ποιέω</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ύπερέχω</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσθενέω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γνωρίζω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔλπιζω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνεργέω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιζητέω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιποθέω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐρίσκω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζῶ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταγγέλλω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαμβάνω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λογίζομαι</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μανθάνω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεριμνάω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρακαλέω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περιπατέω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκοτέω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στήκω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναθλέω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταπεινόω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαρίζομαι</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3: NOUNS AND VERBS IN ROMANS

There are 1680 nouns in the letter. The following list shows the nouns that occur more than thrice in Romans (Noun Occurrence). ‘Ἀμαρτία and πίστις are the fourth and the sixth most frequent noun respectively, demonstrating two very strong patterns of lexical cohesion. Although the occurrence of Ῥωμαίος does not seem to be frequent, the word also demonstrates a pattern of lexical cohesion due to the following reason.

Among all the proper names in the letter, including Ἰσραήλ, Ἡσαίας, Ἰερουσαλήμ, and Μωυσῆς, Ῥωμαίος is the most frequent name apart from Χριστός.

| θεός       | πραγματικός | ἐλπίς       | ἀπανθισμός | ἣρως | Ἁγίος       | Ἄνθρωπος | θάνατος | θόρυβος | θεία | θεόπλοιον | θησαυρός | θησαυρός | θροάργος | θρήνος | θριμώμα | θριμώμα | θρυμώμα | θρυμώμα | θύματος | θύματος | θύματος | θύματος | θύματος | θύματος | θύματος | θύματος | θύματος |
|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------|-------------|----------|----------|---------|------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 153        | 74          | 65          | 48          | 43   | 40          | 36       | 27       | 26      | 24   | 15        | 15       | 14       | 13       | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      | 12      |
| όριλη      | ύιὸς       | ἁκρωβυστία | ἡμέρα      | μέλος | Ἀβρααμ    | ἀνόηΤα | ἀνήρ     | εὐαγγέλιον | κόσμος | παράπτωμα | ἐπαγγελία | ἀδήνη     | ἀδικία    | γράφω     | προπρονήμα | ἡγεμόνα   | ἓθελήθυ   | ἑρατικόστασις | ἐπικρίσεων |
| 12         | 12          | 11          | 11          | 10    | 9           | 9         | 9         | 9        | 9     | 9          | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         |
APPENDIX 4: NOUNS IN 2 CORINTHIANS 1–9

There are 629 nouns in 2 Cor 1–9. The following list shows the nouns that occur more than once in 2 Cor 1–9 (Noun Occurrence). Τίτος is among the most frequent noun on the list. Furthermore, among all the proper names, including Μακεδονία, Μωυσῆς, Ἀχαία, Ἰσραήλ, Κόρινθος, Μακεδών, Τιμόθεος, it is the most frequent name apart from Χριστός. The unusually frequent occurrence of Τίτος suggests a strong pattern of lexical cohesion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστός</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόξα</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάρις</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἱησοῦς</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πνεῦμα</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διακονία</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καρδία</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παράκλησις</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άδελφος</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θλίψη</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρόσωπον</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θάνατος</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγάπη</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τίτος</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικαίουνη</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκκλησία</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζωή</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡμέρα</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόπη</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σαρξ</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄνθρωπος</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δύναμις</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιστολή</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐαγγέλιον</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μακεδονία</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοινωνία</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κόσμος</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μυσῆς</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νόημα</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὀσμή</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάθημα</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πεποίθησις</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνείδησις</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ύστερημα</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰών</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμαρία</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάγκη</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπόστολος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρραβων</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀχαία</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δέσης</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαθήκη</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διάκονος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰκών</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰλικρίνεια</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐλπίς</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπαγγελία</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιπόθησις</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θέλημα</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ναός</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰκία</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐρανός</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραστάσις</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρρησία</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περισσεύμα</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλάξ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτωχεία</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκήνος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκότος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στέρημα</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στοργή</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στόχος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέλος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τιμόθεος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ύπομονή</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φῶς</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φωτισμός</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There are 317 nouns in 1 Thessalonians. The following list shows the nouns in the letter (Noun Occurrence). The occurrence of ἀδελφός is strikingly frequent that it is the third most frequent noun on the list, demonstrating a very strong pattern of lexical cohesion. Both ἐλπίς and παρουσία are also among the most frequent nouns on the list, demonstrating two strong patterns of lexical cohesion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδελφός</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἱησοῦς</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστός</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πίστις</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδελφός</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰησοῦς</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστός</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πίστις</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 5: NOUNS IN 1 THESSALONIANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδελφός</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἱησοῦς</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστός</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πίστις</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδελφός</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰησοῦς</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστός</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πίστις</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 6: NOUS AND VERBS IN GALATIANS

There are 527 nouns in Galatians. As shown on the list of the nouns that occur more than once (Noun Occurrence), Χριστός is the second most frequent noun in the letter, demonstrating a very strong pattern of lexical cohesion. Both πνεῦμα and σάρξ are the fifth most frequent words on the list, illustrating two strong patterns of lexical cohesion.

| Χριστός 38 | πατήρ 5 | έτος 3 | Ιουδαίσμος 2 |
| νόμος 32 | στέρμα 5 | Ίάκωβος 3 | λόγος 2 |
| θεός 31 | δουλός 4 | καιρός 3 | μεσίτης 2 |
| πίστις 22 | ελευθερία 4 | κατάρα 3 | μήτηρ 2 |
| πνεῦμα 18 | Κηφᾶς 4 | κληρονόμος 3 | δρος 2 |
| σάρξ 18 | θεός 31 | κόσμος 3 | ὑβαθαμός 2 |
| Ἰησοῦς 17 | ἄνθρωπος 14 | πρόσωπον 3 | παιδαγωγός 2 |
| ιδέας 13 | υἱός 13 | σταυρός 3 | Παύλος 2 |
| ἀδελφός 11 | άνθρωπος 14 | ἀγάρ 2 | Πέτρος 2 |
| ἔνοχος 10 | ἀγάττη 3 | ἀκοή 2 | πράυσις 2 |
| επαγγέλμα 10 | ἀγκρυβυστία 3 | ἀνάθεμα 2 | Σινά 2 |
| Ἀβραάμ 9 | ἀληθεία 3 | ἀποκάλυψις 2 | στοιχεῖον 2 |
| ἔργον 8 | ἀποκαθίσταται 4 | ἀραβία 2 | χείρ 2 |
| εὐσαγγέλια 7 | ἀπὸστολή 3 | δουλεία 2 | χρόνος 2 |
| περιποιήσια 7 | ἀποκάθιστος 3 | ἀσκολίευσιν 2 | Σινά 2 |
| χάρις 7 | ἀποκαθιστάται 4 | ἀποστολή 2 | Παύλος 2 |
| κύριος 6 | ἀποκάθιστος 3 | ἀποστολή 2 | Πάπας 2 |
| παιδίσκη 5 | ἀποκάθιστος 3 | ἀποστολή 2 | Παύλος 2 |

There are 416 verbs in Galatians. The following list shows the verbs that occur more than once in the letter (Verb Occurrence). The high occurrence rates of both δικαίωμα and περιτέμνω are evident. These two strong patterns of lexical cohesion demonstrated by these verbs become more prominent when considering their respective cognates, the nouns δικαιοσύνη and περιτομή.

| εἰμί 53 | γινώσκω 4 | προλέγω 3 | κατηχέω 2 |
| γίνομαι 12 | δουλεύω 4 | στείρω 3 | καυχάομαι 2 |
| λέγω 11 | ἐνεργεύω 4 | σταυρόω 3 | κηρύσσω 2 |
| ζῶ 9 | θερίζω 4 | τρέχω 3 | κηρύσσω 2 |
| θέλω 9 | καλέω 4 | ἀγαπάω 2 | παραλαμβάνω 2 |
| δικαίωμα 8 | ὀρῶ 4 | ἀθετέω 2 | πάρειμι 2 |
| ἔρχομαι 8 | άκοιμω 3 | ἀναβάινω 2 | πορθέω 2 |
| γράφω 7 | ἀναγκάζω 3 | ἀνέρχομαι 2 | προσανατίθημι 2 |
| εὐσαγγέλισθη 7 | ἀνεξάκοιμω 3 | ἀποθησόμεθα 2 | στοιχεῖον 2 |
| διδώμι 6 | γεννάω 3 | ἀποκάλυπτω 2 | συγκλέωσις 2 |
| περιτέμνω 6 | ένεμι 3 | ἀρέσκω 2 | ταράσσω 2 |
| ποιεῖ 6 | ζηλόω 3 | αἰφνίζω 2 | ὑπάρχω 2 |
| διώκω 5 | καταργέω 3 | διαφέρω 2 | φοβέω 2 |
| δοκεῖ 5 | λαμβάνω 3 | ἔξαγγελον 3 | ὑδίνω 2 |
| ἐγκλωβίζω 5 | οίδα 3 | ἔξαποστέλλω 2 | ζητέω 2 |
APPENDIX 7: NOUNS AND VERBS IN PHILEMON

There are 81 nouns in Philemon as shown on the following list (Noun Occurrence). The recurrence of δέσμιος, together with its cognate, δεσμός, is evident. The total occurrence of the word group is equal to that of ἀδελφοί, placing it just behind three other nouns on the list. This indicates a strong pattern of lexical cohesion displayed by the word group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Χριστός</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰησοῦς</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κύριος</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδελφός</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάτη</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παύλος</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σπλάγχνον</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δέσμιος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δοῦλος</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεός</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πίστις</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεσμός</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοινωνία</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδελφή</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάγκη</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀπφία</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρισταρχός</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρχιππος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παράκλησις</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρρησία</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πατήρ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πνεῦμα</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρεσβύτης</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σάρξ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναιχμάλωτος</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συστρατιώτης</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέκνον</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίμῳ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλήμων</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαρά</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χείρ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐρα</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 44 verbs in Philemon as shown below (Verb Occurrence). The repetition of παρακαλέω places the word only behind ἔχω, εἰμί, and ποιέω in terms of the rate of occurrence. This repetition indicates a pattern of lexical cohesion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἔχω</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰμί</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ποιέω</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναπταύω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γράφω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρακαλέω</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδικέω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκούω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναπέμπω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνήκω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπέχω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποκρίσθημι</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐχαριστέω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θέλω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατέχω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἶδα</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὀνήμημι</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὀφείλω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πείθω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσλαμβάνω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσοφείλω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαρίζομαι</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χωρίζω</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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