# A Socio-Rhetorical Approach to the Pauline Theology of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians

**VS Sindo**

**20500394**

Dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree *Masters of Arts* in New Testament at the Potchefstroom Campus of the North-West University

Supervisor: Prof DP Seccombe

Co-supervisor: Prof GJC Jordaan

September 2014

It all starts here ™

NORTH-WEST UNIVERSITY
YUNIBESITI YA BOKONE-BOPHIRIMA
NOORDWES-UNIVERSITEIT

**ABSTRACT**

This study is a socio-rhetorical approach to the Pauline theology of reconciliation in 2 Corinthians. Scholars generally focus their attention on where καταλλάσσω and καταλλαγή terminology appears in discussing Paul's theology of reconciliation. This has led to some scholars reducing Paul's theology of reconciliation to simply referring to God being reconciled to men and vice versa, while other scholars tend to focus on reconciliation between human beings, almost to the exclusion of reconciliation between God and men. The current research argues that reconciliation with God is intrinsically linked to reconciliation between people in the church.

Chapter One of this study looks at areas of disagreement amongst scholars concerning Paul's theology of reconciliation. Chapter Two reviews the current state of research on Paul and his theology of reconciliation, while Chapter Three discusses the question of the Socio-historical use of the καταλλάσσειν and διαλλάσσειν terminology in the New Testament, and its uniqueness in Paul. In Chapter Four both the literary and historical contexts of Paul's teachings on reconciliation in 2 Corinthians are explored. In Chapter Five the exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 is performed and the implications for reconciliation are spelled out.

[**KEY WORDS:** Reconciliation, Atonement, Justification, Righteousness, Adoption, Peace, Christology, Socio-rhetorical]

**OPSOMMING**

Hierdie studie is 'n sosio-retoriese benadering tot Paulus se teologie van versoening in 2 Korintiërs. Geleerdes fokus oor die algemeen hul aandag op waar καταλλάσσω en καταλλαγή terminologie in Paulus se teologie van versoening verskyn. Dit het gelei tot ŉ verwatering van Paulus se teologie van versoening deur sommige geleerdes, deurdat hulle net verwys na die versoening tussen God en die mens en andersom, terwyl ander geleerdes geneig is om net op die versoening tussen mense te fokus, byna tot die uitsluiting van versoening tussen God en die mens. Die huidige navorsing argumenteer dat versoening met God onlosmaaklik gekoppel is aan versoening tussen mense in die kerk.

Hoofstuk een van hierdie studie kyk na punte van verskil tussen geleerdes oor Paulus se teologie van versoening. Hoofstuk twee gee 'n oorsig oor die huidige stand van navorsing oor Paulus en sy teologie van versoening. Daarna bespreek hoofstuk drie die kwessie van die sosio-historiese gebruik van καταλλάσσειν en διαλλάσσειν terminologie in die Nuwe Testament, as ook die unieke gebruik van die terme deur Paulus. In hoofstuk vier word beide die literêre en historiese konteks van Paulus se lering oor versoening in 2 Korintiërs ondersoek. In hoofstuk vyf word die eksegese van 2 Korintiërs 5: 11-6: 10 uitgevoer en die implikasies vir versoening uitgespel.

[**SLEUTELWOORDE:** Rekonsiliasie, Versoening, Regverdigmaking, Geregtigheid, Aanneming, Vrede, Christologie, Sosio-retoriese]

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

My grateful thanks to the following people for their support and encouragement during the process of writing this dissertation:

- My church Holy Trinity Church (HTC) for lowering my workload so that I could focus on this research.
- Rev. Alan Noble (the Rector of HTC) for his friendship, encouragement, understanding and support during this research.
- Mr. Alexander James Anderson for his generous contribution towards making this research possible, for his encouragement, and for making time to meet with me regularly.
- My Supervisors, Prof. David Seccombe and Prof. Jorrie Jordaan for their helpful guidance during this research.
- Dr. Jenni Courtney for her patience in editing and giving timely feedback on this research.
- Mrs. Jo Stocks and Mr. Dennis Steenkamp for proof reading.
- Madalitso Phiri and Darlington Mushambi for arranging access to the books I needed, and to John Paul Harper for help with translation of the abstract.
- Kagiso Motaung and Raoul Snyman for their friendship and support over the years.

A special thanks to two people who have been instrumental in me embarking on this project, my wife and Bishop Desmond Inglesby. My lovely wife Ronél Sindo, I want to thank you for your encouragement, patience, support, proof reading and understanding during research. Bishop Inglesby, thank you so much for encouraging me to do this Masters, and for making time to meet me regularly to find out how I was doing.

Above all, I want to thank the Lord Jesus Christ for the many and wonderful gifts that He gives to us. Without Him, this project would have been futile. My prayer is that it would be useful in building up His kingdom.

# Contents

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM ..... 8
1.1. No clear Biblical understanding of reconciliation ..... 8
1.1.1. The diversity of thoughts with regard to Paul's theology ..... 8
1.1.2. The place of reconciliation in Paul's theology ..... 10
1.1.3. The origins of Paul's theology of reconciliation ..... 11
1.2. The extent of reconciliation ..... 12
1.2.1. The vertical approach to reconciliation ..... 13
1.2.2. The horizontal approach to reconciliation ..... 18
1.3. The second letter to the Corinthians ..... 21
1.4. Problem statement ..... 22
1.4.1. A lack of contextual consideration ..... 22
1.5. Key research question ..... 23
1.5.1. Specific research questions ..... 23
1.6. Research aim and objective ..... 23
1.6.1. Research aim ..... 24
1.6.2. Specific objectives of the research ..... 24
1.7. Central theoretical argument ..... 24
1.8. Methodological considerations ..... 24
1.8.1. Socio-rhetorical analysis ..... 24
1.9. Schematic representation ..... 26
CHAPTER 2: THE CURRENT STATE OF RESEARCH ON PAUL AND HIS THEOLOGY ..... 27
2.1. The elusive task of reconstructing Paul's theology ..... 27
2.2. The quest for the centre of Paul's theology ..... 29
2.2.1. Martin R.P.: Reconciliation: A study of Paul's theology ..... 31
2.3. Toward the centre: a narrative approach ..... 35
2.4. Socio-rhetorical approach ..... 39
2.4.1. A brief background to socio-rhetorical approaches ..... 40
2.4.2. What is socio-rhetorical interpretation? ..... 41
2.4.3. Robbins' socio-rhetorical approach ..... 43

2.5. Summary ..... 45
CHAPTER 3: THE ORIGINS OF PAUL'S CONCEPT OF RECONCILIATION AND HOW HE BECAME ITS AMBASSADOR ..... 47
3.1. What is reconciliation? ..... 47
3.1.1. Reconciliation in the Greco-Roman world ..... 49
3.1.2. Reconciliation amongst the Jewish writers ..... 52
3.1.3. Reconciliation within the Septuagint ..... 56
3.1.4. Reconciliation in the New Testament ..... 57
3.1.5. Reconciliation in Paul's writings ..... 57
3.1.6. The uniqueness of Paul's teaching on reconciliation ..... 65
3.2. The origins of Paul's theology of reconciliation ..... 66
3.2.1. Pre-Pauline traditional material ..... 67
3.2.2. Hellenistic diplomatic origins ..... 69
3.2.3. The Jewish Hellenistic origins ..... 70
3.2.4. Old Testament origins with special reference to the book of Isaiah ..... 72
3.2.5. Damascus road experience ..... 74
3.3. Summary ..... 77
CHAPTER 4: EXEGETICAL BACKGROUND ISSUES TO 2 CORINTHIANS ..... 79
4.1. Introduction ..... 79
4.2. Historical considerations ..... 80
4.2.1. The city of Corinth ..... 81
4.2.2. Paul's contact with the church in Corinth ..... 83
4.2.3. The authenticity of 2 Corinthians ..... 85
4.3. Background to the partition theories ..... 88
4.3.1. 2 Corinthians as a literary unit from a historical perspective ..... 89
4.3.2. 2 Corinthians as a literary unit from the rhetorical perspective ..... 90
4.4. The historical context of 2 Corinthians ..... 93
4.5. Historical approach: identification of Paul's opponents ..... 95
4.5.1. The opponents of Paul as the Judaizers ..... 97
4.5.2. The opponents of Paul as the Gnostics ..... 98
4.5.3. The opponents of Paul as the divine men ..... 98
4.5.4. The opponents of Paul as the Pneumatics ..... 100

4.6. The issues of dispute between Paul and the Corinthians ..... 103
4.7. Summary ..... 104
CHAPTER 5: EXEGESIS - 2 CORINTHIANS 5:11-6:10 ..... 106
5.1. Setting the literary context of 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 ..... 106
5.2. Boers: "2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2: A fragment of Pauline Christology" ..... 107
5.3. Various delimitations of the text concerning reconciliation ..... 109
5.3.1. 2 Corinthians 5:11-21 as the delimitation ..... 109
5.3.2. 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 as the delimitation ..... 111
5.4. The structure of the text ..... 113
5.5. Paul's defence (2 Corinthians 5:11-13) ..... 113
5.5.1. A contrast between what is seen and unseen ..... 115
5.5.2. The fear of the Lord ..... 123
5.6. Theological reasons for reconciliation (2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2) ..... 125
5.6.1. The love of Christ (5:14-15) ..... 125
5.6.2. New way of knowing ..... 128
5.6.3. New creation ..... 131
5.6.4. God reconciling the world to himself (5:18-6:2) ..... 136
5.7. Paul's defence again: the reality of apostolic ministry (6:3-10) ..... 144
5.7.1. Introduction to the realities of ministry (6:3-4a) ..... 145
5.7.2. 2 Corinthians 6:3-10 as a hardship catalogue ..... 146
5.8. Summary and conclusion ..... 148
5.9. Findings ..... 149
Appendix A: A review of R.P. Martin's book ..... 151
Appendix B: Partition theories ..... 156
Bibliography ..... 172

# CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

## 1.1. No clear Biblical understanding of reconciliation

The doctrine of Reconciliation is undeniably one of the central doctrines of the Christian faith. Both James Denney (1917) and Karl Barth agree on this. Barth (1956:3) wrote: "we enter that sphere of Christian knowledge in which we have to do with the heart of the message received by and laid upon the community, and therefore with the heart of the Church's dogmatics". Similar sentiments are shared by Martin (1981) who finds reconciliation to be *centrum Paulinum,* an "umbrella" idea to accommodate the leading aspects of Paul's theology.

### 1.1.1. The diversity of thoughts with regard to Paul's theology

Paul's theology of reconciliation has become a catchphrase among scholars. Breytenbach (1986:1) observed that, amongst English theologians, "Reconciliation only became a central theological idea after World War II". He stated that the καταλλάσσειν terminology does not play a major role in the theology of the Greek Fathers, neither does it amongst Latin theologians (1986:2). Even though reconciliation has since become a catchphrase, the difficulty has been that, until recently highlighted within the Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) group, scholars did not pay much attention to clarifying what was meant by "Paul's Theology", let alone his theology of reconciliation. What are we looking for when we speak of "Pauline Theology"? Are we looking for a centre that holds all of Paul's thoughts together? Or are we looking for contingency and coherence as suggested by Beker (1980:23-36). In the nineteenth century, the use of the word "reconciliation" in Paul was often identified with the substitutionary theory of the atonement, and sometimes was used as a comprehensive word to describe the whole of soteriology and doctrines associated with it (Furnish, 1977:204). During this time Pauline scholarship tended to systematize Paul's various ideas under familiar doctrinal categories. This was evident among Pauline scholars such as Bultmann,

Barth, Käsemann, and Martin, a pattern which continued until the 1970s. Bassler (2002:ix) said that the problem with this approach became evident in the 1970s and 1980s "when it became increasingly clear that the various presentations of Paul's theology tended to reflect the theological perspective of Paul's interpreters more clearly than the theological emphasis of the apostle himself". Other scholars, rather than looking for the central thought or a coherent set of thoughts in Paul, began to look for something more subtle. They began to look for a sub-story that could be found in all of Paul's letters; this approach became known as the narrative approach. The scholars who hold to this approach are: Hays, Petersen, Wright, Witherington, Fowl, Keesmaat, Grieb, Campbell, and Constantineanu. Theologians who make use of the narrative approach agree that Paul was not a systematic theologian; they however maintain that "there seems nevertheless to be a pattern, a center, a commitment, a conviction, a vision, an underlying structure, a core communication, a set of beliefs, a narrative, a coherence …" in Paul's theology (Bassler, 1993:6). Hay (1993:21), who is an advocate of this approach, has also raised a difficulty regarding it: "What does it mean to claim that a discourse has a "narrative substructure"? Does it make sense to say that a *story* can function as a constraint on the logic of an *argument*?" (Italics his).

In 1985 when the Pauline Theological Consultation of the Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) was formed, they all agreed that Paul's theology must be studied first from the way "it came to expression in each letter" separately without influence from other letters (Bassler, 2002:ix). The other area of agreement within the SBL group was that the theology of each Pauline book is found in its argument (Bassler, 1993:4). But where in the argument is the theology located? Is it located on the surface structure of the argument? Alternatively, is it located in the tension of the two opposing views in the argument, such as the conflict between Christ and the cosmos, as proposed by Gaventa (1993)? This became the area of disagreement within the group. This, however, does not mean that since the formation of the SBL group, scholars only disagree about the location of Paul's theology in his argument. The other area of conflict among scholars, with specific reference to Paul's theology of reconciliation, is the place of this theology in Paul's thought. Does it serve as a major theme or a minor one? What are its origins? What is the extent of reconciliation?

### 1.1.2. The place of reconciliation in Paul's theology

Scholars disagree about the place of reconciliation in Paul's theology. Martin (1981) described reconciliation as the centre that holds all of Paul's theology together. This view was also expressed by DuPont (1952) who argued that reconciliation occurs right at the point where all the major Pauline themes intersect. At the opposite extreme is Käsemann (1971:51), who argued in his article, "Some thoughts on the theme 'the doctrine of reconciliation in NT'", that reconciliation is simply incidental in Paul's theology and is "without having any significant meaning for Pauline theology as a whole". For him, the theology of reconciliation in Paul is simply a marginal concept that is there to highlight the doctrine of justification. Pesch (1970) agreed with Käsemann that reconciliation cannot play a major role in Paul's theology. As evidence for his claim, he points to the scarcity of the terminology of reconciliation in Paul's letters, saying: "Despite its uniquely Pauline characteristics [that is, Paul's theology of reconciliation] and its fairly thematic development in 2 Cor. 5:18-20 and Col. 1:20,22, the theme of reconciliation occurs so sporadically in Paul (as, for example, in Rom 5:10f, where it serves to give point to what he says about justification, and in Rom 11:15 and Eph 2:16) that it cannot assume this role [that of centrality in Pauline soteriology]" (Pesch, 1970:735). Both Käsemann's and Pesch's arguments are based on the lexical frequency of the reconciliation terminology in Paul. This concordance approach argument has been rejected by scholars such as Constantineanu (2006:48), who argued that it is misleading because it only considers explicit occurrences of terms but it does not pay attention to the "whole range of terms and synonyms which describe the "idea" of reconciliation in Pauline arguments, as well the occasional nature of the letters". He cites Paul's use of the term "forgiveness" as an example. Forgiveness only appears four times in Pauline writings, but Constantineanu argued that it is very important in Paul. Gloer (1996:190) on the other hand has used the example of the Lord's Supper to show the inconsistency of the concordance approach argument. He says: "Does the fact that Paul mentions the Lord's Supper once in his letters indicate that it had little significance for him? Certainly not! It does, however, indicate that Paul felt no need to discuss it in his other letters, and, therefore, reminds us of the occasional

nature of Paul's writings, and that they are addressed to particular situations and issues".

The third area of disagreement among scholars concerning Paul's theology of reconciliation is on the origins of the καταλλάσσω and καταλλαγή (reconciliation) terminology in Paul.

### 1.1.3. The origins of Paul's theology of reconciliation

Scholars generally agree that the καταλλάσσω and καταλλαγή terminology is uniquely used by Paul in the New Testament. However, they disagree about the possible socio-historical background. The scholars are divided into four main camps (plus a fifth camp being the pre-Pauline tradition). This section of this paper will simply highlight these, with greater detail in Chapter 3. There are those who see Paul's reconciliation theme originating in the Hellenistic diplomatic language. Among these scholars are Breytenbach (1986) and Domeris (1987), who see the origins to be the Hellenistic legal system. Breytenbach comes to this conclusion by noting the parallelism of the Hellenistic conception of the "ambassadors" who are sent to "petition" or "appeal" to warring parties for reconciliation, and the same set of vocabulary in 2 Cor. 5:20 (Breytenbach, 1986:3). Thus for him the language of "ambassador of Christ" in 2 Corinthians 5:1-7:1 has its root in the Hellenistic diplomatic sphere. Domeris (1987:8) on the other hand said that, "The peculiar nature of the death of Jesus fired the legal mind of Paul, and gave birth to the theological construct of καταλλαγή or reconciliation. An idea, not from the Hebrew Bible but from the Greek legal system, became one of the basic tenets of Pauline soteriology."

Marshall (1978) believed that Paul was influenced by the Jewish Hellenistic tradition, especially the Jewish martyrs' tradition that is found in 2 Maccabees.

Still other scholars such as Hofius (1980), Beale (1994), Lane (1982) and Walters (1993) believed that Paul was influenced by the Old Testament, especially Deutero-Isaiah. Beale (1994:215) argued that Paul in 2 Corinthians makes a conceptual link

between reconciliation and new creation and thus, for him, the origins of Paul's theology of reconciliation are to be found in Deutero-Isaiah. Beale's thesis is thus to "show that Paul understands both "new creation" in Christ as well as "reconciliation" in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17-21) as the inaugurated fulfillment of Isaiah's and the prophets' promise of a new creation in which Israel would be restored into peaceful relationship with God…"(Beale, 1994:219).

The fourth camp of scholars comprises those who view the origins of Paul's theology of reconciliation to be his Damascus road experience. Kim (1997) is the main recent advocate for the Damascus road experience as the origin of Paul's theology of reconciliation. Kim (1997) proposed that, for Paul, reconciliation is the unique metaphor of God's saving work that originated in his Damascus road experience where Paul personally experienced God's reconciliation (1997:360). He developed this by doing a careful exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5:11-21, making three observations about reconciliation:

> "1) that the καταλλάσσειν-terminology is unique with Paul in the NT, 2) that its usage in Paul is quite different from that in Hellenistic or Hellenistic Jewish literature, and 3) that Paul's Damascus experience of conversion/call is reflected in several points in 2 Cor. 5:11-21, one of the two passages in the Pauline Hauptbriefe (the other being Rom. 5:1-10) where 'reconciliation' is a key term." (Kim, 1997:360)

The fourth area of disagreement is about the extent of the idea of reconciliation in Paul.

## 1.2. The extent of reconciliation

Society at large tends to see "the Church" as an agent of reconciliation, and many people are looking to it to play its role. Volf (2000), in his article "The social meaning of reconciliation", highlights the church's failure to play this role - at times the church has been guilty of the most horrendous atrocities. He views the cause of the failure of the church in reconciliation to be its lack of understanding of what reconciliation truly is. Volf (2000:161) talks about two approaches that have been problematic concerning

reconciliation, i.e. the “vertical approach” and the “horizontal approach”. The “vertical approach”, which is also what Constantineanu calls the “traditional approach”, “reduces the doctrine of reconciliation to the reconciliation of the individual with God” (Volf, 2000:162). This approach has a theological and personal meaning, but has no wider social meaning. It tends to focus on various aspects related to the concept of reconciliation, and mostly seeks to answer questions relating to the extent of reconciliation, whether it is only us who are reconciled to God or God who is reconciled to us (Constantineanu, 2006:49). Among the scholars who follow this approach are Taylor (1946), Aldrich (1961), Murray (1966), and Kim (1997). In this section the focus will be on the works of Taylor and Kim. The following section will look at these works briefly and highlight some of their weaknesses. Thereafter, attention will be turned to how some scholars have used the “horizontal” approach to respond to these weaknesses.

### 1.2.1. The vertical approach to reconciliation

The vertical approach primarily limits Paul’s teachings on reconciliation to reconciliation between men and God.

#### *1. Vincent Taylor*

The book, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation* by Taylor (1941) is the earliest of the books written concerning the theology of reconciliation. Taylor was principal of Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds. He was the Ferens Professor of New Testament Language and Literature from 1930–1958. According to Johnson (1942:366), Taylor became well known for his works on the Third Gospel and Form Criticism.

In the preface Taylor (1941:v) said that this book is the next stage of his investigation that he began in “Jesus and His Sacrifice” (1937), and which he continued in “The Atonement in New Testament Teaching” (1940). The questions that Taylor (1941:vi) seeks to address are: “What does the NT teach regarding forgiveness, justification, and

reconciliation, and how are these experiences related to the death of Christ?" The book is divided into six chapters, which are, in order: "Forgiveness", "Justification", "Reconciliation", "Fellowship", "Sanctification" and "Atonement". This review will only focus on the third chapter, "Reconciliation", as the other sections are beyond the scope of this current research.

When dealing with reconciliation, Taylor focused on Paul's teachings concerning reconciliation. He looks at the instances where Paul uses the καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή and άποκαταλλάσσω terminology. Upon looking at the various texts where these terms are used in Paul, Taylor summarised the elements of Paul's teachings on reconciliation as follows:

1. For Paul reconciliation means a restoration of men to a fellowship with God.

2. The reconciliation is that of men to God, not that of God to men.

3. In Paul's view reconciliation is an act achieved by God.

4. Men cannot contribute anything in this reconciliation except consent.

5. The condition which men are delivered from is that of enmity and estrangement.

6. Reconciliation is wrought through the sacrificial death of Christ.

Taylor emphasized however that an inquiry on reconciliation in Paul should not be limited to the instances where the καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή and άποκαταλλάσσω terminology is used. He said, "It will also be necessary to consider his [Paul's] teaching on congruous themes, such as peace with God, freedom, sonship, and fellowship with God; and, indeed, to study the witness of the New Testament wherever reconciliation is described, even though the Pauline terminology is not employed." (Taylor, 1941:83)

In the second part of his thesis Taylor proceeded to look at these themes, opening his inquiries to the rest of the New Testament books. Taylor believed that by doing this one will come to a comprehensive understanding of New Testament teaching on the doctrine of reconciliation.

Upon investigating the New Testament teaching on “reconciliation and peace with God”, Taylor (1941:107-108) came to the following conclusions:

1. Reconciliation is not only restoration to fellowship with God, but is also, and at the same time, the gift of His presence.

2. As such, it is a change in the disposition and experience of men from frustration and defeat to the condition of harmonious adjustment to the will of God.

3. Reconciliation is a state of blessedness as well as the act of redeeming love.

4. The work of God is confirmed and strengthened in the life of believers through inner peace, for that is a gift of God.

5. Reconciliation is wrought through the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ.

Taylor said the following concerning what the sacrificial death of Christ brings in regards to our relationship with God:

> “…reconciliation is meaningless if it does not include fellowship with God. Through this experience unreality in our thoughts of Him, and the sense of alienation from Him, are gone. As reconciled men, we know that He is our Father and that we are His Children; we receive His peace and the freedom He bestows” (Taylor, 1941:169).

The shortfall of Taylor’s work is that even though he mentions social reconciliation on page xiii, this idea is not fully developed within the book. Taylor himself was aware of this shortfall in his presentation of social reconciliation and the lack of details concerning it within his book. He gave the following reasons concerning its absence: “…. In themselves, they are far reaching enough to warrant independent study, but mainly because, in the writer’s view, for purposes both of understanding and of practical treatment, they depend upon the primary question of forgiveness and reconciliation with God” (Taylor, 1941:xiii). Taylor does not consider the possibility that Paul may have developed his theology of reconciliation (in relation to the Corinthians) partly in the light of social concerns; he has been rejected by the Corinthians and writes primarily to deal with this problem. This will be explored in Chapter 3 of this paper.

Therefore to overlook the social aspect of Paul's theology of reconciliation may be to miss the primary purpose for which the text was written. In systematizing Paul's theology we may be at variance with Paul's original intention. This was clearly expressed by Beker (1980:24-25) when he said, "The interpreter of the Pauline letters cannot focus on the 'substance' of the letter apart from its contingent setting. Too often, interpreters act as if the situational particularity of the letter is merely peripheral… Thus theologies of Paul often tend to forget that Paul's thought is geared to a specific situation and that his arguments cannot be divorced from the need of the moment." It is important that we do not treat Paul as a systematic theologian, for if we do this we may easily overlook the full meaning and implications of his theology of reconciliation, and we will neglect the social context (Bassler, 1993:6).

### 2. *Kim*

The vertical approach focuses on individuals being reconciled to God. It thus comes as no surprise that part of this approach seeks to address the question, who is reconciled to whom? Is God reconciled to us or is it only we who are reconciled to him? Kim, focusing mostly on καταλλάσσω and καταλλαγή, reached the following conclusion about the nature of reconciliation between God and human beings:

> "Paul never says that God is reconciled (or, that God reconciles himself) to human beings, but always that God reconciles human beings to himself or that human beings are reconciled to God… It is not, in fact, God who must be reconciled to human beings, but human beings who need to be reconciled to God. Nor is it by peoples' repentance, prayers or other good works that reconciliation between God and human beings is accomplished, but rather by God's grace alone (Kim, 1997:103)".

Kim's sentiments are also shared by Domeris (1987:78) who, while looking at the meaning of καταλλαγή in 2 Corinthians 5, made the following conclusion, "We note that "the world" is reconciled to God, not God to the world."

Domeris (1987:79) in his paper "Biblical perspectives on reconciliation" further maintained that when Paul uses the καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή and άποκαταλλάσσω

terminology, he never uses it for reconciliation between human beings. He said that the καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή and άποκαταλλάσσω terminology are always used by Paul in a theological sense, i.e. reconciliation with God and not reconciliation between two people. Even in passages such as Ephesians, where άποκαταλλάσσω is used in the text to speak of the dividing wall of hostility being broken down between the Jews and the Gentiles, Domeris (1987:79) maintained that "the writer does not say that Jesus reconciles the two groups to each other". He said that the only terminology that can be used for reconciliation between warring parties is the verb συνήλλασσεν in Acts 7:26, which he viewed to be a legal reconciliation as compared to καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή and άποκαταλλάσσω, which refer to theological reconciliation. By doing this word study Domeris (1987) thus maintained that social reconciliation cannot be found in Paul, since Paul uses reconciliation in a theological sense. Unfortunately Domeris provided no solid explanation for his contention that καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή and άποκαταλλάσσω terminology is purely theological while the verb συνήλλασσεν is purely legal. Domeris failed to make a socio-historical study of the terminology καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή and άποκαταλλάσσω. Had he done so, he would have soon realized that this terminology in the *Corpus Hellenisticum* is generally used to refer to making peace between warring parties, peace treaties or reconciliation of individuals, kings, and nations (Breytenbach, 1990:67). The same can also be said of his failure to recognize that the verb συναλλασσω was not limited only to use in a legal sense but it was also used in the commercial world (Breytenbach, 1990:67).

It is also questionable whether reconciliation is only to be understood as human beings being reconciled to God, and not God to us. Paul's references to God's wrath and his use of the language of propitiation suggest that God may be one of the parties needing to be reconciled. Thus the inquiry may need to be extended from a narrow focus on semantic considerations and broadened to include other concepts. For example, if reconciliation is initiated by God and is achieved through Christ (as this paper will investigate), some questions that need to be considered are: Who is this God? What kind of role does Christ play in our reconciliation? If Christ is fully man and fully God, is it possible to say that God was reconciled to humanity in the person of his Son?

These questions, however, do not mean that the narrow semantic approach has not been valuable. As Chapter 2 of this paper will demonstrate, the narrow semantic approach has given us valuable insights into what reconciliation is, the origins of Paul's usage of καταλλάσσω and καταλλαγή, and the nature of Paul's theology.

### 1.2.2. The horizontal approach to reconciliation

The horizontal approach seeks to strike a balance between 1) reconciliation with God and men, and 2) reconciliation between men. Scholars have different views on how they see the theology of reconciliation being applied in society. Burdon (1984:137-141) argued from an ideological perspective about social reconciliation. He challenged the individualist salvation approach that is presented by the vertical approach, and said, "…approaching Paul with the individualistic world-view of post-Renaissance or even post-Augustinian man, we dissolve a vision of cosmic change into one of personal salvation which is false to Paul's theology, to the teaching of Jesus and to their whole Hebrew background" (Burdon. 1984:138). Burdon understands Paul's world-view to involve the solidarity of all mankind; first, solidarity in Adam, and then solidarity in the last Adam, Jesus Christ. The other aspect that Burdon (1984:139) highlighted is what is meant by salvation. He said, "Salvation is reconciliation: not the revelation of an eternal truth but the bringing about of a new state of affairs, not gnostic but social." (1984:139)

Constantineanu (2006:23) also challenged the vertical approach. He said that if one uses the narrative approach, one will soon discover that there is an "intrinsic relationship between theology and ethics in Paul and that we simply cannot study one without the other without the risk of misreading Paul". He also charges the vertical approach with misrepresenting Paul. He said, "To reduce the concept of reconciliation in Paul's theology exclusively to the reconciliation of human beings with God (which most of the exegetical Pauline scholarship did) means not only to leave the church with no resources to deal with social process, but also to misread Paul's letters." (Constantineanu, 2006:23)

As was seen in 1.1.3., scholars such as Kim (1997) and Wolff (1989) suggested that the origins of Paul's theology of reconciliation are grounded in his Damascus road experience. Constantineanu (2006:41) took that argument concerning the origins of Paul's theology to its logical conclusion. He said that the Damascus road shows us the "intrinsic relationship between the reconciliation of human beings to God and reconciliation between human beings" (Constantineanu, 2006:41). When the resurrected Lord met Paul, he did not ask Paul why he was persecuting the Christians; rather he asked him "why are you persecuting me?" According to Constantineanu (2006:41), "When the resurrected Christ told Paul that persecuting the church meant, in fact, persecuting him, he may have understood that enmity towards human beings was enmity towards God and vice versa. And in the same manner, reconciliation with God meant reconciliation with those he had persecuted, which Paul proved in his life."

The other area that the horizontal approach pursues is the relationship between justice and reconciliation. This can be seen in the works of scholars such as Constantineanu (2006:41), De Gruchy[1] (2002) and the authors of the *Kairos*[2] Document. De Gruchy (2002:1-2) said, "At the heart of my argument is the conviction that reconciliation is about the restoration of justice, whether that has to do with our justification by God, the renewal of interpersonal relations, or the transformation of society."

The authors of the *Kairos* Document on the other hand highlight the need for clarity and also the difficulty concerning reconciliation. Volf (2000) observes that the *Kairos*

[1] It is worth noting that even though De Gruchy is known as a Bonhoeffer scholar and a public theologian, in Chapter 2 of his recent book titled, *Reconciliation: Restoring Justice*, he uses the Apostle Paul's teachings about reconciliation to argue his thesis. He said that Paul used "reconciliation as a controlling metaphor for expressing the gospel" (2002:45). Paul used reconciliation to describe God's redemptive plan/activity. In Paul's theology of reconciliation, Paul also speaks of justification which tells us that there is a link between reconciliation and the justice of God (2002:45).

[2] The *Kairos* Document was monumental in helping the church in South Africa to start a dialogue about reconciliation. The identities of the authors of the *Kairos* Document are unknown, they are only known as the black church leaders, but this does not necessarily mean that there were no academic theologians among them either. The author of this paper is also aware of the criticism that has been levelled against the *Kairos* Document by scholars such as Domeris (1987:77-80), and Mosala (1987:19-25), who accuse it of "Biblical hermeneutical bankruptcy". It is, however, worth noting that the methodologies of both Domeris (1987:77-80), and Mosala (1987:19-25), who claim that their approaches represent a proper teaching of the biblical message of reconciliation, have been described by Breytenbach (1990:68) as follows: "Their constructs of the meaning of 'reconciliation' in the Bible and their theses on the origins of this use are semantically, exegetically and tradition-historically unfounded".

*Document* is very critical of what is called "cheap grace"[3], that is, reconciliation without justice. The *Kairos Document* states:

> "In our situation in South Africa today it would be totally unchristian to plead for reconciliation and peace before the present injustices have been removed. Any such plea plays into the hands of the oppressor by trying to persuade those of us who are oppressed to accept our oppression and to become reconciled to the intolerable crimes that are committed against us. That is not Christian reconciliation, it is sin. It is asking us to become accomplices in our own oppression, to become servants of the devil. No reconciliation is possible in South Africa *without jus*tice. What this means in practice is that no reconciliation, no forgiveness and no negotiations are possible without repentance. The Biblical teaching on reconciliation and forgiveness makes it quite clear that nobody can be forgiven and reconciled with God unless he or she repents of their sins. Nor are we expected to forgive the unrepentant sinner." (*Kairos* Document, 1985:68, italics mine)

Breytenbach (1986:17) affirmed the *Kairos* Document at this point and said, "It is undoubtedly true that reconciliation and new creation (Paul) or recapitulation (Ireneaus) or restitution of order (Anselm) cannot be separated. On this matter the *Kairos* Document must be supported. Reconciliation cannot mean to cover up differences and structural injustice." [4] The problem with the horizontal approach as stated by the authors of the *Kairos* Document is that it places "liberation and justice as primary categories of the Christian" faith and divorces them from the narrative of the Cross (Volf, 2000:163). De Gruchy (2002) in his latest work tried to provide a corrective to the *Kairos* Document. He nonetheless shares their sentiments about the centrality of justice in our reconciliation.

Therefore, there is a need for this study to establish what the theology of reconciliation is. Since Paul is the only New Testament writer who uses the terminology of καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή and άποκαταλλάσσω to write about the theology of reconciliation, this study will focus on him, and particularly on his second letter to the Corinthians.

[3] This phrase was coined by Dietrich Bonhoeffer in 1959 in his book *The Cost of Discipleship*.

[4] This, however, does not mean that he affirms the whole document; he is sceptical of political reconciliation, and that reconciliation presupposes a mere repentance (Breytenbach, 1986:18).

## 1.3. The second letter to the Corinthians

Although other Pauline passages about reconciliation come into view, such as Romans 5:8-11; Colossians 1:19-22 and Ephesians 2:11-16, this research will focus on the socio-rhetorical analysis[5] of Paul's teachings on reconciliation in 2 Corinthians. 2 Corinthians is one of the earliest letters written by Paul that contains his teachings on reconciliation. It is also one of the most autobiographical books written by the apostle where characteristics of the apostle, his ministry and the struggles he had with his congregation are discovered. Furnish (1984:3), commenting on 2 Corinthians, said the following: "No Pauline letter requires more of its readers or offers more of a reward to those who apply themselves carefully to its interpretation than 2 Cor.". Unlike some other books written by Paul, whose authorship has been questioned, 2 Corinthians enjoys a general consensus[6] among New Testament scholarship that its author is Paul (Harris, 2005:1, Thrall, 2004:3, and Plummer, 1915:xii).

Scholars such as Breytenbach (1986), Turner (1989), Beale (1994) and Vegge (2008) all agree that Paul first used the καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή terminology in 2 Corinthians in defence of his apostleship. The context of 2 Corinthians is that the Corinthians have rejected Paul as a true apostle of God (cf. 3:1; 5:12; 10:10; 11:6-8 and 13:3,7). Beale (1994:219) said that Paul's purpose in writing 2 Corinthians is to prove that he is the true apostle of the Gospel and that those who judge him are using incorrect worldly standards in their judgement of him (cf. κατὰ σάρκα in 5:16 and 10:3-7). This is critical for our understanding of Paul's theology. It shows us that Paul expressed his theology of reconciliation not as an abstract systematic theological treatise; rather he expressed it in light of serious opposition to his apostleship. This means that if there are any societal implications for his theology of reconciliation, it will be in this book that they will be found. Witherington (1995:348) sees the causes of conflict between Paul and his Corinthian church to be social and practical matters rather than theological. He (1995:348) said, "Social and practical matters are more at the fore than theological and

[5] Socio-rhetorical analysis will be explained in 1.8.1, and fully explored in 2.4.
[6] The exception is when it comes to 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1, with some scholars calling this section an interpolation, written by someone in the Pauline school (Carson & Moo: 1992:263).

ethical matters… The fundamental problem is the Corinthians' image of Christian leadership. At least some of them had created in their minds an image, largely shaped by the values of their culture, of a leader who had honor, power, spiritual gifts, rhetorical skills, and good references and who would accept patronage." Since Paul did not meet these social expectations, he was rejected by the Corinthians.

This paper thus hopes that by employing the socio-rhetorical approach it would be able to meaningfully contribute in resolving some of these disagreements concerning Paul's teachings on reconciliation.

## 1.4. Problem statement

A narrow focus on the καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή and άποκαταλλάσσω terminology and an over systematisation of Paul's theology of reconciliation has resulted in the distortion of Paul's theology of reconciliation and a neglect of its socio-historical context and social significance.

### 1.4.1. A lack of contextual consideration

Most scholars tend to focus their inquiry on Paul's theology of reconciliation on the four texts where the καταλλάσσω and καταλλαγή terminology are found; these texts are Rom 5:8-11; 2 Cor 5:14-21; Col 1:19-22; Eph 2:11-16. This has been done mostly in isolation from the context where these terms appear. A lack of contextual consideration within each individual Pauline letter has resulted in Paul's statements about reconciliation being interpreted as though they were propositions in a treatise of systematic theology. The problem with this approach is that it tends to miss important questions such as: What made Paul write about reconciliation within his letters at all? Was it only for theological purposes (i.e. a systematic theology) devoid of social concern, or vice versa? How did the original audience understand Paul's teachings on reconciliation? What was the outcome that Paul was expecting to see in his original audience?

## 1.5. Key research question

The key question that this research seeks to answer is: does giving attention to the social context of 2 Corinthians lead us to a mostly unnoticed social dimension in Paul's teaching on reconciliation and can reconciliation with God be abstracted from social reconciliation?

### 1.5.1. Specific research questions

The sub-divisions of the problem are:

***Examining the current state of research in Paul's theology of reconciliation***

i. What approach can be used to construct Paul's theology of reconciliation and what is meant by Paul's theology?

ii. What is the Socio-historical use of the *καταλλάσσειν* and διαλλ*άσσειν* terminology in the New Testament and its unique use by Paul?

***The nature of Paul's theology of reconciliation***

i. What gave rise to Paul's teachings on reconciliation in 2 Corinthians?

***The application of Paul's theology of reconciliation***

i. Is reconciliation with God inclusive or exclusive of reconciliation with people within the Christian community?

## 1.6. Research aim and objective

### 1.6.1. Research aim

This research aims to inquire whether Paul's teaching on reconciliation in 2 Corinthians within its socio-historical context has a horizontal (social) as well a vertical (God-man) component and what the relationship is between the two.

### 1.6.2. Specific objectives of the research

i. To inquire into the current state of research on Paul's theology and in particular reconciliation in 2 Corinthians.

ii. Explore the Socio-historical use of the *καταλλάσσειν* and διαλλάσσειν terminology in the New Testament.

iii. Explore the influence of context on Paul's teaching in 2 Corinthians 5-6, with special reference to his teaching on reconciliation.

## 1.7. Central theoretical argument

Paul, after he was rejected by the Corinthians as their apostle, expressed his theology of reconciliation in 2 Corinthians using language that was familiar to the Corinthians (but not so to us) in order to foster reconciliation between himself and the Corinthians.

## 1.8. Methodological considerations

### 1.8.1. Socio-rhetorical analysis

The approach that this paper prefers is a socio-rhetorical analysis. Rhetorical approaches seek to move away from the debate that is mostly concerned with Paul's theology; it wants to focus on the argumentative nature of Paul's letters. As Wuellner proposed, "A study of the rhetorical nature of Paul's argumentation, or a study of the

nature of argumentation in Paul's letters, will help us out of two impasses created by the fixation with form- and genre-criticism on the one hand, and with a specific social or political situation on the other hand" (Wuellner cited in Crafton, 1990:317). Rhetorical analysis is not a new approach to Pauline studies. Watson (2010:166) traced this approach to the Bible from the works of St Augustine, who used rhetoric conventions from the works of Cicero to analyses the Bible. Paul wrote his letters to different communities addressing specific issues. It is true that certain ideas, phrases, themes, and conventions could appear in more than one of Paul's letters; the character and the circumstances of each letter, however, need to be appreciated. This will help us to avoid prematurely harmonising Paul's theology from various letters into one amalgamated whole (Horrell, 2006:44). This is what rhetorical criticism seeks to achieve: to appreciate each letter in its own right. In employing the tools of rhetorical criticism Paul's letters are read in light of other ancient letters. In doing this Paul is placed in his own world, and we put ourselves in the place of his original audience, how they understood Paul as his letters were read out loud (O'Connor, 1995:65). Just like the historical-critical methodologies, the rhetorical approach is concerned with the historical, contextual issues that the author of the text and the original audience were facing (Watson, 2010:169). Watson (2010:169) said that "the interpreter can glimpse the dynamics that created the text through analysis of the type of rhetoric, arguments, and strategies selected, especially as these are informed by other studies of the social, cultural, and ideological milieu of the first-century Mediterranean world".

Socio-rhetorical analysis is a sub-discipline of the rhetorical approach. It is a multi-dimensional approach to the texts guided by a multi-dimensional hermeneutic (Robbins 2010:192). In its exegesis of the text, socio-rhetorical interpretation puts the focus on how "social, cultural, historical, psychological, aesthetic, ideological and theological information" of a particular text influences our understanding of the text (Moon, 2004:4). It incorporates and uses insights from semiotics, literary criticism, sociolinguistics, social-scientific criticism, rhetorical criticism, post-modern criticism, ethnography, cognitive science, and theological criticism together into an integrated hermeneutical methodology (Moon, 2004:4, Robbins 2010:192).

## 1.9. Schematic representation

| Problem Statement | Aims and objectives | Methodology |
|---|---|---|
| What is the current state of research on Paul and his theology of reconciliation? | To review the current state of research on Paul and also his theology of reconciliation. | This will be done through a literature review. |
| What is the Socio-historical use of the *καταλλάσσειν* and διαλλ*άσσειν* terminology in the New Testament, and its uniqueness in Paul | To explore the unique features of Paul's use of the καταλλάσσω and καταλλαγή terminology. | A Socio-historical Criticism will be employed in determining the use of the καταλλάσσω and καταλλαγή terminology in the Greco-Roman world. To interpret reconciliation within the Greco-Roman world, an intertextual analysis will be done. |
| What gave rise to Paul's theology of reconciliation in 2 Corinthians? | To explore the current state of scholarship on the exegetical issues concerning 2 Corinthians. | A Socio-rhetorical approach will be employed. To classify the location of Paul's discourse within the first century Greco-Roman world, analyses of socio and cultural texts and ideological texts will be done. |
| What is Paul's theology of reconciliation? | To study and exegete 2 Corinthians 5 | The method according to which the exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5-6 and other Scripture texts will be done is the socio-rhetorical method. |

# CHAPTER 2: THE CURRENT STATE OF RESEARCH ON PAUL AND HIS THEOLOGY

There has been an explosion in recent studies on Paul, with old paradigms and consensuses being disintegrated, and an emergence of new paradigms and methodologies. The aim of this chapter is to provide a brief summary of the current state of research concerning Paul's theology[7], and seeks to validate why a socio-rhetorical approach is necessary when trying to understand Paul's theology of reconciliation. As was seen in Chapter 1, scholars argue about the place of reconciliation within the overall theology of Paul. It is therefore important for us to understand his theology, in order to understand the place of reconciliation within it. Recently Paul's theology has been called into question - its nature, and even its existence. This is most evident in the work of the Society of Biblical Literature's Pauline Theological Group (Bassler, 2010:373). When one looks at 'Paul's theology', one soon discovers that 'Paul's theology' means different things to different people. We will now turn our attention to determining why this is the case.

## 2.1. The elusive task of reconstructing Paul's theology

The apostle Peter, commenting on the letters of Paul, made the following statement[8]: "He [Paul] writes the same way in all his letters, speaking in them of these matters. His letters contain some things that are hard to understand, which ignorant and unstable people distort …" (2 Peter 3:16). Determining and defining 'Paul's theology' is not an easy task. How is it to be defined? What methodology should be employed in this quest? Are the methodologies comprehensive enough to cater for all of Paul's diverse teachings? What is the nature of his theology? Is it static or fluid? How does Paul relate the Jewish story to his Gentile audience? All these questions are "stock-in-trade of what 'Pauline Theology' is all about", said Bassler (1993:10). Before the formation of the SBL

[7] This paper will not be dealing with the "new perspective on Paul", since that falls beyond the scope of the current research. A systematic treatment of the "new perspective on Paul" and its criticism is provided by Waters, G.P. 2004. Justification and the New Perspective on Paul: A Review and Response. NJ: P&R publishing.

[8] Sentiments that are also expressed by Bassler (1994:iv), and Constantineanu (2006:5).

group on Pauline studies, scholarship was content to speak about “Paul’s theology”, and organised it around the categories of systematic or dogmatic theology without qualifying what is meant by it. Bassler (2010:373) said that this approach has been recently criticised as “artificial harmonization that creates the impression of a coherent theological vision only by careful selectivity from Paul’s diverse statements”. However, this does not mean that since the formation of the SBL group on Paul there is now a consensus regarding Paul’s theology.

Dunn (1997:96-97) has provided a number of definitions of ‘Paul’s theology’ by scholars in the group to highlight the confusion regarding what is meant by the term. In this paper, four definitions that have been used by scholars in the SBL group in trying to explain ‘Paul’s theology’ will be highlighted:

Bassler (2002:72), in his definition of Paul’s theology, highlighted the occasional nature of theology; that is, theology is more concerned with praxis than just a formulation of ideas. He (2002:72) said the following: “… insofar as theology is defined as *Paul’s appropriation and application of scripture and Christian traditions to the specific situation of the Thessalonian community*, seems more properly located at the interface between theological presuppositions and contextual argument, rather than defined through their distinction” (italics mine).

Stowers (2002:106), on the other hand, placed an emphasis on the systematization of various religious dogmas, and how these relate to each other. He (2002:106) understood ‘Paul’s theology’ to be “a method of organizing religious knowledge that arose at a particular time in the history of Christianity…”

Scroggs (2002:212), in trying to understand Paul’s theology, focused on trying to understand Paul’s thought world, i.e. how Paul in his mind perceives the reality about God and his world. He (2002:212) said that “*Paul’s theology is what he thinks about the transcendent and its intervention into immanent reality”* (italics his). Scroggs thus tries to psycho-analyse Paul.

Wright (1991:184) tried to provide an all-encompassing definition of ‘Paul’s theology’ as “that integrated set of beliefs which may be supposed to inform and undergird Paul’s

life, mission, and writing". As much as this definition seems to be all-encompassing, scholars such as Bassler (1993:10) have noted that the problem with this definition is that it presents Paul's theology as static rather than dynamic. The difficulty with regard to Paul's theology is that he never wrote a systematic theological treatment of his thoughts and the doctrine of reconciliation.[9] Moreover, Paul in his letters does not speak of his "theology", he speaks of his gospel (Rom. 2:16; 1 Cor. 9:18; 2 Cor. 4:3; 11:4; Gal. 1:18-19 and 2:2, 7). Everything we know about Paul's theology of reconciliation is based on the "occasional documents that are known as his letters" (Capes, Reeves, and Richards, 2007:267). This paper thus prefers Bassler's (2002:72) definition of his theology as an "*appropriation and application of scripture and Christian traditions to the specific situation".* The reason that this definition is preferable is that it is true to the occasional nature of Paul's letters. But how does reconciliation fit into Paul's theology? In the previous chapter (1.1.2) it was noted that Martin (1981) suggested that reconciliation is the centre of Paul's theology, while Käsemann[10] (1970) argued that reconciliation is a marginal doctrine that does not have any real significance. Close attention now needs to be paid to the quest of finding the centre of Paul's theology, and the place of reconciliation within that theology.

## 2.2. The quest for the centre of Paul's theology

In discussion of 'Paul's theology', scholarship has been greatly concerned with determining whether there is a centre to it. Capes, Reeves, and Richards (2007:267) stated that the reason scholars want to discover the centre of his theology is that Paul holds to so many diverse theological ideas. They continued to say that:

> "…if we could find the centre, the essence, of what Paul believed, then we might be in a better position to explain some of his more ancillary theological ideas. If we could discover the generative source of his theology, then we might be able to map out his convictions… Knowing the source of an idea can sometimes

[9] In the following chapter, the definition of reconciliation and an explanation of how it is used by Paul will be provided.
[10] A critique of Käsemanns's position was provided in 1.1.2 of Chapter 1.

> provide enough missing pieces to flesh out a thought that was too sketchy to understand previously" (Capes, Reeves, and Richards, 2007:267).

The quest for the centre of Paul's theology requires one to assume that the unity in Paul's thinking exceeds his diversity (Porter, 2006:10).

According to Constantineanu (2006:6), finding the centre of Paul's theology has been approached from the systematic perspective, "and has been interpreted in light of a consistent centre and structured around major doctrinal categories". There are various theological centres that have been suggested by scholars. Porter (2006:8-10) provided the following summary of proposed centres to Paul's theology: "These include God, Christ or Christology, justification by faith, salvation history, reconciliation, apocalyptic, (mystical) participation in Christ, the cross, anthropology and salvation, resurrection and/or exaltation, ethics, and gospel, among others". The difficulty with all these centres is in quantifying the significance of a particular concept. Is significance based on lexical appearance of a particular word or phrase?[11] How much should contextual indicators, theological constructs, and historical factors in establishing the significance of a concept be considered (Porter, 2006:11)? Porter (2006:11) cautioned that in our methodological inquiry into establishing a centre of Paul's theology, we need to be able to differentiate between "Paul's theological assumptions and his developed theological ideas. The assumptions constitute the building blocks for Paul's theology" (Porter, 2006:11).

For quite some time Evangelical scholarship, influenced by Luther and Calvin, saw the centre of Paul's theology to be "justification by faith" in Christ. This position enjoyed popularity for a long period of time, with scholars such as Käsemann (1969:168) modifying it slightly and calling it the nucleus of Paul's message. This has, however, been questioned by scholars such as Schweitzer, Wrede, and Sanders. Wrede (1908:123) saw this doctrine as polemic, which "is only made intelligible by the struggle of his life, his controversy with Judaism and Jewish Christianity, and is only intended for this". According to Wrede (1908:127) Paul used the doctrine of justification by faith only

[11] This is the issue that Käsemann had with reconciliation as the centre of Paul's theology. He said that from the lexical point of view, reconciliation is not the centre of Paul's theology. But is this a fair assessment of significance? More details on this argument were provided in 1.1.2.

when polemic was necessary. Paul used it as a "weapon" “to achieve his mission to the Gentiles”, which "must be free from the burden of Jewish national custom”.

Schweitzer (1968:225), on the other hand, said the following concerning the doctrine of justification by faith: “The doctrine of righteousness by faith is therefore a subsidiary crater, which has been formed within the rim of the main crater - the mystical doctrine of redemption through being-in-Christ”. Schweitzer saw the main crater of Paul’s theology as eschatological mysticism and rabbinic-juridical thought (Beker, 1991:16).

Sanders (1977:334) made the same point with great emphasis, saying: “The catch-word ‘righteousness by faith’ must be given up as a clue to Paul’s thought”.

“Justification by faith” has thus been rejected as the centre of Paul’s theology on two grounds: 1) it does not appear in, nor is it integral to, all of Paul’s letters - it only appears in Romans and Galatians, 2) it is not generative - it is derived from the doctrine of redemption (Capes, Reeves, and Richards, 2007:268).

Schweitzer (1968) proposed that “mystical union with Christ” was the centre. Scholars like Sanders, however, view the centre as “participation in Christ”, while other scholars like Beker (1980) see it as the “triumph of God”.

Martin (1981) has proposed that reconciliation was the centre of Paul’s theology. Since Martin’s book deals with the subject of this current research, this paper will now pay careful attention to it.

### 2.2.1. Martin R.P.: Reconciliation: A study of Paul’s theology[12]

From the preface, Martin made it clear that his intention is to try to identify, isolate and discuss the single theme of reconciliation in its different uses by Paul and his followers. He searches for a *centrum Paulinum,* an “umbrella” idea to accommodate the leading aspects of Paul’s theology, and he finds that *centrum* to be reconciliation. Martin set out four criteria for the centre of Paul’s theology. He first said that “any statement of the

[12] Appendix A contains a full review of Martin’s book.

centre of Paul's theology should set the sovereign design of God in his initiative and grace at the heart of the matter" (Martin, 1981:2). Secondly, the centre should accommodate both the cosmic and the human predicament and its restoration by the cross of Christ. Thirdly, the centre should explain what Christ did on the cross, but should also provide a basis for how Christians ought to live (Martin, 1981:2). And finally, the centre should cater for Paul's conversion.[13] He stated that the theology of reconciliation meets at least three aspects of those criteria: 1) the cosmic predicament, 2) the saving action of God in Christ, and 3) Paul's own experience from his encounter with the risen Lord (Martin, 1981:46-47). Thus, for Martin, reconciliation is the centre of Paul's theology.

After performing an exegesis of the texts in Paul where the *καταλλάσσειν* and διαλλ*άσσειν* terminology appears, Martin said that the exposition of reconciliation reveals the following:

> "i) God is the provider of the new relationship he freely offers…; ii) At great cost, epitomised in Christ's blood or death on the cross, God has moved to deal with a situation only he could resolve, the 'dilemma' is that reconciliation is not cheaply secured since God both 'justifies' (i.e. vindicates) himself and offers 'justification' (Rom.3:26) as the means by which he extends the grace of reconciliation; iii) Human need is the dark canvas against which the divine love shines brightly. Reconciliation is the concomitant of justification, but it is a larger term. It is 'peace with God' and a place not only in the new world now 'rectified' but in the new fellowship of the Spirit (Rom. 5:5); iv) Above all, reconciliation moves on the plane of personal relationships." (Martin, 1981:151-152)

Martin's book contributes immensely to our understanding of reconciliation. It helps us to see that reconciliation is fundamentally a relational term; i.e., in Paul's thinking it operates within the realm of personal categories (1981:89). God, out of love, acts through the mission of Jesus, who is Lord, to bring about a new relationship between

[13] Martin highlights that K. Stendahl was against the use of this term 'conversion' and called it a misnomer since it implies ones dissatisfaction with his own religion and a switch of religion. Stendahl proposed that what happened with Paul was not a conversion but simply a "new vocation spelled out in terms of service to the Gentile (Martin, 1981:25)". Conversion is used here simply for readability. Martin prefers to call Paul's conversion a 'Damascus road experience'; on page 26 of his book Martin offers a critique of Stendahl.

himself and humanity (Martin, 1981:242). Reconciliation is brought about through the vicarious sacrifice of the death of Jesus Christ. Martin's work also helps us to see how reconciliation is related to major doctrinal themes such as soteriology, justification, justice, and ethics.

Most scholars[14] have found Martin to have failed in demonstrating reconciliation as the centre of Paul's theology. Constantineanu (2006:46) says the reason for this is that Martin's approach has "its reductionist tendencies of imposing a rather artificial demand that the texts are systematically organized". Secondly, Martin fails to meet the criteria that have been set by other scholars such as Capes, Reeves, and Richards (2007:268) for the centre of Paul's theology: 1) He fails to demonstrate that reconciliation is integral to all of Paul's letters, and 2) He fails to show that reconciliation is a generative concept, where all of Paul's theology could be organized around it. As much as Martin has failed in demonstrating reconciliation as the centre of Paul's theology, his book still provides valuable insight into the subject of reconciliation in biblical studies, especially the balance he strikes between the vertical aspect of reconciliation and the horizontal aspect. The problem with Martin is not in his exegesis of the texts concerning reconciliation, but his failure to demonstrate that reconciliation is the centre of Paul's theology.

Boers (1988) is very critical of the quest for the centre of Paul's theology and made the following insightful observations regarding the approach. He said:

> "The cumulative value of these contributions is that they help clarify one of, if not the most fundamental problem in Pauline interpretation. However, none of them succeed in identifying a centre which makes it possible to integrate the diversity of the Apostle's thinking into a coherent whole. Such a centre cannot be found in any particular Pauline idea, such as Beker's eschatological triumph of God, or Patte's patterns of convictions. The center of Paul's thought transcends every instance of its expression." (Boer, 1988:61)

The problem with all the proposed centres of Paul's theology is that they fail to provide sufficient answers for all of Paul's diverse themes and ideas. This paper can however

[14] Scholars such as Giblin, S.H; Gillette, J.W; Davis, J.A and Constantineanu, C.

not help but agree with Bassler (1993:ix) that the whole enterprise of trying to find the centre of "Paul's theology tends to reflect the theological perspective of Paul's interpreters more clearly than the theological emphasis of the apostle himself". The only data available in the letters are contingent expression; the coherent centre is a reconstruction of scholars (Bassler, 2010:373). This approach has a tendency to read and interpret Paul and his letters from an "anthropocentric and individualistic viewpoint" (Hultgren, 2010:360).[15] That is, the focus of the interpretation revolves around the human predicament, particularly the predicament of the individual, and how this can be resolved through faith in Christ (Hultgren, 2010:360).This view was first expressed by Bultmann (1952), who said the following concerning Paul's theology:

> "Pauline theology is not a speculative system. It deals with God not as He is in Himself but only with God as He is significant for man, for man's responsibility and man's salvation... Every assertion about God is simultaneously an assertion about man and vice versa. For this reason and in this sense Paul's theology is, at the same time, anthropology...The Christology of Paul likewise is governed by this point of view. In it, Paul does not speculatively discuss the metaphysical essence of Christ, or his relation to God, or his "natures," but speaks of him as the one through whom God is working for the salvation of the world and man. Thus, every assertion about Christ is also an assertion about man and vice versa; and Paul's Christology is simultaneously soteriology." (Bultmann, 1952:190-191)

Fundamentally, the problem with the quest for the centre of Paul's theology is that it places too much of an accent on human beings, and it fails to take into account Paul's work concerning the work of God for redemption of all creation, not only human beings (Hultgren, 2010:362). It also tends to over-systematize Paul's theology and presents it as static and unchanging (Dunn, 1998:20). Furthermore, it fails to provide a dynamic description of Paul. Paul was never just a theologian, "but was always at the same time Paul the theologian, missionary, and pastor" (Dunn, 1998:21).

[15] Hultgren (2010:357-362) provided a link between the quest for the centre of Paul's theology and the anthropocentric and individualistic approach. Hultgren analyses the works of scholars such as Stendahl, Schweitzer, Wrede, Bornkamn, Davies, and Compbell, and comes to the conclusion that what is common among all these scholars is that they are all anthropological and individualist in nature.

Paul never wrote a theological treatise for the sake of theology *per se*. Rather, his letters provide a glimpse into how Paul's thoughts intersect with real life issues concerning his churches. It is within the context of each letter that we should try to understand Paul's theology, and we should tread carefully not to rush to harmonize all his letters.

## 2.3. Toward the centre: a narrative approach

The narrative approach is a reaction to the quest for the centre of Paul's theology. It is formed[16] by the "shift from modernity (ideas) to postmodernity (narrative)" (Capes, Reeves, and Richards, 2007:270). The following eight scholars are generally associated with this approach: Hays, Petersen, Wright, Witherington, Fowl, and Keesmaat, Grieb, and Campbell.[17] Among the latest scholars to use this approach is Constantineanu (2006) in his doctoral thesis on reconciliation, and hence this is being considered here. Scholars associated with the narrative approach agree that Paul was not a systematic theologian; they however maintain that "There seems nevertheless to be a pattern, a centre, a commitment, a conviction, a vision, an underlying structure, a core communication, a set of beliefs, a narrative, a coherence…" in Paul's theology (Bassler, 1993:6). Hays ([1994] 2002:231-232) explains the difference between the quest for the centre and the narrative approach as follows: "the ground of coherence in Paul's thought is to be found not in a system of theological propositions (e.g. "justification by faith"…) but in the kerygmatic story of God's action through Jesus Christ…". The narrative approach views the centre of Paul's thoughts/theology to be in his narrative substructure; the story beneath the letter (Capes, Reeves, and Richards, 2007:270). In this approach the story becomes "integral and a generative ingredient in Paul's theological formulations" (Longenecker, 2002:3). It can thus be said that the narrative approach seeks to find a locus of commonality behind the diverse expressions of Paul's thoughts. The discourse of Paul's letters, it is claimed, is understood as a product of underlying narrative bedrock (Longenecker, 2002:3). There is, however, diversity

[16] Longenecker (2002:4-5) expands more on the shift on philosophy as formative for this approach.
[17] All these are cited in Constantineanu (2006:13)

among scholars about what constitutes or makes up these substructures or the narrative bedrock.

Richard Hays is the scholar who made the first and the strongest case for a narrative approach to Paul and his letters (Constantineanu, 2006:14). This sentiment is also shared by scholars such as Longenecker (2002:5) when he said, “Much of the impetus for the contemporary study of narrative ingredient in Paul’s thought can be traced to the groundbreaking work of Richard Hays.” Hays’ work is viewed by scholars such as Constantineanu (2006:14) and Longenecker (2002:5) as providing a methodological foundation for the narratological features of Paul’s theology. This inquiry will not consider arguments for this approach in detail, but will simply summarize what different scholars perceive to be Paul’s substructure.

Hays summarised his main thesis as follows: "*A story about Jesus Christ is presupposed by Paul's argument in Galatians, and his theological reflection attempts to articulate the meaning of that story*” (Hays, 2002: xxiv, emphasis his). Hays (2002:6) argues that the framework of Paul’s thought is neither in his religious experience nor in sacred doctrines; Paul’s framework lies in a “sacred story, a narrative structure”. He goes on to say that “in these texts Paul ‘theologizes’ by reflecting upon this story as an ordering pattern for thought and experience; he deals with ‘variable elements’ of the concrete situation … by interpreting them within the framework of his ‘sacred story’, which is a story about Jesus Christ” (Hays, 2002:6). Thus for Hays, the story of Jesus Christ provides the narrative substructure on which all of Paul’s theology hangs.

Beker[18] (1991:17) on the other hand suggests that the “Jewish apocalyptic is the substratum and master symbolism of Paul’s thought because it constituted the linguistic

[18] Scholars normally place Beker’s approach among those who look for the centre of Paul’s theology, especially in his work “Paul the Apostle; the triumph of God in life and thought”. In fact, he is mostly quoted as being against the narrative approach to Paul, and is cited as having said, “Paul is not a storyteller…[he] is a man of the prepositions, the argument, and the dialogue, not a man of the parable or story” (Beker, 1984:353). It is, however, worth noting that after he was criticised by Boer (see above), Beker’s language changed and he then talked about the “coherence” of Paul’s thoughts rather than a centre. He said, ‘The term “coherence … suggests a fluid and flexible structure. In contrast to a fixed core and a specific centre or particular symbol, it points to a field of meaning, a network of symbolic relations that nourishes Paul’s thought and constitutes his “linguistic world”’ (Beker, 1991:17). It is thus better to view Beker’s proposal of Paul’s theology as characterized by both a coherent centre and flexible structure.

world of Paul the Pharisee and therefore formed the indispensable filter, context, and grammar by which he appropriated and interpreted the Christ-event, the ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ".

Wright argued that the narrative substructure has always played a vital role from the exodus community to Jesus and Paul. This is how he expressed it: "Israel's theology had nearly always been characteristically expressed in terms of an explicit story: the story of the Exodus, of the Judges, of David and his family, of Elijah and Elisha, of exile and restoration …" (Wright, 1992:77). Wright went on to say that Jesus continued this long tradition, but it does not end with Jesus. It is a tradition that the apostle Paul also followed. Wright (1992:79) asserted that in Paul's writing, "the apostle's most emphatically 'theological' statements and arguments are in fact expressions of the *essentially Jewish story now redrawn around Jesus"* (italics his). For Wright, Paul's theology is comprised of telling and retelling the Jewish story about Jesus. He says it is "the whole story of God, Israel and the world as now compressed into the story of Jesus" (Wright, 1992:79). For Wright, Paul read all of the scriptures and found their climax in the story of Jesus Christ.

Dunn (1998:18) said that Paul's theology emerges from "the interplay between several stories, his theologizing to consist in his own participation in that interplay". He saw the substructure of Paul's theology to be "the story of God and creation, with the story of Israel superimposed upon it" (Dunn, 1998:18). He went on to say that on top of that is "the story of Jesus, and then Paul's own story, with the initial intertwining of these last two stories as the decisive turning point in Paul's life and theology" (Dunn, 1998:18). Thus for Dunn, Paul's theology is the interaction between the different stories.

Witherington (1993:103) saw Paul's thoughts to be revolving around Jesus Christ, the Son of God. He (Witherington, 1993:103) said that "Paul's view of Christ was so broad that he could conceive of him being involved in God's dealings with his people long before he was born and began his earthly ministry". He went on to say that the reason that Paul's thoughts revolved around Jesus is because he saw "Christ as Wisdom come in the flesh" (Witherington, 1993:103).

Constantineanu (2006 and 2010) also employed narrative substructure as a way of overcoming weaknesses in previous research on reconciliation, which tended to limit reconciliation "almost exclusively to its vertical dimension … between individuals and God" (2010:39). According to Constantineanu (2006:23) the vertical dimension "leaves the church with no resources to deal with complex social process", and it also misreads Paul's letters. By employing the narrative approach Costantineanu reads reconciliation alongside the story of Christ, and thus brings together the vertical aspects of reconciliation with the horizontal aspects. Thus, for Constantineanu (2010:209), "to be justified and reconciled with God is be reconciled and at peace with one's sister and brother, to be at peace with 'the other'". Constantineanu would have been much more effective if he had demonstrated that the whole of the Bible is about the story of reconciliation, God being reconciled with his people.

The narrative approach would appear to offer a better picture of the biblical data as compared to the quest for the centre; that is, the Bible is primarily the story of God. In our quest for Paul's theology, that story needs to be an integral part. It helps us to see how various dynamics of the text (such as the story of Christ, creation, Paul's mission, his identity) influence Paul. The insight that is gained from this will become evident in the next chapter where different views concerning the origins of reconciliation in Paul will be considered.

Narrative theologians seem to differ on the stories operating as Paul's substructure. A commonality in the narrative approach is that all scholars perceive the substructure of Paul's thinking to be around the person and the work of Christ. Even though this approach is much more plausible than the quest for the centre, it still has a downside. Hays himself is aware of the difficulty of this methodology and what it needs to overcome. He said:

> "The basic methodological problem which must be surmounted is this: in the case of Paul, where we encounter texts discursive in form, how is it possible to discern the shape of the narrative structure which, as we have proposed, underlies the argumentation? [...] What does it mean to claim that a discourse has a "narrative substructure"? Does it make sense to say that a

> *story* can function as a constraint on the logic of an *argument*?" (Hays, 1993:21, Italics his)

The difficulty with this methodology has also been articulated by Bassler (1993:8), i.e., we are looking for something that "Paul does not fully articulate". This has resulted in scholars such as Hays resorting to cross-referencing among the letters, in hopes of supporting what scholars perceive to be the foundational story, and in different narrative substructures.

It thus seems that both the quest for the centre of Paul's theology and the narrative approach do not adequately state Paul's theology. An approach is therefore needed that can help us to understand the Pauline texts better without psycho-analysing Paul. Socio-rhetorical analysis is an interpretive analytic that seeks to explore the dialogical interrelations between the author, texts, and readers/interpreters (Gowler, 2010:191). It is not a quest for the centre of Paul's theology, nor does it try to find a story that runs through all of Paul's letters. What it does is to analyse the text as it relates to its context and circumstances. This is in line with how this paper views Paul's theology, which has been previously defined by Bassler (2002:72) as an "*appropriation and application of scripture and Christian traditions to the specific situation".* The socio-rhetorical interpretation invites detailed attention to the text itself (Robbins, 1996:1).

## 2.4. Socio-rhetorical approach

As was seen in the previous chapter, this paper seeks to understand Paul's theology of reconciliation in 2 Corinthians by employing a socio-rhetorical approach. As Wuellner (cited in Crafton, 1990:317) proposed: "A study of the rhetorical nature of Paul's argumentation, or a study of the nature of argumentation in Paul's letters, will help us out of two impasses" created by the fixation with the centre of Paul's theology on the one hand, and trying to find a story that runs through all of Paul's letters on the other hand. Socio-rhetorical analysis helps us to understand that Paul's various arguments are not just empirical formulas of induction and deduction (reducing Paul's theology to a single concept), but rather in line with classical modes of persuasion found among the

Greeks and Romans. It is a combination of two different methods: sociological analysis and rhetorical analysis. This paper hopes that by employing a socio-rhetorical approach, we will be true to Paul's teachings on reconciliation in 2 Corinthians. Paul wrote his theology of reconciliation in 2 Corinthians in order to persuade the Corinthians about the genuineness of his motives and gospel.

### 2.4.1. A brief background to socio-rhetorical approaches[19]

There are essentially two camps in scholarship that employ a socio-rhetorical approach. On the one side is the SBL group on socio-rhetorical criticism, and on the other are Ben Witherington III and Craig Keener (whose work is on the gospel of Matthew) (Robbins, 2004:20). Amongst the SBL group are scholars such as Vernon K. Robbins, Stanley E. Porter and D.A. de Silva. Unfortunately the two camps seem to ignore each other and at times are harsh in their treatment of each other.[20] These two camps[21] define socio-rhetorical criticism differently. Witherington (2009:2) defines it as primarily a "historical discipline, not primarily a hermeneutic one", while Robbins (2004:1) defines socio-rhetorical interpretation as a "multi-dimensional approach to the texts guided by a multi-dimensional hermeneutic". These two camps are guided by different hermeneutical interpretations. Thus Witherington's camp places accent on the historical understanding of the author's original intention of the text, and this approach is closer to historical criticism (Witherington, 2009:3). Robbins' approach on the other hand is more

[19] Gowler (2010), Robbins, (1992, 2004), and Moon (2004) provide a historical development of the socio-rhetorical approach.

[20] Robbins' (2012) harsh review of Witherington's book, "What's in the Word: Rethinking the Socio-rhetorical Character of the New Testament" can be found at http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/8066_8821.pdf (last visited 26 August 2013). One of the issues that Robbins seems to have with Witherington is his evangelical outlook. This is clear on page 2 of the review, where he said, "His [Witherington's] project, rather, seems to be to bolster Christians in their belief that they are "truly" the ones who understand God and God's ways, and they are the ones whom God "truly" blesses at all times. This seems to me, once again, to be more of a nineteenth – and twentieth – century project than a twenty–first century project". This is compared to his own views that "socio-rhetorical approach to the New Testament might help people of multiple cultures and religious traditions live together during the twenty-first century without destroying one another". In this research Witherington's evangelical position is supported as the true reflection the Biblical teachings.

[21] Robbins' (2004) "Beginnings and Developments in Socio-rhetorical Interpretation" (pages 20-26) provides further details on the two camps of socio-rhetorical approach.

sociological and multi-disciplinary in nature. This is what Robbins (2012:1) said about his approach:

> "…"socio-" referred to Clifford Geertz's *Interpretation of Cultures*, Roger Keesing's anthropological role theory, and Theodore Sarbin and Vernon Allen's social psychological role theory. In this context the term "rhetorical" referred to a focus on persuasive strategies in the New Testament writings that could help us interpret the rhetorical heritages of Jewish, Greek, and Roman speaking and writing in the context of Mediterranean local cultures, which display a wide variety of ethnic subcultures, countercultures, contracultures, and marginal cultures" (Robbins, 2012:1).

Robbins uses the socio-rhetorical approach to the New Testament to describe "a set of integrated strategies that move coherently through inner literary and rhetorical features of the New Testament text into a social and cultural interpretation of its discourses in the context of the Mediterranean world" (Moon, 2004:40). By the term 'strategies', Robbins (2010:1) is referring to the interrelation of communication between theology, philosophy, and the social sciences (Moon, 2004:45).

Scholarship generally attributes Robbins with introducing a socio-rhetorical approach to the New Testament in his 1984 book "Jesus the Teacher" (Moon, 2004:40, and Gowler, 2010:91). These claims are also supported by Robbins (2012:1) himself, when he said: "…I created the term 'socio-rhetorical' in the subtitle of *Jesus the Teacher* in 1984, the purpose was to move rhetorical criticism of the New Testament forward beyond literary-historical criticism."

### 2.4.2. What is socio-rhetorical interpretation?

The socio-rhetorical approach incorporates multi-disciplines into the reading of biblical text. According to Robbins (1996:1), as seen above, the term "socio-" refers to "the rich resources of modern anthropology and sociology that socio-rhetorical interpretation brings to the interpretation of a text," and "rhetorical" refers "to the way language in a text is a means of communication among people." So Robbins uses the term "socio-rhetorical" to bring insights and results from "every approach into an organized frame of

understanding" that can help us to understand the context of the Mediterranean world (Robbins, 2012:1, see also Moon, 2004:40).

There are three main historical background issues that led to the appearance of socio-rhetorical interpretation in the New Testament studies. The first one has been the realization that language is never static and context free, and therefore the texts need to be understood within their given context. DeSilva (1999:33) said that: "as one discovers the context within which the text was written and read, and adds these dimensions to the reading of the text, the closer one approaches the full meaning and impact of the text within a particular setting". Within the exegetical analysis attention needs to be paid to the settings of the first hearers and readers.

The second cause for the appearance of a socio-rhetorical approach to the New Testament has been as a result of the reader oriented approach (Moon, 2004:41, Witherington, 2009:3 and 8). This is very clear in Robbins' socio-rhetorical approach that utilizes "rhetorical analysis and interpretation that is based on both oral and literary dynamics within social, cultural, ideological, and religious contexts of interaction during the first century A.D. to interpret New Testament literature" (Robbins, 2009:3).

The third aspect that gave rise to the appearance of socio-rhetorical approach in the New Testament has been the recognition of the multi-dimensional nature of the textual communication (Moon, 2004:41). Robbins in his socio-rhetorical analysis of the text has not just included the first century context of the New Testament text but he also includes the latest methodological approaches in interpretation of the text. These include insights from historical criticism, literary criticism, ideological criticism, social scientific criticism, reader-oriented approaches, sociology, anthropology, and modern day rhetorical reading of the text (Robbins, 1996:1-2; Moon, 2004:41; Gowler, 2010:92; deSilva, 1999:33). Socio-rhetorical approach creates a dialogue between all these approaches and tries to appreciate the insight that each brings.

### 2.4.3. Robbins' socio-rhetorical approach

Robbins (1992, 1996, 2010), Gowler (1994), and Moon (2004) provide a sketch and the historical development of socio-rhetorical interpretation. Robbins is accredited by Moon (2004:45) and Gowler (1994:93) for codifying five different angles of exploring the multiple textures within the text (Robbins 1996:3). These are inner text, intertexture, social, cultural texts, ideological texture, and sacred texture. Moon (2004:45) noted that "within each of these [categories], one will find recognizable aspects of other exegetical disciplines". The following section will provide a brief overview of Robbins' multi-textures, but the one that will be used in the current research is intertexture, in conjunction with Witherington (2009). The reason that Witherington will be used is because of his evangelical convictions.

#### 1. *Inner Texture*

The inner texture is concerned with the linguistic patterns within a text, such as the repetition of a particular word. It also looks at structural elements of a text such as the creation of the beginnings and endings, "alternation of speech and storytelling, particular ways in which the words present an argument and the particular "feel" or aesthetic of the text" (Robbins, 1996:3). Here Robbins utilizes both literary and rhetorical tools to analyze the text.

#### 2. *Intertexture*

Intertexture is very similar to socio-historical analysis; it asks the interpreter to look for other "texts" which are at work in the primary text (Moon, 2004:46). According to Gowler (2010:195) intertexture "designates a text's representation of, reference to and use of phenomena in the 'world' outside the text, including a text's citations, allusions and reconfigurations of specific texts, events, language, objects, institutions and other specific extra-textual contexts with which the text interacts". There are four kinds of intertexture according to Robbins (1996:3): oral-scribal intertexture, cultural intertexture,

social intertexture, and historical intertexture. Oral-scribal intertexture is concerned with the specific use of language in other texts, and how the language was used in daily life. Cultural intertexture is concerned with things like the significance of clothes people wear, and family structures, political arrangements and the distribution of things like money, food, and services. Social intertexture on the other hand is concerned with modes of understanding and beliefs. It looks at things like social role, social institutions, and social relationships. Historical intertexture is concerned with events outside the texts that can give us insight into the text. This current research will be making use of intertexture analysis under the heading of socio-historical analysis of the *καταλλάσσειν* and διαλλ*άσσειν* terminology.

### 3. *Social and Cultural Texture*

According to Robbins (1996:3) social and cultural texture "concerns the capacity of the text to support social reform, withdrawal, or opposition and to evoke cultural perceptions of dominance, subordinance, difference, or exclusion". This is very important for our understanding of Paul's message of reconciliation. What was Paul hoping to achieve by this message? And how were the Corinthians to respond to that particular text concerning reconciliation? In social and cultural texture Robbins (1996:3) invites the investigator to focus on the social world of the readers of a particular text, and moves them to respond to that world. He says that the social world of the text will make the investigator aware of the common social practices, social values, perceptions about resources for life and wellbeing, and presuppositions about purity and taboo that are embedded in the text. Here Robbins invites us to use various appropriate social and anthropological theories in order to understand the difficult aspects of the text.

### 4. *The Ideological Texture*

The ideological texture "concerns the particular alliances and conflicts nurtured and evoked by the language of the text and the language of the interpretation as well as the way the text itself and interpreters of the text position themselves in relation to other

individuals and groups" (Robbins 1996:4, see also Gowler, 2010:195). Here Robbins (1996:4) invites the interpreters to be aware of various ideological discourses, and the interpreter's own ideological presuppositions. He said that "different modes of intellectual discourses evoke different ways of viewing people and reality" (Robbins, 1996:4). He gave the following modes of different ideological interpretive discourses: "anthropological, feminist, theological, literary, or historical" (Robbins, 1996:4). Each of these interpretive discourses will influence how the interpreter analyses a given text.

#### *5. Sacred Texture*

Sacred texture focuses of the relationship between humans and God. This texture includes aspects concerning such things as deity, holy persons, spirit beings, divine history, human redemption, religious community and ethics (Robbins, 1996:4, see also Gowler, 2010:195). A study of the Biblical text will be done in conjunction with other texts that describe the material, social, cultural, and ideological nature of life during the times of the Biblical texts. This is done in order to gain a much richer understanding of the Biblical text. Sacred texture analysis hopes to root the realities of the Bible in our own world.

## 2.5. Summary

Two dominant approaches that have been used by scholarship have been examined in this chapter: the quest for the centre of "Paul's theology" and the narrative approach. The problem with the "quest for the centre of "Paul's theology"" is that it fails to provide sufficient answers for all of Paul's diverse themes and ideas. It has also been quick to systematize Paul, while Paul's letters were written mostly as occasional documents. The narrative approach is much more plausible as an approach, compared to the quest for the centre of "Paul's theology". The problem with it, however, is that scholarship is looking for something that Paul does not fully articulate. The result of this has been that scholars have differed on the story that operates as Paul's substructure. This paper will

not focus primarily on the attempts to unify or integrate Paul's thinking. Rather it seeks clarity about the full meaning of Paul's theology of reconciliation as it appears in 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10. It is for this reason that this paper prefers to use an analytical approach that focuses on each text of Paul's teaching on reconciliation, without trying to harmonise it with others. A socio-rhetorical approach will thus help us with this endeavor, since it is an analytical approach that can help us get to grips with the text of 2 Corinthians.

In conclusion, by employing the socio-rhetorical approach this paper hopes to acquire a comprehensive understanding of the text dealing with reconciliation. By using intertexture this paper will keep in mind phenomena outside of the text that are being raised into the text by Paul. Paul had two strong cultural influences, one being his Jewish culture and the other being his Greco-Roman culture. We need to keep these in balance and see how Paul brings them into a given text. Intertexture helps us to place the texts in its own world: Paul's audience was accustomed to an oral culture; the question then is how the original audience interacted with Paul's text. Socio and cultural texture help us explore the range of social orientation and location in the text, and the manner in which these orientations and locations relate to one another (Moon, 2004:49). In the exegesis of the sacred text we are not only concerned with how the original audiences were moved by the text to act, but we are also concerned about making the text alive in our own reality.

# CHAPTER 3: THE ORIGINS OF PAUL'S CONCEPT OF RECONCILIATION AND HOW HE BECAME ITS AMBASSADOR

The aim of this chapter is twofold. Firstly, this chapter seeks to do a socio-historical investigation of the use of the *καταλλάσσειν* and διαλλάσσειν terminology in the New Testament. A socio-historical approach is primarily concerned with the identification of the "social, cultural, political, religious, and historical dynamics that are embedded in the text. It seeks to understand how a person in the original audience would have understood the text" (Hoffman, 2007:1). This point is underscored by Meeks (1983:2) when he said the following concerning the first century Christians: "…ordinary Christians did not write our [biblical] texts and rarely appear in them explicitly. Yet the texts were written in some sense *for* them, and were used in some ways by them. If we do not ever see their world, we cannot claim to understand early Christianity" (italics his).

The second aim of this chapter is to explore the different theories concerning the origins or the root of Paul's theology of reconciliation. Here possible influences on Paul's theology of reconciliation will be considered. This is done with the hope that we will discover how Paul became the ambassador of reconciliation.

## 3.1. What is reconciliation?

Reconciliation is a difficult and ambiguous term to define, for it means different things to different people depending on the objectives one is trying to achieve. The result of this ambiguity has caused people to use various metaphors in trying to describe reconciliation such as "quest", "journey", "action", "process", and "goal" in trying to define reconciliation (Noble, 2006:10). For example, the Australian based organisation ReconciliACTION Network[22] defines reconciliation as the "coming together between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians". In this sense reconciliation becomes a process by which these different groups can come together or a process of overcoming

[22] http://reconciliaction.org.au/nsw/education-kit/what-is-reconciliation/ (Date of access: 4 July 2012).

the enmity that exists between them. The focus in this definition is on the outcome, the bringing together of the people. For others, reconciliation is "the act of making amends and offering apologies in order to again be friends and enjoy peace with the other person or people".[23] In this latter definition reconciliation is described as the action that the individual takes in order to establish peace again, with the focus being on the action the individual takes. The accent here is placed on justice, making amends for the actions that cause enmity.

The term reconciliation in the English comes from the Latin *reconciliāre* which can be translated as "to bring together again, from re- + *conciliāre* to make friendly".[24] The use of the word "reconciliation" for the context of South Africa has been questioned by Krog (2000:143). Krog, working with the definition laid out in the Oxford dictionary, places much emphasis on the "re"- of reconciliation. As a result she says, "But in this country, there is nothing to go back to, no previous state or relationship one would wish to restore. In these stark circumstances, "reconciliation" does not even seem like the right word, but rather "conciliation"" (Krog, 2000:143). By "conciliation" Krog means getting together and forging new relationships without going back to a previous state of relationship, since that was non-existent in South Africa. The Oxford dictionary also defines reconciliation as the "the action of making one's view or belief compatible with another".[25] Here the emphasis is not necessarily on the past state of positive relationship, but on the future restoration, or of compatibility of the belief between two opposing parties. Noble (2006:11) makes a striking observation that "when we speak of reconciliation we are at once referring to the events in the past, the present and the future". To only focus on the past positive relationship will be short-changing reconciliation. For reconciliation can also be used to refer to the inception of a relationship between two previously warring parties and a "resumption of relationship between those whose affectionate bonds has been raptured" (Fitzgerald, 2003:334). To emphasize one element of the definition at the expense of the other will not do justice to the term.

[23] http://www.thefreedictionary.com/reconciliation (Date of access: 18 February 2012)
[24] http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/reconcilement (Date of access: 18 February 2012)
[25] http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/reconciliation?q=Reconciliation (Date of access: 5 May 2012)

It is worthwhile to note, as Hardimon (1994:87) has observed, that the English word for reconciliation carries with it more baggage than its German counterpart, or the Greek word in our case. Due to the ambiguous nature of the definition of reconciliation, there are general disagreements about the nature of reconciliation itself. Is it a process, a goal or a combination of the process and a goal (Noble, 2006:10)? Hardimon, commenting on Hegel's philosophy of political reconciliation, made a distinction between these two aspects and said, "The process may be variously described as a process of overcoming conflict, division, enmity, alienation or estrangement; the result, as the restoration of harmony, unity, peace, friendship, or love" (Hardimon, 1994:85). Hardimon's definition is helpful in assisting us to see how personal experiences influence our perception of reconciliation. In this paper reconciliation will be viewed as both the process and the goal.

Since the understanding of reconciliation is directly linked to people's experiences, it is important that we first discover how reconciliation was perceived in the Greco-Roman world. Secondly, the ways in which Paul was following the common norms will be examined. Lastly, we will explore in what ways his teaching on reconciliation was different from those common norms.

### 3.1.1. Reconciliation in the Greco-Roman world

There are four similar Greek words that the New Testament scholarship focuses on when referring to reconciliation.[26] These are: *διαλλάσσω*/*καταλλάσσω* (*diallassō/katallassō*) and *διαλλεγή*/*καταλλαγή (diallagē/katallagē*). In the Greco-Roman world the *διαλλάσσω*/*καταλλάσσω* and *διαλλεγή*/*καταλλαγή* terminologies are primarily used for interpersonal relationships and in the political-military context of peace treaties. Constantineanu (2006:36), following Porter (1994), adds that the *καταλλάσσω*/καταλλαγή is never used for religious reconciliation between God and

[26] Scholars such as Marshall H.I. 1978. The meaning of Reconciliation in unity and diversity of the New Testament theology ed. Guelich. Eerdmans: Michigan. Also Bieringer, R. unknown date. Reconciliation to God in light of 2 Corinthians 5:14-21. *perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0007546/seminar/bieringer.doc (visited 3 May 2012)*

people in the Greco-Roman world. This is however not entirely the case, for in the work of Plato, S*ymposium*, Aristophanes argues: "…if we make friends with the god and are reconciled [διαλλαγέντες τῷ θεῷ], we shall have the fortune that falls to few in our day, of discovering our proper favourites…." (Plato *Symposium* 193b). This means that even though reconciliation in the Greco-Roman world was primarily used for interpersonal relationships and also in the political-military context of peace treaties, the idea of reconciliation with God was not foreign.

The basic meaning of the *καταλλάσσειν* and διαλλ*άσσειν* terminology is "to change from enmity to friendship or to alter or exchange" (Büchsel, 1964:258). There seems to have been no precise difference between these two terms. When *διαλλάσσω* is used in its active form it refers to the "action of the person in persuading his enemy to abandon his enmity and treat him peaceably" (Marshall, 1978:118). Fitzgerald (2003:334) observed that these terms are used for both the "inception of friendship between two previously hostile to one another and the resumption of relationship between those whose affectionate bonds have been ruptured".

In the Hellenistic world there is a strong link between reconciliation and friendship. This can be seen in the works of scholars such as Dio Chrysostom in his speech to the Nicomedians about a treaty with the Nicaeans.[27] Chrysostom said that friendship, reconciliation and kinship are the same, "... ή γάρ αύτῃ καὶ καταλλαγή καὶ συγγένεια, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα περιειλῆφεν'' (Chrysostom, *Or.* 38:11).[28] In Chrysostom's work the connection between reconciliation and friendship is so strong that the same idea is repeated in a concord between his city and that of Apameians when he said:

> "οὐ μέντοι πρὸς ἐκεἰνους γε ἦλθον οὐδέ εἶπον φιλάνθρωπον οὐδέν πρὸ τοῦ καταλλαγῆναι δημοσία τήν πὸλιν και φἰλους ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι. καἰτοι ψἠφισμά γε ἔπεμψαν εὐθὺς ἐν ἀρχῇ φιλοφρονούμενοι και παρακαλοῦντες ἀφικέσθαι[29]'' (Chrysostom, *Or.* 40:16b).

[27] The following section draws from the insightful work of Fitzgerald (2003), "Paul and friendship".
[28] The translation is based on the work of Crosby, H.L (1929) unless otherwise indicated.
[29] Translated as, "However, I did not go to them or speak any word of human kindness in anticipation of the official reconciliation of the city and the establishment of your friendship with them. And yet at the very outset they sent

What starts to emerge from the works of Chrysostom is that in the Greco-Roman world, the *κατάλλασσειν* and διαλλάσσειν terminology for reconciliation is closely associated with friendship, especially within the context of a peace treaty. This is made clear in the works of classic writers such as Herodes Atticus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Fitzgerald, 2003:334). In book 3 Dionysius[30] tells the story of Mettius Fufetius, an Alban general who succeeded Cluilius upon his death before the war with the Romans. Mettius Fufetius took the initiative in bringing about reconciliation/καταλλαγάς[31] (Dionysius, 3.5.4) and friendship/φιλἰας.[32] In Fufetius it is also seen that the mutual enmity is laid aside in order for reconciliation to occur. This becomes clear in book 3 when Fufetius said, "But I need say no more to convince you that we ought to lay aside our enmity [καταλυσαμένοις τά ἔχθη] and march with all speed against these impious men" (Dionysius, 3.8.3). He goes on to talk about the terms of reconciliation that will favour both cities. Fufetius then said, "For my part, I hold that mutual reconciliation [διαλλαγας] is best and most becoming to kinsmen and friends [φἰλιος], in which there is no rancor nor remembrance of the past injuries, but a general and sincere remission of everything that has been done or suffered on both sides" (Dionysius, 3.8.4). He further discusses the less honorable form of reconciliation. What might shock the modern reader is that for Fufetius the less honourable form of reconciliation is the one where justice is carried out. He said, "less honourable than this form of reconciliation is one by which, indeed, the mass of the people are absolved of blame, but those who have injured one another are compelled to undergo such a trial as reason and law direct" (Dionysius, 3.8.4).

For Fufetius, the kind of reconciliation he prefers, the form he deems honourable, is the one that advocates complete absolution from previous hostility. One wonders whether Fufetius' preference was influenced by 1) his inability to conduct the war, and 2) the fact

---

me an official resolution expressing their friendship towards me and inviting me to pay them a visit" by Crosby (1946).

[30] The translation is that of Cary (1939) unless indicated otherwise.

[31] For some reason Cary in his translation of the text does not translate καταλλαγάς as reconciliation; he instead simply says, "taking the initiative himself".

[32] Again the translation here is different to that of Cary who translates φιλἰας as peace instead of friendship. The reason he has done this might be to pre-empt the goal of that friendship which will be peace during the time of war.

that the Albans lost interest in the war since the sacrifices concerning the battle were not in their favour (Dionysius, 3.5.3). What is interesting is that even though he knows which reconciliation he prefers he still leaves it up to Tullus to choose which reconciliation he would prefer (Dionysius, 3.8.5). This is perhaps more telling in that it explains that for reconciliation to happen, both parties who are in conflict need to agree on the terms of reference, on how that reconciliation is to be achieved. Based on the information gathered from the Hellenistic authors we can thus conclude with Fitzgerald (2003:335) that reconciliation is linked and closely associated with friendship and kinsmen and is used in accounts that depict the process of negotiating a truce between warring parties. The idea of reconciliation between God and people was present in Plato's writings even though it was not fully developed, the nuances of it are not given and God in this process is aloof. In the Hellenistic world reconciliation was thus primarily about inter-personal relationships, especially in the politico-military context of peace-treaties.

### 3.1.2. Reconciliation amongst the Jewish writers

The link between reconciliation and friendship can also be seen in antiquity among the Jewish authors such as Sirach and Philo. Sirach 22:21-22 says: "If you draw a sword on a friend, don't despair, because there can be a way back. If you speak harshly to a friend, don't be concerned, because there can be reconciliation [διαλλαγή]. But in the case of reproach, arrogance, the revealing of a secret, or a treacherous blow, any friend will flee" (CEB). In Sirach 22 reconciliation presupposes that there is a problem that has been caused in the friendship, inferring that there are three steps involved in the process of reconciliation. The first step is friendship. The second step is that friendship becomes severed due to a fight (whether verbally or physically). The third and final step is reconciliation. Sirach wants his readers to know that reconciliation can still happen. In this instance reconciliation restores the relationship to the previous state of harmony.

In Philo, however, Fitzgerald (2003:336) observed that the association between reconciliation and friendship is self-evident. Philo, upon commentating about the

reconciliation of Joseph and his brothers, said: “then his brethren will make with him covenants of reconciliation [καταλλακτηρίους ποιήσονται συμβάσεις], changing their hatred [τὸ μῖσος] to friendship [Τὸ φιλίαν], and their ill-will [τὸ κακὸνουν] to good-will [εἰς εὔνοιαν μεταβαλόντες]” (Philo, *Somm.* 2.108). Reconciliation involves a change from enmity to friendship, and a change from hatred to affection in the case of Joseph’s brothers. In general it means a change from hatred to former friendship or the inception of new friendship. Good- replaces ill-will, and with that change, enemies are transformed into friends (Fitzgerald, 2003:336). What is also astonishing about the story of the reconciliation of Joseph and his brothers is that it is the victim, Joseph, who hastens to reconcile before his brothers even know his identity (Philo, VI.237). Reconciliation is thus not always initiated by the perpetrators; the victims can also initiate reconciliation, as in the case of Joseph.

In Philo it is also seen that reconciliation is associated with the role of the mediator. In his comment on the golden calf incident, when Moses heard about the unfaithfulness of Israel, Philo said:

> “Struck with dismay, and compelled to believe the incredible tale, he yet took the part of mediator and reconciler and did not hurry away at once, but first made prayers and supplications, begging that their sins might be forgiven. Then when tis protector and intercessor had softened the wrath of the Ruler…he rejoiced that God accepted his prayers...” (Philo, Vit Mos. 2.166).

In the account of the golden calf incident by Philo, it is seen that, in order for reconciliation to occur, a mediator is sometimes required. A mediator is one who can speak on behalf of those who are perpetrators. In this case, the perpetrators are those who have broken the law of God. Moses interceded on behalf of Israel, meaning that he played the role of a diplomat representing the Israelites before God. Here we also see reconciliation being used in terms of the relationship between God and man, something that was only alluded to by Plato in the Hellenistic world.

Without a doubt, reconciliation language is used mostly in the religious sense amongst the Jewish writers. This becomes even clearer in Josephus. Josephus reports that when the prophet Nathan confronted King David about his sin with Uriah’s wife, the prophet

told David that God was angry and was about to punish David's house. We are told that David, upon hearing Nathan, confessed his sin. Then the Lord had pity on him and was reconciled [διαλλάττεται] to him.

> "ταραχθέντος δ' ἐπὶ τούτοις τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ συσχεθέντος ἱκανῶς καὶ μετὰ δακρύων καὶ λύπης ἀσεβῆσαι λέγοντος, ἦν γὰρ ὁμολογουμένως θεοσεβὴς καὶ μηδὲν ἁμαρτὼν ὅλως περὶ τὸν βίον ἢ τὰ περὶ τὴν Οὐρία γυναῖκα, ᾤκτειρεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ διαλλάττεται φυλάξειν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν ἐπαγγειλάμενος (Josephus, Ant.VII.153).

What emerges here is a pattern of reconciliation between God and his people. The people sin, God becomes angry with and inflicts punishment on them, but when they repent, God has pity on his people and is reconciled to them (Marshall, 1978:118). In this process of reconciliation people are the initiators who institute reconciliation by their repentance, and God forgives them and thus He becomes reconciled to them. The second religious use of reconciliation in Josephus is a negative one, where reconciliation is denied. In Ant. 6.143 the prophet Samuel pleads with God on behalf of Saul for God to be reconciled to Saul. "μετανοεῖν οὖν ἔλεγε πρὸς τὸν προφήτην Σαμουῆλον ἐπὶ τῷ χειροτονῆσαι βασιλέα τὸν Σαοῦλον μηδὲν ὧν αὐτὸς κελεύει πράττοντα, τῇ δ' οἰκείᾳ βουλήσει χρώμενον" (Josephus, Ant.VI. 143). What is interesting here is that the idea of mediator in the reconciliation process is made clear; the prophet Samuel acts as the mediator between God and Saul. God nevertheless refuses reconciliation with Saul, probably because Saul did not show any repentance.

The idea of reconciliation between God and men is further propounded by the authors of Maccabees. *Καταλλάσσω* is used three times in 2 Maccabees in a religious sense, where God is reconciled to his people. The *καταλλάσσω* is used in 2 Maccabees 1:5, 7:33 and 8:29, while the noun is used once in 2 Maccabees 5:20. What becomes clearer in 2 Maccabees is the link between judgement and reconciliation. In 2 Maccabees 7:32-33 we read: "ἡμεῖς γὰρ διὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτίας πάσχομεν. εἰ δὲ χάριν ἐπιπλήξεως καὶ παιδείας ὁ ζῶν κύριος ἡμῶν βραχέως ἐπώργισται καὶ πάλιν καταλλαγήσεται τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις". The people knew that when they sinned against the Lord, they aroused his wrath. The Lord proceeds by judging or punishing them.

When his anger is satisfied or the punishment is completed, God then reconciles to his people. The experience of punishment inflicted by the Lord may lead the people to repentance, and when they repent the Lord has pity on them and the result is reconciliation between God and the people (Marshall, 1978:121). The link between reconciliation and judgment is, however, not that clear in 2 Maccabees 1:5. At best we can say that it is alluded to by the phrase "ἐν καιρῷ πονηρῷ".[33]

In 2 Maccabees we also discover that it is people who initiate reconciliation with God through prayer. The verses that support this are 2 Maccabees 1:5a, "may he hear your prayers and be reconciled to you", and 2 Maccabees 8:29, "When they had done this, they made common supplication and besought the merciful Lord to be wholly reconciled with his servants (RSV)". Bieringer reports however, that DuPont objected to this interpretation and said, "It is not the prayer of humans that brings about reconciliation, but exclusively God's mercy" [cf. "the merciful God" in 8:29] (Bieringer, sine anno:2). Yet the context shows that at the very least the people take the initiative to appeal to the mercy of God. Therefore, according to 2 Maccabees, human beings are the ones who initiate reconciliation with God. Bieringer observes that the nature of this reconciliation is that of a master and slave relationship; it is not reconciliation between equals (sine anno:2).

In summary, 2 Maccabees gives us glimpses into how *Καταλλάσσω* and *Καταλλάγή* are used in a religious sense. It is also worth noting that in the mind of the author of 2 Maccabees the relationship between God and his people is like that of a master to his slaves. The need for reconciliation is linked to the wrath of God that needs to be propitiated, or the removal of sin that has caused enmity with God (2 Maccabees 1:5, 5:20 and 7:33). 2 Maccabees 7:33 says, εἰ δὲ χάριν ἐπιπλήξεως καὶ παιδείας ὁ ζῶν κύριος ἡμῶν βραχέως ἐπώργισται καὶ πάλιν καταλλαγήσεται τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις. From our reading of 2 Maccabees it can thus be concluded that reconciliation is first and foremost "the cessation of the God-inflicted calamities caused by people's sin" (Bieringer, sine anno:3). What is absent in 2 Maccabees is the means of reconciliation. We know that God's wrath has to be satisfied in order for reconciliation to happen, but

[33]"In time of evil".

also that people may appeal to his mercy. The exact nuances of this are not clearly seen.

### 3.1.3. Reconciliation within the Septuagint

In the Septuagint (LXX) the *Καταλλάσσω* terminology is rare, and there are no religious overtones to it. The instances where *Καταλλάσσω* is used in the LXX is in Jeremiah (ιερ.) 31:39, where it is used to mean "to change" thoroughly (Büchsel, 1964:258). The other instance where *Καταλλάσσω* appears is in Isaiah 9:4 but it is difficult to say what it means since it is different from the Hebrew text (Verbrugge, 2000:293). What is, however, commonly found in the LXX is *ἀλλάσσω* which has a variety of meanings. In Lev. 27:10, 27 and 33 *ἀλλάσσω* is used to mean "exchange" and redeem. This is made especially clear in verse 33: οὐκ ἀλλάξεις καλὸν πονηρῷ ἐὰν δὲ ἀλλάσσων ἀλλάξῃς αὐτό καὶ τὸ ἄλλαγμα αὐτοῦ ἔσται ἅγιον οὐ λυτρωθήσεται (cf. Exodus 13:13). The other meanings of *αλλάσσω* include everyday usages of the term "change", such as short changing someone on their wages (ἤλλαξεν τὸν μισθόν Gen. 31:7), and changing clothes (Gen. 35:2, 41:14).

*διαλλάσσω* on the other hand is mostly used for interpersonal relationships, as in the Hellenistic world. In the active *διαλλάσσω* is used to "refer to the action of a person in persuading his enemy to abandon his enmity and treat him peaceably" (Marshall, 1978:118). An example of this is found in Judges 19:3 where *διαλλάσσω* is used in reference to the Levite persuading his unfaithful concubine to reconcile with him: διαλλάξαι αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ. The active form can also be used for the actions of the mediator who persuades two enemies to reconcile.

When it is used in the passive form the offended person gives up his enmity (Marshall, 1978:118). An example of this is in 1 Esdr 4:31 (LXX) where the Persian King Darius persuades one of his concubines by the name of Apame to stop being angry with him and to be reconciled to him (κολακεύει αὐτήν ὅπως διαλλαγῇ αὐτῷ), even though she was the one at fault.

### 3.1.4. Reconciliation in the New Testament

When it comes to the New Testament (NT) it is soon discovered that *Καταλλάσσω* becomes more prominent than *διαλλάσσω*, which is in direct contrast to the LXX, where *διαλλάσσω* was prominent (Marshall, 1978:119). The only reference to *διαλλάσσω* is in Matthew 5:24, where Jesus talks about reconciliation between brothers (ὕπαγε πρῶτον διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου). Here *διαλλάσσω* is used for interpersonal relationships, as it is in the Hellenistic world and by Jewish writers. There is, nonetheless, a slight difference here. In Matthew 5 Jesus associates inter-human reconciliation with a person's relationship with God. Reconciliation with God cannot be divorced from inter-human reconciliation. Matthew 5:24 demonstrates that our relationship with God is partly dependent on how people treat others. God will not accept a gift at the altar until one is reconciled with his neighbour. Reconciliation with God also means reconciliation with man. Morris, commenting on Matthew 5:23-24, said:

> "It is impossible to enter into the reconciliation that Christ died to accomplish and at the same time to nourish grudges against other people. The two reconciliations are closely connected" (Morris, 1983:143).

*διαλλάσσω* thus mostly focuses on human inter-relationship, with God in view. The question that needs to be asked is, which use of reconciliation did Paul adhere to? Is it the Hellenistic, the Jewish authors', the Septuagint or the New Testament? If Paul follows any of these, then in what ways does he do so? If he does not, then in what ways is his use of the term reconciliation different from the others?

### 3.1.5. Reconciliation in Paul's writings

In the NT *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* terminologies occur only in Pauline literature. Paul uses the verb *καταλλάσσω* six times (Romans 5:10[bis]; 1 Corinthians 7:11; 2 Corinthians 5:18, 19 and 20) while the noun *καταλλαγή* occurs four times (Rom 5:11;

11:15; 2 Cor 5:18.19). *καταλλαγή* is translated “atonement” by the King James Version while the RSV translates *καταλλαγή* as “reconciliation”. *καταλλάσσω* is a compound verb of *ἀλλάσσω*, which means “to change”, “to exchange”, “to alter”. Paul uses the *ἀλλάσσω* in Galatians 4:20 where he wishes to change his tone/voice (ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν) with the Galatians. Here Paul uses *ἀλλάσσω* for a change in the natural sense; in 1 Corinthians 15:51-52 he uses it to mean change in the eschatological sense (οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἄφθαρτοι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα). In Romans 1:23 Paul uses *ἀλλάσσω* to convey an exchange; that is, people exchange the glory of God (ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου) for created things in their worship of false idols, even though God has plainly revealed himself to them through general revelation. Thus the basic meaning of *ἀλλάσσω* in Paul is to change one state or thing (i.e. body) for another.

*καταλλάσσω* simply means “to change” or “exchange” one condition for another. In Paul’s letters however, *καταλλάσσω* is used to signify the work of God in Christ. Romans 5:10, “εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλῷ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ”· Reconciliation in this verse is thus a change from enmity to fellowship. Paul says that we were the enemies (ἐχθροὶ) of God, and God has done something in order to rectify that situation in Christ. The exchange is as the result of the substitution work of Christ (Torrance, 2009:138). This means that reconciliation is accomplished through atonement: “διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ”. Christ’s death is the one that propitiates God’s wrath (αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς cf. verse 9) away from us. Reconciliation with God can only be received through the work of Christ; “Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν” (Romans 5:11). It is interesting to note that, unlike in 2 Maccabees where reconciliation with God was initiated by the people, here in Romans 5, God is the one who initiates reconciliation while we were his enemies (“εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ”). Paul also adds something that was absent from the Hellenistic understanding, Jewish writers and the LXX; that is, the means of reconciliation. We are reconciled through the death of Jesus Christ (διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ). Reconciliation with God is thus only possible through the death of Christ. This reconciliation brings with it intimacy with God, something that was foreign in the Ancient Near East. Reconciliation becomes the basis of the joy of believers in God (Verbrugge, 2000:293): “οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ

καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν" (Romans 5:11).

The idea that God is the one who initiates reconciliation with people, and not the converse, is strongly put forward by Paul in 2 Corinthians 5. In 2 Corinthians 5:18, "τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς". This verse is without doubt the clearest indication that God unilaterally acts in Christ and that reconciliation is his gift to us. It is, however, interesting to note that, for Paul, even though reconciliation is entirely the work of God alone, the work of God is synonymous with the work of Christ: "θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ". Paul further adds a drastically new idea to our understanding of the *καταλλάσσειν* terminology - he adds the concept of renewal. This is not just renewal in terms of a change from enmity to fellowship; he adds a more comprehensive renewal for man, namely, that he has become a new creature (Büchsel, 1964:255). In 2 Corinthians 5:17 we read: "ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις· τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινά". The old things have passed away and all things have become new. According to Romans 5 we are no longer enemies (ἐχθροὶ verse 10), weak (ἀσθενῶν), ungodly (ἀσεβῶ verse 6), but now the love of God has been poured out into our hearts (ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος, Romans 5:5). Christ's reconciliation does not merely change our legal standing but it also transforms and brings about a completely new state of life (Büchsel, 1964:255). This is a drastic departure by Paul from the Jewish Hellenistic tradition. In Pauline theology God becomes the sole author of reconciliation (Schwöbel, 2003:16).

Adding to the view that reconciliation is initiated by God and is achieved through Christ, Paul also links reconciliation with justification. The hint of this is his use of λογιζόμενος in 2 Corinthians 5:19. Λογιζεσθαι is vital to Paul's view of justification (Büchsel, 1964:255). Romans 4:3 reads: "Abraham believed God and it was accounted (ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ) to him as righteousness." The verse that shows a strong link exists between λογιζεσθαι and justification is Romans 4:5: "τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην" (see also Romans 4:4, 6, 8-11, 23-24). In 2 Corinthians 5:19 the link between justification and reconciliation is

established by the negative of λογιζεσθαι: μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς. Yet the idea that God does not reckon or count our trespasses against us can be perceived as God giving a blanket amnesty, and would suggest that he is not concerned about justice. That notion is, however, far from the truth. In 2 Corinthians 5:21 a great exchange is seen: "God made him who had no sin to be sin for us, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God". The justice of God was fulfilled in Christ's death. Reconciliation is thus entirely the work of God and centers around the death and the resurrection of Christ (2 Corinthians 5:19). The sinless Christ was made sin so that we can be reconciled to God. Schwöbel (2003:17) says that "The basis of this reconciliation is twofold identification; the sinless Christ is identified with human sinfulness so that sinful humans may be identified with God's righteousness."

The uses of the *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* terminologies in Paul are not without controversy. The question amongst scholars in terms of reconciliation with God is, who is reconciled to whom? Are we the only ones who are reconciled to God while God is not reconciled to us? Scholars such as Kim and Büchsel insist that God reconciles us and the world to himself, but God is never reconciled to us or the world, nor does he need to be reconciled (Büchsel, 1964:255). Kim explains his position as follows:

> "Paul never says that God is reconciled (or, that God reconciles himself) to human beings, but always that God reconciles human beings to himself or that human beings are reconciled to God… It is not, in fact, God who must be reconciled to human beings, but human beings who need to be reconciled to God. Nor is it by people's repentance, prayers or other good works that reconciliation between God and human beings is accomplished, but rather by God's grace alone" (Kim, 1997:362).

At the heart of this view is the desire to maintain the supremacy of God, not to reduce him to the level of man, as if God and man are on an equal footing. This view, however, misses a crucial point, namely that it is the person of Christ through whom we have reconciliation with God. In this paper it has already been demonstrated that the work of Christ is synonymous with the work of God; God was, in Christ, reconciling the world to himself. But who is Christ? He is fully God and fully man, according to Philippians 2:6-8. Christ in his person has therefore reconciled God and man. God has been reconciled to

man in Christ and God has reconciled man to himself. The work of Christ is simultaneously the work of God, and vice versa in reconciliation. The work of God in soteriology has been explained by Packer as follows:

> "God—the Triune Jehovah, Father, Son and Spirit; three Persons working together in sovereign wisdom, power and love to achieve the salvation of a chosen people, the Father electing, the Son fulfilling the Father's will by redeeming, the Spirit executing the purpose of Father and Son by renewing. Saves—does everything, first to last, that is involved in bringing man from death in sin to life in glory: plans, achieves and communicates redemption, calls and keeps, justifies, sanctifies, glorifies. Sinners—men as God finds them, guilty, vile, helpless, powerless, unable to lift a finger to do God's will or better their spiritual lot". [34]

It is worth noting that the work of Christ is simultaneously the work of man, since Christ is also fully man.

Reconciliation is primarily about how our alienation from God is addressed and removed by the work of Christ. All alienation in life is as a result of our sinfulness (Eph. 2:1-3; 4:18; 2 Cor. 5:19-21; Rom. 1-3; 5). The origin of our alienation from God is the sin of Adam (Rom. 5:12). Keller (2009:3) speaks of three consequences of our alienation from God: "1) psychological alienation[35] within ourselves, 2) social alienation[36] between individuals and nations, races, classes, and 3) finally physical alienation[37], including hunger, natural disasters, disease, and death". All human alienation is a symptom, and alienation from God is the cause (Keller, 2009:3). The gospel is primarily about the removal of that first alienation, as it brings about reconciliation with God. Once the cause of all human alienation is dealt with i.e. we are reconciled to God, then we are to pursue other forms of reconciliation.

---

[34] http://www.all-of-grace.org/pub/others/deathofdeath.html (Date of access: 24 July 2013)

[35] Because of our alienation from God we are alienated from ourselves- we experience shame and fear (Gen. 3:10)

[36] In Gen. 3:16 one of the early evidences of alienation between Adam and Eve is the blame game between the couple. The other evidence is that after they sinned they became aware of and embarrassed by their nakedness, whilst earlier they were both naked and felt no shame.

[37] Adam's sin resulted in sorrow, painful toil, physical degeneration and death (Gen. 3:16-19.) In fact, the ground itself is 'cursed' (Gen. 3:17; Rom 8:18ff.)

In Paul's writings, it is not only our enmity against God that comes to the fore, but also God's alienation from us. This alienation on the part of God is, as has already been seen, caused by our sinfulness. It is our sins that evoke the righteous anger of the holy God. But it is God's alienation from us that is brought into the foreground whether reconciliation is viewed as an action or result (Murray, 1955:34). Perhaps the scripture in which Paul best demonstrates this is Romans 11:15. If the Israelites receive their Messiah this will lead them to experience the divine favour and grace again. The result of God rejecting Israel is that the Gentiles receive God's mercy and grace and they become part of his family. What the text makes clear is that it is God's attitude towards them that changes. The Gentiles have not repented and the text does not even tell us that they are aware of their sinfulness, but due to God rejecting Israel, the Gentiles are now able to receive God's favour.

However, Paul in 2 Corinthians 5:20 said: "ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν· δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ". In this verse Paul uses the imperative καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ (be reconciled to God). This is ambiguous; is Paul saying "let yourselves be reconciled to God", which means that the Corinthians will be passive in the process (which will be in line with Kim's understanding), or is Paul saying "reconcile yourselves to God", which would be an active process with the Corinthians reconciling themselves to God. These questions will be dealt with in greater detail under exegesis of the text.

What can be concluded thus far is that the way in which Paul uses the *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* terminologies is different from how it was used in the Hellenistic sense, in that he uses it in a religious sense. Secondly, in Paul, reconciliation is initiated by God; it is God who took the first step in reconciling us to himself. Thirdly, Christ is the agent of reconciliation; that is, reconciliation is through the person and the work of Christ. What is also noticeably absent in Paul's use of *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* terminologies is the master-slave relationship that was present in the Hellenistic Jewish literature (Bieringer, sine anno:5). The similarity though is that, even in Paul, reconciliation presupposes estrangement. In both 2 Corinthians and Romans 5, Paul speaks about

sin, wrath and enmity which characterises our relationship with God prior to our reconciliation.

Paul also uses *καταλλαγή* for interpersonal reconciliation, and this use is found in 1 Corinthians 7:11. Here in 1 Corinthians 7:11 Paul uses *καταλλαγήτω* for reconciliation between a husband and a wife (ἢ τῷ ἀνδρὶ καταλλαγήτω). What is interesting about *καταλλαγήτω* is that it is a passive form where active participation or co-operation is implied (Taylor, 1941:85). The woman is to be actively involved in reconciliation with her husband. The context leads us to presume that the wife left the husband initially perhaps because she was offended by him. She is now urged to actively seek reconciliation, meaning that she is to lay aside her feelings of offense and to seek friendly restoration, in this case of her marriage (Marshall, 1978:121). Reconciliation will happen when both parties are restored to a state of friendship and mutual relationship.

A drastic departure by Paul in his use of the reconciliation language is in Ephesians 2:16 and Colossians 1:19-22.[38] Here Paul uses an entirely new vocabulary that has not been seen previously in his teachings regarding reconciliation. Büchsel (1964:258) said that Paul probably coined the *ἀποκαταλλάσσω* terminology. *Ἀποκαταλλάσσω* is similar yet it is a stronger form of *καταλλάσσω* and is used for God's reconciling act, God reconciling man or the world to himself (Torrance, 2009:138). There are many similarities between the use of *ἀποκαταλλάσσω* and what has been seen in the use of *καταλλάσσω* in 2 Corinthians 5 and Romans 5. All state that alienation from God was as the result of sin, with Colossians 1:21 stating emphatically that we are alienated from God and we are his enemies in our minds (καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς). In Colossians 1 it is still God who takes the initiative to reconcile us to himself. Verse 22 states: "νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατηλλάγητε ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ

[38] Scholars such as Büchsel (1964) and Martin (1981) have denied Pauline authorship of Ephesians and Colossians. Martin says that in these books we are "reading the work of a man who is both Pauline theologian and Pauline polemicist (Martin, 1981:194)". The current evangelical scholarship has sufficiently demonstrated Pauline authorship of Ephesians. O'Brien's commentary provides a detailed argument for Pauline authorship of Ephesians, and other scholars who shared his views are: Carson, Moo, Morris and Hoehner. Hoehner (2002:46) shows that the questioning of Pauline authorship of these books is a late phenomenon that only began in 1792 in the history of the Christian faith.

θανάτου". In the *άποκαταλλάσσω* terminology our reconciliation is still through the death of Christ – "διὰ τοῦ θανάτου" (verse 22). In Colossians 1:19, Paul adds a new phrase that makes explicit what in other texts he merely alluded to. That is, both God and Christ are the architects of reconciliation and that the work of God's reconciling action is synonymous with that of Christ's. In verse 19 we see the phrase "πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι", meaning the fullness of God dwells in Christ. The work of Christ is thus the work of God. Reconciliation is also initiated by God in Colossians 1; this is made clear by the fact that what marked our status before God was enmity and alienation (Col.1:22). This enmity, notes Büchsel (1964:259), "does not consist in discord or mistrust". It is in the mind, the faculty of our being. Our reconciliation was a gracious purpose of God, for it pleased (εὐδόκησεν) God to dwell in the person of his son in order that we might be reconciled to him. Christ's death as the means of our reconciliation is referred to in the text by the words "blood" (αἵματος which symbolizes death) and the "cross" (δια τοῦ σταυροῦ).

In Ephesians 2 reconciliation with God is fundamentally linked to reconciliation between Jews and Gentiles. Ephesians 2:16 states: "καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ". Sin produces a twofold alienation: alienation from God and alienation from fellow human beings. The death of Christ puts to an end both forms of alienation, and creates a peaceful relationship between God and humanity and between Jews and Gentiles. Reconciliation is thus not a mere coexistence between people. Paul uses stronger language by stating, "ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον ποιῶν εἰρήνην, καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ" (Ephesians 2:15b-16). Reconciliation in Ephesians does not only remove hostility but it also creates something new - Jews and Gentiles becoming one.

In summary, reconciliation in Paul can be viewed as a new relationship that has been achieved through the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. In Paul, reconciliation is seen as the "means of expressing the significance of the action of God in Jesus" (Marshall, 1978:117). It overlaps with justification, but is at the same time different to it. Reconciliation is about the "recreation of the bond of union between God

and humanity and humanity and God, a bond which is ontological and personal, which involves our human being and knowing" (Torrance, 2009:137).

### 3.1.6. The uniqueness of Paul's teaching on reconciliation

Schwöbel (2003:22-25)[39] highlights four unique Pauline teachings on reconciliation, things that can be observed in Paul, and also the dimensions Paul adds:

1) The soteriological dimension: reconciliation is a relational term, which marks a transition from a broken relationship to a restored relationship. Humanity is broken (sinful) and deserves God's wrath and there is absolutely nothing humanity can do in order to save itself. God intervenes in Christ, by Christ dying, so that we can be reconciled.
2) The Christological dimension: reconciliation is exclusively achieved by the death and resurrection of Christ. This work of Christ is identified in terms of exchange (2 Corinthians 5:21 and Colossians 1:19-20); God made him who had no sin to be sin for us, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God (2 Cor.5:21).
3) The theological dimension: reconciliation is initiated by God and is achieved by God through Christ. God was motivated by his love in his act of reconciliation. Marshall (1978:130) observed this unique feature in Paul and said, "Whereas in popular usage 'to reconcile Y to oneself' means 'to remove Y's grounds for being offended', Paul uses the phrase to mean 'to remove Y's offense'." God, the offended party, takes the initiative in reconciliation. Unlike in the Jewish writings where reconciliation was initiated by the people's repentance, in Paul's understanding God intervenes prior to repentance. In Romans 5:8,10 "συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν", "εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ". Fitzgerald (2001:253)

[39] Fitzgerald (2001:248-257) calls these unique features of Paul's teachings about reconciliation "Paul's shifts of the paradigm", with the Hellenistic and Jewish views about reconciliation a "standard paradigm".

said that this shift in Paul's paradigm is of "momentous import, for it suggests a radically new and unprecedented understanding of God". He goes on to say that the action of God in initiating reconciliation with us means that God assumed responsibility for both atonement and reconciliation (Fitzgerald, 2001:253).

4) The pneumatological dimension: "The Holy Spirit links to the past event of Christ's death, the medium of our relationship with the living God and the effective anticipation of the perfection of this relationship in the eschaton" (Schwöbel, 2003:25). Both Jews and Gentiles have the same access to the Father through the one Spirit (Eph. 2:18). Rom. 8:11, "And if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead is living in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies through his Spirit, who lives in you". The Holy Spirit gives believers assurance that truly nothing can separate us from the love of God (Schwöbel, 2003:25).

Looking at the uniqueness of Paul's teachings on reconciliation raises questions for Pauline scholarship. What are the origins of Paul's theology of reconciliation? What is it that influenced Paul in his unique understanding of reconciliation? Paul was born a Jew, grew up to be a zealous Pharisee, persecuted the early Christians, and then had an encounter with the risen Lord. The Lord Jesus called him to be an apostle to the Gentiles. This means that there are three possible influences to Paul's thoughts and life: Judaism, Christianity and the Hellenistic world (Fitzgerald, 2001:241). The question is, was Paul influenced by any one of these or all of them combined?

## 3.2. The origins of Paul's theology of reconciliation

In Galatians 1 Paul tells us that his teachings are not of human origins but that they are inspired by the Holy Spirit; this includes his thoughts about reconciliation (as with all other aspects of his teachings). He nevertheless made use of, and linked terminology,

concepts and views that were known and used by those around him. In this way it was assured that his teaching would be well understood by his audience.

There are five suggested theories about the origins of Paul's theology of reconciliation. The first theory is that Paul uses pre-Pauline Christian (traditional) material. The second one is that Paul was informed by the Hellenistic diplomatic language. The third theory is that Paul was influenced by the Hellenistic Jewish background (which is also called the Jewish martyr tradition). The fourth theory is that Paul was influenced by the Old Testament, especially the vision of Isaiah. The fifth theory is that Paul was influenced by his Damascus road experience. Tied to these questions about the origins of "Paul's theology" is the nature of "Paul's theology"; is it static, meaning it can be traced to a single event/vision, or is his theology a dynamic process that can be traced to different sources? Before the nature of his theology is examined, the five suggested origins of "Paul's theology" will be presented.

### 3.2.1. Pre-Pauline traditional material

The Early Christian hymn tradition is sometimes simply referred to as a hymn tradition. There are four main proponents of the hymn tradition. These are: Käsemann, Martin, Stuhlmacher and Furnish. These scholars propose that Paul drew the language of reconciliation from hymnic tradition, a soteriological credo that summarised "what the first Christians believed about God's redemptive work in Christ" (Martin, 1986:139). Essentially what this tradition says is that, when Paul wrote about reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5, he used existing material/hymns about reconciliation. This does not mean that the four scholars who are the proponents of this view agree which part of the verses are early traditional hymns. Martin, for example, proposed that 2 Corinthians 5:18,19a, 19c, and 20a are pre-Pauline confessional statements. Martin, however, views verse 19b as Paul's adaptation of that traditional material (1986:139). So for Martin not only did Paul use pre-Pauline tradition but he sometimes adapted that material for his theological purposes (Martin, 1986:138). Thrall (2004:449) has provided

a good summary of what the other three scholars perceive to be pre-Pauline hymn in 2 Corinthians 5:18-21.

2 Corinthians 5: [18] τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ
καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς, [19] ὡς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον
καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, καὶ θέμενος ἐν
ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς. [20] ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ
παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν· δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ. [21] τὸν μὴ γνόντα
ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.

_____Non -Pauline according to Kasemann
_____Non -Pauline according to Martin
_____Non -Pauline according to Stuhlmacher and Furnish

The fact that these scholars differ in their opinions on which parts of the verses are pre-Pauline leaves much to be desired about this theory. Perhaps the most damning observation against this theory is proposed by Marshall. Marshall refutes this theory by observing that if the language of reconciliation was pre-Pauline, and was well-known by the early church, evidences of that would have been found in others texts in scripture, but as it stands there are no such texts except in Paul (Marshall, 1978:129). The allowance of the adaptation of this early Christian material by Martin makes it probable that perhaps that is what Paul did. However, it does not make sense that Paul used early Christian hymns that had not yet been written, and then adapted this material in his writing prior to them being written. Furthermore, Thrall (2004:447) correctly observed that even if Paul did quote traditional material, "he does so because he agrees with it, and wants to use it positively for the expression of his own viewpoint". It thus becomes part of his own theological thinking, and it expresses his own views, and it becomes impossible to distinguish between Paul and such material.

### 3.2.2. Hellenistic diplomatic origins

As already noted above, in the Hellenistic literature the *καταλλάσσω* terminology is used primarily for interpersonal relationships and for peace-treaty processes in the politico-military context. Breytenbach[40] is said to be the first scholar to propose the Hellenistic diplomatic context as the origins of Paul's concept of reconciliation. Breytenbach (1986:3-6) came to this conclusion by noting the parallelism of the Hellenistic conception of the "ambassadors" who are sent to "petition" or "appeal" to warring parties for reconciliation, and the same set of vocabulary used in 2 Corinthians 5:20. Breytenbach was quick to note that the *καταλλάσσω* terminology prior to Paul was essentially secular, rather than religious. He did this by first demonstrating that the *καταλλάσσω* terminology is separate and different in the Old Testament to the atonement (ἱλάσκεσθαι) language. The atonement language in the Old Testament is primarily from the cultic tradition; the Hebrew words for atonement are normally translated by the Greek word *ἱλάσκεσθαι* and not by the *καταλλάσσω* terminologies. Breytenbach (1986:3) thus concludes that there is "no semantic or traditio-historical reason to link the origins of the Pauline notion of 'reconciliation' (or the scant use the Greek translations of the Hebrew Scriptures make of *καταλλάσσω*) with the Old Testament theology of atonement". Breytenbach (1986:4), by divorcing the language of atonement from reconciliation, is then able to conclude that Paul took the *καταλλάσσω* terminologies from the Greek secular concept of reconciliation and that he combines it with the Jewish concept of atonement. He insists however "that only the profane Hellenistic usage is background of Paul's usage" (Breytenbach, 1986:3), not the Jewish Hellenistic background. This is interesting since Breytenbach (1986:3) himself allows that the concept of the diplomatic language can be found in authors such as Josephus, Philo and also in 2 Maccabees. These authors used the Hellenistic diplomatic language in reference to God being reconciled to his servants; it thus seems disingenuous of him

[40] According to Constantineanu (2006:37) Breytenbach wrote his paper to argue against the Jewish Hellenist tradition and he places the origins of reconciliation in the Hellenistic diplomatic sphere where reconciliation is used for making peace between enemies. Breytenbach's earlier paper proved inaccessible for this work, and so this paper depended on his later work (1986) and also scholars such as Constantineanu (2006), Marshall (1978), Kim (1997) and Fitzgerald (2001).

to insist that only the Hellenistic diplomatic language is the background to Paul's use of the *καταλλάσσω* terminology. Furthermore, it is clear in Josephus (Ant. 3.315) and Philo (Vit. Mos.2.166) that the Jewish writers did use the language of mediator and reconciliation in reference to Moses as a mediator between God and his people. It is plausible to say that Paul drew his language of reconciliation from that tradition since in 2 Corinthians 3 he compares and contrasts his ministry of the new covenant to Moses' ministry of the covenant (Kim, 1997:362). It is thus highly probable that in 2 Corinthians 5-6 Paul drew his understanding from the Jewish tradition.

The significance of Breytenbach's contribution cannot be underestimated. By pointing to the Hellenistic diplomacy as the source of Paul's idea of reconciliation, Breytenbach has placed Paul in the context of his Hellenistic world, especially the ancient political concepts (Fitzgerald, 2001:243). The significance of this is that it helps us to understand that Paul, in his teachings about reconciliation, spoke to the intellectual, cultural and social context of his day in which the language was being used. A noteworthy problem with Breytenbach is that only the profane Hellenistic usage serves as the basis for Paul's understanding of reconciliation. This is reductionist, and is directly opposed to Paul's own autobiography in Philippians 3:4-6 where he declares that he is a Jew. In Acts 22:1-5 it is also reported that Paul was a student of Gamaliel and was trained in Jewish laws. Therefore, to deny Jewish influences on Paul would be to deny Paul's dynamic and complex theological upbringing.

### 3.2.3. The Jewish[41] Hellenistic origins[42]

Scholars[43] generally attribute the view that Paul's theology of reconciliation has a Jewish-Hellenistic origin to I.H. Marshall. As already observed above it is only in 2

[41] The criticism by Porter that Jewish Hellenistic literature is Hellenistic literature, especially 2 Maccabbes since it was written in Greek (Porter, 2006:134), is well-known and so this division is simply made for chronological reasoning.

[42] This is sometimes referred to as the Jewish martyrs traditions, since they all come from 2 Maccabees.

[43] Scholars such as: Porter (2006) "Paul and his theology"; Kim (1997) "2 Cor. 5:11-21 and the origin of Paul's concept of reconciliation"; and Constantineanu (2006) "The social significance of reconciliation in Paul's theology, with particular reference to the Romanian context".

Maccabees where reconciliation is used in a religious sense. In 2 Maccabees 1:5, 5:20, 7:33 and 8:29, we saw *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* terminologies used for reconciliation between God and his people, with men taking the initiative. In Maccabees the need for reconciliation is linked to the wrath of God that needs to be appeased, or the removal of sin that has caused enmity with God (2 Maccabees 1:15; 5:20 and 7:33). Marshall also observed that in 2 Maccabees we get to see the sufferings of others on behalf of the nation bringing about reconciliation. Marshall said:

> "Even more powerful is the action of the martyrs who, while recognising that their suffering and death are primarily for their own sins, beseech God to accept their suffering as being on behalf of the nation and to be reconciled to the nation as a whole. In short, God is reconciled, i.e., abandons his anger, as a result of the prayer of the people and their endurance (in themselves or their representatives) of the punishment which he inflicts upon them. Men act in such a way as to induce God to be favourable to them" (Marshall, 1978:121).

Marshall is, nonetheless, aware of the sharp contrast between Paul and the Jewish tradition concerning God's reconciliation. In Paul, God is always the subject of reconciliation and God is the one who lays aside his wrath in pursuit of reconciliation, while in 2 Maccabees it was the people who persuaded God to forgive them. This, however, does not mean that Marshall believes in cheap reconciliation; simply that God lays aside his wrath. In fact Marshall said that the act of reconciliation on God's part comes about in two sections. He stated:

> "There is the act of reconciliation in Christ, and there is the ministry of reconciliation which consists in the proclamation of this prior act of God in Christ and the declaration of the message, which is then finally specified as an appeal to men to be reconciled to God on the basis of the prior act of God in Christ." (Marshall, 1978:122)

When Marshall says that, in Paul, God is always the subject of reconciliation and God is the one who lays aside his wrath in pursuit of reconciliation, he knows that this reconciliation is through Christ. God laid aside his wrath because of what Christ did. It is because of this action of Christ that leads Marshall to confess that it is very tempting to say that Paul must have developed his theology of reconciliation in contrast to the

Jewish tradition. At the same time he says that Paul was aware of the martyr's tradition of 2 and 4 Maccabees and that he used it to interpret the death of Jesus as the atoning sacrifice (Marshall, 1978:129). Marshall then concludes that it is highly probable that the Jewish martyr traditions which surface in 2 Maccabees served as a catalyst for Paul's development of the doctrine of reconciliation (Marshall, 1978:130). The significance of this is that it places Paul within his Hellenistic-Jewish heritage.

### 3.2.4. Old Testament origins with special reference to the book of Isaiah[44]

This tradition proposes the origins of Paul theology to be the concept of peace and new creation that are found in Deutero-Isaiah. There are four main proponents of Deutero-Isaiah as the origins of Paul's theology. These are Hofius[45], Beale (1994), Lane (1982) and Walters (1993). The benefit of the study of this tradition is that it is helpful in explaining both the literary and thematic contexts of 2 Corinthians 5-7. Scholarship has often struggled to link 2 Corinthians 5:17-21 and 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1. This tradition offers the best explanation of the variety of the texts of 2 Corinthians. Walters on the other hand looks at the echoes of Isaiah in Romans.

In this tradition it is said that Paul found the concept of *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* terminologies in the Hellenistic Jewish tradition but that Paul added to it the content of Deutro-Isaiah (Kim, 1997:364). According to Kim, Hofius "developed the reconciliation motive chiefly from the fourth Servant Song of Deutro-Isaiah (Isa. 52:13 – 53:12)" (Kim 1997:364). Kim said that Hofius does this by looking at the parallelism between "Isaiah 52:13 – 53:12 where the Sinless Servant's suffering and death 'for many' makes them righteous and gives them 'peace', and 2 Cor. 5:11-21 where the sinless Christ's vicarious death is affirmed as the ground for God's justification of human beings and his reconciliation of them to himself" (Kim, 1997:364). Hofius' argument, according to Kim, is that he equates the peace of Isaiah with God's saving work in Christ's death (Kim

[44] The exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5-6 will be done in Chapter 5.

[45] The work of Hofius proved to be inaccessible and secondary sources such as Kim (1997) and Constantineanu (2006) were used in this work.

1997:364). This equation has been criticised as being inadequate, since it only points to the concept of "peace" in Isaiah 52-53, and does not fully develop the concept of how Paul came to understand the *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* terminologies.

It is at this point that scholars such as Beale (1994) emerge. Beale further developed Hofius' thesis showing that "Paul understands both 'new creation' in Christ as well as 'reconciliation' in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17-21) as the inaugurated fulfillment of Isaiah's and the prophets' promise of a new creation in which Israel would be restored into peaceful relationship with God and that this theme extends through the beginning of 2 Corinthians 7" (Beale, 1994:219). Beale (1994:218) first made an observation that in 2 Corinthians 5:17, Paul conceptually links reconciliation with a new creation. He said that Paul in 2 Corinthians 5:17 draws from the language of Isaiah 43:18-19 and 65:17. He draws this conclusion by looking at the parallelism in Isaiah 43:18-19; 65:17 and 2 Corinthians 5:17.

Isaiah 43:18-19 in the Septuagint version reads, "μὴ μνημονεύετε τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τὰ ἀρχαῖα μὴ συλλογίζεσθε. ἰδοὺ ποιῶ καινὰ ἃ νῦν ἀνατελεῖ καὶ γνώσεσθε αὐτά καὶ ποιήσω ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὁδὸν καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀνύδρῳ ποταμούς". When this is contrasted to 2 Corinthians 5:17, "ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις· τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινά", we notice a parallelism or similar vocabulary. There is a call (ἰδοὺ) to forget former things (τὰ ἀρχαῖα) and focus on the new things (καινά), the new creation. What Beale (1994:220) picked up is that in Paul the new creation language, which is contrasted to the old creation, is connected to reconciliation. Beale then went on to observe that both the restoration of Israel and the new creation are to be viewed as being brought about through the payment of ransom (Isaiah 43:3ff.) and the forgiveness of sin (Isaiah 43:22 ff.) (Beale, 1994:223). He also noted that the vicarious suffering of the servant of Isaiah 53 probably has the same function (Beale, 1994:223). Beale, after making comparison between the restoration of Israel and the new creation in 2 Corinthians 5, drew the following conclusion:

> "In light of the thematic overview of Isaiah 40-66 it is plausible to suggest that 'reconciliation' in Christ is Paul's way of explaining that Isaiah's promises of 'restoration' from the alienation of the exile have begun to be

> fulfilled by the atonement and forgiveness of sins in Christ. The believer's separation and alienation from God because of sin have been overcome through the divine grace expressed in Christ, who has restored the believer into a reconciled relationship of peace with God" (Beale, 1994:223).

This tradition reflects both the secular usage of the *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* terminology and at the same time connects the teachings of Paul with the Jewish scriptures. The value of this approach is that it reveals how Paul might have reflected on certain Old Testament scripture. This has forced recent scholarship to take into consideration the centrality of the Israelites' story in formulating Paul's theology (Constantineanu, 2006:38). As a result, it is able to better explain how in Paul's theology God became the subject of reconciliation. The other advantage of this approach is that it also opens the debate wider than merely focussing on narrow semantic parallelism to include conceptual considerations (Beale, 1994:218). However, this still falls short of explaining the multifaceted nature of Paul's theology of reconciliation. Kim critiqued this approach and questioned the adequacy of it. He said: "it is a question whether it is adequate just to point to the concept of "peace" in Isa. 53:5 and 52:7 to explain how Paul could have come to designate God's saving act in Christ's death and his apostolic ministry in terms of his *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* while interpreting them in the light of Isa. 52-53, when the terminology is lacking in the Isaianic passage" (Kim, 1997:364).

### 3.2.5. Damascus road experience

Kim is the main advocate of the Damascus road experience as the origins of Paul's theology of reconciliation. He does however build on the conclusion that was first made by Hofius[46], who said:

> "The Pauline idea of 'reconciliation' is ...shaped decisively by the message of Dt.- Isa. Its foundation lies, however, elsewhere: in the encounter with the Risen One, in which God disclosed to the persecutor the cross as his act of reconciliation and called him to be the envoy of the word of

[46] The paper by Hofius proved to be inaccessible and secondary references by Kim (1997) and Constantineanu (2006) were used in this work.

> reconciliation. What had been revealed to Paul in this event, he then found confirmed and interpreted through the prophetic witness of Scripture. Thus he obtained from the OT the language in which he was able to express the saving act of God in Jesus Christ" (in Kim, 1997:366).

Building on Hofius' conclusion, Kim proposed that 'reconciliation' is a uniquely Pauline metaphor for God's saving act in Christ. He said that this originated from Paul's personal experience of God's reconciliation of Paul to himself on the Damascus road (Kim, 1997:360). Kim developed his thesis by careful exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5:11-21. He first looks at the three aorist participles that are found in verses 18 and 19 (καταλλάξαντος, δόντος and θέμενος) and says that these allude to Paul's experience of God's forgiveness/reconciliation and his call to apostolic ministry (Kim, 1997:368). Kim then builds on the observation that was made by Hofius and says that verse 19c corresponds with Paul's testimony about his Damascus Road experience that is found in Galatians 1:12, 15-16a, with 2 Corinthians 5:18c corresponding with Galatians 1:16b, which is a testimony about God's apostolic commission to Paul (Kim, 1997:368). Kim's understanding of participles has been criticised by Porter (2006). Porter (2006:137) claimed that had Kim consulted a Greek grammarian, he would have discovered that the participles are not always time-based indicators. Therefore Kim's use of participles as making reference to external events would not stand. This however does not mean that Kim can simply be dismissed, for he does not build his arguments based on the allusions of the participles alone. Kim also bases his arguments on 2 Corinthians 5:16, especially the phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, which Kim views as the turning point that was brought about as the consequence (ὥστε) of Paul's recognition of "the eschatological saving event of Christ's death and resurrection" (Kim, 1997:369). The change in Paul's perspective strengthens Kim's point that Paul's idea of reconciliation can be traced to the Damascus experience.

The contribution of Kim (1997) has been very influential. It greatly influenced the social significance approach to Paul; scholars of this approach are more concerned about the impact of Paul's teachings in social reconciliation. Both Volf and Constantineanu build their thesis of social reconciliation on Kim's contributions, with Volf drawing the following conclusions: he said that on the Damascus Road we see that firstly, justice is

subordinate to grace (Volf, 2000:165). On the Damascus Road Paul came to see himself as the enemy of God, but God (who identifies himself with the Christian victims that Paul was persecuting) "did not let the demands of justice govern" him, showing love instead by offering reconciliation to Paul (Volf, 2000:165-166). Volf said that if the victims demanded strict justice, Paul would have never been reconciled to God nor given the vocation of being a minister of the gospel. Paul underscores this in Romans 5:10, "for if, when we were God's enemies, we were reconciled to him…"

Constantineanu (2006:41) however concluded here that this seems to "suggest that the initiative for reconciliation may be taken by the 'offended' party, before 'justice' is done to it by the offending party". Constantineanu's conclusion highlights the difficulty of trying to reduce the source of Paul's reconciliation idea to one single factor. The result of this is that it causes him to misapply Romans 5:10, for when you read the rest of the verse, justice is elevated. Romans 5:10 "εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλῷ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ". Reconciliation demands justice for it is διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ that reconciliation is made possible. Yes, it is offered to us freely, because Jesus did meet the demands of justice through his death. Of course Volf maintained that even though justice is subordinate to grace that does not mean that God is not concerned with justice. In Acts 9:4 Jesus "named the injustice but at the same time offered reconciliation" (Volf, 2000:166). Volf (2000:166) said, "Hence, though justice was an indispensable element of reconciliation, peace between Paul and the speaker of the divine voice was not the consequence of justice carried out, but of *justice both affirmed and unmistakably transcended in an act of undeserved grace* (italic his)". This grace, however, needs to be linked to the cross. Jesus the man died in order for our reconciliation to be possible.

The second conclusion that Volf (2000:166) drew about the impact of the Damascus Road experience on Paul is that, though reconciliation of human beings to God has primacy, reconciliation between human beings is intrinsic to their reconciliation to God. This is seen in Jesus' address to Paul in Acts 9:4-5: "He [Paul] fell to the ground and heard a voice say to him, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" "Who are you, Lord?"

Saul asked. “I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting,” he replied”. What is clear here is that persecution of God’s people is equivalent to the persecution of Jesus; Jesus is intrinsically identified with his people. Thus Volf concludes that enmity with God is enmity with fellow human beings and vice versa. “Consequently, reconciliation has not only a vertical dimension but also a horizontal one; without that horizontal dimension reconciliation would simply not exist (Volf, 2000:166)”. In Paul’s life, he was reconciled to God and also to the community of believers.

There is no doubt that the Damascus Road experience left a permanent mark on Paul. It is through this experience that God revealed to Paul that the crucified Jesus Christ is indeed the Messiah who was to come and deliver God’s people. It is through this experience that Paul came to a correct knowledge about Jesus Christ and his vicarious death on behalf of human kind, finding himself forgiven and being made a “new creature” (Constantineanu, 2006:40).

All that being said, it would be difficult to explain the multifaceted nature of Paul’s theology of reconciliation with a single theory. While each of these theories is able to explain certain aspects of his theology of reconciliation, they fall short of being able to argue convincingly which one influenced Paul the most. One can thus argue that a synthesis of these views is necessary in order to understand Paul. The exception being the pre-Pauline tradition theory since there is not enough evidence to support it. Paul was born a Jew who came to realize that Jesus was the Jewish Messiah. Upon his encounter with the Lord, he was commissioned to be an apostle to the Gentiles. All of these different aspects of Paul’s life need to be taken into account in our endeavor to understand Paul’s theology of reconciliation.

## 3.3. Summary

In the twenty-first century there is great confusion about the definition of reconciliation. In this chapter we have argued that a socio-historical analysis of *διαλλάσσω*/*καταλλάσσω* and *διαλλεγή*/*καταλλαγή* will help us in two ways. Firstly, it helps us to see the differences between how Paul, as opposed to his immediate

environment (the Greco-Roman world, Jewish writers, and New Testament), and the Old Testament scriptures (LXX), used *διαλλάσσω*/*καταλλάσσω* and *διαλλεγή*/*καταλλαγή* terminology. We discovered that Paul uses the *διαλλάσσω*/*καταλλάσσω* and *διαλλεγή*/*καταλλαγή* terminology in four unique ways. These are: soteriological, Christological, theological, and pneumatological. Secondly, this knowledge helps us not to impose our post-morden understanding of reconciliation onto Paul.

# CHAPTER 4: EXEGETICAL BACKGROUND ISSUES TO 2 CORINTHIANS

## 4.1. Introduction

As was noted in Chapter 2, socio-rhetorical analysis is an approach that is concerned with the text. It was observed that the socio-rhetorical approach is a multidisciplinary approach that uses insight from historical criticism, literary criticism, ideological criticism, social scientific criticism, reader-oriented approaches, sociology, anthropology, and modern day rhetorical reading of the text. The text concerned is 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10. It is in this text that Paul used the καταλλάσσειν and διαλλάσσειν terminology.

2 Corinthians is one of the earliest letters written by Paul containing his teachings on reconciliation. It is also one of the weightiest books written by the apostle. It contains an autobiographical description of the apostle, his ministry and the struggles he had with his congregation. Furnish (1984:3) said the following: "No Pauline letter requires more of its readers or offers more of a reward to those who apply themselves carefully to its interpretation than 2 Cor.". Unlike some other books written by Paul, whose authorship has been questioned, 2 Corinthians enjoys a general consensus[47] among New Testament scholarship that Paul wrote it (Harris, 2005:1; Thrall, 2004:3; and Plummer, 1915:xii). 2 Corinthians is generally described by scholars as a classic Pauline letter that contains his literary style. Harris (2005:1), for example, described the book as containing all the characteristics of Paul's writings. He noted:

> "[it contains] all the characteristically Pauline stylistic devices, such as antithetic parallelism, chiasmus, paradox, anacolutha, ellipsis, and litotes; it reflects that delicate blend of generous encouragement, gentle expostulation, and (if necessary) stern rebuke that was typical of Paul when he addressed his spiritual children…" (Harris, 2005:1).

[47] The exception is when it comes to 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1, with some scholars calling this section an interpolation, written by someone in the Pauline school (Carson & Moo: 1992:263).

Yet despite the general consensus concerning Pauline authorship, 2 Corinthians is fraught with problems, both literary and historical (Gignilliat, 2007:32). The literary issues include: how many letters are contained within the book? Historical issues are: what are the historical circumstances that led to the composition of the letter? What is the identity of Paul's opponents? There are also exegetical issues in the book, such as: the delimitations of the text concerning reconciliation, and "the force of κατά σάρκα (2 Corinthians 5:16), the force of ἐν χριστῷ (2 Corinthians 5:17, 19), the syntax of 2 Corinthians 5:19, and the meaning of ἁμαρτίαν (2 Corinthians 5:21) and δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ (2 Corinthians 5:21)" (Milinovich, 2010:11). All of these issues are critical for the understanding of Paul's teaching on reconciliation. Furnish (1984:3) said: "Indeed, the student of 2 Cor. quickly discovers that… biblical interpretation involves in virtually equal measure historical reconstruction, literary analysis, and a sensitivity to theological concerns".

The goal of this chapter is to determine both the literary and historical context of Paul's teaching on reconciliation within the letter of 2 Corinthians. It is important that, before Paul's teachings on reconciliation in 2 Corinthians and the syntax of the letter can be examined, the background, the history and the character of the congregation at Corinth and Paul's relationship with that church are considered.

## 4.2. Historical considerations

In following the advice of Furnish (1984:3) that biblical interpretation involves a historical reconstruction, this paper uses historical criticism to understand the context of the first century world. This is done with the hope that it will open up the text. Gignilliat (2007:32) said, "Historical-criticism has encouraged the interpreter of Scripture to establish the *Sitz im Leben* of the text before its meaning can be produced". Thus historical reconstruction is used with the hope it will illuminate the exegesis of the text, for this task places the reader in the world of the text.

### 4.2.1. The city of Corinth

Corinth was located on the strip of land that connects the Peloponnese with the rest of Greece, roughly halfway between Athens and Sparta. Corinth was a prime location for controlling trade between Asia and Rome. The two harbours, Lechaeum on the Corinthian Gulf and Cenchreae on the Saronic Gulf, made the city an indispensable land link between the east and the west, as the southern tip of the Peloponnese was very dangerous. Owing to its ideal location, Corinth became very wealthy (Carson & Moo, 1992:362).

The city of Corinth received its fair share of tragedies. The first city was destroyed by the Romans in 146 B.C. because of its involvement in the Achaean League (O'Connor, 1991:4). Many of the people of the first Corinth were killed, and others sold into slavery (Barnett, 1997:1). The Romans made sure that Corinth lay desolate for many years. Nevertheless, a century later, in 44 B.C., it was rebuilt by Julius Caesar as a Roman colony. Unlike other Roman colonies, the new city of Corinth was mostly populated by poor Romans and freed slaves, whose status was only slightly above the slaves (Carson & Moo, 1992:263).

During the time of Paul, Corinth had already regained its prominence. It had become a prosperous city and was an important trade, banking and financial centre (Ashley, 2006:26). The resumption of the Isthmian Games, the second most important games after the Olympics, meant that Corinth became a hub of tourist activity (O'Connor, 1991:6). These games were held in the spring of 51 A.D. (O'Connor, 1991:6), most likely during the time of the proconsul Gallio (cf. Acts 18:12). Since Paul stayed in Corinth for about eighteen months (cf. Acts 18:11), it is probable that he was in Corinth during the time of these games, or at least during the preparations for, or aftermath of, the games. Some scholars believe that it was these games that influenced Paul's imagery of an athlete in 1 Corinthians 9:24-25. The games meant that there was a great demand for people like Paul, Priscilla and Aquila, who possessed skills of tent making (cf. Acts 18:1-3). During the games visitors from abroad were housed in tents, and the shopkeepers moved into the city to supply the needs of the visitors, using tents to

display their products (O'Connor, 1991:7). The games also provided a great opportunity for someone like Paul to do evangelism.

The location of Corinth meant that the city had a diverse population, and this naturally gave rise to religious pluralism. According to O'Connor (1991:5), archaeological findings[48] in the ruins of Corinth reveal temples and shrines that attest to the worship of a large number of different gods and goddesses. These range from the Greek gods, to the Egyptian gods and goddesses such as Isis and Serapis, and also to emperor cult worship. However, evidence points to the dominant worship of the Greek gods such as Apollo, Athena, Tyche, Aphrodite, Dionysos, Artemis, Cybelle, Poseidon, Asclepios, Demeter and Kore, Hera, Argaea, Zeus and others (Furnish, 1984:15-18; Ashley, 2006:27). Furnish (1984:15) noted that, even though the city was destroyed in 146 B.C., a number of the temples and shrines were damaged, but not completely ruined. This resulted in some of the old Greek cults remaining active and, by the time of the rebuilding of Corinth, many of the temples were repaired or rebuilt by the colonists. The majority of these Greek gods and goddesses were associated with fertility; this is perhaps the reason that Paul had to repeatedly address issues concerning sexual immorality amongst the Corinthians (cf. 1 Corinthians 5, 6 and 7).

What is absent from the archaeological data is material concerning the Jewish presence in Corinth. However, we know from the historical data that there was a large and vibrant Jewish community at Corinth in the first century A.D. (Philo, in O'Connor, 1991:5). One does not know how much can be drawn from the fact that at Corinth emphasis was placed on the harmony of all religions and their compatibility with other religions (Ashley, 2006:28). Religion was an integral part of life and impacted heavily on the cultural, social, political and commercial realities of everyday life. It was less concerned with doctrines than with the favour of the gods. This could have had serious ramifications for the Jewish community.

[48] O'Connor (1983) and Furnish (1984) (15-18) provided detailed archaeological findings concerning the city of Corinth.

### 4.2.2. Paul's contact with the church in Corinth

In this section historical criticism is used to try to reconstruct Paul's contact with the Corinthians. This is done by looking at the logical and chronological sequence that is found in Acts concerning Paul's movements. The reason for the concern regarding Paul's contact with the Corinthians is that it has a bearing on the number of letters that are contained in 2 Corinthians. This in turn has a bearing on the identity of Paul's opponents, which directly affects the interpretation of Paul's theology of reconciliation.

Paul's relationship with the Corinthians spans a period of approximately seven years, ca. 50-57 A.D. Scholars differ on how many visits Paul made and how many letters he wrote to the Corinthians. However, it is probable that Paul made three visits and sent four letters to the Corinthians (Donahoe, 2002:7). Paul first came into contact with the Corinthians towards the end of his second missionary journey in 50 A.D. According to Acts 18:1-2, his first contacts in Corinth were the Jews named Priscilla and Aquila. They had left Rome and moved to Corinth because of Claudius' decree that Jews must leave Rome. Paul worked with Priscilla and Aquila as a tent-maker and on every sabbath he went to the synagogue to evangelize the Jews and proselytes (Acts 18:1-4). When he was rejected by the Jews he turned his attention to the Gentiles and many believed and were baptized (Acts 18:5-9). He then received a vision in which the Lord assured him of his presence and protection. Following that vision Paul stayed at Corinth for a year and a half, teaching the word of the Lord (Acts 18:9-11). Paul had a quarrel with the Jews who brought him to the proconsul Gallio, accusing him of "persuading the people to worship God in ways contrary to the law" (Acts 18:12-13). Gallio, however, refused to be drawn into what he perceived to be a Jewish squabble about their laws (Acts 18:14-16). After this incident Paul stayed in Corinth for some time and "then he left the brothers and sailed for Syria, accompanied by Priscilla and Aquila" (Acts 18:18).

In Acts 18:23-21:17 Luke recounts Paul's third missionary journey. Upon his arrival in Ephesus Paul encountered twelve disciples of John the Baptist, who only knew about John's baptism. Paul explained to them the purpose of John's baptism and preached the gospel of Christ to them. They received the gospel of Christ and the Holy Spirit

came upon them (Acts 19:1-7). As was his usual habit in all his missionary journeys, Paul first evangelized in the synagogue, but within about three months, the Jews became hardened to his message. He left with the disciples and had daily discussions in the lecture hall of Tyrannus (Acts 19:8-10). Paul did this for two years, and the Lord did great miracles through him (Acts 19:10-12).[49]

It was during this third missionary journey that Paul received the disheartening news about his young church - the church in Corinth. Paul first wrote to the Corinthians around 52 or 53 A.D., a letter that has not been preserved for us (Belleville, 1996:16). The contents of the lost letter could be deduced to be about the issue of association with sexually immoral people (1 Corinthians 5:9).[50] This letter seems not to have made an impact on the Corinthians. Upon learning from Chloe's household about the issues that crippled the church in Corinth, such as division in the church, immorality, lawsuits and the Corinthians' indifferent attitude to sin (such as disunity and sexual immorality), Paul wrote 1 Corinthians in 55 A.D. from Ephesus. In this letter he dealt with the issues that are discovered from Chloe's household and the questions that the Corinthians had raised with him (1 Corinthians 7:1). Paul also sent his right-hand man, Timothy, to the Corinthians (Acts 19:21-22; 1 Corinthians 4:17-19 and 16:10-11). Timothy discovered that things had not improved in Corinth (Donahoe, 2002:9). He reported the situation to Paul who, upon receiving the news, made a brief trip to Corinth, perhaps around the summer or autumn of 55 A.D. During this visit, known as the "painful visit" in 2 Corinthians 2:1, he was grieved by the members of the church. Paul left Corinth hoping to return there on his way back from Macedonia (1 Corinthians 16:5-9; cf. 2 Corinthians 1:16, 23 and 2:1). Instead of returning, Paul wrote a harsh letter, which is called the

[49] Many people in Ephesus believed in the Lord Jesus; even those who practiced sorcery brought their scrolls together and burned them publicly (Acts 19:17-20). However, this meant that the ministry of Paul affected those who were making profit from the idolatry crafts. This resulted in Paul and his compatriots coming into conflict with the artisans who crafted shrines of Artemis, the patron goddess of Ephesus (Acts 19:23-27). The riot by the artisans threatened the safety of Paul and his associates. After this event, Paul and his traveling companions spent several months in Macedonia and the Achaia region. Paul ended his third missionary journey around the year 57 A.D. Acts 20-21 provides more details on Paul's traveling journeys and the opposition he encountered on his third mission trip.

[50] Other scholars have tried in vain to prove that some contents of that missing letter are contained in 2 Corinthians 6:4-7:1. Scholars such as Belleville (1996:16) have correctly pointed out that the contents of 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 and that of the lost letter are not the same. In 2 Corinthians 6:4-7:1 Paul refers to the association of a believer with an unbeliever, while in the lost letter Paul was referring to the immoral believers.

"tearful letter" by some commentators and the "sorrowful letter" by others (Peterson, 1998:42). Paul described this letter in 2 Corinthians 2:4: "For I wrote to you out of great distress and anguish of heart and with many tears…" Later, Paul received both a positive and a negative report from Titus about how the "sorrowful letter" had been received by the Corinthians (2 Corinthians 7). This letter hurt the Corinthians but at the same time resulted in their repenting (2 Corinthians 7:8-9). The negative report was that the Corinthians were now questioning Paul's authority and integrity as an apostle. This seems to coincide with the arrival of the "super apostles". Paul responded to this report by writing 2 Corinthians, probably from Macedonia, and most likely within a year or so of writing 1 Corinthians (around 56 A.D.). Titus and two others delivered the letter to the Corinthians (2 Corinthians 8:6, 16-24). The book of 2 Corinthians ends with Paul intending to visit the Corinthians for the third time (2 Corinthians 12:14; 13:1-2). According to Acts 20:2-6, this did happen, and Paul stayed in Corinth for three months. The historical reconstruction of Paul's contact with the Corinthians reveals a few things about the church at Corinth. Firstly, this was a troubled church that had to deal with sin such as disunity and sexual immorality. Secondly, with the help of Acts, it can be deduced that Paul must have written at least four letters to the Corinthians. Scholarship agrees that the first letter was lost and the second one is 1 Corinthians. There is disagreement about the whereabouts of the third letter (the harsh letter); some say it is part of 2 Corinthians while others disagree (this debate is considered again in appendix B). The fourth letter is 2 Corinthians, although its unity/composition has been questioned. Before its composition and unity can be considered, the authenticity of 2 Corinthians needs to be considered.

### 4.2.3. The authenticity of 2 Corinthians

The authenticity of 2 Corinthians is important for understanding reconciliation, especially since socio-rhetorical analysis is being used. Chapter 2 said that the socio-rhetorical approach is an analytical approach that focuses on each text of Paul's teaching on reconciliation. The integrity of that text is thus crucial, and needs to be authenticated in order for us to validate its Pauline authorship. The debate regarding the authenticity of 2

Corinthians revolves around the date for the earliest evidences about the existence of the book; when was 2 Corinthians used in the church and when was it recognized as a Pauline letter? The apparent lack of references to the book by the early church fathers Clement and Ignatius is what fuels the debate (Harris, 2005:2). Clement, makes many allusions to 1 Corinthians. For example, in 1 Clement 47:1-4[51], he wrote:

> "[1]Take into your hands the epistle of the blessed Apostle Paul. [2]What did he first write unto you in the beginning of his gospel? [3]Of a truth, he warned you spiritually, in a letter, concerning himself, and concerning Cephas and Apollos, because even then there were factions among you; [4]but the faction of that time brought less sin upon you; for ye inclined unto Apostles of good repute, and unto a man approved among them" (1 Clement 47:1-4).

Verse 1 of this treatise makes it clear that Clement was acquainted with the epistle of Paul, while in verse 3 Clement alludes to 1 Corinthians. In verse 1, Clement only mentions one letter (τήν ἐπιστολήν) of Paul, and when you look at his writings he does not make any allusion to 2 Corinthians.[52] His lack of reference to 2 Corinthians is surprising, even though 2 Corinthians would have helped his argument. Thus Harris (2005:4-5) concluded that Clement probably did not know 2 Corinthians. This conclusion "involves a legitimate use of argument from silence, for there are not a few passages in 2 Corinthians (e.g., 11:2-3; 12:20; 13:5,9b) that would have been directly relevant to Clement's concern (e.g. at 1 Clement 5:6) as he sought to combat the pneumatic of the 90s". Some scholars, in trying to resolve the lack of referencing to 2 Corinthians by Clement, have proposed that perhaps 2 Corinthians was not known as such to him. However, this view is rejected by scholars such as Thrall (2004:2) and Furnish (1984:30).

[51] Translated by Hoole in http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/1clement-hoole.html (Date of access 15 October 2012).

[52] There is, however, no consensus among scholars about whether or not Clement alluded to 2 Corinthians in his writings. Harris (2005:2, footnote 4) gives a list of the alleged allusions to 2 Corinthians by Clement in 1 Clement. Clement's alleged allusions are highly improbable since he does not quote 2 Corinthians texts that would have strengthened his position in refuting the pneumatics of his day.

It is also debated whether or not Ignatius of Antioch, who wrote in the early parts of the second century, was aware of 2 Corinthians. Scholars such as Harris (2005:3) maintain that Ignatius alluded to 1 Corinthians but hardly to 2 Corinthians. Scholars such as Thrall (2004:2), however, argue that it is conceivable that Ignatius alluded to 2 Corinthians in Phld 6:3, where he wrote:

> "And I give thanks to my God, that I have a good conscience in my dealings with you, and no man can boast either in secret or openly, that I was burdensome to any one in small things or in great. Yea and for all among whom I spoke, it is my prayer that they may not turn it into a testimony against themselves" (Phld 6:3).[53]

There are indeed strong similarities in the vocabulary used here to 2 Corinthians. Thrall (2004:2) correctly observed that, "I have a good conscience" (εύσυνεἰδητός εἰμι) is reminiscent of 2 Corinthians 1:12, while Ignatius' statement that he was not a burden (ἐβάρησα) to anyone is very similar to the language used by Paul in 2 Corinthians 11:9 and 12:14. Here Paul said, "And when I was with you and needed something, I was not a burden (οὐ κατενάρκησα) to anyone...I have kept myself from being a burden (ἀβαρῆ) to you in any way, and will continue to do so" (2 Corinthians 11:9). Barnett (1941:162, 170) demonstrated that Ignatius knew 2 Corinthians. These vocabulary similarities are enough to convince us that Ignatius was aware of 2 Corinthians, and that the early church fathers acknowledged it or at the very least they indirectly referred to it.

It is also clear though that during the mid-second century 2 Corinthians was widely known. Polycarp, who wrote during the first half of the second century, alluded to 2 Corinthians and there is no debate concerning his allusion. Scholars agree that there are three to four allusions made by Polycarp to 2 Corinthians[54]. Irenaeus of Lyons referred to the epistle by name when he said: "*apostolus ait in epistola secunda ad Corinthios"* (in Harris, 2005:3).

---

[53] Translation by Lightfoot and Harmer in http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/ignatius-philadelphians-lightfoot.html (Date of access: 15 Oct. 12).

[54] Harris (2005:3), Thrall (2004:3) and Barnett(1941:173,176) showed that there are similarities between Polyc. 2:2 and 2 Corinthians 4:14; and also between Polyc. 6:2 and 2 Corinthians 5:10, and so it is probable that Polycarp was aware of 2 Corinthians.

It is thus difficult to establish the exact date that 2 Corinthians was known as such in the early church, but what becomes clear is that by the time of the mid-second century, 2 Corinthians was widely used. However, this does not resolve all the questions about the integrity of 2 Corinthians, for linked to this is the question of the unity of 2 Corinthians. The question is, can 2 Corinthians as it is today be trusted as the book that was written by Paul in its original form?

## 4.3. Background to the partition theories

In order to understand Paul's theology of reconciliation properly, one needs to see how his theology fitted into and contributed to the overall argument of 2 Corinthians. Answers to questions about Paul's intentions in writing about reconciliation need to be found: what was Paul hoping to achieve? What were the circumstances that led him to write about reconciliation? Throughout 2 Corinthians Paul confronts many issues that were obstacles between him and his young congregation, while his teachings concerning reconciliation are found more or less in the middle of the letter. What is the reason for this? The unity of 2 Corinthians must be understood to comprehend what Paul was trying to achieve by his teachings on reconciliation. In 2 Corinthians 1-9 Paul mostly dealt with theological issues, such as the comparison of his ministry to the ministry of Moses, while in 2 Corinthians 10-13 he dealt more with social opposition to his ministry, such as his speech and his demeanor as an apostle. If 2 Corinthians is a composition of two letters, for example, then Paul's teaching on reconciliation is primarily about theological issues. But if 2 Corinthians is a literary unit, as this paper proposes, then Paul's teachings on reconciliation dealt with both theological and social issues.

The unity of 2 Corinthians has been hotly contested among scholars. The key issue here is whether 2 Corinthians, as handed down to future generations, is the same as the 2 Corinthians that Paul wrote. The debate varies from those who regard 2 Corinthians as a single letter (Hughes, 1962; Stephenson, 1965), to those who regard 2

Corinthians as a composite of several letters.[55] Scholars have noted a change in tone and apparent changes of thought within the letter of 2 Corinthians. This causes some to argue that 2 Corinthians is a composite of different short letters that were written by Paul. The perceived breaks in thoughts are between 2 Corinthians 2:13 and 2:14, between 6:13 and 6:14, between 7:1 and 7:2, between 7:4 and 7:5, between 7:16 and 8:1, between 8:24 and 9:1, and between 9:15 and 10:1 (Ashley, 2006:31 and Vegge, 2008:12). There also appears to be separate treatment of the collection for the church in 2 Corinthians 8 and 9.The state of Paul's relationship with the Corinthian church and his expectation of his forthcoming visit to Corinth, which is alluded to throughout the letter, have compounded the problem of the unity of the letter.

All the partition theories, however, see 2 Corinthians 10-13 as distinct from the rest of the book (Vegge, 2008:12). Further details on the various theories are provided in Appendix B. For this work, 2 Corinthians is considered as one letter for reasons documented below.

### 4.3.1. 2 Corinthians as a literary unit from a historical perspective

One of the strongest arguments for treating 2 Corinthians as a single letter is offered by Lambrecht (1999:7-9). Lambrecht (1999:9) made the following statements in defence of the literary integrity of 2 Corinthians: 1) Nothing in the text or in the MSS traditions betrays the lack of integrity. 2) Those who assume that the text is a post-Pauline composite are forced to explain how this letter came to be arranged and for what purpose. Lambrecht said that this is a task that the hypotheses fail to deliver, and thinks it difficult at best, impossible at worst. 3) Modern interpreters may be inclined to require from Paul too much consistency. "After all, we are dealing with a letter, not a systematic exposé" (Lambrecht, 1999:9). Lambrecht (1999:9) went on to say that the partition theorists do not know how long it took Paul to compose the letter. He further accuses

[55] Harris (2005:8-10) provided a detailed summary of various partition theories by different scholars such as: Halmel (1904), who identified 2 Corinthians to be a collection of three letters, and Weiss (cited in Harris, 2005:8-10), who identified four letters but omits 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1. Bornkamm, Georgi and Marxsen all identified four or more letters (cited in Harris, 2005:9-11). Schmithal, on the other hand, "finds portions of 2 Corinthians in seven of thirteen pieces written by Paul to the Corinthians" (cited by Harris, 2005:10).

them of excluding a change in Paul's mood while writing the letter and also of not paying attention to the rhetorical strategy that Paul might have employed in his arguments in 2 Corinthians. Lambrecht (1999:9) made the following conclusion: "No break in the narrative or argument, no change in vocabulary or tone appears to be so great that the parts could not have stood originally, one text to the other, in a single letter".

### 4.3.2.2 Corinthians as a literary unit from the rhetorical perspective

Scholars such as Barnett (1997:17), Witherington (1995), Young and Ford (1987), and Danker (cited in Witherington, 1995:333 and Peterson[56], 1998:55) use rhetorical arguments to prove the unity of 2 Corinthians. Witherington (1995:329) observed that the reason for the variety of partition theories is that "most treatments of 2 Corinthians have not taken into account Paul's use of ancient rhetorical conventions". These scholars contend that the change in tone in chapter 10 does not necessarily imply a separate letter, but can also fit within a rhetorical scheme. This paper will simply provide a summary of the argument made by Young & Ford, and Witherington for the literary unity of 2 Corinthians.

Young and Ford (1987:28) first made their appeal for the literary unity of 2 Corinthians from the historical evidence; that is, 2 Corinthians was always read as a unit until the advent of modern criticism. They also used arguments similar to those noted above in Lambrecht (1999:9), contending that there are no textual evidences for partition theories. They however admit that chapter divisions have organized the texts in such a way that the apparent breaks in sequence are reinforced (Young and Ford, 1987:28). Nonetheless, to show unity in the book of 2 Corinthians, Young and Ford (1987:36-37) claimed that the shift in tone in 2 Corinthians 10:1 was expected by the hearers who were familiar with the rhetorical norms. Young and Ford (1987:37) argued their case by

[56] Peterson also employed Hellenistic rhetoric but he limited his approach on 2 Corinthians 10-13. His conclusion is that 2 Corinthians 10-13 is a separate rhetorical unit that occurs chronologically before 2 Corinthians 1-9 (cited in Moon, 2004:29). The insight that Peterson offers is that the rivalry between Paul and his opponents did not only concern societal issues but theological issues as well.

showing similarities between the epistle of 2 Corinthians and that of Demosthenes who wrote his apologetic letter to the council of Athens while in exile. This is how Young and Ford (1987:37) described the similarities:

> "Both begin by focusing on common ground, respect, mutual recognition assumed as the basis from which to make the case; both go over points for and against the pleader, reminiscing about service rendered, answering charges; and, assuming that 2 Corinthians is a unity, each ends with a passionate review of the material covered, in which tact and politeness gives way to hard-hitting emotion".

Young and Ford (1987:38-39) concluded that, assuming rhetorical structures of argument, 2 Corinthians 10-13 is "the emotional peroration recapitulating the proofs and arguments laid out in the body of the epistle". In this way 2 Corinthians 10-13 becomes a conclusion of the argument that was laid out in chapters 1-9. 2 Corinthians as a whole then becomes an apologetic letter in which Paul defends his apostolic ministry (Young and Ford, 1987:40).

Young and Ford's conclusions have been challenged by scholars such as Peterson (1998:54) and Moon (2004:13), who argued that 2 Corinthians 10-13 do not seem to be summarizing the arguments of 1-9. They also questioned Young and Ford's identification of 2 Corinthians 10-13 as a peroration. They stated that 2 Corinthians is far too long to be the *peroratio.* This is in line with the suggestion made by Quintilian 6.1.2. (cited in Peterson, 1998:55) that the "final recapitulation must be as brief as possible…For… if we devote too much time thereto, the peroration will cease to be enumeration and will constitute something like a second speech". Their sentiments are also shared by Witherington (1995:338) who questioned the conclusion that in 2 Corinthians 10-13 Paul has arrived at the *peroratio*. Rather than seeing 2 Corinthians 10-13 as a *peroratio*, Witherington (1995:338) suggested that the shift in tone here is because "Paul now chooses to counterattack by means of a rhetorical *synkrisis,* and this will include *pathos*, an appeal to the stronger emotions".

Witherington took 2 Corinthians as a classic example of judicial rhetoric. He (1995:333) said: "[2 Corinthians] *as a compositional whole is an example of forensic or judicial*

*rhetoric*" (italics his). He noted that the distinguishing marks of forensic rhetoric are that the argument of the author focuses on the things done in the past, "things for which one could be taken to trial, and for which the audience will be the judge" (Witherington, 1995:333). Witherington said that this line of argument can be seen from the beginning right through the letter of 2 Corinthians. 2 Corinthians 1-2 is a narration. In 2 Corinthians 1:17 and 2:17 Paul focuses on the past actions of how he acted towards the Corinthians and how the Corinthians acted towards him (Witherington, 1995:333-334). Here Paul explains and defends his behavior, which could have been a source of misunderstanding between him and the Corinthians. The same scenario of the courtroom continues right through 2 Corinthians. Witherington (1995:334) stated that the same thing can be seen in the final warning of 2 Corinthians 13:1ff, "which leads up to the *peroration* in 13:ff.," where Paul focuses on what was said and done in the past, and again he defends himself against his opponents.

Using rhetorical analysis one can see the structure[57] that runs through 2 Corinthians, a structure that shows the flow of Paul's thoughts:

1. 2 Corinthians 1:1-2 *salutation / epistolary prescript*
2. 2 Corinthians 1:3-7 *proem and thanksgiving*
3. 2 Corinthians 1:8-2:14 the *narration* (introduced by γὰρ, these verses also explain the occasion of the letter. Kennedy (1984:87) notes that woven into this narration are passages containing Paul's defence.)
4. 2 Corinthians 2:14-17 the *proposition* (which states the basic facts under dispute)
5. 2 Corinthians 3:1-13:4 the *probitio* and *refutation*
6. 2 Corinthians 13:5-10 the *perotatio*
7. 2 Corinthians 13:11-13 epistolary greetings and final remarks

In summary, the arguments for 2 Corinthians as a single letter are as follows: the consistency in theme within 2 Corinthians at the very least suggests the probability of

[57] The following structural outline is based on a combination of Witherington (1995:335-336) and Kennedy (1984:87-89). Kennedy (1984:87) also saw 2 Corinthians as a judicial rhetoric with chapters 8 and 9 being the exception chapters, which he views as being deliberative.

unity of the book. There is nothing in the text or in the MSS traditions that suggests the letter was ever anything but a whole. The book makes sense as a whole when one considers it against the background of judicial rhetorical methods.

This argument shows, with Milinovich (2010:14), that “literary, rhetorical, and historical evidence support the integrity of 2 Corinthians”. Henceforth, in this paper, 2 Corinthians will be treated as a literary unit of a coherent document written by Paul dealing with various issues being faced by the church of Corinth.

The overarching logic of Paul’s argument within the letter can now be traced. In chapters 1:1-2:13 Paul explained the change in his travelling plans and defended himself for having written the “Severe Letter”. In 2 Corinthians 2:14-6:13 Paul explained his ministry in light of the new covenant; reconciliation teachings fall within this section. In 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:4 Paul admonished the Corinthians, and warned them that his affection for them does not mean he will be tolerant of their consorting with those who would turn them to a different gospel. He also called them to separate themselves from the unbelievers. In 2 Corinthians 7:5-16 he is encouraged by news from Titus that the Corinthians responded positively to his “Severe Letter”. Next, chapters 8 and 9 are about the collection for the saints in Jerusalem, with chapter 9 being a theological motivation for their giving. In the last section, 2 Corinthians 10-13, Paul exhorted the Corinthians to prepare for his upcoming visit. He also dealt with the criticisms that were leveled against him, such as the assertion that his letters are powerful but his speech is weak (2 Corinthians 10:2-10). He argued, however, that his power is realized in weakness (2 Corinthians 12:7-10). He also dealt with the “super apostles” (2 Corinthians 11).

## 4.4. The historical context of 2 Corinthians

Sampley (2002:5) said that each letter was written to restore the theological balance that had been made "twisted and askew" by the congregation or by his opponents. Sampley (2002:7) stated that, “Any adequate interpretation of Paul depends on a reconstruction of the argument of the opponents and a careful estimation of Paul's

rhetoric strategy". He went on to say, "Our capacity to understand Paul is directly proportionate to our ability to understand Paul's opponents" (Sampley, 2002:7). The task of identifying the opposition[58] of Paul with regard to the church in Corinth will serve as a reminder that this opposition constitutes one of the crucial questions for the understanding of Paul's teachings on reconciliation. The more we know about Paul's opponents, the better it will be for us to understand Paul's context and theology of reconciliation in light of opposition to him. Did Paul utilise his theology of reconciliation in order to reconcile with his opponents, or did he develop his theology in order to refute the opponents so that he could be reconciled with the Corinthians? The identity of the opponents is thus crucial for the understanding of Paul's objectives concerning his teachings on reconciliation.

This is in line with the sentiments of the SBL group on Paul when they said that the most fulfilling way of understanding Paul's theology is to study each of Paul's letters separately from each other (Bassler, 1993:vii). Gaventa (2002b:194) argued that the vital element in Paul's theology in 2 Corinthians is the delineation of the relationship between Paul and the church or Paul's opponents. Wright (1991:189), on the other hand, has urged that the statement about reconciliation in its context in 2 Corinthians 5:21 is more self-referential than most exegetes have realised. Most scholars at the SBL group agree that the theology of each Pauline book is located in its argument (Bassler, 1993:4). But where in the argument is it: in the surface structure of the argument or in the deep structure of the "binary opposition, such as the conflict between Christ and the cosmos", as proposed by Gaventa (2002:148).

In 1 Corinthians Paul dealt with the issues arising within the church. In 2 Corinthians it is, however, not clear why Paul is writing the letter. It seems that the arrival of Paul's opponents caused disruptions within the church, and that Paul is writing in response to them. It is, however, not an easy task to identify the opponents of Paul in 2 Corinthians. Porter (2005:1), in his book "Paul and his opponents", raised three crucial questions concerning Paul and his opponents: the definition of what is meant by Paul's opponents,

[58] Barnett (1997:33-40), Barrett (1973:28-32), Furnish (1984:48-54), and Harris (2005:67-87) offer a historical inquiry on this topic and an explanation of different views.

determining the best methodology for such discussion about Paul's opponents, and determining and describing the opponents. The historical approach is the dominant approach that has been used in trying to identify Paul's opponents.

## 4.5. Historical approach: identification of Paul's opponents

The historical approach treats the text as a "human artifact produced by real people in remote times and places, and under certain historical circumstances" (Moon, 2004:15). In this approach the text of the NT is treated the same way as any other ancient text, i.e. it is interpreted by relating its texts to its time or the life of the author by using available public evidences.

It is a well-established fact that Paul had opponents to his work. However, scholars disagree about who these opponents were and the nature of their opposition to Paul. Scholars such as Porter (2005:1) and Guthrie (1990:433) traced the debate about Paul's opponents to F.C. Baur in 1831, in *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie 4*. Baur saw the opponents of Paul as representing Jewish Christianity. Guthrie (1990:433) observed though that this was "based on his presupposition of a fundamental clash between the Jewish and Gentile section of the church". From Baur, Paul's opponents have since been seen as a means of accounting for much of the contents of Paul's letters. Porter (2005:1), however, has observed that, even though among scholars the opponents of Paul are assumed, no one has defined who these opponents are. He said that the reasons for this failure are partly due to the scarcity of data concerning these opponents. All that we know about them is Paul's response to them. Secondly, the opposition to Paul could also involve a "variety of factors, such as personal or corporate opposition, theological conflict, inter- or intra-group social dynamics, and the like (Porter, 2005:2). It is important that one does not take a narrow view of identifying the opponents of Paul, rather to view any expressed or implied opposition as possible opponents of Paul.

The methodology of identifying Paul's opponents is another factor that has been questioned by Porter (2005) and Sumney (1990). Porter asked a pertinent question

concerning methodology - how does one go about identifying whether there are such opponents in any or all of Paul's letters? Should one focus on an individual letter and divorce it from its socio-political context of the day or should one include the variety of surrounding factors such as the inter-Jewish disputes and the relation of Paul's mission to the larger Greco-Roman religious and philosophical world (Porter, 2005:2)?

Scholars such as Baur, in identifying Paul's opponents, tend to place their reconstruction of the historical context of the first and second century above the primary text of 2 Corinthians[59]. Another issue in identifying Paul's opponents is how Paul's letters relate to each other. Should 2 Corinthians be analyzed individually or in conjunction with other Pauline letters? Are the opponents that Paul deals with in his letter to the Corinthians the same throughout all his letters? Baur (in Sumney, 1990:20) thought they were, and came to this conclusion by looking at the verbal similarities that exist between Pauline letters. Take for example 2 Corinthians 11:20ff. Baur identified these opponents as being of Palestinian origin because they claim to be "Hebrews', "Israelites", and "Seed of Abraham". He goes further to say that they belong to the Petrine party (in Sumney, 1990:20). Of course, what Baur did here was to look at the verbal similarities between 2 Corinthians 11 and Galatians 2 and deduced that Paul was facing the same opposition, without Paul himself identifying it as such.

There are four groups that have been identified as the opponents of Paul: Judaizers, Gnostics, divine men, and pneumatics. The following section, which will review the work of Sumney (1990), will provide a brief summary of these positions and the problems associated with each. Scholars such as Moon (2004), Porter (2005) and Peterson (1998) agreed that Sumney's analysis of the debate concerning the opponents of Paul is a good representation of the different views.

[59] Sumney (1990:15-22) offers a well-balanced critique of Baur's approach and findings.

### 4.5.1. The opponents of Paul as the Judaizers

This position was first proposed by F.C. Baur and argues that the opponents of Paul were Judaizers[60], who were advocates of Gentiles believers adopting circumcision, the sabbath, and food laws from the Torah. What is surprising though is that when it comes to 2 Corinthians itself, these issues are not mentioned by Paul. Thus, the argument that Paul's opponents were Judaizers relies on others texts (such as Galatians) that are not the primary text (2 Corinthians), and on the presupposition that Paul's opposition was the same in all his letters.

Lüdemann and Barrett argued that each letter should be read individually (cited in Sumney, 1990:41). Barrett (1973:6-7) agreed with Baur that Paul's opponents were Judaizers from the Jerusalem church who were insisting on bringing the new Gentile churches in line with the Jerusalem church. His disagreement with Baur is when it comes to a single-front opposition to Paul. Barrett (1982:65) said that instead of using a current hypothesis or constructing a new one, it is best to "take a number of vital and difficult passages, and establish from them, as firmly as possible, exegetical results. On the basis of these, one may hope, a picture will emerge with reasonably clear outlines, however vague some of the details may remain". Barrett then goes on to interpret the vital and difficult passages by means of verbal parallelism between 2 Corinthians and other Pauline letters and non-Pauline texts. This, however, still raises more questions than answers. As an example, with the non-Pauline texts, can we say that the sources from the fourth century are adequate in helping us to reconstruct a situation in Corinth in the first-century, as Baur and Gunther did? Second, what criteria does one use to identify vital passages (Sumney, 1990:31)? Third, as Witherington (1995:347) pointed out, the opponents of 2 Corinthians seem to stress things such as rhetorical speech, wisdom and letters of recommendation, completely dissimilar to Galatians, where the opponents emphasised things like law, sabbath and circumcision. This being said, there is an exception in 2 Corinthians 3:7 where it seems that the opponents of Paul had

[60] Among the scholars who identify the opponents of Paul to be the Judaizers are: Baur; Oostendorp, Barrett, Gunter, and Lüdemann (all cited in Sumney, 1990:13-42).

something to do with the Ten Commandments. It does, though, seem improbable that this inference necessitates that the opponents are Judaizers.

### 4.5.2. The opponents of Paul as the Gnostics

Among the scholars who hold to the view that the opponents of Paul were Gnostics are Lütgert, Bultmann and Schmithals, who are said to be the major proponents of this view (all cited in Sumney, 1990:202). The preoccupation of the Corinthians with "wisdom", "knowledge" and "mysteries" (i.e. 1 Corinthians 1-2; 8 and 12-14) has led these scholars to postulate that the opponents of Paul in Corinth were Gnostics or, at the very least, proto-gnostic (Ashley, 2006:39).

Schmithals saw the opponents as Jewish Christian Gnostics (Guthrie, 1990:434) [61]. Like Baur, Schmithals' presupposition is that Paul was facing a single front opposition in all his letters. His starting point is a historical reconstruction that identifies Gnosticism as a pre-Christian syncretistic phenomenon of the first century (Moon, 2004:21). He developed his case by looking at second century Gnosticism and transferring these texts to Paul's context of the first century. Schmithals' position has, however, been rejected by scholars such as Wilson (cited in Guthrie, 1990:434), who argue that "parallels in terminology and thought between the New Testament books and developed Gnosticism are not enough to conclude for a first-century Gnosticism". The fundamental problem with Schmithals' approach is that in his analysis and reconstruction of Paul's opponents he uses second-century and later material to identify a first-century situation (Sumney, 1990:47).

### 4.5.3. The opponents of Paul as the divine men

Divine men ideology focused on things like miracles and visions in order to demonstrate that one is full of the Spirit (Moon, 2004:20). In this view, Paul's main opponents were Hellenist-Jewish propagandists who were heavily influenced by the "divine men" (θεῖος

[61] Sumney (1990:42-48) provides a detailed explanation of Schmithals' position.

ἀνήρ) ideology, which was allegedly dominant in the Hellenistic synagogues (Sumney, 1990:49). Georgi (1986) and Friedrich are the main proponents of this view. Georgi first limited his investigation to 2 Corinthians (2 Cor. 2:14-7:4 [excluding 6:14-7] and 2 Cor. 10-13), which he views as two letters. However, he viewed the situation behind the 'two letters' to be the same. Sumney (1990:49-50) outlined four issues as identified by Georgi that were in Corinth, these are: "1) The importance of the terms διάκονος and διακονία, 2) an emphasis on the Spirit, 3) the appearance of apostles who proclaim their own worth, and 4) other similarities in the opponents, such as boasting and demanding support".

Unlike the two above-mentioned positions (i.e. the Judaizes and Gnostics), Georgi placed an emphasis on the primary texts and rejected the idea of a single-front attack on Paul. First, he focused on 2 Corinthians 10-13 where the identity of Paul's opponents is clearer. His starting point was to identify how Paul described his opponents. Georgi looks for Paul's opponents either as they are "quoted by Paul or are found through ironic or sarcastic charges" (Moon, 2004:19). According to Moon (2004:19), Paul designates three titles for his opponents: he sarcastically calls them "servant of Christ" (11:23) and "super-apostle" (11:5; 12:11); he also calls them "false apostles, deceitful workers, masquerading as apostles of Christ" (11:13), and "Hebrews, Israelites, and seed of Abraham" (11:22). It is in light of these designated descriptions by Paul that Georgi asserts that the opponents of Paul were Hellenistic-Jewish apologists or propagandists.

Even though Georgi first focuses on the primary texts, he later analyses these texts in light of his reconstruction of Hellenistic propaganda techniques, according to Sumney (1990:54). This in turn governs his interpretation of 2 Corinthians. Sumney (1990:54) said, "The defense Georgi offers for his interpretation of many passages from 2 Cor. 2:14-7:4 has less to do with literary/contextual matters than with his reconstruction. He justifies his interpretation by showing how they fit with the idea of the divine man".

### 4.5.4. The opponents of Paul as the Pneumatics

Sumney (1990:63) observed that scholars usually misplace Käsemann's views about the identification of Paul's opponents. He noted that scholars generally think that Käsemann identified Paul's opponents to be the Judaizers. Sumney said, however, that this is not the case since Käsemann did not think that the opponents demanded law-keeping, but rather saw the issue between Paul and his opponents to centre on the Spirit. Thus Sumney (1990:63) stated that Käsemann is to be associated with those who viewed Paul's opponents to be pneumatics.

Käsemann placed most of his focus on 2 Corinthians 10-13, since he saw it as a distinguishable section which can give more light to the issues at Corinth. In his methodology he used mirror reading exegesis but he limits it only to the passages that contain key words (*Stichworte*), catchphrases and themes in Paul's response to his opponents. He does this because he believes that the *Stichworte* reveal information about the opponents of Paul (Sumney, 1990:63). Among the *Stichworte* that Käsemann focuses on are: weakness, signs of an apostle, λογιζέσθαι, ἐξουσία and τολμῆσαι. Käsemann believed that all these *Stichworte* reveal the opponents' charge that Paul was not a true pneumatic (Sumney, 1990:64). The one problem that this paper has with Käsemann is that he believed that the Pneumatic was closely connected with the Jerusalem church. However, this presupposes that Paul faced a similar opposition in all his letters, such as in Galatians 2. This contradicts the principle of interpreting letters individually. Moreover, the term Ἑβραῖος in 2 Corinthians 11:22 does not denote Palestinian origin, since Paul himself claims to be Ἑβραῖος (2 Cor. 11:22), but is a native of Tarsus. It thus becomes difficult to accept the claim that these opponents of Paul were under the auspices of Jerusalem (Milinovich, 2010:21). The other difficulty with Käsemann is his *Stichworte* - what constitutes a key word? Is it its repetition within a letter?

The truth of the matter is that nowhere in 2 Corinthians does Paul provide a systematic description of his opponents, "their background, their claims, their methods of operation, or their teachings" (Furnish, 1984:48). Witherington (1995:348) says that perhaps the

reason Paul does not mention the theology of his opponents is that the issues between Paul and his opponents were more about practice, that is "the character and criteria of apostolic praxis", and not necessarily theological. The real issues between Paul and his opponents were more to do with the practice of ministry and an evaluation of genuine ministry.

Paul prefers to present his opponents as shadows, a strategy that was common in ancient rhetorical style, where one denied their enemies even the status of using their names (Furnish, 1984:49). Besides Paul using derogatory terms such as "super-apostles" (2 Cor.11:5; 12:11), "false apostles, deceitful workers" (2 Cor. 11:13), ministers of Satan in disguise as "ministers of righteousness" and "ministers of Christ" (2 Cor. 11:13-15), Paul generally prefers to use impersonal pronouns to refer to his opponents such as τις, τινες, τιναϛ ("some", "someone", certain persons - 2 Cor. 3:1; 10:2, 7, 12; 11:20,21b); πολλοί ("so many", "many" - 2 Cor.2:17 and 11:18); and ὁ τοιοῦτος, οἱ τοιοῦτοι ("such a person", "such people" - 2 Cor. 10:11; 11:13) (Furnish, 1984:49).

It is for these reasons that the methodology that will be much more beneficial in identifying Paul's opponents is the mirror reading exegesis, for it allows 2 Corinthians to remain as the primary text and is not in danger of having our reconstruction imposed on the text. By using mirror reading exegesis we can deduce the following concerning the opponents of Paul[62]:

- Some were Jewish[63] Christians[64]; this is clear from the texts "are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they Abraham's descendants? So am I. Are they servants of Christ?" (2 Cor. 11:22-23)
- They had letters of recommendation with them, and they also commended themselves (2 Cor. 3:1; 10:12)

[62] Similar findings are also in Furnish (1984:50-53), Ashley (2006:38-41) and Milinovich (2010:23-24)
[63] This, however, does not mean they are the same Judaizers of Galatians. There is nothing in the text that indicates that they forced the Gentiles to submit to the Jewish law.
[64] It is debated whether all the opponents were from the outside. Scholars such as Ashley (2006:38) saw the opponents in 2 Corinthians 1-9 as from within the church while in 2 Corinthians 10-13 they are seen as missionaries. This is of course based on their views that 2 Corinthians is comprised of two separate letters. This paper is, however, of the view that 2 Corinthians is a single literary unit.

- They took pride in what was seen - "worldly" things (2 Cor. 5:11-13; 11:18)
- They peddled the word of God for financial gain (2 Cor. 2:17; 4:1-2)
- It seems that they have accepted[65] financial support (2 Cor. 11:7-12; 12:13), even demanded such support (2 Cor. 11:19-20; cf. 2:17)
- They had ecstatic experiences and "signs and wonders" were important to them (2 Cor. 12:1, 12)
- They were eloquent speakers[66] (2 Cor. 10:10; 11;6).

It is likely that the opponents accused Paul of the following:

- He lacked credibility because he had no letters of recommendation (3:1)
- He acted in a worldly fashion (implying a weak nature (10:2)
- His letters were strong but his presence was weak (10:10-11)
- He was an untrained speaker (5:11-13; 11:6)
- He refused money for himself but took a collection allegedly for the poor in Jerusalem (12:17).

The above list represents a general description of what the text of 2 Corinthians tells us about the opponents of Paul and their allegations against Paul. However, it does not provide the background of the opponents, nor does it provide their theology, and doing so will be speculative. Paul's comments concerning the opponents mostly relate to their methods and lifestyle, rather than to the content of their teachings (Ashley, 2006:41). These opponents seem to have favoured a different model of apostleship, one that was contrary to Paul's. They demonstrated wisdom, power and eloquence. Conversely, Paul's model of apostleship was one that was marked by "weakness, humility and dependence, based on the example of the crucified but risen Christ". This was in stark contrast to the cultural expectations of the Corinthians (Ashley, 2006:41).

Hence, Witherington (1995:348) came to the conclusion that "Social and practical matters are more to the fore than theological and ethical matters…The fundamental

[65] Contrary to Paul, who did not.
[66] As opposed to Paul who shunned the rhetorical style expected by the Corinthians (Ashley, 2006:41).

problem is the Corinthians' image of Christian leadership". The Corinthians wanted a leader that was compatible with their cultural expectations and values; they wanted "a leader who had honor, power, spiritual gifts, rhetoric skills, and good references and who would accept patronage" (Witherington, 1995:348). Having made this analysis of the opponents of Paul, it seems strange that most New Testament scholars have focused on the theological/vertical (i.e. reconciliation with God) aspect of reconciliation and have neglected this social dynamic in which Paul developed his theology. Is it possible that it was out of social opposition that Paul wrote about his theology of reconciliation? In the following section other elements that may have led to the relational breakdown between Paul and his congregation are considered - was it only theological issues or was it perhaps a matter of mistrust and miscommunication, which will mean that the issues were also social?

It was not only the opponents of Paul that severed the relationship between Paul and his congregation. To blame them for all that went wrong between Paul and the Corinthians will be providing a distorted picture of what happened at Corinth. From 1 Corinthians one can pick up that there were a number of contentious issues between Paul and the Corinthians.

## 4.6. The issues of dispute between Paul and the Corinthians [67]

In 1 Corinthians the issues between Paul and the Corinthians were clear: division in the Church, with some claiming to follow Paul, while others followed Peter and still others following Apollos. The Corinthians also abused the grace of God as a licence for sin, and Paul had to painstakingly correct these issues. Some of the issues involved wisdom and spirituality. When it comes to 2 Corinthians there were things that Paul had done that caused the Corinthians to question Paul's integrity as their apostle. This paper will highlight only two of these.

One of the issues that may have caused difficulties between Paul and the Corinthians is changing his traveling plans. In 1 Corinthians 16:5-9, Paul promised that he would visit

[67] Ashley (2006:41-44) offers a detailed list of the issues between Paul and the Corinthians.

the Corinthians on his way to Macedonia. By the time we reach 2 Corinthians 1:15-22, Paul had not returned to the Corinthians. For some at Corinth, this was evidence that Paul could not be trusted (Ashley, 2006:42). In 2 Corinthians 1:23-2:4, Paul had to explain that the reason he did not return to the Corinthians was to spare them another painful visit.

The second issue between Paul and the Corinthians is that of finances. In 1 Corinthians 9:1-23 Paul talks about the rights of an apostle; among those rights was financial support from those to whom he ministered. But when it came to the Corinthians, Paul refused their financial support using strong words. He said, "…οὐκ ἔγραψα δὲ ταῦτα ἵνα οὕτως γένηται ἐν ἐμοί, καλὸν γάρ μοι μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν ἤ— τὸ καύχημά μου οὐδεὶς κενώσει" (1 Corinthians 9:15). Meanwhile, in 2 Corinthians 11:7-11, Paul told the Corinthians that other churches supported him, but he refused support from the Corinthians. It is thus possible that the Corinthians thought that Paul did not love them since he refused financial support from them and treated them differently from other churches he planted. Paul had to write and show the Corinthians that the reason he did not accept financial support from them is that he wanted to demonstrate to them parental love (2 Corinthians 12:14-18), unlike his opponents who took advantage of them. What might have complicated matters however is that as much as Paul refused financial support from the Corinthians, he asked them to support the church in Jerusalem. Ashley (2006:42) said that there is a hint in the text that some at Corinth saw this as a dishonest way for Paul to extract funds from them, and that some of the funds were going to Paul, not to Jerusalem.

## 4.7. Summary

In this chapter I have provided a brief historical reconstruction of the city of Corinth, and an overview of how Paul came to establish a church in that city. This was done as a precursor to the discussion on the authenticity of 2 Corinthians. Both historical context and literary context are important for our understanding of Paul's teachings on reconciliation. In this chapter we also looked at the possible reasons that compelled

Paul to teach about reconciliation. We saw that Paul penned his teachings about reconciliation in a context in which his personality and integrity were being attacked. Paul did not write a systematic theology concerning reconciliation, rather he wrote about reconciliation within a context of conflict between himself and the Corinthians.

Now that the context of 2 Corinthians, the literary integrity of the letter, and the opposition that Paul faced at Corinth have been established, Paul's teaching on reconciliation can be considered.

# CHAPTER 5: EXEGESIS - 2 CORINTHIANS 5:11-6:10

## 5.1. Setting the literary context of 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10

Setting the literary context of the text concerning reconciliation in 2 Corinthians is not an easy task. Barrett (1973:163), referring to 2 Corinthians 5:11-21, called this section "…one of the most pregnant, difficult, and important [passages] in the whole of the Pauline literature". Among the recent attempts to understand the literary context of 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10, we have scholars such as Lambrecht (1994), Boers (2002), Gignilliat (2007), and Milinovich (2010). Boers (2002:527) said the following referring to 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10, "The interpretation of 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2 is beset by what appear to be unsolvable problems with its grammatical structure, syntactic as well as semantic". Unlike other Pauline letters, in 2 Corinthians there is no apparent structure and unity in the letter, hence the various theories regarding the composition of the letter described in the previous chapter. Plummer (1915) made the following comment about the nature of 2 Corinthians:

> "With regard to the letter itself it is better to talk of 'contents' rather than 'plan.' Beyond the three clearly marked divisions (i.-vii.; viii-ix.; x.-xiii.) there is not much evidence of plan. In these main divisions the Apostle seems to have dictated what he had to say just as his thoughts and feelings moved him, without much consideration of arrangement or logical sequence." (Plummer, 1915:xx)

This is of course due to the occasional nature of the letter. Scholars agree that Paul's teaching on reconciliation is part of a broader section of 2 Corinthians 2:14-7:4[68], where the apostle defends his apostolic ministry. Martin (1986:43) said that 2 Corinthians 2:14-7:4 is Paul's "main theme", which is about apostolic ministry. This sentiment is also shared by Barnett (1997:137) who stated that 2 Corinthians 2:14-7:4 "is the longest coherent section within 2 Corinthians and is, arguably, the centerpiece of the entire

[68] Among the scholars who take this view are Bultmann (1985:61-174 English translation), Martin (1986:43, changes it slightly by extending it to 2 Corinthians 7:16), Barrett (1973:51), Barnett (1997:137), Thrall (1994:188) and Lambrecht (1994:363)

letter". The area of disagreement amongst the scholars is on the subdivision of 2 Corinthians 2:14-7:4, specifically the delimitation of the text concerning reconciliation. The study of the literary context of 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 will be done in two stages: firstly, the work of Boers (2002), which is thought to be a seminal work by scholars such as Gignilliat (2007:56), is considered; secondly, various delimitations of the text by different scholars are examined.

## 5.2. Boers: "2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2: A fragment of Pauline Christology"

The difficulty when it comes to the section on reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5, is that not only does Paul use the unique vocabulary of *καταλλάσσω* terminology, there is also a change from the first person singular (which refers to Paul alone) to the first person plural ἡμᾶς[69] (which could be Paul and his reader or other apostles). This has led some scholars to question whether Paul's teachings on reconciliation still form part of his overall apologia of apostolate of 2 Corinthians 2:14-7:4. Scholars such as Boers (2002:527) have noted that 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2 is embedded between two sections which deals with Paul's apologia for his ministry, 5:11-13 and 6:3-10. The difficulty, however, is that in 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2 there is no explicit or implicit mention of Paul's apology. The subject matter of 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2 is around two Christological statements, 5:14-17 (Christ died for all) and 5:21-6:2 (Christ being made sin) (Boers, 2002:527).

Noticing this difficulty in the text, Boers (2002:528) proceeded to discuss what he calls "the widest possible spectrum" of Windisch and Bultmann concerning the text, 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10. For Windisch 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2 has been misarranged: 2 Corinthians 5:11-13 goes with 2 Corinthians 6:3-10, and 2 Corinthians 6:1-2 belongs to 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 (Boers, 2002:527-528). Windisch made the connection between

[69] Some scholars however, take ἡμᾶς to mean Paul and his apostleship or other apostles. The scholars who take this view are Barret (1973:176), Harris (2005:438), Martin (1986:153) and Plumber. Others scholars however, take ἡμᾶς to refer to Paul and community of believers. Among those who hold to this view are Furnish (1984:317), Barnett (1997:300), and Thrall (1994:430). In this paper the view is that here Paul refers to himself and his co-workers.

2 Corinthians 5:11-13 and 2 Corinthians 6:3-10 by means of the γὰρ (Boers, 2002:528). Boers (2002:528) went on to says, "…one seeks in vain in 5:14-6:2 for the ἀφορμήν καυχήματος, which Paul promised in 5:12, but can find it in 6:3-10". Bultmann, on the other hand, maintained that the entire passage is a unit that speaks about the apostolic office (Boers, 2002:528). For Bultmann, even though Paul does not directly speak about himself in 2 Corinthians 5:18-6:2 compared to 2 Corinthians 5:11-13 and 6:3-10, the passage (2 Corinthians 5:18-6:2) clarifies that the "apostolic office is grounded in the events of salvation" (Boers, 2002:528). Boers (2002:545) disagreed with the views of Windisch and Bultmann. He said that Bultmann's interpretation remained unconvincing and that Windisch's reconstruction was speculative (Boers, 2002:545). His position is that 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2 has its own literary integrity, and that it is "a rare fragment[70] of Pauline Christology" (Boers, 2002:546). He also said that "ἡμᾶς in v. 14a could include Paul as well as his readers, in which case γὰρ would signal a new theme…in which Paul presents the foundations of Christ's love that binds him and his readers" (Boers, 2002:529). Boers' use of the plural ἡμᾶς as grounds in which Paul changes the theme in verse 14 has been criticised by Gignilliat (2007:56). Boers' (2002:29-30) position is that ἡμᾶς in 5:11-13 refers to Paul alone while in 5:14 it refers to Paul and his audience.

Gignilliat (2007:56) has criticised him, saying that Boers does not properly take into account the use of this plural ἡμᾶς in verses 11-13, and hence he removes 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2. For Gignilliat (2007:56) there is no apparent reason to remove 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2 from the flow of 2 Corinthians 5:11-13 and 2 Corinthians 6:3-10. He is, however, quick to add that Paul does not only offer an apologia for himself in 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2, but he also contributes to the unique "Christological perspective in 5:14-6:2, coupled with soteriological and eschatological aspects" (Gignilliat, 2007:56). For Gignilliat (2007:56-57), Paul in his self-defence links his ministry with the redemptive story of Christ. This is critical for the understanding of reconciliation; one needs to be cognisant of the fact that Paul's theology of reconciliation is expressed

[70] Scholars such as Käsemann (1971:52), and Martin (1981:94) call this section a pre-Pauline hymn. This position has been successfully refuted by Thrall (1994:448), and Gignilliat (2007:56) on the grounds that there are no biblical manuscripts to support it and that it remains speculative.

within a context of conflict. Paul has been rejected by the Corinthians as their apostle, and he is seeking to restore that relationship by linking his apostolic ministry with the redemption story.

Thus far in Boers (2002) we have seen that scholars differ with regard to placing 2 Corinthians 5:14-21 within the overall logic of 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10. This has resulted in Paul's teachings concerning reconciliation in 2 Corinthians being studied under various delimitations that can be grouped into two major categories: 2 Corinthians 5:11-21 and 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10[71] (Milinovich, 2010:3). There are small variants to these categories; however these two are the dominant ones. It thus becomes necessary that, before the exegesis of Paul's teachings on reconciliation in 2 Corinthians is dealt with, the reason for the delimitation of the text concerning reconciliation as 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 must be justified in light of other various proposals concerning the delimitations of the text.

## 5.3. Various delimitations of the text concerning reconciliation

### 5.3.1.2 Corinthians 5:11-21 as the delimitation

The scholars who delimit the text as 2 Corinthians 5:11-21 do so mostly by focusing on the *κατάλλασσειν* terminology. Among the scholars who delimit the text as 2 Corinthians 5:11-21 are Barrett (1973:161-181), Belleville (1996:155-160), Martin (1986:134-159), Martyn (1997:85-156), Kim (1997), and Winter (sine anno: 1). [72]

At first glance one might be tempted to place Lambrecht among these scholars since in both of his treatments of reconciliation the title contains 2 Corinthians 5:11-21, i.e. in his earlier work in 1989 "'Reconcile Yourselves'…: a reading of 2 Corinthians 5:11-21"[73] and in his later work "The Ministry of Reconciliation (5:11-21)" in 1999. This, however,

[71] Milinovich 2010:3 makes this to be 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:2. However, this paper thinks that 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 is broad enough to encompass all that Paul has to say concerning reconciliation within the context of his apology.
[72] as cited by Milinovich, 2010:3.
[73] This work has been republished in 1994 in "Studies on 2 Corinthians" ed. Bieringer & Lambrecht.

ought not to be misleading, for Lambrecht (1994:364) said that “5:11-6:10 forms a larger unit which deals with the ministry of reconciliation”. So, Lambrecht belongs to the group of scholars who delimits the text as 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10. Where Lambrecht is helpful is in his demonstration of why 2 Corinthians 5:11 serves as the beginning section of Paul’s teachings on reconciliation. He acknowledges that the participle οὖν acts as the conclusion of the previous section, i.e. “the fear of the Lord” ought to influence how we behave. He also made the following observation: the verb πεφανερῶσθαι has been used twice in verse 11 and has already been used in the previous section. He said that this serves as a connecting link between 5:11 and the foregoing passage: “yet in spite of these connections with what precedes, a different line of thought breaks through in 5:11” (Lambrecht, 1999:102). Lambrecht’s position will be relooked at when the scholars who delimit the text as 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 are examined.

Blomberg (1989) is also among the scholars who delimit the text as 2 Corinthians 5:11-21. Using chiastic structures, Blomberg (1989:9) demonstrated that Paul’s theology of reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5:11-21 is the theological climax of the whole section of chapters 1-7. 2 Corinthians 5:11-21 sits between two obvious matching pairs which are linked by suffering but also verbal parallelism: 2 Corinthians 4:7-5:10 (which is about surviving and triumphing despite every hardship) and 2 Corinthians 6:1-10 (which is also about surviving and triumphing despite every hardship) (Blomberg, 1989:9-12). The verbal parallelism can be seen in the “introductory combination of θλιβόμενοι ἀλλ’ οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι (‘being afflicted but not distressed’—4:8) and ἐν θλίψεσιν... ἐν στενοχωρίαις (‘in affliction… in distresses’—6:4)” (Blomberg, 1989:12). All of these observations led Blomberg (1989:16) to conclude that 2 Corinthians 5:11-21 is the main point Paul is trying to make in chapters 1-7. Moreover, 2 Corinthians 5:11-21 provides the theological basis for resolving the tension between Paul and his congregation.

Bieringer (1994:1-13) is also among the scholars who take 2 Corinthians 5:21 as their end point. However, he slightly adjusts his delimitation as 2 Corinthians 5:14-21. He said that 2 Corinthians 5:14-21 is the *locus classicus* of the Pauline theology of reconciliation (1994:6). He subdivides the section into two: 2 Corinthians 5:14-17, which he calls “Christo-centric”, and 2 Corinthians 5:18-21, which he calls “Theo-centric”

(Bieringer, 1994:6-11). The bulk of his paper, however, is devoted to the debate about the origins of *κατάλλασσειν* terminology in Paul. It is thus not surprising that he delimits his texts to where that specific terminology appears.

The problem with setting 2 Corinthians 5:11-21 as the delimitation of the text regarding reconciliation is that this position fails to take into account the Old Testament quote in 2 Corinthians 6:2. Gignilliat (2007:60) argued that 2 Corinthians 6:2 is a hermeneutical key. He said, "…suffice it to say at this point that Isaianic allusions in 5:14-21, coupled with Paul's own defense in light of his suffering in 6:3-10, hover around Paul's quotation of Isa. 49:8. Thus 2 Corinthians 6:2 serves as a bridge holding these two pericopai together". Moreover, Mead (1989) contended that Paul generally cites the OT at the climax of his argument (in Milinovich, 2010:5).

### 5.3.2.2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 as the delimitation

Among the scholars who delimit their text as 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 are: Keener (2005:181-190), O'Connor (1991:28-65), Hughes (1962:186-238), Bultmann (1985:144-167), and Lambrecht (1994:363-411 &1999:91-116).

There are a few scholars who make small variants to this delimitation. These are Barnett (1997:299-321), Witherington[74] (1995:392-397), and Milinovich (2010:5-7) who set as their end point 2 Corinthians 6:2. Barnett (1997:320) views 2 Corinthians 6:2 as the climactic appeal of Paul to the Corinthians. In fact, Barnett (1997:318) extends the argument by saying that 2 Corinthians 6:2 "is arguably the key verse of the apostolic excursus (2:14-7:4) and, indeed, of the entire letter. Quoting God's words to Isaiah (Isa 49:8), and applying them to the Corinthians, Paul declares that, with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (5:14-15), the very day of God's salvation has dawned". It is

[74] Argues that in 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:2 Paul employs rhetoric devises. He says that Paul's use of the three terms ambassador, servant of God, herald are "clearly interconnected and presuppose a person adept at rhetoric" (Witherington, 1995:397).

important to note though that not all scholars who set their end point as 2 Corinthians 6:2 agree on the beginning of the section[75].

Milinovich (2010:5-7) argued his case on two grounds. First, he said that his "position is grounded on the grammatical data since ὥστε in v. 16 presents a logical consequence of the activities of Christ in vv. 14-15, and the end of the section is denoted by the abrupt shift from appeal in 6:2 to recitation of Paul's hardships in 6:3". His second argument is that the chiastic structure of A-B-B'-A' in 5:16-6:2 affirms his delimitations (Milinovich, 2010:5)

In this paper, 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 will be treated as a single unit. This is based on Lambrecht's (1994:364) chiastic structure of A-B-A', with A- being the self- defence (2 Corinthians 5:11-13), B[76]- being the theological aspect of reconciliation, and A'- being self-defence again. It is clear that the first unit and the third unit correspond. The use of πείθομεν (translated as 'we persuade' or 'trying to win') in 5:11 verbally corresponds with παρακαλοῦμεν (translated as 'we entreat you' or 'we urge') in 6:1 (Lambrecht, 1994:364). In this paper, however, Lambrecht's chiastic structure is adjusted slightly: A- 2 Corinthians 5:11-13, B- 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2, and A'- 2 Corinthians 6:3-10. The reason that the B unit is changed is that the Isaiah quotes of 2 Corinthians 6:1-2 is the climax of Paul's teaching on reconciliation, especially in light of what the Servant of Isaiah did in achieving reconciliation.

The reason that Lambrecht's chiastic structure is used in this paper instead of Milinovich is that, in this way, the broader context of Paul's theology of reconciliation comes into focus. That is, Paul did not write a systematic theology of reconciliation. Rather, his theology was expressed out of the context of conflict, a conflict that was primarily about social and practical matters, not in the first instance about theological issues (Witherington, 1995:348). Blomberg (1989:16) offers a key insight by stating that 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:2 "provides the theological basis which alone can make possible the practical and pastoral solution to these conflicts". However, it must be maintained that,

[75] Witherington (1995) starts his section at 5:11, Milinovich (2010:5) starts his at 5:16, while Barnett (1997:301) starts his section at 5:18.
[76] Lambrecht (1994:364) calls this "emissary of Christ".

in order to be faithful to Paul's theology of reconciliation, his defence needs to be an integral part of that theology. Also, the last section at 2 Corinthians 6:10 caters well for the next ABA structure that is found in 2 Corinthians 6:11-7:4[77]. Here there is a clear ABA structure: A- 6:11-10 (widen your hearts), B- 6:14-7:1 (separate yourselves from uncleanness), and A'- 7:2-4 (open your hearts).

Now that the literary (in this chapter) and historical (in the previous chapter) contexts of 2 Corinthians have been set, and the issues that caused conflict between Paul and the Corinthians have been identified, the exegesis of the passage can proceed.

## 5.4. The structure of the text

In points number 5.2 and 5.3 the delimitation of the text was examined, and it was argued that 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 forms a single structure that can be divided into three sections: Paul's defence (2 Corinthians 5:11-13), theological basis for reconciliation (2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2), and self-defence again (2 Corinthians 6:3-10). The first section corresponds to the last one in that they both deal with Paul's self-defence. Lambrecht (1994:162) pointed to the extent of similarities in vocabulary between these two corresponding units: "ἀφορμὴν διδόντες (5:12) with διδόντες προσκοπήν (6:3); ἑαυτοὺς συνιστάνομεν (5:12) with συνιστάνοντες ἑαυτοὺς (6:4); and θεῷ (5:11, 13) with θεοῦ διάκονοι (6:4)".

## 5.5. Paul's defence (2 Corinthians 5:11-13)

In this section Paul is clearly using rhetorical techniques in order to defend himself against his opponents. In verse 11 we read: "Εἰδότες οὖν τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου ἀνθρώπους πείθομεν, θεῷ δὲ πεφανερώμεθα· ἐλπίζω δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς συνειδήσεσιν ὑμῶν πεφανερῶσθαι". There are two words that hint at Paul employing rhetorical skills in 2

[77] See also Blomberg (1989:1-20)

Corinthians 5:11-13. The first word we find in verse 11b "πείθομεν[78]", and the second is in verse 20 "πρεσβεύομεν". Witherington (1995:392) said that Paul calling himself an ambassador in verse 20 is clear evidence that Paul is employing rhetorical skills. He (1995:392) noted that, "An ambassador would use epideictic rhetoric to praise a ruler he was sent by or to, deliberative rhetoric to argue for a particular future course of action, perhaps of a client king, and forensic rhetoric to defend a policy of his overlord or to accuse a client king of misconduct."

Verse 11 is also a clear mark that Paul is making use of rhetorical techniques, when he says in verse 11b: "ἀνθρώπους[79] πείθομεν[80]". According to Marshall (1987:331) the

[78] There is a debate amongst scholars about what Paul is doing with πείθομεν in verse 11, since in 1 Corinthians 2:4 and Galatians 1:10 Paul refused to operate by means of persuasive words of wisdom (O'Connor, 1991:56). O'Connor (1991:56) believed that πείθομεν represents Paul's opponents' terminology, and that Paul is here appropriating it for his own purpose, to show them true persuasion that is based on the knowledge of Christ. Plummer (1915:169) takes πείθομεν as Paul trying to convince both the Jews and Gentiles about his gospel of salvation. The difficulty with the first position is how we can identify the vocabulary of the opponents of Paul, since we only have access to Paul's words and not theirs. The second position is highly plausible. In this paper, πείθομεν is viewed as Paul's attempt to convince the Corinthians about the genuineness of his ministry and motives. Paul is indeed persuading the Corinthians but he qualifies his persuasion by the use of δὲ which has a mild adversative force (=but) (Furnish, 1984:309). Paul is thus persuading the Corinthians, but he adds a qualifying statement to that persuasion, i.e. he is open/manifest to God. In this sense the verse can be paraphrased as: "it is true that we persuade people, but we are open to God" (Lambrecht, 1994:367).

[79] Is inclusive of both men and women (Martin, 1986:121; Barnett, 1997:278).

[80] There is a debate among scholars about what Paul is persuading people of. Is he defending his integrity as an apostle of God (Plummer, 1915:169-170; Hughes, 1962:186; Bultmann, 1985:147; Furnish, 1984:306)? Does he want the Corinthians to side with him against those who question his integrity? Or is Paul using πείθομεν as the equivalent of his proclamation of the gospel (Barnett, 1997:280; Belleville, 1996:144)? In this paper ἀνθρώπους πείθομεν is viewed as referring both to Paul's proclamation of the gospel (see Acts 17:4; 18:4; 19:8, 26; 26:28; 28:23, where πείθομεν is used of Paul's evangelism), and to Paul's apostolic defence (Martin, 1986:121). Throughout 2 Corinthians Paul, as the ambassador of the new covenant, has been concerned about proclaiming the truth of the gospel plainly (2 Corinthians 4:2, 6). This is a character trait of Paul, who is ambitious about taking the gospel to the nations (this has been referred to in the Acts references). But also, in the present section (2 Corinthians 5:11-13), Paul is persuading the Corinthians about "the genuineness of his ministry and motives" as the true apostle of Christ (Martin, 1986:121). Hughes (1962:186-187) says that this whole epistle can be "described as a vindication of his [Paul's] genuineness". Paul has been persuading the Corinthians about his personal integrity (2 Corinthians 1:12-14; 4:1-2; 6:3-10; 7:2-4). Thus Paul's use of πείθομεν has two nuances: Paul's persuading men and women about the gospel of Christ, and he's also persuading the Corinthians about his genuineness as their apostle (Martin, 1986:121).
There is also a debate amongst the scholars about the meaning of the present tense. Is πείθομεν conative or durative? Furnish (1984:306) states that here πείθομεν is conative, that is Paul is trying to persuade men (which denotes an incomplete task). Lambrecht (1994:366) has however, correctly pointed out that "the nuance of 'trying' [that is Paul trying to persuade or convince people] belongs to the verb as such and cannot be taken as 'conative' in a grammatical sense. The aspect of the present tense here points solely to the duration, the action in progress". Paul is currently persuading people, and as we do not know whether he succeeds in that or not, the focus of the verb is on the action. This paper takes πείθομεν to be durative.

verb πείθομεν is “synonymous with rhetoric”. Hubbard (1998:53) said that πείθομεν “is positioned like a signpost at the head of this passage and should serve to orient our exegesis of 5:11-21”.

The use of the art of persuasion is thus in line with a rhetorical style, but Paul’s use of rhetoric is not the same as that of the Sophists[81] who were using more ornamental rhetoric which was preoccupied with form and eloquence (Witherington, 1995:392). Paul’s rhetoric takes a different form; it is motivated by Christ’s judgment seat (2 Corinthians 5:10) and the love of God demonstrated by Christ’s death on the cross (2 Corinthians 5:14). Paul knows that he is accountable to God, not to the Corinthians, hence the language of the fear of the Lord in 2 Corinthians 5:11. Winter (1997:217), comparing Paul’s rhetoric to that of the Sophists, said that it was the “deceit which all too often accompanied [rhetoric’s] spoken manifestation” of the Sophists which Paul rejected. He would not bow to the conventions of oratorio or to its use of the “grand style” which was so characteristic of the Sophists (Winter, 1997:217).

Paul’s defence here revolves around two things that are interrelated: a contrast between what is seen and unseen; and the fear of the Lord.

### 5.5.1. A contrast between what is seen and unseen

Paul’s defence firstly revolves around what is seen and unseen (Milinovich, 2010:167). Paul makes a contrast between those whose ministry is based on what is seen (his opponents) and himself (whose ministry is based on what is unseen). The antithesis between Paul and those who took pride in what is seen becomes even more evident in verse 12c, when he says: “πρὸς τοὺς ἐν προσώπῳ καυχωμένους καὶ μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ”.

[81] Commentators say that the Sophists were more concerned about appearance, dress, and a form of speech (Witherington, 1995:392). They cite Diss. 3.1.1. in support of this claim. In Diss.3.1.1. Epictetus was visited by “a rhetoric student” from Corinthian; the text describes the student as someone who was elaborately dressed, and very concerned about his looks including his hair style. Winter (1997:114) says that this was not atypical of the Sophists and their students. He then proceeds to prove his thesis in pages 114-122, that the preoccupation of the Sophists was with “natural attributes”: personal appearances or image, and physical attributes as well (Winter, 1997:114). In this paper, Paul is compared with the Sophists in order to show an antithesis to Paul’s style of rhetoric; this is not to mean that the opponents of Paul were solely Sophists. It is probable that one of the reasons that the Corinthians rejected Paul as their apostle was that Paul did not meet the standard of a public speaker.

Here Paul makes a distinction between those who boast or take pride in what is seen (προσώπῳ καυχωμένους), literally those who "take pride in the face", and those (whom Paul is part of) who take pride in what is unseen - ἐν καρδίᾳ (what is in the heart). The focus of Paul's opponents is on what is seen (προσώπῳ καυχωμένους or κατὰ σάρκα according to verse 16) rather than what is unseen (ἐν καρδίᾳ). Paul is persuading the Corinthians to have a different perspective in judging him – a godly perspective, i.e. God does not look at outer appearances but looks at the heart (1 Kgdms 16:7). Thrall (2004:404) said that it is possible that Paul here has in mind the story of Eliab in 1 Kgdms 16:7, where Samuel is told that God does not look εἰς προσώπον but he looks εἰς καρδίαν[82]. The point of 1 Kgdms 16:7 is that the outward appearance of Eliab does not mark him as the Lord's anointed.

The identity of the people who boast about outward appearance is heavily debated by scholars[83]. In this paper, it is held that προσώπον simply refers to outward appearance in general, a view that is taken by Furnish (1984:308). Paul is here defending himself against a multi-directional attack, ranging from the Sophists, non-Christian Jews, and super-apostles. He says that all these groups have one thing in common: they use outward appearance to measure true apostleship. His defence is that outward appearance has no place in the Christian community.

This will be better understood once a link between what happens in 2 Corinthians 5:11-13 and what happens in 2 Corinthians 5:6-10 has been established. This link is first established by the repeated appearance of the verb φανερόω "to appear" (once in 5:10 and twice in 5:11) and secondly by the double use of the coordinating conjunction

[82] Furnish (1984:308) provides a similar view.

[83] Winter (1997:217) and Witherington (1995:392) think that this refers to the Sophists, while most scholars view them as the opponents that Paul contends with in chapters 10-13. Older scholars such as Plummer (1915:171) interpreted those who boast "in the face" as those who were proud of their Jewish ancestry, those who know the original apostles. Thrall (2004:405) traces the identity of these people back to chapter three, to the criticism of non-Christian Jews who looked down on Paul, as compared to the glorious figure of Moses, whose face was transfigured. He said, "they boast ... of the glorified *face* of Moses, as attesting the splendour of the old covenant" (Thrall, 2004:405).

εἴτε…εἴτε in 5:9, 10 and 13. Using parallel structure[84] the link between verse 10 and 11 becomes even more apparent.

2 Corinthians 5:10 A: a) τοὺς γὰρ πάντας **ἡμᾶς "we"**

b) ***φανερωθῆναι***

c) ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ

2 Corinthians 5:11 A': a) Εἰδότ**ες** οὖν τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου

b) ***πεφανερώμεθα***

c) θεῷ

a) ἐλπίζω δὲ **"we**"

b) ***πεφανερῶσθαι***

c) ταῖς συνειδήσεσιν ὑμῶν

From the parallel structure we can see that there is clear verbal correlation between Paul and his co-workers being apparent to God (πεφανερώμεθα in 11), his hope that he is also apparent (πεφανερῶσθαι) to the consciences of Corinthians in verse 11, and with him being aware that we will all appear (φανερωθῆναι in 10) before the judgment seat of Christ. Milinovich (2010:168) noted that the statement of verse 11 points the audience back to the statement that Paul has already made in verse 10 that "'we [all believers] aspire' to be acceptable to the Lord and thus be in good standing when 'we [all humanity] appear' (φανερωθῆναι) before Christ in his eschatological court (5:10)". Paul has already demonstrated that he has conducted himself properly before God in 2 Corinthians 1:12-14, 15, 17, 18, 23; 4:1-4; 5:10; he is now trying to make this apparent to the minds of his audience.

[84] The following chiastic structure follows that of Milinovich (2010:168-167). He used chiastic structures that are grounded in the lexical and grammatical criteria (Milinovich, 2010:79).

The contrast between what is seen and unseen becomes even stronger when we look at the three instances of the appearance of the double coordinating conjunction εἴτε… εἴτε in 5:9, 10 and 13. The following diagram is taken from Milinovich (2010:169).

5:8-9 (C): believers (1) aspire to be acceptable,

(2) whether (εἴτε) home with the Lord

or (3) whether (εἴτε) away from the Lord.

5:10 (C): the (1) deeds of the body must be judged,

(2) whether (εἴτε) good

or (3) whether (εἴτε) bad.

5:13 (C´): the (1) truth of Paul's gospel is evident,

(2) whether (εἴτε) poorly (for God's glory)

or (3) whether (εἴτε) successfully (for "you," the Corinthians).

Paul's emphasis since 2 Corinthians 4:16-5:10 has been on things unseen, the future glory. Furnish (1984:288) has noted that "the unfortunate placement of chapter division after 4:18 has too often caused interpreters to overlook the close connection between the last verses of our present chapter 4 and the first verses of chap. 5. The overall theme of these eight verses is a contrast between what is of preliminary significance only and what is of absolute significance". The contrast between things seen and unseen is clearly stated in 4:18 where Paul said that the things that are seen are temporary while things unseen are eternal. But the contrast has been expressed since 4:16 in various interrelated ways: outer/inner (4:16), momentary/eternal (4:17), light affliction/abundant glory (4:17), seen/unseen (4:18), temporary/eternal (4:18), earthy/heavenly (5:1-2), tent like house/building from God (5:1), destroyed/eternal (5:1), naked/clothed (5:2-4, mortality/life (5:4). It is worth noting that all of these eight verses still form part of Paul's overall defence of his apostolic ministry, especially as it relates to the hardships he and his coworkers have experienced. Paul's defence is that these

hardships are serving his apostolic ministry, rather than invalidating it (Furnish, 1984:288). Paul wants the Corinthians to understand that suffering and hardships are temporary, as is this mortal existence (4:16-5:1). In 4:7-15 Paul points to his sufferings as a clear sign that he is the true apostle of Christ.

In 2 Corinthians 5:5-6:10 the line of argument that is based on what is seen and unseen is continued. When we are at home in the body (seen) we are away from the Lord (unseen) (5:6,8). Believers live by faith (unseen), not by sight (seen) (5:7). Believers, while they are away from the Lord, aspire or make it their goal to please him (5:9). The motivation for this is that we will all appear before the judgment seat of Christ to give account of the deeds that are done in the body, whether good or bad (5:10). Lambrecht (1994:367) noted that even though 5:11 is connected to what precedes it, (i.e. the contrast between what is seen and unseen) a different line of thought breaks through in 5:11. The emphasis of verse 11 is not predominantly about the future glory of all Christians, rather in this section Paul now focuses on his relationship with the Corinthians. He is still carrying the line of argument between what is seen and unseen, but here he is using it as his self-defence and plea. The link in 5:11-13 between what is seen and unseen is clearly stated in verse 12: "οὐ πάλιν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστάνομεν ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ ἀφορμὴν διδόντες ὑμῖν καυχήματος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα ἔχητε ***πρὸς τοὺς ἐν προσώπῳ καυχωμένους*** (those who boast in outward appearance [seen]) καὶ ***μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ*** (not in heart [unseen])". What Paul wants to underscore by his use of the seen and unseen motif is that the power of the gospel comes from God, not from external skills or the eloquence of the speaker, something that he has already told the Corinthians in 1 Corinthians 2:1-5[85] (Milinovich, 2010:170). Since 1 Corinthians Paul

[85] Kennedy (1980:131-132), commenting on this passage, said that here Paul "may be said to reject the whole of classical philosophy and rhetoric". Kennedy's hypothesis offers valuable insight, especially when we look at it in light of Paul's near contemporaries like Dio Chrystostom and Cicero. In Orator 97 Cicero wrote, "I mean the kind of eloquence which rushes along with the roar of a mighty stream, which all look up to and admire, and which they despair of attaining. This eloquence has power to sway men's minds and move them in every possible way. Now it storms the feelings, now it creeps in, it implants new ideas and uproots the old." (cited in Hubbard, 1998:62)
In Or. 33.1, Dio Chrystostom, querying the Tarsans as to why they wish to hear "sweet-voiced songbirds" like him, asks, "… do you believe that we possess a different power in word and thought alike, a power of persuasion that is keener and truly formidable, which you call rhetoric, a power that holds sway both in the forum and on the rostrum…" Comparing Paul with both of these rhetoricians, one can thus conclude with both Kennedy (1980:131-132) and Hubbard (1998:62) that Paul rejects the conventions of classical philosophy and rhetoric. Against Cicero, Paul contends that it is not the words of the speaker that rush in, uprooting the old and implanting the new, but

had specifically spelled out his *modus operandi* as the preacher to the Corinthians (Hubbard, 1998:61). Paul in his proclamation of the gospel was more concerned with the substance of his message than the form of its delivery. In 1 Corinthians 1:17 we read: “for Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel; not in words of wisdom, lest the cross of Christ be emptied of its power”. Paul does not want to lose the substance of his message: the cross. Earlier in 1 Corinthians 2:1, 4 Paul deliberately rejected “eloquent speech” (ύπεροχήν λόγου, 2.1) and “persuasive words of wisdom” (ούκ έν πειθοίς σοφίας λόγοις, 2.4) in order that πίστις might not rest on human σωφίą but on God's δύναμις (Hubbard, 1998:61).

There is no agreement amongst scholars about how to interpret ἐξέστημεν and σωφρονοῦμεν in 2 Corinthians 5:13, with scholars such as Martin (1986:40) having said that “The total understanding of this passage may be beyond our grasp”. Hubbard (1998:39-43) provided a summary of various interpretations and their criticism. There are three main views on the interpretation of ἐξέστημεν and σωφρονοῦμεν. The first is described by Hubbard (1998:40) as an abnormal interpretation. Hughes (1962:191-192) proposed that ἐξέστημεν and σωφρονοῦμεν refer to Paul’s behaviour, i.e. Paul’s “conduct was characteristic of the religious maniac”. Prumm, however, saw ἐξέστημεν as referring to Paul’s forceful and exaggerated manner of speaking (cited in Hubbard, 1998:40). The second view is proposed by scholars such as Matera (2003:132), who said that here Paul is referring to his ecstatic experience (in support of this he cites 2 Cor. 12:1-10). This seems to be a popular position amongst the scholars; Hubbard (1998:42) called this a consensus view. Other scholars compare Paul’s use of ἐξέστημεν here with γλώσσαις of 1 Corinthians 14:14, where the *glossolalic* speaker’s mind is said to be “unfruitful” (ἄκαρπός). Hubbard (1998:40) called this an “ecstatic religious” interpretation. The problem with this interpretation is that in 1 Corinthians 14:15 Paul encouraged the Corinthians to pray with both mind and spirit. It thus seems strange that Paul will now in 2 Corinthians 5:13 be practising something he discouraged earlier. Moreover, this interpretation is not in step with the context of 2 Corinthians 1-9. In 2 Corinthians 1-9 Paul does not discuss the issue of charismata, and thus if 2

---

the words of the Spirit (1 Cor. 2:5, 12-14). Against Dio, Paul maintains that this is accomplished not through the δύναμις of πείθω, but through the δύναμις of the πνεύμα (1 Cor.2:4) (Hubbard, 1998:62).

Corinthians 5:13 refers to religious experience as suggested in this view and the following one, that would be “an abrupt intrusion” to the flow of Paul’s thoughts in this passage (Hubbard, 1998:45).

Milinovich (2010:170 footnote 67) noted that there is a third interpretation of ἐξέστημεν and σωφρονοῦμεν which is much more conciliatory. This interpretation is proposed by scholars such as Martin (1986:126-127) and Barnett (1997:284) who said that Paul did indeed have an ecstatic experience, but Paul views that as a private experience that is between him and God. He thus warns the Corinthians not to focus on such external expressions of the Spirit. Hubbard (1998:42-47) provides a critique of all these interpretations.

In this paper, it is held that here Paul refers to his unpolished oratory. If Paul’s speech is poor, as his opponents accused him of (2 Corinthians 10:10 and 11:6), it is for the benefit of the Corinthians because that means that their faith rests solely on the power of the Spirit. On the other hand, when he speaks well it is also for the benefit of the Corinthians “whose infantile spirituality prefers such external qualities” (Milinovich, 2010:170).

This view was expressed by Hubbard (1998:47-63) after doing a rhetorical analysis on 1 Corinthians 2:1-5; 2 Corinthians 2:14-17; 4:1-5. He argued that the terms σώφροων and ἐξέστημεν refer to Paul’s rhetorical skills. North (cited in Hubbard, 1998:59) analysed the works of rhetorical theorists such as Dionysius, Demetrius, Maximus of Tyre, Aristides, Dio Chrysostom, and Philistratus, and came to the conclusion that the σώφροων style of orator referred to “moderation, good taste, and avoidance of excess”, while ἐξἰστηι is used by Aristotle to describe an orator who “wanders from his subject” (cited by Hubbard, 1998:60). Thus Hubbard (1998:58) building on the lexical work of North, stated that σώφροων refers to the “fitness and propriety in speech and action”. For him σώφροων refers to the quality of a good orator, while ἐξέστημεν refers to the absence of a good rhetoric skill. ἐξέστημεν is an action that “diverts the hearer’s attention from the main subject” (Cope cited in Hubbard, 1998:59).

Thus far we have seen that Paul, by using the seen/unseen motif, is thus nullifying the approach of his opponents and at the same time he is giving his converts the sort of data which would enable them to respond to those who judge a person by outer appearances (O'Connor, 1991:56). Since 1 Corinthians, Paul has been struggling with this young church and has tried repeatedly to map out for them a life that is compatible with life in the Spirit. In 1 Corinthians 3:1-14, the Corinthians were struggling with sins such as division, jealousy, and strife. Paul described their behavior as worldly, of the flesh, and that they lived according to the standard of men, i.e. they judged according to the common estimations of men (1 Corinthians. 9:8;15:32; Galatians 3:15; Romans 3:5 contrast with living according to God 2 Corinthians 7:9-10) (O'Connor, 1991:59).

Paul wanted the Corinthians to change their standards of judging not to be the same as everyone else's, but to be compatible with new life that is brought about by Christ dying on the cross. First he tells them in 2 Corinthians 5:15 that because Christ died for all, those who belong to him no longer live for themselves but for him who died for them. Secondly in 5:16a, the death of Christ brings about a new way of thinking; Ὥστε ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἴδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα[86]. Suffice it to say for now that κατὰ σάρκα is a world view that encapsulates taking pride in external prestige and appearance, not in internal realities of the heart (1 Cor 1:26, 29; 3:1-4; 2 Cor 1:12, 17; 5:12; 10:2-4; 11:18) (Turner, 1989:81). Thirdly the death of Christ brings about a new creation; the old criterion of judging is gone, the old value system is gone, the new has come (5:17). The full exegesis of these verses will be done shortly. By using the seen/unseen motif Paul wanted the Corinthians to change the criteria of their standards; in judging Paul, or anyone for that matter, they should not use worldly standards but God's standards. They should base their decision on what is eternal rather than what is temporary, on what is in the heart rather than on outer appearances. Paul hopes that if the Corinthians were to change their perspective by changing their criterion of judging him, then they will be able to be proud of him and his coworkers, and then they will be able to answer those who take pride in what is seen rather than what is in the heart (5:12).

[86] Later on in this paper, the meaning of "know according to the flesh" will be explained.

Thus far it has been argued that Paul, in defence of his ministry, uses a contrast between what is seen/unseen. By using the seen/unseen contrast Paul wishes to portray to the Corinthians what genuine apostolic ministry looks like, so that the Corinthians can respond and defend him from his opponents (who took pride in what was seen rather than what is in the heart). In verse 12 Paul said: “οὐ πάλιν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστάνομεν ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ ἀφορμὴν διδόντες ὑμῖν καυχήματος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα ἔχητε πρὸς τοὺς ἐν προσώπῳ καυχωμένους καὶ μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ”. Milinovich (2010:173) noted that if the Corinthians had boasted in Paul when the opponents first came, the situation would not have deteriorated to its present state. Thus, that Paul is giving the audience an opportunity to boast in him recalls that he hoped that they would boast in him (just as he boasts about them in 1:14. In 2 Corinthians 1:14 Paul said: καθὼς καὶ ἐπέγνωτε ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ μέρους, ὅτι καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμεν καθάπερ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ.). Some scholars think that 1:14 is the reason for Paul to write the present letter (Milinovich, 2010:173). If the audience cannot boast in Paul, i.e., if they cannot recognise that his suffering ministry has brought them the light of the knowledge of the glory of God and life in Christ, then their “faith” and his ministry are in vain.

### 5.5.2. The fear of the Lord

When the exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5:11-13 was begun it was noted that Paul’s defence revolves around two things that are interrelated: a contrast between what is seen/unseen, and the fear of the Lord. We saw that Paul, in his ministry, wants to please God because he knows that he is accountable to God in all that he does. This idea becomes evident when we look at 2 Corinthians 5:11a: Εἰδότες οὖν τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου (therefore knowing the fear of the Lord). οὖν connects verses 11 to 5:1-10, especially 10. Furnish (1984:322) noted that there is a “certain material connection between the idea of the divine judgment in 5:10 and the reference to *knowing the fear of the Lord* in 5:11”. This connection is made clear by the introductory participle οὖν, which functions as a resumptive participle (Furnish, 1984:322). Paul is carrying out his defence or persuasion in light of the prospect of God’s judgment in 2 Corinthians 5:10, something that the Corinthians seem to have forgotten about (hence from 4:16 to the

present section he has been using the seen/unseen motif). The prospect of appearing before Christ's judgment seat is a strong motivation for Paul. Paul will not be drawn into the self-commendation of his opponents (5:12; cf. 3:1-2; 10:12, 18; 12:19) [87]. Paul would only commend himself in light of what God has done for him through Christ, not based on outward appearance but inward integrity (4:2; 6:4; 12:11). Plummer (1915:168) said that the first δὲ in 5:11 expresses the antithesis that is "God knows all about us through and through, but we have to persuade men to believe in our sincerity".

However, scholars question the meaning of the phrase "Εἰδότες οὖν τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου" (therefore, knowing the fear of the Lord) in 5:11. How does Paul use the verb Εἰδότες? Is Paul saying: "therefore knowing about the fear of the Lord" or is it "therefore having experienced the fear of the Lord"? Thrall (2004:401) suggested that we should translate εἰδότες to have a sense of "knowing what the fear of Lord is". [88] This translation combines both cognitive knowledge about the fear of the Lord, and an experiential aspect of that fear. Thus the fear of the Lord becomes a strong influence on how Paul conducts himself and his ministry.

Paul wanted his audience to know that his motives are pure; they are based on the "reverential awe" of Christ. The fear of the Lord in Paul is a healthy attitude which promotes reliance on the Spirit of God rather than on one's rhetorical abilities (cf. 1 Cor. 2:4). In other scriptures he uses the phrase "in fear and trembling" (Phil. 2:12; 1 Cor. 2:3; 2 Cor. 7:15; Eph. 6:5) as the attitude that Christians are to live by in light of what Christ has done for them (Martin 1986:120). For Paul "the fear of the Lord" is an important aspect of how Christians are to live their lives of faith. The "knowledge of the fear of the Lord" for Paul is not just an intellectual knowledge, but it is a conviction that influences him in how he conducts himself and his ministry. Bultmann (1985:146) said that "τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου" refers to Paul's consciousness of the responsibility of his apostolic office. Paul's motivation in his ministry is out of the reverential awe or fear of the Lord. He wants to please God in all that he does.

[87] 2 Corinthians 10:18 is very telling "for it is not he who commends himself that is approved, but he whom the Lord commends" (NASB).

[88] Thrall (2002:401-402) supports her translation by investigating the use of "φόβος κυρίου" in the LXX, and concludes that in the LXX φόβος generally renders "fear felt". This idea is also evident in Furnish (1984:306-307).

Thus far it has been explained that Paul, in defence of his ministry, uses a seen/unseen motif in order to help the Corinthians understand that what counts in Christian ministry is what is in the heart, what is eternal and not outer appearances. This is a characteristic of the Christian life and thus should be that of the Corinthians as well. Since Paul's motives were also questioned by his opponents, the next section will set out Paul's explanation to the Corinthians of the theological reasons for his ministry. It is in this section that the centrality of reconciliation in Paul's argument will be discovered.

## 5.6. Theological reasons for reconciliation (2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2)

Paul's use of the *καταλλάσσειν* (reconciliation) terminology (in verses 18-21) falls between two sections that clearly deal with his self-defence (5:11-13, and 6:1-10). Lambrecht (1994:364) noted that there is still a hint of an apologetic tone in 5:14-21, but here Paul spoke in a more theological way, "he is not so much addressing the Corinthians as explaining his insights and manifesting his certainty". Paul provided the theological basis for his apologia in this section. He does this by placing his apostolic ministry within the redemptive plan of Christ. Paul wants his audience to know what really motivates him as their apostle, so that they can boast about him as he boasts about them (2 Cor. 1:14; 5:12). In 5:14-21 he gives the theological basis for that motivation. The first thing he tells them about is the controlling power of the love of Christ.

### 5.6.1. The love of Christ (5:14-15)

So far in 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 it has been seen that there are two strong motives for Paul's ministry: the first one is the fear of the Lord (5:11), the second one is the love of God demonstrated by Christ's death on the cross (5:14). This is clearly stated in verse 14 ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει[89] ἡμᾶς, κρίναντας τοῦτο ὅτι εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων

[89] There are eight different translations of this term according to BDAG: (1) to hold together; (2) to close by holding together; (3) to crowd/press hard; (4) to guard; (5) to cause distress by force of circumstances; (6) to occupy

ἀπέθανεν· ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον (For Christ's love compels us, because we are convinced that one died for all, and therefore all died (NIV)). It is worth noting that γὰρ at the beginning of this sentence connects verses 14 to the preceding verses of 11-13. The reason that Paul is persuading people about the gospel and his pure motives is that he is compelled by the love of Christ (ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει). Hence, Lambrecht (1994:364) called 14-21 a "reflection, mediation, and exposé" of Paul's theology. Paul is here giving credence to his apostleship. He wants the Corinthians to know that he is compelled or controlled by the love of Christ. Plummer (1915:178) paraphrased Paul's thoughts well by saying that Christ's love "restrains us from self-seeking", and "keeps me from selfish motives" (Harris, 2005:419, provided a similar analysis).

Most protestant scholars take ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ to be a subjective genitive emphasising the love of Christ for sinners rather than the objective genitive "love for Christ" (Turner, 1989:80). Wallace (1996:120) noted that here we can take the genitive to be both subject and objective. He said, "The love that comes from Christ produces our love for Christ - and this [whole package] constrains us". This seems to be in line with Paul's argument in this text. The subjective genitive produces the objective genitive: Christ's love for Paul enables Paul's love for Christ (Wallace, 1996:120). The love of Christ has huge implications for Paul and his co-workers: it was like a "compulsive force", "a dominating power that effectively eradicates choice" in the lives of Paul and his companions, leaving them with no option except to live for the one who died for them (Harris, 2005:419). This attitude of Paul's should serve as a basis for why the Corinthians should boast about Paul and his co-workers (cf. ἡμᾶς in 5:12, and 5:14)[90].

---

someone's attention intensely; (7) to provide an impulse for someone's activity; urge, impel; and (8) to hold so as to guide. English Bible translators (such as NIV,NAB,NKJV,RSV) and BDAG take 7 to be an appropriate translation of συνέχει. It is the love of Christ that gives Paul an impulse for his ministry and life. It is this love that impels him to live for others. The RSV, REB,KJV, NASB, ESV, on the other hand prefers 8 to be an appropriate translation of συνέχει. In this sense, Paul works within the parameters of the love of Christ. Thrall (2004:408), and Lambrecht (1994:377) prefer a much more negative translation (4) i.e., the love of Christ restrains Paul. Lambrecht cites Phil. 1:23 where Paul also uses συνέχω to mean "to hold into one's grip, to constrain". In this paper, it is held that both 4 and 7 are possible, the love of Christ impels Paul to act, to live for others while at the same time it acts as a restraint in his life. Paul refuses to commend himself, because he is restrained by the love of Christ.

[90] With γὰρ reflects on the love of Christ that he demonstrated by his death.

The implication of the love of Christ is that those who belong to him no longer live for themselves but for the one who died for them. κρίναντας τοῦτο ὅτι εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν· ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον (14b). Paul said that he concluded (κρίναντας[91]) that "one died for all, therefore all died". Martin (1986:129) noted that Paul, by using the phrase εἷς ὑπὲρ[92] πάντων ἀπέθανεν, is laying the foundation for his doctrine of reconciliation that he is going to expand upon in the following verses. "The bedrock of this conviction is Paul's evaluation of Jesus' death, its hope for Christians, as well as its call to service" (Martin, 1986:129). There is a debate amongst scholars about the meaning of εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν. Is Paul here referring to all of humanity, i.e. does Paul here have the Adam-Christ or First Adam-Second Adam antithesis in mind[93] (cf. Rom. 5:15-19)? Or is he referring to Christians who have received that gift of salvation, meaning that Christ's death was on behalf of all Christians? In this paper, the latter view is preferred because of the qualifying statement of verse 14d and 15b: "ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον… and ἵνα οἱ ζῶντες μηκέτι ἑαυτοῖς ζῶσιν ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι". It seems improbable that all of humanity is now living for the one who died for them. Thus, in this paper, "εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν" is believed to refer to Christ's death on behalf of and in the place of all Christians. This is what Paul wants the Corinthians to understand - that the death of Christ changes the way Christians live their lives. They no longer live for themselves; they live for the one who died for them (1 Corinthians 6:19-20). Paul wants the Corinthians to know that their bodies have been purchased at a price, they no longer belong to themselves, they belong to the one who died for them (in this sense they have died: ἄρα οἱ πάντες

[91] Hughes (1962:193) said that the aorist participle κρίναντας points to the judgement formed in the past, perhaps at or soon after his conversion on the Damascus road. Martin (1986:129), however, said that we should not let the aorist rule out any period of time for contemplation. It is possible that here Paul is also including a period of reflection between his conversion and missionary activity (cf. Gal. 1:17-18) (Martin (1986:129). The latter helps us to see that Paul after a period of time after his conversion, and after a time of contemplation, was still as convinced and guided by the love of Christ.

[92] This can denote either a representation (that is Christ death on our behalf-) or a substitute (in the place of-). In this paper, ὑπὲρ is seen to have a dual meaning here. When Christ died he was acting both on behalf of and in the place of all humanity (Harris, 2005:421 expands on this). Christ represented us by becoming our substitute.

[93] Turner (1989:81) says that the "The theological framework behind this is that the Adamic order, characterized since the Fall by selfishness and death, has been superseded by the order of the second Adam, characterized by selfless living for Christ". Similar views are shared by Lambrecht (1994:377) who says that: "Paul probably has in mind the Adam-Christ typology".

ἀπέθανον). ἀπέθανον is an aorist, meaning that when Christ died, all died, his death involved their death (Harris, 2005:421). ἀπέθανον here thus refers to the mystical union in the death of Christ (Rom.6:3-4). The two aorist εἷς… ἀπέθανον (one died) and πάντες ἀπέθανον (all died) both refer to a single event: the cross. When Christ died on the cross believers died with/in him. Hughes (1962:195) notes that for Paul the death of Christ has twofold significance for believers: firstly, Christ died for me (cf. Rom. 5:6), and secondly, I died with Christ (cf. Rom. 6:8). In verse 15 the idea of dying is contrasted to living. This is the great exchange that Paul is talking about here, Christ died for all, and those for whom he died now live for him. The death of Christ means then two things for Paul: 1) all died to sin and self; 2) those who enjoy life in Christ (οἱ ζῶντες), live for Christ (Harris, 2005:422). Milinovich (2010:181) said that the life and death contrast here "underscores the prevailing dichotomy of things seen/unseen (4:15-5:13)". 2 Corinthians 5:14-15 thus still has an apologetic edge to it. If the Corinthians understand the implications of Christ death properly then they will boast about Paul as he boasts about them (cf. 2 Cor. 1:14; 5:12). The death of Christ does not only change the state of our being (ontology) but it also changes our epistemology.

### 5.6.2. New way of knowing

5:16-17: "Ὥστε ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἴδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα·εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν. ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις· τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινά"[94]. In these verses Paul refers to knowing Jesus

[94] There are exegetical difficulties associated with these verses. In this footnote Wolff's paper "True apostolic knowledge of Christ: Exegetical reflections on 2 Corinthians 5:14ff" will be used in reviewing different scholars' positions. Wolff (1989: 81) noted that 2 Cor. 5:16 is probably one of the most difficult verses to exegete, for Paul here speaks of his earlier relationship to Christ. In 5:16 Paul said "so from now on we regard no one from a worldly point of view. Though we once regarded Christ in this way, we do so no longer". This verse has raised a number of questions among the scholars; did Paul know Jesus personally? Scholars disagreed about the answer to this question. Both Weiß and Feine answered this question with an emphatic 'yes', with Feine concluding thus: "I must insist that the words themselves [meaning 2 Cor. 5:16] allow of no other interpretation than that Paul had seen and known Jesus in person" (cited in Wolff, 1989: 82). Feine comes to this conclusion by combining 2 Cor. 5:16 with Acts 7:58; 22:3 and 26:4ff, and says that Paul spent time in Jerusalem during his schooling to be a Pharisee. Fiene noted that "his hatred of the first Christians was to be explained by the fact that 'already during Jesus' lifetime' he had 'been troubled by his behaviour and teaching' (cited in Wolff, 1989:82). Feine's conclusion is that Paul was present when Jesus was on trial and that Paul would have witnessed the crucifixion. Wolff correctly

Christ according to the flesh. Knowledge according to the flesh in this instance refers to knowing Christ as a Messianic imposter. After his conversion Paul came to realise that his views about Christ were false.

Christ's death and resurrection brings about a new way of living, and this new way of living is characterised by a new way of knowing (Gloer, 1989:398). Ὥστε tells us that there are consequences for living for the ones who died for us. Christians are to stop certain things that belonged to their former life. They do not judge, know or perceive anyone (οὐδένα οἴδαμεν[95]) according to the flesh κατὰ σάρκα, especially believers for all believers have died in Christ (verse 14). The identity of all believers is now bound up together in the death and the resurrection of Christ.

---

refutes this conclusion by Feine saying that nowhere does Paul ever mention that his hostility toward Jesus was aroused by his contact with Jesus (Wolff, 1989:82). In his letters, Paul only mentions that he was a persecutor of the church (1Corinthians 15:9; Gal.1:13,23 and Phil. 3:6). Surely if Paul hated Christ because of his message he would have mentioned this, especially to demonstrate God's grace in his conversion. "Had Paul known and rejected Jesus in person, then such a background would have been a far more impressive witness to the grace which the apostle had experienced; but of this Paul breathes not a word (Wolff, 1989:82)". Scholars such as C.F.G. Heinrici on the other hand have proposed that we should take verse 16 as a "hypothetical real or an unreal condition" (Wolff, 1989:82-83). The problem with this solution is that, if that were the case, Paul would have used the Greek optative word εἰ, or would have used an aorist indicative to express past unfulfilled conditions (Wolff, 1989:82).

The other question that needs to be raised about verse 16 is the identity of the 'we'. Who is the 'we' in 2 Corinthians 5:16? Windisch viewed the 'we' as the experience of certain prominent representatives that Paul includes himself in, even though it did not apply to him. Allo said that the 'we' refers to Paul's co-workers Barnabas, Silas and John Mark who would have known Jesus during his earthly ministry, But after Easter and Pentecost the importance of Jesus' earthly ministry diminished for them and now what was important was the redemptive work of Christ (Wolff, 1989:83). The problem with this is, why would Paul use a 'we' in a statement that does not apply to himself? Wolff says that this raises the question of the Jesus tradition and Paul's relation to it.

This can also be linked to the understanding of κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν (Christ according to the flesh). Wolff said that Bousset is the one who drew attention to the possibility that "Paul here is referring to an indirect knowledge of the earthly Jesus via the church and means that he too once set store by acquiring knowledge of the earthly Jesus through eyewitnesses' accounts. Now, however, he wants 'to know no more of him. It is enough for him to be sure that he is preaching his gospel as the exalted Lord would wish'" (Wolff, 1989:84). But is this really what Paul is saying here? Is he saying that he is not interested in the historical Jesus or is Paul perhaps referring to the knowledge of Christ that was prior to his conversion? That is, prior to his conversion Paul regarded Christ from a fleshly point of view, meaning that he saw Jesus as an Messianic imposter, whose death he viewed as a curse from God (Deut. 21:23). But now he no longer knew him that way (ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν), meaning that after his conversion Paul saw that his views of Jesus as being a Messianic imposter were false views. In this paper, this is viewed as the most plausible view, i.e. Paul is here referring to the time when he once thought of Jesus as a messianic imposter, but now he no longer regards him that way.

[95] Wolff, 1989:87 said that οἴδαμεν contains an element of judgment, understanding. This can be cross referenced with κρίναντας (judge) in verse 14.

"ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν[96]", Paul here in verse 16 said that from the decisive moment, when he saw Jesus during his Damascus road experience, he came to the realization that when Christ died and rose[97] from the dead, the situation of humanity was forever changed. It is generally agreed upon by scholars that ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν refers to Paul's Damascus road experience (Kim, 1997:369; Wolff, 1989:93; and Barrett, 1973:170). Kim (1997:369) noted that the turning-point in Paul came as a consequence (ὥστε) of his proper recognition of the eschatological saving event of Christ's death and resurrection (5:14ff). The consequence of the Damascus road experience resulted in Paul abandoning his prior knowledge of knowing Christ according to the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα), i.e. as a messianic imposter, to him recognising that Jesus is the messiah who died for the sins of the world.

Paul, after his Damascus road experience, came to recognise that there are now two ways of knowing. On the one hand, there is the old way of knowing - knowing "according to the flesh" (κατὰ σάρκα). On the other hand, there is knowing according to the Spirit (the latter is implicit in the statement). "To know according to the flesh" (κατὰ σάρκα) is to live without reference to God and his purposes; it is to make judgments that are purely based in secular manner" (Furnish, 1984:312). It is a way of knowing in which "one's estimates of others are based on purely human and especially self-regarding consideration" (Barrett, 1973:170). With Christ's death, however, there has come a radically new and different way of knowing. Gloer (1989:398) said that: "The epistemology of the flesh is [now] superseded by the epistemology of the Spirit. There is a transvaluation [sic] of values, and in particular, the turning upside down of the secular canons of wisdom and power" (citing Bruce). For Paul this new epistemology of the Spirit is best understood as an epistemology of the cross (Gloer, 1989:398). From the beginning Paul's message to the Corinthians had been "Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2), whose power is revealed in what the world considers weakness (1 Cor. 1:17-18, 23-24; 2 Cor. 13:4). This message is clear in his personal mantra:

[96] According to Barrett (1973:170) ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν does not refer to the time of writing the letter but "from the time at which he saw the One had died for all" (citing Denny).

[97] Hughes (1962:196) correctly pointed out that in the New Testament the death of Christ is always associated with his resurrection.

> "But whatever were gains to me I now consider loss for the sake of Christ. [8] What is more, I consider everything a loss because of the ***surpassing worth of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord***, for whose sake I have lost all things. I consider them garbage, that I may gain Christ [9] and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own that comes from the law, but that which is through faith in Christ – the righteousness that comes from God on the basis of faith. [10] ***I want to know Christ*** – yes, to know the power of his resurrection and participation in his sufferings, becoming like him in his death, [11] and so, somehow, attaining to the resurrection from the dead." (Phil. 3:7-11 NIV)

Verse 16 still forms part of Paul's overall apologia. He wants the Corinthians to know that there is now a new way of judging, where we do not use the old categories of the flesh. The old way of knowing according to the flesh is no longer acceptable. Paul uses a personal example and he says that he himself used to judge Christ from a human point of view or as Wolff (1989:87) calls it a "purely human, self-sufficient perspective". But Paul says that is in the past "ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν" (but from now on we no longer know him that way). Paul wanted the Corinthians to know that there is now a new way of seeing; a way of seeing that is not based on the outer appearance (προσώπῳ καυχωμένους /κατὰ σάρκα) but based on what the Lord Jesus Christ did when he died on the cross. Christ's death and resurrection thus does not only change Paul's state of being and knowledge, it also brings about a new creation. 5:17 says "ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις· τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινά". Believers are to no longer know Christ according to the flesh because there is something new that has happened; they are a new creation.

### 5.6.3. New creation

Scholars such as Harris (2005:431) and Beale (1994:219) noted that ὥστε ('so that' or 'so then') in verse 17 is the consequence of verses 14-16, i.e. the new creation is as a result of Christ's death and resurrection. This is the basis of Paul's appeal in verse 16, that he should not be judged using worldly standards which are not compatible with the new reality that has been brought by Christ's death and resurrection. Both Stuhlmacher

(cited in Beale, 1994:220) and Kim (1997:369) are right in saying that verse 16 primarily talks about Paul's conversion and apostolic call. But most scholars[98] agree that in verse 17 Paul alludes to Isaiah 43:18-19 and 65:17. Beale (1994: 221) has correctly stated that most commentators have noted the Isaianic allusion in verse 17, but they then have to make an attempt to "link this Old Testament background closely with the following discussion of reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5:18-21".

We will thus consider Beale's work in greater detail for two reasons: 1) it shows that Paul does not merely use Old Testaments words, but rather his teachings are rooted in it, and 2) the new creation as received by Paul is a fulfillment of the exilic promise made to Israel concerning the establishment of peace between Israel and Yahweh (Beale, 1994:225).

Beale (1994:220) first noted that the new creation in Christ still functions as an apologia for Paul, i.e. the Corinthians should evaluate all things by the spiritual standards of the new world. He also demonstrated that Paul in verse 17 draws from the language of Isaiah 43:18-19 and 65:17. He came to this conclusion by looking at the parallelism that exists between Isaiah 43:18-19; 65:17 and 2 Corinthians 5:17. He noted that both in Isaiah and 2 Corinthians 5:17 there is a contrast between τὰ ἀρχαῖα (the old things) and καινά (new) which is connected by ἰδοὺ (behold) combined with the creation vocabulary (Beale, 1994:220). He then considers the questions of whether Paul has in mind Isaiah while writing verse 17, in what manner is he developing the OT in verse 17, and how does verse 17 connect with the following verses 18-21.

The context of Isaiah 43 is that God promised that he will cause Israel to return from the exile and He will restore them back to the land. In Isaiah 43:18-19 God exhorts the Israelites not to dwell in their past sin where they experienced the wrath of God and God sent them to the exile, but rather to reflect on God's promises of restoration. The promise of restoration is more than just a return to the land, it also promises "renewed relationships with Yahweh as their creator, redeemer, saviour, and king (cf. Isaiah 43:1,3,7,10-11)" (Beale, 1994:222). In Isaiah 43:1, 14 and 6-7 the promise of Israel's

[98] Amongst the scholars who take this view are Beale (1994), Milinovich (2010), and Gignilliat (2007).

restoration is viewed as the imminent redemption and creation. Beale (1994:222) observed that the emphasis on Yahweh as the creator does not refer to the initial creation nor the exodus, but to the recreation of the nation of Israel after the exile. This is made clear by Isaiah 43:3-7. In fact Isaiah 43:2, 16-17 refers to the new creation as a second exodus. The idea of new creation is repeated again in Isaiah 65:17, and it is quite possible that this is included in Paul's allusion in 2 Corinthians 5:17 (Beale, 1994:222).

In Isaiah the exile is caused by the sin of the Israelites. Due to the sin of the nation God's wrath was aroused (Isaiah 51:20; 60:10). The exile was an expression of the anger of God (Isaiah 47:6; 51:17, 22; 54:8; 57:16-17). In response to their sins God rejected them (Isaiah 49:14; 54:6-7; 62:4). The consequence of this was separation between God and his people (Isaiah 59:2). However, God promised that he would wipe away their transgressions (Isaiah 43:25) and free them from the bondage of sin (Isaiah 42:6-9). God will do this through the sacrificial death of his servant who becomes a guilt offering for his people (Isaiah 53:4-12) (Beale, 1994:223). This period is viewed as the time of the Lord's favour, the time of salvation (Isaiah 49:8; 61:2), where the Lord's anger ceases and peace is re-established between God and his people (Isaiah 48:18; 52:7; 57:19). Beale (1994:223) said that the restoration of Israel and the new creation are to be viewed as being brought about through the payment of ransom (Isaiah 43:3ff.) and the forgiveness of sin (Isaiah 43:22 ff.). He went on to note that the vicarious suffering of the servant of Isaiah 53 probably has the same function (Beale, 1994:223). He also said that:

> "In light of the thematic overview of Isaiah 40-66 it is plausible to suggest that 'reconciliation' in Christ is Paul's way of explaining that Isaiah's promises of 'restoration' from the alienation of the exile have begun to be fulfilled by the atonement and forgiveness of sins in Christ. The believer's separation and alienation from God because of sin have been overcome through the divine grace expressed in Christ, who has restored the believer into a reconciled relationship of peace with God" (Beale, 1994:223).

For Paul this reconciliation results in a new lifestyle and identity. The Corinthians now ought not to live for themselves but for the one who died for them (2 Cor. 5:14-16), and

the criteria that they use to judge Paul should be compatible with their new lifestyle (2 Cor.5:16-21), not κατὰ σάρκα (2 Cor. 5:16), which is a characteristic of the old lifestyle. If the Corinthians insist on rejecting Paul as their true apostle, they will be rejecting God whom Paul represents as his servant. Paul's message of reconciliation is the message of God that has been entrusted to him (cf. 2 Cor. 5:20; 2:14-17; 3:6; 6:7; 10:8; 13:3).

Beale (1994:224) made the following observations about the implication of reconciliation: first there is a connection between the identity of the Corinthians as reconciled people and their behaviour. Secondly, Paul adds the imperative καταλλάγητε in verse 20 after he previously used the participle four times in its nominative form, which brings the Corinthians into this reconciliation; this is made clear by the use of ἡμᾶς, first person plural in verse 18 (Beale, 1994:224). Paul "alludes to Isaiah 43:18-19 and 65:17 in order to link this Isaianic promise with the work of Christ" (Beale, 1994:224).

Beale's thesis has been criticised by Gignilliat (2007:92). Gignilliat's contention with Beale's work is about the role of the Servant figure within the narrative of Isaiah. Gignilliat (2007:92) noted that even though "Paul does use "new creation" language in 5:17, the "new thing" about to be accomplished by Yahweh in Isaiah 40-55(66) centres on the dramatic development of the Servant figure within the narrative". Gignilliat's issue with Beale's is that even though Beale acknowledged the role of the Servant figure of Isaiah, this is not his major concern in his thesis. Rather, the "new creation" and the "return from exile" became his main concern. Gignilliat (2007:92) felt that this was not a proper reflection of what is happening in Isaiah. His second issue with Beale is his presentation of Isaiah being mostly concerned about the restoration of Israel, while presenting Paul as concerned about sinful humanity. Gignilliat (2007:92) felt that had Beale paid more attention to the role of the Servant in Isaiah, he would have seen that the Servant brings salvation for the nations (cf Isaiah 49:6), not only for Israel. With all this being said, Beale's work is still very important for the understanding of reconciliation. It places Paul's teachings on reconciliation within the overall fulfillment of God's promises to people. His work is also helpful in showing that the new creation and reconciliation are intrinsically linked, an idea that is fully developed in 5:18. The first

question that needs to be asked, however, is what was Paul hoping to achieve by alluding to Isaiah in verse 17?

Paul, by alluding to Isaiah, wants to impress upon the Corinthians that the "new creation" that God promised in Isaiah for the “new age” has been fulfilled by Christ's death and resurrection. “One of the characteristics of the new creation that was predicted by Isaiah was peace: between God and humanity, among people, and between different antagonistic groups” (Constantineanu, 2006:103). The eschatological peace will bring “harmony and a new set of relationships between alienated and divided groups”, such as the circumcision and uncircumcised of Gal. 6:15 (Barrett, 1973:174). Paul wanted to demonstrate for the Corinthians that they are part of the fulfillment of the Old Testament promises, that they have, through Christ's work, been restored and reconciled with God. Could it be that Paul wanted them to realise that being part of the “new creation” affects their lives and behavior, and that their reconciliation with God should also result in their being reconciled with Paul, since Paul is the Lord’s apostle? Beale thinks so, and said:

> “Paul's point in 2 Corinthians 5:14-21 is that if the Corinthians are truly partakers of the new creation and of a reconciled relationship with God (vv.14-19), then they should behave like reconciled people (v. 20). They have been acting like people alienated from God since they have questioned the divine authority of Paul’s apostleship. If this alienation between Paul and his readers continues, it will also be an alienation from God since Paul represents God’s authority…There is to be a connection between their identity as reconciled people and their behaviour as such people.” (Beale, 1994:223-224)

Constantineanu (2006:103) correctly observed that the whole of 2 Corinthians 6 develops further and elaborates exactly this understanding and significance of reconciliation in their everyday life.

### 5.6.4. God reconciling the world to himself (5:18-6:2)

In this section the uniqueness of the *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* terminologies will not be examined, nor will Paul's understanding of reconciliation, since this has already been covered in Chapter 3. What will be explored is Paul's use of the *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* terminologies in defence of his apostolic ministry.

2 Corinthians 5:18-21 is characterised by the repetition of key words. θεὸς appears five times, as does the καταλλάσσω terminology, while Χριστὸς appears four times. Lambrecht (1994:384) noted that some people could think that apology and polemics are no longer present here. The only reason that people could think this is if they take τὰ πάντα not to refer to the "new creation" of verse 17 or the whole context of 5:11-17.

Lambrecht is amongst those who take such a view. He said, "The phrase τὰ πάντα must not be understood in a cosmological sense and is not particularly connected with καινὴ κτίσις of v.17a" (Lambrecht, 1994:384-385). For Lambrecht (1994:385) there is a shift in verse 18-21 from the Christocentric statements of 5:14-17 to theocentric statements in verse 18a. He said that Paul in verse 18 introduces a new idea: ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ that is first introduced by the adversative δὲ. If Lambrecht paid attention to the allusions to Isaiah in verse 17 (as has been done above), he would have come to a different conclusion. In verse 17 it was seen that the phrases "new creation" and "new things" recall what God promised to the Israelites. The "new things" in Isaiah (40-55,66) that were about to be accomplished by Yahweh centres on the dramatic role of the Servant of Yahweh. The Servant of the Lord (who is Christ) accomplishes the work of Yahweh. Both Gignilliat (2007:100) and Constantineanu (2006:104) noted that if one reads the narrative of Isaiah 40-55 one soon discovers that the actions of Yahweh on behalf of his people are described as the actions of the Servant of Yahweh. Thus Lambrecht's claims about the shift from Christocentric to theocentric in 5:18-21 seems to bring a dichotomy that Paul may not have intended.

Furnish (1977:211) noted that the phrase τὰ πάντα in 5:18a is "Paul's own way of expressing the same thought: "All this [sc. All that is involved in the "new creation," vs.

17] is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself…"". Moreover, the conjunction δὲ connects verse 18 to verse 17. Gloer (1989:400) describes verses 18-21 as the "theological and practical implications of all" that Paul had said in verses 11-17.

τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ of verse 18 then refers to all that God has done for Paul and the Corinthians, and all of this is achieved through Christ (διὰ Χριστοῦ). It can thus be said that according to verse 18 the "new way of living" (of verse 14-15), "the new way of knowing" (verse 16), and "the new creation" (verse 17) are all as the result of God's reconciliatory work through Christ (Gloer, 1989:401; Furnish, 1984:335). In verse 18, Paul not only tells the Corinthians that reconciliation is initiated by God, he also tells them that he received his ministry of reconciliation from God. This verse still has an apologetic ring to it.

Furnish (1984:317) correctly noted that the phrase ""τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς" (the ministry of reconciliation) parallels what Paul said about the "ministry of the Spirit" (2 Corinthians 3:8) and "the ministry of righteousness" (3:9), which he had contrasted with "the ministry of death" (3:7) and "the ministry of condemnation"". By looking at it in this way, it can be seen that verse 18 is reminiscent of the seen/unseen and death/life motif that has already expounded upon from verse 11-17. Paul wanted the Corinthians to know that his ministry is in line with God's agenda. He wanted them to know that he is the genuine apostle of God; in verse 19 he said that God has committed to him and his fellow apostles the message of reconciliation (καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς). This becomes clear when the role of Christ is examined in reconciliation.

Reconciliation is central in all that has been done by God through Christ. Thus Constantineanu (2006:104) is correct in his comparison of the work of Christ in 2 Corinthians 5:20-21 with the work of the Servant in Isaiah 53:5-12, an idea that he garnered from Beale (1994). Constantineanu (2006:104) eloquently stated the similarities when he said:

> "The work of Christ in almost all its fundamental elements is described by Paul through the language and images of the Servant of Yahweh: the great suffering he had to endure, being despised, punished, wounded, crushed, and afflicted for others,

> and his sinless life, being made a sin offering." (Constantineanu, 2006:104)

Both in Isaiah 53 and in 2 Corinthians 5:18-21, the work of the Servant/Christ is seen as God's work (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ). In both texts it can be seen that it is God who initiates reconciliation on behalf of humanity; this reconciliation is, however, achieved through Christ. The following parallel structure of verses 18-19 demonstrates that God is the one who initiates reconciliation.

A) τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ **θεοῦ**
B) τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς **ἑαυτῷ** διὰ Χριστοῦ
C) καὶ **δόντος** ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς,
A') … **θεὸς**
B') ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων **ἑαυτῷ**…
C') καὶ **θέμενος** ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς

God's initiative in reconciling us to himself is not a uniquely Pauline idea, it can also be found in the Isaiah passages that speak about the Servant of the Lord[99]. This is especially clear when Isaiah 53:6,10 and 2 Corinthians 5:18 are examined. Isaiah 53:6b reads: "…the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all", and verse 10 reads, "Yet it was the Lord's will to crush him and cause him to suffer, and though the Lord makes his life an offering for sin..." The same idea is repeated by Paul, "τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλάξαντος" (2 Corinthians 5:18), and this reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5:21 is achieved through the atoning work of Christ. We read: τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν.

2 Corinthians 5:21 in particular is very reminiscent of Isaiah 53:6. In Isaiah and in 2 Corinthians 5:18-21, the Servant/Christ is presented as being passive, while God takes the central role. Verse 21 says, "God made him who knew no sin to be sin for us, so that we might become the righteousness of God". Verse 21 is difficult to understand, with Gignilliat (2007:104) having said that verse 21 is frankly "beyond our grasp to understand completely what Paul has in mind". The difficulty is in understanding how

[99] In Chapter 3 it was noted that in the Ancient Near East, people initiated reconciliation with the gods, and that within the Roman society reconciliation was mostly a relational term for peace treaties.

God made Christ to be sin. The witness of the New Testament[100] is that, even when Jesus was tempted, he was found to be without sin (Hebrews 4:15). In Hebrews 7:26 (NIV) he is described as "one who is holy, blameless, pure, set apart from sinners". In fact verse 21 says that Jesus knew no sin (ὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν). Belleville (1996:158) explained that γινωσκω "denotes a personal acquaintance with something". This view is also held by Harris (2005:450), who said that "behind the Greek verb γινώσκειν here lies the Hebrew word יָדַע having personal acquaintance or experience with". According to Harris (2005:450), it is normal in the classical Greek that when the verb "γινώσκειν was used and followed by ἁμαρτίαν as the direct object, it denotes personal participation". This seems to be in contradiction with the whole of the New Testament that speaks of Christ's sinlessness. In fact, in verse 21 Paul uses the phrase "τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν", which could be rendered "he who never knew sin" (TCNT). μὴ signifies ""not (ever)" = "never", while the aorist participle being timeless", to signify never at any point in Jesus' life was he ever sinful (Harris, 2005:450). Paul is thus in line with all of the New Testament that states that Jesus was sinless. How then is the phrase "ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν[101]" (God made him sin for us) to be understood?

There are three ways that scholars have interpreted this verse:

1) Jesus was treated like a sinner, i.e. he stood as our substitute. Barrett (1973:180) said that "Christ became *sin*, i.e. came to stand in that relation to God which normally is a result of sin, estranged from God and the object of his wrath".

2) Jesus was made sin through the incarnation; "God did by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Romans 8:3 NIV).

3) God made Jesus a sin offering. The latter draws from Isaiah 53:10, that God made the sinless Servant to be a sin offering (Belleville, 1996:159).

What is common in all three views is identification, i.e. "God caused Christ to be identified in some way with what was foreign to his experience, namely human sin"

[100] The other New Testament verses that speak of Christ's sinlessness are: John 7:18; 8:46; Acts 3:14; Hebrews 4:15; 7:26; 1 Peter 1:19; 2:22; 3:18; 1 John 3:5.

[101] Harris (2005:451), commenting about this phrase, said that "we penetrate to the center of the atonement and stand in awe before one of the most profound mysteries in the universe".

(Harris, 2005:451). In this paper, the last view is seen to be the correct interpretation of what Paul had in mind here, since in 2 Corinthians 5:17-6:2 he draws heavily from the language of Isaiah[102].

In light of God's initiative in our reconciliation, Harris (2005:451) noted that even though ἐποίησεν generally means "making something into something (else)", here ποιείν denotes causation or appointment. Thus the verse could be rendered, "God caused the sinless one *to be* sin". Just as in Isaiah 53:10 where our sins were laid on the sinless Servant so as to make many righteous (Isaiah 53:11), so in 2 Corinthians 5:21 Christ, the sinless Servant of God, was made sin so that we might become/receive the righteousness of God (Gignilliat, 2007:104). In verse 21 Paul speaks of double imputation, our sins imputed on Christ while Christ's righteousness was imputed on us.[103] Gignilliat (2007:101) has correctly observed that in both passages the

[102] Scholars such as Harris (2005:452) note that there are two Hebrew sacrificial terms, *hattā't* and *'āšām,* that could be translated as both sin and sin offering. Since Paul in this section extensively quotes Isaiah, it is highly probable that he uses ἁμαρτίαν referring both to both sin and sin offering (Harris, 2005:452). This seems to be in line with Isaiah 53 which speaks of Yahweh making his Servant a sin offering (ἐὰν δῶτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας (verse 10)), and Yahweh laying on him the iniquity of us all (κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν (verse 6)).

[103] Wright (1997:104-105) is against taking δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ to refer to Christ's righteousness imputed on us. He said: "I regard it as a firm conclusion that Paul's other uses of the phrase [δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ] treat θεοῦ as referring to a δικαιοσύνη that is God's own, rather than a δικαιοσύνη that he gives, reckons, imparts, or imputes to human beings" (Wright, 2002:200). Thus Wright prefers to take δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ to refer to God's own righteousness, God's covenantal faithfulness, rather than God's righteousness imputed to a sinner. Carson (2004:46-78) provided a well detailed argument on why δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ could be read as imputed righteousness. Harris (2005:455) also took δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ to refer to imputed righteousness. Dunn (1998:344) wanted scholars to take a much more neutral position in dealing with the righteousness of God, and for scholars to see how the righteousness of God fits within the covenantal faithfulness framework. He (1998:344) said: "The debate whether "the righteousness of God" was subjective or objective genitive, "an active of God" or "a gift bestowed by God", can too easily become another piece of either-or exegesis. For the dynamic of relationship simply refuses to conform to such analysis…The other dispute as already noted, was whether the verb *dikaioō* means "*make righteous"* or "*reckon as righteous.*" But once again the basic idea assumed by Paul was of a relationship in which God acts on behalf of his human partner, first in calling Israel into and then in sustaining Israel in its covenant with him. So once again the answer is not one or the other but both. The covenant God counts the covenant partner as still in partnership, despite the latter's continued failure" (Dunn, 1998:344). Dunn is right in highlighting the covenantal aspect of justification, i.e. God acts out of covenantal faithfulness in achieving for us justification. But the process does not end there; Christ's death on the cross grants us the righteousness of God. Amongst the scholars who follow Dunn's advice is Gignilliat (2007:104-105) who takes a much more neutral position. The problem with both Dunn and Wright is that they seem to merge both ethical righteousness and forensic righteousness. In 5:21 it is clear that forensic righteousness is in view. Jesus took upon himself the sins of the world but at the same time the text emphatically states that he knew no sin. Ladd (1993:487) eloquently stated that: "his "sinfulness" must then be forensic sinfulness by virtue of which he stood in the place of sinners, bearing their sin, their guilt, and the doom of their sin". He goes on to say that "in the same way those who are in him [Christ] have become the righteousness of God. Righteousness in this context is not an ethical subjective righteousness any

Servant/Christ is the agent through which Yahweh achieves his plans. But when does this exchange takes place? It took place at the cross; Paul's argument in verse 14-15, has been that Christ's death brought about a new reality for those who believe in him.[104] It was at the cross, where God μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν (verse 19), because our sins were laid or reckoned on him. Christ in his death dealt with the cause of separation between men and God; by his death he removed the stumbling block between God and men - sin. Christ on the cross assumed the full penalty of our sin, thus he became our substitute. Harris (2005:453) noted that on the cross Christ died a death that was under the divine wrath deserved by sinners. Thus God's justice

---

more than the "sinfulness" of Christ is ethical subjective sinfulness; it means rather that the individual in Christ now stands in the position of a righteous person and sustains a relationship with God that only the righteous can enjoy" (Ladd, 1993:487-488).

Wright (1997:101) provided a detailed list of the different interpretations of the genitival phrase δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ in a table format, the following table is taken from him:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **A. God's own righteousness** | **A1.** Righteousness as a moral quality ('of God' as a possessive genitive) | **A1a.** 'distributive justice' |
| | | **A1b.** 'covenant faithfulness' |
| | **A2.** Righteousness **as** God's salvation-creating power ('of God' as a subjective genitive) | **A2a.**acts of covenant faithfulness |
| | | **A2b.** non-covenantal world-defeating actions |
| **B. A 'Righteousness' given to humans** | **B1.** Righteousness as a righteous standing 'from God' ('of God' as a genitive of origin) | **B1a.** 'imputed righteousness' |
| | | **B1b.** 'imparted rigteousness' |
| | **B2.** Righteousness as a quality 'which comes before God' or 'avails with God' ('of God' as an objective genitive) | **B2a.** a natural quality recognized by God |
| | | **B2b.** a special gift from God, then recognized as such |

In this paper, along with scholars like Carson (2004), δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ is treated as a genitive of origin; it is God's own righteousness that he imputes on those who by faith have received Jesus Christ as the Lord's Messiah. This seems to be the best exegetical reading of verse 21. Other scholars who take δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ to be B1 (genitive of origin) are Milinovich (2010:196) who points out that Paul, by using the phrase τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ in verse 18, leaves us without a doubt that here in verse 21 he uses δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ as a genitive of origin. These sentiments are also shared by Matera (2003:144) who said, "The righteousness that God grants in Christ results in acquittal and justification for humanity… humanity stands in the condition of a God-given righteousness because Christ stood in the sinful condition before God".

[104] Harris (2005:452) pointed out that even though in verse 21 Christ's death is not mentioned, the διὰ Χριστοῦ of verse 18 and ἐν αὐτῷ (of verse 21) is clearly equivalent to ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν (of verses 14-15). This becomes even more evident when we look at Romans 5:10, which clearly speaks of our reconciliation through the death of the son of God (διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ [God]).

was satisfied in the death of his son so that those who believe in him did not have their sins counted against them.

"Becoming the righteousness of God" has huge consequences for the Corinthians. Milinovich (2010:195) noted that "ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ" recalls what Paul had already told the Corinthians in 5:16-17, that they are a new creation, they reflect the glory of God (3:18), they are being renewed daily, they belong to the glorious ministry of the Spirit which brings about righteousness (3:7-9), a ministry whose glory lasts for eternity (3:10-11). In 1 Corinthians 1:18-30 Paul made a comparison between the wisdom of this world and the cross. The wisdom of this world regards the cross to be foolishness, while for us it is the power of God for salvation. Christ became for us our wisdom from God (ἀπὸ θεοῦ which is reminiscent of ἐκ θεοῦ of 5:18), δικαιοσύνη (our righteousness) τε καὶ ἁγιασμὸς (sanctification) καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις (redemption) (1 Corinthians 1:30). Believers have received all of these things in Christ.

Paul's point in 2 Corinthians 5:18-6:2 is that it is through his ministry that believers come to participate in all of what Christ has done for them. He mentions this idea twice within a span of two verses. In 5:18-19 we read: "…καὶ [God] δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς… καὶ [God] θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς". This has huge consequences: just like the Servant of Yahweh in Isaiah who did not have any beauty to attract us to himself, so it seems to be the case with Paul's ministry[105]. Paul identifies his ministry as a fulfillment of the promises of Yahweh. This becomes clearer when we look at the link between 2 Corinthians 5:18-6:2 and Isaiah. In 2 Corinthians 6:2 we have a verbatim citation of Isaiah 49:8a.

"… Καιρῷ δεκτῷ ἐπήκουσά σου καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας ἐβοήθησά σοι· ἰδοὺ νῦν καιρὸς εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἰδοὺ νῦν ἡμέρα σωτηρίας" (At an acceptable time I have listened to you, and on a day of salvation I have helped you) (2 Cor. 6:2).

[105] In this paper, Beale's view (1994:230-231) that Paul saw himself as the Servant of Isaiah is opposed. However, it is agreed with Harris (2005:460) that Paul saw his ministry as the "continuation of the role of the Servant of Yahweh". It is clear in 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 that Christ is the real Servant who achieves reconciliation for us. Even though Paul's sufferings are reminiscent of the sufferings of the Servant of Isaiah, Paul saw himself as a δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Romans 1:1). Interestingly, he said this before he talked about his sufferings. Paul in 2 Corinthians 4:5 emphatically said that he does not proclaim himself, but Jesus Christ. It thus seems improbable that Paul would view himself as the Servant of Yahweh, while he saw himself as the servant of the Servant (Christ).

“…καιρῷ δεκτῷ ἐπήκουσά σου καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας ἐβοήθησά” (In time of favour I have answered you, on a day of salvation I have helped you) (Isaiah 49:8a).

What Paul is driving home by his use of the *καταλλάσσω* and *καταλλαγή* terminology is that the Corinthians are to live lives that are compatible with the new dispensation that has been achieved through the death and the resurrection of Christ. Paul wants the Corinthians to know that "the acceptable time" and the "day of salvation" have been fulfilled in the death and resurrection of Christ. If the Corinthians reject Paul as their apostle, then they are rejecting Christ whom Paul represents as an apostle, hence the plea in 6:1 where he said, “Συνεργοῦντες δὲ καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν μὴ εἰς κενὸν τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς.” Scholars such as Harris (2005:456-457) and Constantineanu (2006:107) noted that there is a verbal link between παρακαλοῦμεν (of 6:1) and παρακαλοῦντος (of 5:20). Constantineanu (2006:107) noted that even though in 6:1 Paul does not use the language of reconciliation, “Paul’s exhortation “not to receive the grace of God in vain”, especially his use of “grace”, refers most probably to “the ministry of reconciliation” (5:18) and “the message/word of reconciliation” (5:19).” God’s grace in 6:1 consists of humanity reconciled with God, but since God’s reconciliation in 2 Corinthians is presented within the context of a conflict, God’s grace also includes reconciliation with Paul (Lambrecht, 1994:520-521). Martin (1986:167) eloquently stated the relationship between God’s grace and reconciliation with Paul. He (1986:167) said, “God reconciled the world to himself and if his people believe this, then there should be reconciliation among them. If Paul’s gospel is true, then the Corinthians should receive him as well as his message”. This becomes clear when we look at the three statements that Paul makes in linking himself and the reconciliation of God. In 5:20 Paul describes himself and his co-workers as Christ’s πρεσβεύομεν. This, together with συνεργοῦντες in 6:1 and the extraordinary transition in 6:3, leads us to deduce that to reject Paul then constitutes receiving the grace of God in vain. Thus when Paul in 5:20 says “be reconciled to God”, Paul is not saying that the Corinthians are not saved, rather he is calling them to embody the grace of God, God’s reconciliation.

## 5.7. Paul's defence again: the reality of apostolic ministry (6:3-10)

We saw earlier at point 3 of this chapter that Lambrecht divided the structure of 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 as follows: Paul's defence (2 Corinthians 5:11-13); theological basis for reconciliation (2 Corinthians 5:14-21, which is adjusted slightly in this paper to be 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2); and self-defence again (2 Corinthians 6:1-10). This section 6:3-10 corresponds with 5:11-13, in that both deal with explicit reference to Paul's defence, while in 5:14-6:2 Paul is much more subtle about his defence. In the previous section, the content of Paul's message of reconciliation and the impact that it should have had on his relationship with the Corinthians were addressed. The section ended with the statement that if the Corinthians reject Paul as their apostle, then by implication they will be rejecting the one who sent Paul. In 6:3-10 Paul continues his apostolic defence.

Beale (1994:232) noted that "whereas in 6:2 Paul employs an Old Testament proof text to support his apostolic legitimacy, in 6:3-10 he offers the integrity of his lifestyle as additional support". Paul in 6:3-10 returns to the subject of his hardships, and his argument here is that his hardships validate his apostleship rather than discrediting it, as the Corinthians would have thought (Beale, 1994:232).

Scholars generally agree that 6:3-10 is a very well structured passage that is full of rhetorical prowess.[106] The structure of 6:3-10 can be set out as follows[107]:

1. 6:3-4a is an introduction to the "hardship catalogue".

2. From 6:4b-10 we have four stanzas of which the first, second, and fourth are roughly equal in length.

- The first stanza 6:4b-5 details a list of nine hardships that Paul endured with each introduced by ἐν + dative, and each in a plural.

[106] Scholars who shared this view are Thrall (1994:454-455), Barnett (1997:321), Harris (2005:464), Ashley (2006:253), Lambrecht (199:112-113), and Fitzgerald (1988:186).
[107] The following structure is an adaptation of the structures by Thrall (1994:454), Ashley (2006:254), Martin (1986:161), and Lambrecht (1999:112).

- The second stanza 6:6-7a deals with the list of eight virtues, character qualities, and the positive ways in which Paul carried out his ministry. All the virtues in the list are all also introduced by the ἐν phrase, but unlike the previous stanza the ἐν phrases are in the singular here. There is a shift to the characterization of Paul's ministry.

- The third stanza 6:7b-8a is completely different from the two previous ones. It contains three phrases that are introduced by διὰ + dative. Thrall (1994:454) observed that the διὰ phrases "formally mark off this section from what precedes and follows", and it refers to Paul's ministerial means and circumstances.

- The fourth and the last stanza 6:8b-10 contains a series of seven antitheses, all introduced by ὡς. It deals with further characteristics of Paul's ministry.

In this section of the paper, an exegesis of all the verses of 6:3-10[108] will not be done, rather the manner in which Paul's hardships enhances his teachings on reconciliation will be explored. In order to achieve this goal it will need to be demonstrated that 6:3-10 follows 5:11-6:2. This will be done by only looking at 6:3-4.

### 5.7.1. Introduction to the realities of ministry (6:3-4a)[109]

Scholars generally note that there is an abrupt and grammatical awkwardness that at first might render unnoticeable a thematic connection between 6:3-4a and the previous section[110]. Barnett (1997:321) has noted that 6:3-10 is closely related with the previous section, with God making his appeal through the ministry of Paul (5:18-6:3). He went on to note that διακονία of verse 3 and the θεοῦ διάκονοι of 6:4 picks up the δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς of 5:18 (Fitzgerald, 1988:185 also pointed to the same connection between 6:3-10 and 5:18-6:2). Chapter 6:3-10 therefore needs to be seen

[108] Ashley (2006:255-265) provided a well detailed exegesis of 2 Corinthians 6:3-10 with "hardship catalogue" as the background.
[109] Title of the heading taken from Ashley (2006:255).
[110] Amongst the scholars who notice this awkwardness are: Ashley (2006:255), Thrall (1994:455), and Barnett (1997:321). Scholars like Windisch (cited in Furnish, 1984:353) averred that 6:3-10 has been misplaced. Martin (1986:161) argued that Paul in 6:3-10 is using a pre-existing material.

as forming part of Paul's teachings on reconciliation, even though Paul does not use the καταλλάσσω terminology. The ministry that Paul does not want to be brought into disrepute (in verse 3) is the same as the ministry that was given to him by God in 5:18 (cf. 6:4a, ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι), the "ministry of reconciliation" (5:18) (διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς), which is the same as the "ministry of the Spirit" (3:8), the "ministry of righteousness" (3:9) (Ashley, 2006:255). Further, verse 3 "μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενὶ διδόντες προσκοπήν, ἵνα μὴ μωμηθῇ ἡ διακονία", complements what Paul said in 5:12, where he wanted the Corinthians to boast about him. Similarly, the mention of self-commendation in 6:4a seems to pick up on the rejection of pretentious boasting based on outer appearances of 5:12 (Furnish, 1984:354). Here Paul uses the "hardship catalogue" to point out that his great endurance underscores how his suffering validates that he is the true apostle of Christ, as compared to those who boasted in their outer appearance in 5:12. Barrett (1973:185) noted that Paul commended himself as the servant of God not by letters of commendation, not by self-praise, not by violence or ambition, but "by the purity of his motives and behavior, the sufferings he endures for the sake of others, and the wealth he is able to bring them through the gospel". Furnish (1984:354) said that 6:4b-10 is perhaps what Paul had in mind when he said that he wanted to give the Corinthians an opportunity to boast about him in 5:12.

### 5.7.2. 2 Corinthians 6:3-10 as a hardship catalogue

According to Ashley (2006:253) and Lambrecht (1999:113), 2 Corinthians 6:3-10 contains the second of the "hardship catalogues" in 2 Corinthians. There are four "hardship catalogues" in 2 Corinthians, these are found in 2 Corinthians in: 4:8-9; 6:3-10; 11:23b-29; and 12:10. In other Pauline letters they can be found at 1 Corinthians 4:10-13a; Philippians 4:12; Romans 8:35b, 38-39 (Lambrecht, 1999:113). Ashley (2006:253) stated that here in 6:3-10 we have the "highest concentration" of the hardship catalogue. "Hardship catalogues" was an established genre and is sometimes

referred to as "*peristalsenkataloge*[111]" (Lambrecht, 1999:113). The examples of this genre can be found in both Greek and Latin literature, as well as in the Hebrew Bible and later Jewish literature (Ashley, 2006:253). Kleinknecht (cited in Beale, 1994:232) proposed that 6:4-10 needs to be read against the backdrop of the "Jewish tradition of the suffering of the righteous (e.g. Slavonic Enoch 66:6; Test. Jos. 1 ff.; DSS; Pss. 118:139) as given its ultimate definition by the suffering of Jesus". Lambrecht (1999:113) also proposed that the Jewish apocalyptic literature was a background of Paul's "hardship catalogue" in 6:3-10. The reason he gave for his proposal was that both in the Jewish apocalyptic literature and in Paul we have a list of hardships and virtues at the same time. Lambrecht (1999:114) went on to say, "Moreover, they are characterized by an eschatological horizon that, through the Christ event, is also visible in the Pauline catalogues". Fitzgerald (1998:116) claimed that it is "the figure of the ideal sage and his sufferings that provides a backdrop for the analysis of Paul's Corinthians catalogue". Fitzgerald (1988:114-115) explained the use of the "hardship catalogue" as follows:

> "Since *peristaseis* constitute a test of human character, they have both a revelatory and a demonstrative function. The man with little or no integrity collapses under the weight of his burdens. His *peristaseis* reveal and prove his deficiencies as a person… His serene endurance of greatest possible calamities is the definitive proof of his virtue and serves to distinguish him from every charlatan who merely claims to be "wise"" (Fitzgerald, 1988:114-115).

Lambrecht (1999:113) provided a timely reminder in the comparison of Paul and the general use of the "hardship catalogue". It should be kept in mind that, as compared to the Stoic attaining their ideal by their own power, through "asceticism and persistent exercise", Paul by contrast is "completely cast down by hardship: both body and soul have a share in suffering" (Lambrecht, 1999:113). Paul makes it clear in 6:3-10 that he endured hardship not because of his own strength or endurance but because of the power of God that was at work in him. Thus Paul's endurance under hardship "was not a proof of his own virtue or self-sufficiency, rather it was a proof of his authenticity as an

[111] Scholars such as Fitzgerald (1988:33) and Ashley (2006:253) rewrite this term into English as "*peristalsis* Catalogue".

apostle chosen by God and approved by God" (Ashley, 2006:253). In 5:14 Paul stated that all have died since one died for all. Paul sees his sufferings as being connected with the death of Christ (Lambrecht, 1999:114). Paul was united with Christ, thus he viewed suffering as an integral part of his ministry, since Christ suffered as well. In light of his apostolic defence, Paul wants the Corinthians to be aware that his sufferings validate him as the true apostle of Christ.

## 5.8. Summary and conclusion

Paul's theology of reconciliation was given within the context of a conflict. The Corinthians had rejected Paul as their apostle. In 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:10 Paul is persuading his young congregants that he is the true apostle of God. What Paul is hoping to achieve in these verses is that the Corinthians will boast about him and come to his defence against those who have infiltrated the church. To persuade them of this, Paul first tells them that the criteria they are using to judge him is not compatible with the Christian life that has been achieved through the death and the resurrection of Christ. The Corinthians and Paul's opponents were focusing on the outer appearances in judging him. He wanted to help this church to understand the Christian criterion of judging ministry; this criterion is that God looks at what is in the heart, not the outer appearances, the flesh. The things that are seen are temporary, while the things that are unseen are eternal. Since Paul is apparent to God (5:11), he hoped that he was also apparent to the Corinthians. His lack of speech was for the benefit of the Corinthians (5:13), since it showed that their faith did not rest on the power of the wisdom of men, but rested on the power of God. The power of the gospel comes from God, not from external skills or the eloquence of the speaker (1 Corinthians 2:1-5).

The second thing that Paul tells the Corinthians is with regard to his motives. Paul tells them that he is motivated by the love of Christ in his ministry. In 5:14-15 he structured his argument using the antithetical properties of life and death. Paul wanted the Corinthians to know that life comes about because one died for all (5:14b, 15a). For this reason all have died (5:14c), and may no longer live for themselves (5:15b) but instead

live (5:15c) for the one who died for them and was raised (5:15d). Christ's love compels Paul in his ministry and, he argues, it should compel the lives of the Corinthians as well. He reminds them of what Christ's death achieved for them: it brings about a new epistemology, and the old way of knowing according to the flesh is now obsolete. The death and the resurrection of Christ also bring about a new creation, the old ways are gone and the new has come. This is the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies, especially those found in the book of Isaiah.

At the centre of Paul's apology is his teaching on reconciliation. Reconciliation is from God, but it is achieved through Christ. Christ, who knew no sin, was made to be sin for us, so that we might become the righteousness of God. It is through Christ's death and resurrection that God reconciles us to himself. Paul describes the benefits of reconciliation with God in a number of ways: we become a new creation, we live for Christ, we use different criteria to judge, and we become the righteousness of God. Paul's point in his teaching on reconciliation is that there is a connection between the identity of the Corinthians as reconciled people, and their behavior. If the Corinthians reject Paul as their apostle, they are in danger of receiving the grace of God in vain, since Paul is the ambassador of the Lord, through whom God makes his appeal.

In 6:3-10 Paul returns to the subject of his hardship. His argument here is that his hardship validates that he is the true servant of the Servant of the Lord. Paul wanted the Corinthians to know that he endured hardships, not because of his own strength but because of the power of God who was at work in his ministry.

## 5.9. Findings

In Chapters 1 and 2 of this research it was seen that scholarship disagreed about the place of reconciliation in Paul's overall theology: is it the centre or a marginal concept? What the exegesis in this research has revealed is that Paul's main concern was not to make reconciliation the centre of his theology. Paul did not write a systematic treatment of his theology of reconciliation, rather he employed his teachings on reconciliation to help him to turn around his relationship with the church at Corinth, and wanted them to

boast about him as he boasts about them. Therefore, Paul must have seen a clear link between reconciliation with God and reconciliation between people.

In 2.2.1 of this paper, it was noted that some scholars limit their exegesis of the text to the passages where the καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή and άποκαταλλάσσω terminology are used. The result has been that some scholars come to the conclusion that Paul's teaching on reconciliation refers only to reconciliation between God and men (the vertical approach), and never to reconciliation between people (the horizontal approach). This is very evident in scholars such as Domeris (1987:78) who claimed that καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή and άποκαταλλάσσω terminology are always used by Paul in a theological sense, i.e. reconciliation with God, and not reconciliation between two people. This is an unsatisfactory conclusion, especially as the exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5:11-6:2 reveals otherwise. Paul used the καταλλάσσω and καταλλαγή terminology in referring to God reconciled to us, but he did this with the hope that the Corinthians would see that rejecting him as their apostle is not compatible with the life of God's reconciled people. Thus we can say that reconciliation with God is intrinsically linked to how we relate to God's people. In the case of Paul, if the Corinthians reject him as their apostle, they would be rejecting reconciliation with God and they would have received their faith in vain, since Paul is the ambassador of the message of reconciliation.

Paul's encounter with Christ and his experience of reconciliation on the Damascus road changed the way he viewed people. It brought about a paradigm shift. He now no longer judged people according to the flesh, and he did not boast in outer appearances. Paul came to the realization that if anyone is in Christ there is a new creation, we no longer live for ourselves but for the one who died for us. Paul came to realize that reconciliation with God through Christ is the fulfillment of the grand vision of restoration and peace found in Isaiah (40-66). Flowing from this, Paul articulated his theology of reconciliation in order to bring about a change in the relationship between himself and the Corinthians. This change is rooted in what Christ did on the cross for us, where we were reconciled to God through his Son.

## Appendix A: A review of R.P. Martin's book[112]

Ralph P. Martin was formerly professor of New Testament and director of Graduate studies at Fuller Theological Seminary. He was also associate professor in biblical studies at the University of Sheffield.

Martin's book is aimed at "students in universities, theological colleges and seminaries, ministers in pastoral charge and informed lay people (Martin, 1981: preface)". The book is built upon the foundation of his two earlier essays in "The Expository Times" in 1979-80 (Martin, 1981:2). In the preface to this book Martin made it clear that his intention was to try to identify, isolate and discuss the single theme of reconciliation in its different uses by Paul and his followers. He searches for a *centrum Paulinum,* an "umbrella" idea to accommodate the leading aspects of Paul's theology, and he finds that *centrum* to be reconciliation. Martin sets out four criteria for the centre of Paul's theology. He first says: "any statement of the centre of Paul's theology should set the sovereign design of God in his initiative and grace at the heart of the matter (Martin, 1981:2)". Secondly, the centre should accommodate both the cosmic and the human predicament and its restoration by the cross of Christ. Thirdly, the centre should cater for the "historical 'is'-ness to ethical 'ought'-ness (Martin, 1981:2)". And finally, the centre should cater for Paul's conversion[113], his experience of grace.

The book is divided into four parts. The first part consists of three chapters, while the second part has four chapters. Parts III and IV each consist of one chapter.

### *Part I*

This part deals with the background to Paul's gospel (pages 9-67). In this section Martin first provides a brief overview of the background influences on Paul such as his Jewish

[112] Martin, R.P. 1981. Reconciliation: A study of Paul's Theology. London: Marshalll, Morgan & Scott.

[113] Martin highlights that Stendahl was against the use of this term 'conversion' and called it a misnomer since it implies ones dissatisfaction with his own religion and a switch of religion. Stendahl proposed that what happened with Paul was not a conversion but simply a "new vocation spelled out in terms of service to the Gentile (Martin, 1981:25)". Conversion is used here simply for readability. Martin prefers to call Paul's conversion a 'Damascus road experience'; see page 26 for Martin's critique of Stendahl.

heritage, Greco-Roman environment and Christian influences. In terms of the interpretation of Paul, he places an accent on the Conversion-Call as the motivational force in Paul's life as a Christian and his ministry as an apostle. He says that for Paul, by his own admission, "*an encounter with the risen Lord and a summons to his service*" were the motivational forces (Martin, 1981:24 italics his). It is clear from Paul in Philippians 3:4-10,12 that Paul talks about an event that changed him from a zealot who saw himself as legalistically righteous to someone who considered everything a loss compared to the surpassing greatness of knowing Christ. Martin then concludes this section by saying of Paul's encounter with the risen Lord, that "*out of it came directly his theology, fashioned and shaped as a reflective transcript of his own experience* as a person who had known at first hand the reconciling love and power of God in Jesus Christ (1981:31 italics his)".

Martin then went on to deal with the leading themes in Paul that have been suggested as the centre, such as justification, salvation, and communion with Christ. He comes to the conclusion that these have not "proved satisfactory since we really need a larger frame to encompass the apostle's diverse modes of expression" (1981:46). Moreover, he says that these leading themes fail to meet the criteria he first set up on page 2. He says that at least the theology of reconciliation meets three of those criteria: 1) the cosmic predicament, 2) the saving action of God in Christ and 3) Paul's own experience from his encounter with the risen Lord (Martin, 1981:46-47). In order to argue that reconciliation is the centre of Paul's theology, he proceeded, in chapter four, to look at the human predicament which serves as the background to Paul's teaching about reconciliation. He said, "The human condition falls into two areas: cosmic rebellion and human need (Martin, 1981:49)". In the subheading of cosmic disorder he looks at topics such as: God-man, Adam's fall, Satan, angels. He then deals with the second subheading - the human condition (where he looks at topics such as sin, flesh, the law and death). In the first subsection Martin looks at Paul's explanation regarding cosmic disruption, while in the second subsection he explains how man came to be held in the grip of the demonic forces and alienation of the world from God through the fall.

***Part II***

In the second part of the book Martin first dealt with Paul and the tradition. Here he dealt with scholars such as E Käsemann. In this section Martin concedes to Käsemann[114] that the terms for reconciliation, *katallassein* (to reconcile) and *hilaskesthai* (to expiate) are by no means major New Testament terms from the lexical point of frequency. He does however contest that the importance of reconciliation goes beyond the appearance of the *katallassein* and *hilaskesthai* terminology. Martin's argument for reconciliation as the centre of Paul's theology rather than justification is on the basis that reconciliation has an ethical aspect while justification lacks this. He said, "It is obvious from 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 that Paul can use reconciliation teaching *both* to state the kerygma *and* to issue the appeal, 'Be reconciled to God' (cf. 6:1) (Martin, 1981:76 italics his)". He also argues that soteriology is also included in reconciliation; the "ideas of man's enmity and God's provision of peace; man's bondage to the cosmos and his 'flesh' (*sarx*) and the divine offer of release and emancipation…" (Martin, 1981:80). He says all these can be "subsumed under the overarching rubric of 'reconciliation'". From here Martin goes on to do a careful exegesis of the key texts. He starts with what he calls "pre-Pauline materials". Here he interprets texts like Romans 3:24-26; 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 and Colossians 1:15-20. The conclusion that Martin reaches from this exegesis is that Paul's thinking operates within the realm of personal categories (1981:89). That is, God, out of love, acts through the mission of Jesus, who is Lord, to bring about a new relationship between himself and humanity (Martin, 1981:242). Reconciliation is brought about through the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus Christ's death. Martin says that Paul's exposition of reconciliation reveals the following:

i) God is the provider of the new relationship he freely offers…, ii) At great cost, epitomised in Christ's blood or death on the cross, God has moved to deal with a situation only he could resolve, the 'dilemma' is that reconciliation is not cheaply secured since God both 'justifies' (i.e. vindicates) himself and offers 'justification' (Rom.3:26) as a ground on which he extends the grace of reconciliation. iii) Human need is the dark canvas against which the divine love shines brightly. Reconciliation is

[114] Whose thesis is that justification is 'at the heart of Christian message' (Martin, 1981:76).

the concomitant of justification, but it is a larger term. It is 'peace with God' and a place not only in the new world now 'rectified' but in the new fellowship of the Spirit (Rom. 5:5); iv) Above all, reconciliation moves on the plane of personal relationships (Martin, 1981:151-152).

In point v Martin says justification and reconciliation are partners but yet they have distinct nuances. Justification has to do with the forensic-cultic idiom that limited soteriology to covenant-renewal for the Jewish nation, while "'*reconciliation' is the way Paul formulated his gospel in communicating it to the Gentiles* (Martin, 1981:153 italics his)".

***Part III***

In part III of the book Martin does a detailed exegesis of the letter to the Ephesians. Martin denies Pauline authorship[115] of the book of Ephesians and attributes the letter to a Pauline disciple. He says here we are "reading the work of a man who is both Pauline theologian and Pauline polemicist (Martin, 1981:194)". This, however, does not mean that part three is not valuable. Martin demonstrates well in this section how a multiracial church can live together in harmony. Martin highlights that the Gentile Christians are in danger of renouncing their Jewish heritage. Paul, however, in Ephesians shows that the Gentile Christians who enjoy salvation privileges can "never deny the Jewish heritage of the gospel without severing that gospel from its historical roots (Martin, 1981:166)". The positive contribution of this section is that the vertical dimension of reconciliation is connected to the horizontal dimension. Reconciliation is set up in the network of personal relationships. "The church, reconciled to God and to itself as a multiracial community, must show by its life and in the most practical terms the integrity and quality of its new life" says Martin (1981:196). Martin then goes on to highlight the ethical imperatives of reconciliation such as the interdependency within the body. Therefore in this section reconciliation is reinterpreted adding to it the ecclesiastical dimension.

[115] This approach to the book of Ephesians has been rejected by current evangelical scholarship, which has sufficiently demonstrated Pauline authorship of Ephesians. For a detailed argument for Pauline authorship of Ephesians see O'Brien's commentary to the Ephesians and other scholars such as Carson, Moo, Morris and Hoehner.

***Part IV***

In the fourth part of the book Martin deals with the question of reconciliation in Paul and in the teachings of Jesus. In this section he first summarises what he has developed concerning Paul's teachings about reconciliation. He then goes on to compare the teachings of Jesus and Paul. Even though he does not say that Paul received his teaching from Jesus, he maintains that there is continuity between the teachings of Jesus and those of Paul. He says the continuity is threefold: i) God's concern for the outcast and sinner, ii) the new beginning of salvation history, and iii) introduction of the filial awareness of being a member of God's family (Martin, 1981:223). Martin goes on to conclude the following: "Paul is expressing in fresh idiom what is implicit in Jesus' life and achievement (1981:223)".

Martin's book undoubtedly adds great insights into our understanding of Paul's theology of reconciliation, with scholars such as Kim (1997) building on his book by linking Paul's theology of reconciliation with his Damascus road experience. What Martin has shown is that reconciliation is a very powerful idea in Paul. There are, however, a few things that leave the reader uneasy.

With regards to what Martin calls pre-Pauline material[116], texts like Romans 3:24-26; 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 and Colossians 1:15-20. Martin uncritically takes on board the pre-Pauline tradition without first paying attention to the broader context of what was happening in the book. For example Paul's teaching on reconciliation in 2 Cor.5 is within a broader context of his apostolic apologia. Thrall, for example, in the commentary to 2 Corinthians has argued convincingly by laying evidences against the "pre-Pauline tradition" (1994:445-449). Even if Paul were quoting traditional material, that does not mean he did not adapt it and use it for his personal message, thus making it his own (Thrall, 1994:448). She then concludes: "the theory of Paul's quotation of tradition (in this case 2 Cor. 5:18-21) is by no means compelling and should probably be rejected (1994:449)".

[116] Giblin (1983:45) says the pre-Pauline text and the Deutero-Pauline texts enable the reader to perceive the profound unity in the development of the Christian biblical tradition. This paper however, is of the idea that these materials are in fact Pauline and more than anything they demonstrate Paul's consistence regarding his doctrine of reconciliation.

## Appendix B: Partition theories

The unity of 2 Corinthians has been hotly contested among scholars. The key issue here is whether 2 Corinthians, as handed down to us, is the same as the 2 Corinthians that Paul wrote. The debate varies from those who regard 2 Corinthians as a single letter (Hughes, 1962; Stephenson, 1965), to those who regard 2 Corinthians as a composite of several letters.[117] Scholars have noted a change in tone and the apparent changes of thought within the letter of 2 Corinthians. This causes some to argue that 2 Corinthians is a composite of different short letters that were written by Paul. The perceived breaks in thoughts are between 2 Corinthians 2: 13 and 2:14, between 6:13 and 6:14, between 7:1 and 7:2, between 7:4 and 7:5, between 7:16 and 8:1, between 8:24 and 9:1, and between 9:15 and 10:1. (Ashley, 2006:31 and Vegge, 2008:12). There are also what appear to be separate treatments of the collection in 2 Corinthians 8 and 9.The state of Paul's relationship with the Corinthian church and his expectation of his forthcoming visit to Corinth, which is alluded to throughout the letter, have compounded the problem of the unity of the letter.

All the partition theories, however, see 2 Corinthians 10-13 as distinct from the rest of the book (Vegge, 2008:12). What the following section of this paper will do is to outline the different theories.

### *1. The influence of Semler*

Semler[118] in 1776 was the first scholar to propose and develop the idea that 2 Corinthians was a composition of different letters written by the apostle Paul. His work is the foundational work for all the partition theories. Semler observed that the subject matter of chapter 8 and 9 was the same (the Jerusalem collection), and the differences

[117] Harris (2005:8-10) provided a detailed summary of various partition theories by different scholars such as: Halmel (1904) who identified 2 Corinthians to be a collection of three letters, and Weiss who identified four letters but omits 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1. Bornkamm, Georgi and Marxsen all identified four or more letters (cited in Harris, 2005:9-11). Schmithal on the other hand, "finds portions of 2 Corinthians in seven of thirteen pieces written by Paul to the Corinthians" (Harris, 2005:10).

[118] This paper could not access Semler's work and it is depended on the report by Thrall (2004), Taylor (1991), Ashley (2006), Peterson (1998) and Vegge (2008).

were simply phraseology (Thrall, 2004:3). The repetition of the same subject matter within the same letter led him to postulate that 2 Corinthians was comprised of various short letters that may have been sent by Paul to various towns in Achaia and were later combined into a single letter. Semler observed the apparent contradiction around the collection within the letter. In 2 Corinthians 8 and 9 Paul makes an appeal to the Corinthians to carry out the giving that they had pledged to give. Paul also sent Titus to collect the gift that the Corinthians had promised. Semler thinks it is improbable that Paul could in the same letter recall the accusation of economic exploitation of the Corinthians in 12:14-18 that were made against him and Titus, and yet still expect the Corinthians to give (Thrall, 2004:4). Thus Semler said that the accusations in 2 Corinthians 12:14-18 must, therefore, have arisen against the background of chapters 8 and 9 (Vegge, 2008:12). He concludes by saying that 2 Corinthians 10-13 must have been written after the reception of the collection that Paul wrote about in 2 Corinthians 8 and 9. He further said that Romans 16 belongs to that same letter (cited in Vegge, 2008:12). Semler thus proposed that 2 Corinthians is a collection of three letters in the following chronological order: 1) 2 Corinthians 1-8 with 13:11-13 (plus Romans 16) is the first letter, 2) 2 Corinthians 9 is the second letter, and 3) 2 Corinthians 10:1-13:10 is the last letter by Paul (Thrall, 2004:4 and Vegge, 2008:12). Selmer's influence regarding the composition of 2 Corinthians cannot be underestimated, for it has been a great influence from his time until the present, with many of scholars putting forward variations of his thesis.

### *2. The Hausrath- Kennedy Hypothesis[119]*

The person, however, who has brought the debate about the unity of 2 Corinthians to the forefront is Hausrath in his monograph titled, "*Der Vierkapitelbrief des Paulus an die Korinther"* in 1870 (Hausrath cited in Taylor, 1991:67 and Peterson, 1998:39). Both Hausrath and Kennedy (1900, cited in Vegge, 2008:13) agree with Semler that 2

[119] Thrall (1994:3-49), (Taylor, 1991:67-87), Furnish (1984:30-48), Sumney (1990:123-177), and especially Bieringer (1994: 73-80) provide well detailed layouts of the different positions given by various scholars in support of their arguments.

Corinthians 10-13 constituted a separate letter. They both independently claimed that 2 Corinthians 10-13 reflected an earlier stage of conflict between Paul and the Corinthians. As a result they proposed that 2 Corinthians 10-13 is earlier that 2 Corinthians 1-9 (Vegge, 2008:13). Placing 2 Corinthians 10-13 before 1-9 resulted in 2 Corinthians 10-13 being identified with the tearful letter of 2 Corinthians 2:2-4,9 and 7:8,12. Kennedy put forward his hypothesis saying, "The epistle referred to in 2 Cor. 2:4 as written ἐκ γὰρ πολλῆς θλίψεως καὶ συνοχῆς καρδίας was not our 1 Cor. but an epistle whose closing portion we possess in chapters 10-13 of 2 Cor" (quote by Welborn cited by Moon, 2004:8). According to Moon (2004:8) and Welborn (1995:138), Kennedy built his arguments by looking at the inferences from the internal evidences by doing a series of cross-referencing from 2 Corinthians 1-7 to 2 Corinthians 10-13. Of particular interest were three passages from 2 Corinthians 1-2 where Paul is clearly referring to 2 Corinthians 10-13. The argument[120] goes as follows:

1) In 2 Corinthians 13:10 Paul uses a harsh tone in a letter so that in his upcoming visit he will not punish the Corinthians. Kennedy believed that this is linked to 2 Corinthians 2:3, in which Paul says that his letter was intended to avert further discord between him and the Corinthians.
2) In 2 Corinthians 13:2 Paul is promising to visit the Corinthians while 2 Corinthians 1:23 tells us that he canceled the visit in order to spare the Corinthians.
3) In 2 Corinthians 10:6 Paul urges the Corinthians to be obedient, while according to 2 Corinthians 2:9 Paul wrote the painful letter to see if the Corinthians will be obedient in everything.

It is on these grounds that Kennedy argued for 2 Corinthians 10-13 to be identified as the painful letter (Moon, 2004:8). Among the scholars who support the Haurath-Kennedy hypothesis are Plummer (1915), Lake (1919), Strachan (1935), Filson (1953), Dodd (1953), Manson (1962), Hanson (1967), Peterson (1998), and Wan (2000).[121] Kennedy's work influenced C.H. Dodd's (1934) reconstruction of "the mind of Paul".

[120] This follows the argument of Moon (2004:8).
[121] All cited in Moon, 2004:9.

Scholars such as Drescher (cited in Welborn 1995:140) and most German scholarship have rejected the Haurath-Kennedy hypothesis on two grounds: 1) The "offence" committed against Paul, which Paul mentions in 2 Cor. 2:3-11; 7:8-12, is not even mentioned in chapters 10-13 (Furnish, 1984:37), 2) The actual content of chapters 10-13 is about Paul's defence of his apostleship against opponents from the outside, while according to 2 Corinthians 2 the problem was with an individual member who offended Paul. Thrall (2004:13-21), Peterson (1998:46-51), Watson (1984:324-346) and Furnish (1984:37) all provide arguments for and against the identification of 2 Corinthians 10-13 with the “tearful” letter. It is, however, safe to say that this view no longer enjoys much scholarly support; it is rejected by Furnish (1984:37), Bruce (1971:167) and Barrett (1973:13-14).

### *3. The two-letter hypothesis*

The two-letter hypothesis remains the most prominent position within the debate about the unity of 2 Corinthians. Among the scholars who hold to this view are Watson (1984) and Plummer (1915), with Watson being the major proponent of this view. He has been heavily criticised by O’Connor saying, “Watson’s arguments have once again failed to carry conviction” (cited in Ashley, 2006:32). The main reason for the argument for the two-letter hypothesis is largely dependent on the drastic change in tone[122] in 2 Corinthians 10:1 as evidence that chapters 1-9 and chapters 10-13 are two separate letters. Paul in 2 Corinthians 9:15 ended that section with his praising the Corinthians for being a blessing from God: “Thanks be to God for his indescribable gift!” In 2 Corinthians 10 from verse one, however, Paul brings up the issues between himself and the Corinthians. Scholars such as Semler think that this abrupt change in tone of chapters 10-12 will undermine the appeal of reconciliation and the request for the collection of chapters 8-9.

Other scholars such as Furnish (1984:32) have observed and come to the conclusion that 2 Corinthians is comprised of two letters since the first person plural dominates

[122] “The patent relief, unbridled joy, and gentle appeal (of chapters 1-9) are replaced by a scathing remonstrance, biting irony (or sarcasm), and impetuous self-defense in chapters 10-13” (Harris, 2005:29).

chapters 1-9 while the first person singular dominates chapters 10-13, and that this is not found anywhere else in Paul's letters. Harris (2005:33) has however objected to these claims. The reason that Harris is against the two-letter hypothesis is that its claim that 2 Corinthians 10-13 is dominated by the first person singular is not founded. There are thirty five uses of the finite verbs and pronouns in the first person plural that can be found in 2 Corinthians 10-13.

Still other scholars such as Barrett (1973:13) also highlighted what they perceived to be contradictions within the texts of 2 Corinthians 1-9 and 10-13, and why some might think that these texts do not belong in the same letter:

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 Cor. 13:5: Examine yourselves to see whether you are in the faith | 2 Cor. 1:24: …it is by faith you stand firm |
| 2 Cor. 12:20-21: it is by faith you stand firm… I will be grieved over many… | 2 Cor. 7:16: I am glad I can have complete confidence in you. |

For these scholars the debate is not only limited to the two letter hypothesis but also extends to the question of when these letters were written i.e. does the order of our letters represent the chronological order in which Paul wrote? There are two major hypotheses to the chronological order, these are: 2 Corinthians 1-9 precedes 10-13, and *2* Corinthians 1-9 succeeds 10-13.

### *a. 2 Corinthians 1-9 Preceding 10-13*

Scholars who view 2 Corinthians 1-9 as preceding and sent separately to 10-13 are Semler (1776), Krenkel (1895), Drescher (1897), Windisch (1924), Munck (1954), Batey (1965), Bruce (1971), Barret (1973), Furnish (1984), Martin (1986), and Best (1987).[123] Other scholars include Buck (1950), Thrall (1994) and Sampley (2000), according to Moon (2004:10). One of the latest scholars who have adopted this position is Ashley (2006). These scholars found the text conclusively suggesting that 2 Corinthians 1-9

[123] All cited in Peterson (1998:40).

precedes 10-13. The first argument that this hypothesis holds is that the change in tone and the seriousness of Paul's defence arguments in 2 Corinthians 10-13 (compared to that of 2 Corinthians 1-9) mean that there was a new outbreak of opposition to Paul's apostolic ministry authority. This resulted in Paul increasing his counter-attack using the strong language of 2 Corinthians 10-13 (Moon, 2004:10). The second argument is based on the remarks about Titus in 2 Corinthians 7:6-7,13-15; 8:6,16-24; 9:3-5; and 12:18 (Peterson, 1998:40).

There are three main claims of this argument concerning the visit of Titus, as noted by Peterson (1998:40-43). The first one is that the visit of Titus with two brothers in 2 Corinthians 8:16-24 is the same as that of Titus and a brother in 2 Corinthians 12:18. The discrepancies in the number of brothers that accompanied Titus could be explained by the simple fact that in 2 Corinthians 8:16-24 Paul makes a distinction between these two brothers. The one was famous among all the churches and was appointed by them (τὸν ἀδελφὸν οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, 2 Cor. 8:18) while the other brother is the one chosen by Paul and those with him because he proved himself to be trustworthy (συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν ὃν ἐδοκιμάσαμεν ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις σπουδαῖον ὄντα, verses 22). Furnish (1984:566) said that the reason that Paul only mentions one brother in 2 Corinthians 12:18 instead of the two is that the other brother (the famous brother of 2 Corinthians 8:18) was known to them and was not responsible for collecting the money. It was only Titus and the earnest brother of 2 Corinthians 8:22 who would have been responsible for the completion of the collection in Corinth. The claim is that since only one brother was an associate of Paul (in 2 Corinthians 8:22), it is he that is mentioned in 2 Corinthians 12:18. This has, however, been rejected as pure speculation because there are no clear indicators in 2 Corinthians 12 about the identity of the brother with Titus (Peterson, 1998:41). The only thing that the text says is that they conducted themselves in an exemplary manner. The more convincing argument for this view is the grammatical argument, i.e. the verb in 2 Corinthians 8:17, 18 and 22 (συνεπέμψαμεν) must be read as an epistolary aorist, i.e. "are sending which refers to the present action" (Furnish, 1984:38 and Peterson, 1998:40). On the other hand, the verb in 2 Corinthians 12:18

(συναπέστειλα) must be interpreted as a real aorist referring to the past event, i.e. “I sent” (Furnish, 1984:38).

The second argument for 2 Corinthians 1-9 preceding 10-13 is that the visit of Titus in 2 Corinthians 12:18 could not be the same as that of 2 Corinthians 7:6, 13-15 (Peterson, 1998:41). Two reasons are given for this. The first is an argument from silence, that is, in 2 Corinthians 7 there is no mention of Titus’ companions while they are mentioned in 2 Corinthians 12. The second reason relates to the nature of the visit. In 2 Corinthians 7 Paul sent Titus either to deliver the “Painful Letter” or check on its result (Peterson, 1998:42), while the subject matter of 2 Corinthians 12 deals with the collection matters. These scholars (those who hold to 2 Corinthians 1-9 preceding 10-13) argue that it is inconceivable that Paul, in the “Painful Letter”, would also raise monetary issues with the Corinthians.

The third argument for 2 Corinthians 1-9 preceding 10-13 is that the visit of 2 Corinthians 12 cannot be before that one of 2 Corinthians 7, since 2 Corinthians 7:14 refers to Titus’ first visit to Corinth (Peterson, 1998:41). This has, however, been well criticised by Peterson who points out that there is nothing in the text or the context that makes it conclusive that this was Titus’ first visit to the Corinthians. 2 Corinthians 8:10 says that “last year you [the Corinthians] were the first not only to give but also to have the desire to do so”. This comes after verse 6 where we were told that it is Titus who made a beginning among the Corinthians and Paul had asked him to complete it ( εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον ἵνα καθὼς προενήρξατο οὕτως καὶ ἐπιτελέσῃ εἰς ὑμᾶς καὶ τὴν χάριν ταύτην). Peterson (1998:42) correctly observed that there is indeed a verbal link between the visit made by Titus and the beginning of the collection a year earlier. It is thus not correct to conclude that it was going to be Titus’ first visit to the Corinthians in 2 Corinthians 7. It is therefore safe to conclude that the beginning of the giving made by Titus is the same as the beginning of the collection a year before the writing of 2 Corinthians 1-9 (Peterson, 1998:43).

### *b. 2 Corinthians 1-9 Subsequent to 10-13*

The scholars who hold to the view that 2 Corinthians 1-9 is a separate letter from 2 Corinthians 10-13, with 2 Corinthians 10-13 being written earlier than 2 Corinthians 1-9, are Hausrath (1870), Kennedy (1900), Plummer (1915), Lake (1927), Goguel (1926), Filson (1953), Hanson (1967), Watson (1984), Talbert (1987), and Taylor (1991).[124] Part of the argument for 2 Corinthians 1-9 as subsequent to 10-13 is the identification of 2 Corinthians 10-13 as the tearful letter. There are generally three main arguments for this position, namely 1) grammatical analysis, 2) the relationship between the collection efforts and the accusations of fraud against Paul, 3) 2 Corinthians 10-13 is reportedly looking forward to things that have already passed in 2 Corinthians 1-9 (Peterson, 1998:43).

The grammatical analysis is in many ways similar to argument three (i.e. 10-13 is looking forward to things that had already taken place in 1-9). Among the scholars who advocate for this view is Kennedy. Kennedy (1900) deduced that 2 Corinthians 10-13 is earlier than 2 Corinthians 1-9 based on the presence of the present tense γράφω in 2 Corinthians 13:10, which corresponds to γράφω in the aorist tense (ἔγραψα) in 2 Corinthians 2:4. He thus supposes the order to be 2 Corinthians 10-13 and then 2 Corinthians 1-9 (in Milinovich, 2010:12).

The second argument for this view is the relationship between the collection and the allegations of fraud. Furnish (1984:38) said that Paul is aware, as he writes 2 Corinthians 10-13, that some in Corinth suspect him of collecting money for the believers in Jerusalem under false pretenses (2 Cor. 12:14-18). This is compounded by the fact that there were rumours about deceit and fraud in 2 Corinthians 12:16-17. Furnish (1984:38) argued that in chapters 8 and 9, where Paul first mentions the collection, he seems to be "unaware of suspicions circulating about motives and aims". As a matter of fact Paul is confident about the collection. Thus Furnish concludes that this "kind of confidence about the collection is as inconceivable in a letter which postdates chap[ter]s 10-13". Those who hold to the view that 2 Corinthians 10-13 precedes 1-9 argue that 2 Corinthians 4:2 mentions the same suspicions of trickery that

[124] All cited in Peterson (1998:43).

are mentioned in 2 Corinthians 12:16 (Peterson, 1998:44), with Taylor (1991) arguing that 2 Corinthians 12 is likely to be earlier in mentioning the trickery. Ultimately, all of these are simply theories that are trying to reconstruct the text of 2 Corinthians.

The third argument is that 2 Corinthians 10-13 is looking forward to things that have passed in 1-9. Here Peterson (1998:45) and Barrett (1973:13) provided a helpful summary of passages, “in which the letter (2 Corinthians 1-9) is thought to refer, in different tone, to passages in the earlier (2 Corinthians 10-13)” (Barrett 1973:13). These are:

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 Cor. 10:2… that when I come I may not have to be as bold/confident (πεποιθήσει) as I expect to be toward some people… | 2 Cor. 8:22 …great confidence (πεποιθήσει) in you. |
| 2 Cor. 10:6 …be ready to punish every act of disobedience, once your obedience (ὑπακοή) is complete. | 2 Cor. 2:9 The reason I wrote you was to see if you would stand the test and be obedient (ὑπήκοοί) in everything.<br>2 Cor. 7:15 …his affection for you is all the greater when he remembers that you were all obedient (ὑπακοήν)… |
| 2 Cor.12:11 I have made a fool of myself, but you drove me to it. I ought to have been commended (συνίστασθαι) by you… | 2 Cor. 3:1 Are we beginning to commend (συνιστάνειν) ourselves again? Or do we need, like some people, letters of recommendation (συστατικῶν) to you or from you? |
| 2 Cor. 12:16 ... crafty (πανοῦργος) fellow that I am, I caught you by trickery | 2 Cor. 4:2 ...We did not use deception/ craftiness (πανουργίᾳ)… |
| 2 Cor. 12:17 Did I defraud/exploit (ἐπλεονέκτησα) you? | 2 Cor. 7:2 We defrauded/exploited (ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν) no one. |
| 2 Cor. 13:2 …If I come for another visit I will not spare (οὐ φείσομαι) | 2 Cor. 1:23 It was with the intention of sparing (φειδόμενος) you that I did not come again |
| 2 Cor. 13:10 This is why I write these things when I am absent, that when I come I may not have to be harsh in my use of authority | 2 Cor. 2:3 I wrote as I did so that when I came I should not be distressed by those who ought to make me rejoice... |

This argument seems convincing at first; there are indeed apparent connections between the forward view in 2 Corinthians 10-13 and a past view of the similar themes/events in 2 Corinthians 1-9 (Peterson, 1998:45). One of the problems with this

view is the lack of the same subject matter of 2 Corinthians 2 in 2 Corinthians 10-13. For example, the person who had offended and received punishment from the church in 2 Corinthians 2:5-8 is not mentioned in 2 Corinthians 10-13. Also 2 Corinthians 10-13 is dominated by false 'apostles' while this is absent in 2 Corinthians 2. The two-letter hypothesis is the simpler among the various partition theories; the more complicated is the multi-letter hypothesis.

### *4. The multi-letter hypothesis*

The multi-letter hypothesis is a variation of the two-letter hypothesis. The variation can also vary from simple to a much more complex one. The simple variation is that 2 Corinthians 8 and 9 are parallel accounts of two distinct letters[125], with 2 Corinthians 8 being a letter that was sent to Corinth and 2 Corinthians 9 the letter that was sent to Christians throughout Achaia (Milinovich, 2010:12). Thrall (2004:38) saw 2 Corinthians 8 as being part of 2 Corinthians 1-7. She, however, finds 2 Corinthians 9 to be an independent letter, and thinks that chapter 9 will be a most unlikely addition to chapters 10-13 (Thrall, 2004:42).

Another variation of the multi-letter hypothesis says that 2 Corinthians 2:14-6:13 is also a separate letter of reconciliation. Scholars such as Schmithals came to this conclusion after observing that there are rough transitions at 2 Corinthians 2:13 and 6:14 (cited in Milinovich, 2010:12). However, what complicates the matter even further is that some scholars argue that 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 also forms a separate letter, with saying that it is an interpolation[126], i.e. it is from a non-Pauline source[127] or a separate letter. Those who hold to 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 as an interpolation say that the vocabulary and the sudden change in argumentation are clear indicators that these verses are none-Pauline. Betz (1973:108) says, "The conclusion is unavoidable that the *theology* of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 is not only non-Pauline, but anti-Pauline". Betz has however been criticised

[125] Thrall (2004:36-43) presents arguments for and against this view.
[126] Harris (2005:14-25) presents arguments for and against this view.
[127] Among those who regard 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 as an interpolation are Bultmann (1985), Wastson (1993), Betz (1972), Bornkamm (1971), Grossouw (1951), Gnika (1968) and Fotzmyer (1974) (all cited in Furnish, 1984:380 and Ashley, 2006:33).

by Harris (2005:25-26) because he does not provide any ancient analogies to back up his findings. Harris goes on to conclude that, "Notwithstanding the *prima facie* non-Pauline features of the paragraph, its incontestable Pauline characteristics and the very presence of the paragraph in a genuine Pauline letter and in such an expected place suggest that it stems *in toto* from Paul's own hands" (Harris, 2005:25). There are, however, scholars[128] who argue that 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 is essentially Pauline in origin. These scholars point to the subject matter of 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 as lending itself to the context of the preceding chapters. Furnish observes that two explanations are normally given for this:

> "1) Paul must repeatedly warn the Corinthians about compromising with the world, and this seems to be a good place for that, since it is 'cushioned' by expressions of his love in [2 Corinthians] 6:11-13; [2 Corinthians] 7:2-4. 2) Paul interposes the admonitions here to warn his readers that his affection for them does not mean he will be tolerant of their consorting with those who would turn them to a different gospel" (Furnish, 1984:380).

Other scholars, such as Milinovich (2010) and Thrall (2004), have also pointed to the stylistic elements of 2 Corinthians 6:14-71 to be denoting Pauline fixtures such as his rhetorical question style "μὴ γἰνεσθε".

### *5. 2 Corinthians as a literary unit*

For as many scholars who argue for 2 Corinthians is a composite of different letters, one will find an equal number of scholars[129] who argue that 2 Corinthians is a literary unit. These scholars have pointed to several weaknesses in the partition hypotheses. The first is that the change in tone in 2 Corinthians 10 does not necessarily indicate a separate letter, and could be explained by a fact that Paul did not write 2 Corinthians in one sitting. It is perceivable that while Paul was writing the first section of the letter, new

[128] Among the scholars who argue for this view are: Héring (1969: 49-52); Allo (1959:189-193); Hughes (1962:241-244); Prümm, I (1967:379-381); Bruce (1971:213-216); de Boor (1978:157-163); Barrett (1973:192-203) (all cited in Furnish, 1984:380).

[129] Among the scholars who argue for 2 Corinthians as a single literary unit are Amador (2000:92-11), Barnett (1997:17-25), Hafemann (2000:31-33), Harris (2005:8-51), Hughes (1962:xxi-xxxv), Lambrecht (1999:7-9), Tasker (1958:23-35), Young and Ford (1987:28-36) and Witherington (1995:328-339) (all cited in Ashley, 2006:34).

information arrived about the state of the church in Corinth. Paul thus also dealt with the new information that he received, and hence we see different content in the same letter. Ashley (2006:34) also pointed to the fact that the themes that are evident in chapters 1-9 can also be seen in chapters 10-13. These are:

| Themes | 2 Corinthians 1-9 | 2 Corinthians 10-13 |
|---|---|---|
| Visiting/sparing | 2 Cor. 1:23 I call God as my witness that it was in order to **spare** you that **I did not return to Corinth.** | 2 Cor.13:2 ... I now repeat it while absent: On **my return I will not spare** those who sinned earlier or any of the others, |
| The obedience of the Corinthians | 2 Cor.2:9 | 2 Cor.10:6 |
| The issue of condemnation[130] | 2 Cor.3:1; 2 Cor.4:2; 2 Cor.5:12; 2 Cor.6:4 | 2 Cor.10:12;2 Cor.10:18; 2 Cor.12:11 |
| Satan blinding and masquerading | 2 Cor.4:4 | 2 Cor.11:4 |
| Those who proclaim the gospel for profit | 2 Cor.2:16-17 | 2 Cor.11:21 |
| Paul not taking advantage of anyone | 2 Cor.7:2 | 2 Cor.12:14-18 |
| The list of hardship | 2Cor.4:8-9; 2 Cor.6:4-10 | 2 Cor.11:22-29; 2 Cor.12:10 |
| The contrast between Paul who does not falsify the word of God and those who preach another gospel.[131] | 2 Cor. 4:2 | 2 Cor.11:4; 2 Cor. 12:16 |
| The issue of using human standards | 2 Cor.1:17 | 2 Cor.10:2-3 |
| The ministry of righteousness vs the ministry of Satan | 2 Cor. 3:9; 2 Cor. 4:1; 2 Cor.6:3,4 | 2 Cor. 11:15 |

[130] Barnett (1997:20) noted that vocabulary of "commend" does not appear in letters written by Paul prior to 2 Corinthians, but in this letter it is ubiquitous.

[131] Again here Paul used rare words which appear together such as "deception" and "distort": "ἐν πανουργίᾳ μηδὲ δολοῦντες" (2 Cor. 4:2) and these words reappear in a parallel though in 2 Cor. 12:16 as "crafty" and "trickery"; "ὑπάρχων πανοῦργος δόλῳ" (2 Cor. 12:16). It will thus seem odd to suggest that these parallels do not belong in the same letter and addressing the same audience.

This table demonstrates that 2 Corinthians 1-9 and 10-13 have similar themes which make it conceivable that they could belong in the same letter. Hence the assertion by advocates of a two-letter hypothesis that the vocabulary of 2 Corinthians 1-9 is different to that of 2 Corinthians 10-13 could be deemed to be unfounded. This paper is aware that this position has been attacked by scholars such as Furnish (1984:37), who said, "However, the basic thematic coherence of these two sections [2 Cor 1-9 and 10-13] is no guarantee of their literary unity. An underlying thematic coherence may also obtain in the case of two (or more) separate letters dispatched over a period of time, especially when they are addressed to the same congregation". It is possible, however, that the converse could also be true, that thematic coherence shows a probability that 2 Corinthians is a literary unit. This paper is of the view that this probability becomes even stronger when one considers the other arguments for the literary unity of 2 Corinthians.

The other argument of scholars who hold to the literary unity of 2 Corinthians is that 2 Corinthians 8 and 9 are not separate letters. These scholars say that as much as there seems to be parallels between these two chapters, chapter 9 does not repeat chapter 8 but rather it explains the theological significance of the collection and Titus's visit (Milinovich, 2010:13).

One of strongest arguments of treating 2 Corinthians as a single letter is the one offered by Lambrecht (1999:7-9). Lambrecht (1999:9) made the following statements in defence of the literary integrity of 2 Corinthians: 1) Nothing in the text or in the MSS traditions betrays the lack of integrity, 2) those who assume that the text is a post-Pauline composite are forced to explain how this letter came to be arranged and for what purpose. Lambrecht says that this is a difficult task that the hypotheses fail to deliver, and thinks it difficult at best, impossible at worst. 3) Modern interpreters may be inclined to require from Paul too much consistency. "After all, we are dealing with a letter, not a systematic exposé". Lambrecht (1999:9) goes on to say that the partition theorists do not know how long it took Paul to compose the letter. He goes on to accuse them of excluding a change in Paul's mood while writing the letter and also to not paying attention to the rhetorical strategy that Paul might have employed in his arguments in 2 Corinthians. Lambrecht (1999:9) made the following conclusion: "No break in the

narrative or argument, no change in vocabulary or tone appears to be so great that the parts could not have stood originally, one text to the other, in a single letter".

## Bibliography


Ackermann, D. M. 2004. Reconciliation: Restoring justice by De Gruchy, J.W. *Theology today*, 61 (1April): 100-102.

Aldrich, W.M. 1961. The objective nature of reconciliation. *Bibliotheca sacra*, 118 (469 January-March): 18-21.

Ashley, E. 2006. Paul's paradigm for ministry in 2 Corinthians: Christ's death and resurrection. Perth: Murdoch University. (Dissetation - PhD).

Barnett, A.E. 1941. Paul becomes a literary influence. Chicago: University of Chicago press.

Barnett, P. 1997. The second epistle to the Corinthians. Michigan: Eerdmans.

Barrett, C.K. 1973. The second epistle to the Corinthians. London: Hendrickson publishers.

Barrett, C.K. 1982. Essaya on Paul. London SPCK.

Barth, K. 1956. The doctrine of reconciliation part 1. In church dogmatics vol. iv. Edinburgh: T& T Clark.

Bassler, J.M. 1993. Paul's theology: whence and whether? (*In* Hay, D.M., *ed*. Pauline theology vol. II: 1 & 2 Corinthians. Minnepolis: Fortress press. p. 3-17).

Bassler, J.M., *ed*. 2002. Pauline theology volume I: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemone. Atlanta: SBL.

Bassler, J.M. 2010. Paul and his letters. (*In* Aune, D.E., *ed*. The blackwell companion to the New Testament. Oxford: Blackwell publishing. p. 373-397).

Beale, G. K. 1994. The Old Testament background of reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5-7 and its bearing on the literary problem of 2 Corinthians 6: 14-7: 1. (*In* Beale,

G. K., *ed*. The right doctrine from the wrong texts? Essays on the use of the Old Testament in the New. Grand Rapids: Baker. p. 217-245).

Beker, J. C. 1980. Paul the Apostle: The triumph of God in life and thought. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Beker, J. C. 1984. Paul the Apostle: The triumph of God in life and thought. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Beker, J.C. 1991. Recasting Pauline theology: the coherence-contingency scheme as interpretive model.(*In* Bassler, J.M., *ed*.Pauline theology vol. I: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon Minneapolis: Fortress. p.15-24).

Belleville, L.L. 1996. 2 Corinthians. Leicester: IVP.

Betz, H.D. 1973. 2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An anti-Pauline fragment? *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 92 (1):88-108.

Bieringer, R. 1994. Paul's understanding of diakonia in 2 Corinthians 5:18. (*In* Bieringer, R and Lambrecht, J., *eds*. Studies in 2 Corinthians. Leuven: UniversityPress.).

Bieringer, R. 1994. Reconciliation to God in light of 2 Corinthians 5:14-21. perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0007546/seminar/bieringer.doc (Date of access: 3 May 2012).

Bieringer, R. and Lambrecht, J. *eds*. 1994. Studies on 2 Corinthians. Leuven: Leuven university press.

Blomberg, C. 1989. The structure of 2 Corinthians 1-7. *Criswell Theological review,* 4(1): 3-20.

Boers, H. 1988. The foundations of Paul's thought: A methodological investigation—the problem of the coherent center of Paul's thought. *Studia theological*, 42(1): 55-68.

Boers, H. 2002. 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:2: A fragment of Pauline Christology. *Catholic biblical quarterly,* 64(3): 527-547.

Bonhoeffer, D. 1959. The cost of discipleship. Translated by Verlag, K. London: SCM press.

Breytenbach, C. 1986. Reconciliation - shifts in Christian soteriology. (*In* Forster, W.S., *ed*. Reconciliation and construction: Creative options for a rapidly changing South Africa Pretoria: Unisa. p. 3-16).

Breytenbach, C. 1990. On reconciliation: an exegetical response. *Journal of theology for South Africa*, 70: 64-68.

Breytenbach, C. 2009. The Septuagint version of Isaiah 53 and the early Christian formula "he was delivered for our trespasses*". Novum testamentum*, 51:339-351.

Bruce, F.F. 1971. Paul and Paulinism. *Vox Evangelica* 7: 5-16.

Büchsel, F. 1964. *ἀλλάσσω, Καταλλάσσω*. (*In* Kittle, G., *ed*. Theological dictionary of the New Testament. Translated by Bromily, G. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. P.255-260).

Bultmann, R. 1948 [1952]. Theology of the New Testament vol. 1. Translated by Grobel, K. London: SCM press.

Bultmann, R. 1955. Theology of the New Testament vol. 2. Translated by Grobel, K. London: SCM press.

Bultmann, R. 1985. The second letter to the Corinthians. Translated by Harrisville, R.A. Minneapolis: Augsburg publishing house.

Burdon, C.J. 1984. Paul and the crucified church. Expository times 95: 137-141.

Calvin, J. 1960[1561]. Institutes of the Christian religion vol.1, ed. McNeill, J.T. London: WJK.

Cape, D.B., Reeves, R., and Richards, E.R. 2007. Rediscovering Paul: An introduction to his world, letters and theology. Illinois: IVP.

Carson, D.A. & Moo, D.J. 1992. Introduction to the New Testament. Michigan: Zondervan.

Carson, D.A. 2004. The vindication of imputation: O fields of discourse and semantic field. (*In* Husbands, M & Treier, D.J., *eds*, Justification: What's at stake in the current debates. Illinois: IVP. p. 46-78).

Child, J. 1998. Restitution and Reconciliation. A paper presented at the synod of the Church of England in South Africa. Muizenberg: George Whitefield College.

Clement. 1885. 1 Clement. Translated by Hoole, C. http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/1clement-hoole.html Date of access: 14 October 2012.

Constantineanu, C. 2006. The social significance of reconciliation in Paul's theology, with particular reference to the Romanian context. Leeds: University of Leeds school of theology and religious studies and the Oxford centre for mission studies. (Dissertation – PhD).

Crafton, J.A. 1990. Paul's rhetorical vision and the purpose of Romans: Towards a new understanding. *Novum testamentumm*, XXXII (4): 317-339.

Danker, F.W. 1989. 2 Corinthians. Minneapolis: Augsburg publishing house.

Davis, J.A. Reconciliation: A study of Paul's theology by Martin, R.P. *Journal of the evangelical theological society*, 26 (2):227-228.

De Gruchy, J.W. 1986. The church and the struggle for South Africa. *Theology today*, 43 (2 July): 229-243.

De Gruchy, J.W. 1987. The struggle for justice and ministry of reconciliation. *Journal of theology for Southern Africa*, 62 (March): 43-52.

De Gruchy, J.W. 1997. The dialectic of reconciliation: Church and the transition to democracy in South Africa. (*In* Baum, G & Wells, H., *eds*. The reconciliation of peoples: challenge to the church. NY: Orbis books. p.16-29).

De Gruchy, J.W. 2002. Reconciliation: restoring justice. London: SCM Press.

Denney, J. 1917. The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation. London: Cunningham Lects.

deSilva, D.A. 1999. Hebrews 6:4-8: A socio-rhetorical investigation (part 1). *Tyndale bulletin*, 50 (1): 33-57.

deSilva, D.A. 1999. Hebrews 6:4-8: A socio-rhetorical investigation (part 2). *Tyndale bulletin*, 50 (2): 225-235.

Dionysius, C 1939. Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Roman Antiquities books iii-iv. Literally translated by Cary, E. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (Loeb Classical Library: 347).

Doyle, R.C. 2009. Reconciliation: Trinitarian reflection. Tanzania: St John's University.

Doyle, R.C. 2009. Reconciliation today: and the attributes of God in the light of God's reconciliation work. Tanzania: St John's University.

Chrysostom, D. 1946. Discourses 37-60. Literally translated by Crosby, H.L. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (Loeb Classical Library: 376).

Domeris, W.R. 1987. Biblical perspectives on reconciliation. *Journal of theology for Southern Africa*, 60: 77-80.

Donahoe, K.C. 2002. Boasting in the Lord: The ground of Paul's apostolic authority in 2 Cor 10:12-18. Massachusetts: Gordon-Conwell theological seminary (Dissertation - MA).

Donfried, K.P. 1983. Reconciliation: A study of Paul's theology by Martin, R.P. *Interpretation*, 37(1): 83-84.

Dukes, J.W. 1989. II Corinthians 5:11-7:16. *Theological educator*, 40: 96-112.

Duling, D. 2008. 2 Corinthians 11:22: Historical context, rhetoric, and ethnicity. *Hervormde teologiese studies*, 64 (2): 819-843.

Dunn, J.D.G. 1997. In quest of Paul's theology: retrospect and prospect. (*In* Johnson, E.E and Hay, D.M., *eds.* Pauline theology volume IV; looking back, pressing on. Atlanta: Scholars press. p. 95-115).

Dunn, J.D.G. 1998. The theology of Paul the apostle. Michigan: Eerdmans.

DuPont, J. 1952. La Reconciliation dans la theologie de saint Paul*. Estudios Biblicos*, 11:255-302.

Elliott, J.H., & Via, D.O., eds. 1993. What is social-scientific criticism? Minneapolis: Fortress. (New Testament series).

Fitzgerald, J.T. 1988. Cracks in an earthen vessel: An examination of the catalogues of hardships in the Corinthian correspondence. Atlanta: Scholars press.

Fitzgerald, J.T. 2001. Paul and Paradigm shifts: Reconciliation and its linkage group. (*In* Pedersen, T.E., *ed*. Paul beyond the Judaism/Hellenism divide. London: Westminster John Knox press. p. 241-260).

Fitzgerald, J.T. 2003. Paul and friendship. (*In* Sampley, J.P., *ed.* Paul in the Greco-Roman world. Harrisburg: Trinity press international. p. 319-343).

Fong, B.W. 1995. Addressing the issue of racial reconciliation according to the principles of Eph. 2:11-22. *Journal of the evangelical theological society*, 38 (4 December): 565-580.

Furnish, V.P. 1968. Theology and ethics in Paul. Nashville: Abingdon press.

Furnish, V.P. 1973. The love command in the New Testament. London: SCM press.

Furnish, V.P. 1977. The ministry of reconciliation. *Currents in theology and mission*, 4(4):204-218.

Furnish, V.P. 1984. II Corinthians. The anchor bible, vol. 32 A. NY: Doubleday.

Furnish, V.P. 1994. On putting Paul in his places. *Journal of biblical literature*, 113: 3-17.

Garland, D.E. 1999. 2 Corinthians: An exegetical and theological exposition of Holy Scripture. Tennessee: Broadman & Holman publishers.

Gaventa, B.R. 1983. Reconciliation: A study of Paul's theology by Martin, R.P. *Journal of biblical literature*, 102(3): 508-509.

Gaventa, B.R. 2002. The singularity of the gospel: A reading of Galatians. (*In* Bassler, J.M., *ed*. Pauline theology vol. 1:Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon. Atlanta: SBL. p. 147-159).

Gaventa, B.R. 2002b. Apostle and the church in 2 Corinthians. (*In* Hays. D.M., *ed*. Pauline theology vol.II: 1 & 2 Corinthians. Atlanta: SBL. p.182-199).

Georgi, D. 1986. The opponents of Paul in second Corinthians. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Giblin, S.J. 1983. Reconciliation: A study of Paul's theology by Martin, R.P. *Catholic biblical quarterly*, 45 (2 April): 313-314.

Gignilliat, M. 2007. Paul and Isaiah's servants: Paul's theological reading of Isaiah 40-66 in 2 Corinthians 5.14-6.10. London: T&T Clark.

Gillette, J.W. 1982. Reconciliation: A study of Paul's theology by Martin, R.P. *Trinity journal*, 3(1): 110-111.

Gloer, W.H. 1989. 2 Corinthians 5:14-21. *Review & expositor*, 89: 397-405.

Gloer, H.W. 1996. An exegetical and theological study of Paul's understanding of new creation and reconciliation in 2 Cor. 5:14-21. Lewiston: Mellen Biblical press.

Gowler, D.B. 1994. The development of Socio-rhetorical criticism. (*In* Robbins, V.K & Gowler, D.B., *eds*. New boundaries in old territory: Form and social rhetoric in Mark. NY: Peter Lang. p. 90-115).

Gowler, D.B. 2010. Socio-rhetorical interpretation: Textures of a text and its reception. *Journal for the study of the New Testament*, 33 (2):91-206.

Gunton, C.E. 2003. Introduction. (*In* Guntun. C.E., ed. The theology of reconciliation. London: T&T Clack. p. I-12).

Gunton, C.E. 2003. Towards the theology of reconciliation. (*In* Guntun. C.E., ed. The theology of reconciliation. London: T&T Clack. p. 167-173).

Guthrie, D. 1990. New Testament introduction. Leicester: Apollos.

Graybill, L.S. 2002. Truth and reconciliation in South Africa: miracle or model? London: Lynne Rienner publishers.

Hardimon, M. 1994. Hegel's social philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harris, M.J. 2005. The second epistle to the Corinthians. Michigan: Eerdmans.

Hartwing, P. B. 1997. The Trinity and the Christian life with attention to the issues of integration and orientation. UNISA. (Dissertation – MA).

Harvey, A.E. 1996. Renewal through suffering: a study 2 Corinthians. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Hay, D.M 1993. Pauline theology volume II: 1 and 2 Corinthians. Minnepolis: Fortress press.

Hays, R.B. 1996. The moral vision of the New Testament: community, cross, new creation - a contemporary introduction to New Testament ethic. New York: Harper Collins.

Hays, R.B. [1994] 2002. Crucified with Christ: A synthesis of the theology of 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Philemon, Philippians, and Galatians. (In Bassler, J.M., *ed*. Pauline theology Vol.1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemom. Atlanta: SBL. p. 227-246).

Hays, R.B. 2002. The faith of Jesus Christ: Narrative substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11. Michigan: Eerdmans.

Hoehner, H.W. 2002. Ephesians: An exegetical commentary. Michigan: Baker academic.

Hoffman, M.V. 2007. Socio-historical criticism exercise. http://www.gettysburgseminary.org/mhoffman/gospels07_x/exegtexts/SocioHistorical%20Criticism%20Exercise.doc Date of access: 11 April 2012.

Hofius, O. 1980. Gott hat unter uns aufgerichtet das wort von der versöhnung (2 Kor. 5: 19). *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde* ***der*** *älteren Kirche*, 7 (1-2): 3-20.

Hooker, M.D. 2008. On becoming the righteousness of God: Another look at 2 Cor.5:21. *Novum testamentum* 50: 358-375.

Horrell, D.G. 2006. An introduction to the study of Paul. London: T&T Clark.

Howe, F.R. 1982. Reconciliation: A study of Paul's theology by Martin, R.P. *Bibliotheca sacra*, 139 (October-December): 361-362.

Hubbard, M. 1998. Was Paul out of his mind? Re-reading 2 Corinthians 5:13. *Journal for the study of the New Testament*, 70: 39-64.

Hughes, P.E. 1962. The second epistle to the Corinthians. Michigan: Eerdmans.

Hughes, R.K. 2006. Preaching the word 2 Corinthians: Power in weakness. Illinois: Crossway books.

Hultgren, A.J. 2010. Paul as theologian: his vocation and its significance for his theology. *Word & world*, 30: 257-370.

Johnson, S.E. 1942. Forgiveness and reconciliation: A study in New Testament theology by Taylor, V. *Anglican theological review*, 24 (4): 366-367.

Josephus, 1934. Jewish antiquities: book vii-viii. Literally translated by Marcus, R. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (Loeb Classical Library: 281)

Kaiser, O. 1970. Reconciliation: Old Testament. (*In* Bauer, J. B., *ed*. Encyclopedia of biblical theology. vol. 2. London: Sheed and Ward. p.730-735).

Käsemann, E. 1969. New Testament questions of today, trans. Montague, W.J. London: SCM Press.

Käsemann, E. 1971. Some thoughts on the theme "The doctrine of reconciliation in the New Testament. (*In* Robinson, J.M., *ed.* Essays in honour of Rudolf Bultmann: the future of our religious past. Translated by Carlston, C.E. & Scharlemann, R.P. NY: Harper & Row. p. 49-64).

Keener, C.S. 2005. 1-2 Corinthians. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keener, C.S. 2009. The gospel of Matthew: A socio-rhetorical commentary. Michigan: Eerdmans.

Keller, T. 2009. Gospel theology. Paper presented at the London church planting consultation, 6 April 2009. file:///C:/Users/user/AppData/Local/Temp/Gospel_Theology.pdf Date of access 4 March 2013.

Kennedy, G.A. 1984. New Testament interpretation through rhetorical criticism. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina press.

Kennedy, G.A. 1999. Classical rhetoric and its Christian and secular tradition from ancient to modern times. North Carolina: University of the North Carolina Press.

Kim, S. 1997. 2 Cor.5:11-21 and the origin of Paul's concept of reconciliation. *Novum Testamentum,* 34: 360-384.

Kim, S. 1997. God reconciled his enemy to himself: the origin of Paul's concept of reconciliation. (*In* Longenecker, R.N., *ed*. The road from Damascus: the impact of Paul's conversion on his life, thought. Michigan: Eerdmans. p. 102-124).

Kraftchick, S.J. 2002. Seeking a more fluid model: a response to Jouette M. Bassler. (*In* Hay. D.M., *ed.* Pauline theology vol. II: 1 & 2 Corinthians. Atlanta: SBL. p.18-34).

Kraftchick, S.J. 2002. Death in us, life in you: the apostolic medium. (*In* Hay. D.M., *ed.* Pauline theology vol. II: 1 & 2 Corinthians. Atlanta: SBL. p.156-181).

Krog, A. 2000. Country of my skull: Guilt, sorrow, and the limits of forgiveness in the new South Africa. NY: Three rivers press.

Ladd, G.E. 1993. A theology of the New Testament (revised edition). Michigan: Eerdmans.

Lambrecht, J. 1994. Reconcile yourselves…: A reading of 2 Corinthians 5, 11-21. *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*, 85 (1): 363-393.

Lambrecht, J. 1999. Second Corinthians. Minnesota: Liturgical press.

Lane, W.L. 1982. Covenant: the key to Paul's conflict with Corinthian. *Tyndale bulletin*, 33:3-29.

Longenecker, B. W. 2002. Narrative interest in the study of Paul; retrospective and prospective. (*In* Longenecker, B.W., *ed.* Narrative dynamics in Paul: A critical assessment. London: Westminster John Knox Press. p. 3-16).

Longernecker, B.W. 2002. The narrative approach to Paul: an early retrospective. *Currents in biblical research*, 1(1): 88-111.

Maclean, I.S. 2004. Reconciliation: Restoring justice by De Gruchy, J.W. *Political theology,* 5 (4): 502-504.

Marshall H.I. 1978. The meaning of Reconciliation in unity and diversity of the New Testament theology ed. Guelich. Michigan: Eerdmans.

Marshall, P. 1987. Enmity in Corinth: social conventions in Paul's relations with the Corinthians. Tübingen: Mohr.

Martin, R.P. 1981. Reconciliation: A study of Paul's Theology. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.

Martin, R.P. 1986. 2 Corinthians. Waco: Word books.

Martyn, W. 1997. Theological issues in the letters of Paul. NY: T&T Clack.

Matera, F.J. 2003. II Corinthians: a commentary. London: Westminster John Knox press.

Mead, R.T. 1989. Exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5:14-21. (*In* Lews, J.P., *ed*. Interpreting 2 Corinthians 5:14-21: An exercise in hermeneutics. Lewiston: Mellen. p. 58-80).

Meeks, W.A. 1983. The first urbarn Christians: The social world of the apostle Paul. London: Yale university press.

Milinovich, T.M. 2010. Paul's ministry and God's new creation: An audience-oriented study of 2 Corinthians 5:16-6:2. Washington: Catholic university of America. (Dissertation – PhD).

Moon, J.H. 2004. Paul's discourse for the Corinthians' edification: A socio-rhetorical interpretation of 2 Corinthians 10-13. Stellenbosh: University of Stellenbosh. (Dissertation – PhD).

Morris, L. 1983. The atonement. Leicester: IVP.

Mosala, I.J. 1987. The meaning of reconciliation: A black perspective. *Journal of theology for Southern Africa*, 59: 19-25.

Murray, J. 1955. Redemption: Accomplished and applied. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Murray, J. 1966. The reconciliation. *Westminster theological journal*, 29 (1): 1-23.

Noble, J.S. 2006. Christ and Conflict: Towards a theology of reconciliation with reference to Northern Ireland. University of St Andrews. (Dissertation – MA).

O'Brien, P.T. 1999. The letter to the Ephesians. Michigan: Eerdmans.

O'Connor, J.M. 1983. St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and archaeology. Minnesota: The liturgical press.

O'Connor, J.M. 1991. The theology of the second letter to the Corinthians. NY: Cambridge university press.

O'Connor, J.M. 1995. Paul the letter-writer: his world, his options, his skills. Minnesota: The liturgical press.

Osborne, G. 2006. The hermeneutical spiral. Illinois: IVP.

Owen, J. 1989. The death of death in the death of Christ. Edinburgh: The banner of truth trust.

Pesch, R. 1970. Reconciliation: New Testament. (*In* Bauer, J. B., *ed*. Encyclopaedia of biblical theology vol. 2. London: Sheed and Ward. p. 375-378).

Peterson, B.K. 1998. Eloquence and the proclamation of the gospel in Corinth. Atlanta: Scholars press.

Philo, 1929. Philo: vol. ii. Literally translated by Colson, F.H and Whitaker. Cambridge: Harvard University press. (Loeb Classical Library: 227).

Philo, 1935. Philo: vol. v. Literally translated by Colson, F.H and Whitaker. Cambridge: Harvard University press .

Philo, 1935. Philo vol. vi translated by Colson, F.H in LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University press. (Loeb Classical Library).

Piper, J. 2007. The future of justification: a response to N.T. Wright. Illinois: Crossway books.

Plato, 1925. Plato in Twelve Volumes: Vol. 9. Literally translated by Fowler, H.N. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (Loeb Classical Library)

Plummer, A. 1915. A critical and exegetical commentary on the second epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. Edinburgh: T&T Clack.

Porter, S.E. 1994. *Καταλλάσσω* in the ancient Greek literature, with reference to the Pauline writings. Cordaba: Ediciones El Almendo.

Porter, S.E. 1996. Understanding Pauline studies. An assessment of recent research: part one. *Themelios*, 22 (1): 14-25.

Porter, S.E. 2005. Introduction to the study of Paul's opponents. (*In* Porter, S.E., *ed*. Paul and his opponents. Boston: Brill. p. 1-6).

Porter, S.E. 2006. Is there a center to Paul's Theology? An introduction to the study of Paul and his theology. (*In* Porter, S.E., *ed*. Paul and his theology. Boston: Brill. p. 1-20).

Porter, S.E. 2006. Paul's concept of reconciliation, twice more. (*In* Porter, S.E., *ed*. Paul and his theology. Boston: Brill. p. 131-152).

ReconciliACTION network. http://reconciliaction.org.au/nsw/education-kit/what-is-reconciliation/ Date of access: 4 August 2012.

Robbins, V. K. 1984. Jesus the teacher: A socio-rhetorical interpretation of Mark. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Robbins, V.K. 1991. Text and context in recent studies of the gospel of Mark. *Religious studies review*, 17: 16-23.

Robbins, V.K. 1992. Jesus the teacher: A socio-rhetorical interpretation of Mark. Reprinted paperback with new introduction and additional indexes. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Robbins, V.K. 1993. Rhetoric and culture: Exploring types of cultural rhetoric in a text. (*In* Porter, S E & Olbricht, T H., *eds*. Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg conference.Sheffield: Sheffield Academic. p. 447-467).

Robbins, V.K. 1996. The tapestry of early Christian discourse: Rhetoric, society, and ideology. London: Routledge.

Robbins, V.K. 1996. Exploring the texture of texts: A guide to socio-rhetorical interpretation. Valley Forge: Trinity International.

Robbins, V.K. 1996. The dialectical nature of early Christian discourse. *Scriptura*, 59: 353-362.

Robbins, V.K. 2004. Beginnings and developments in socio-rhetorical interpretation. Atlanta: Emory university.

Robbins, V.K. 2010. Socio-rhetorical interpretation. (*In* Aune, D.E., *ed*. The Blackwell companion to the New Testament. Oxford: Blackwell publishing. p.192-219).

Robbins, V.K. 2012. What's in the word: Rethinking the socio-rhetorical character of the New Testament by Witherington, B. III. RBL: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/8066_8821.pdf Date of access: 28 Febuary 2013.

Sampley, J.P. 2002. From text to thought world: The route to Paul's ways. (*In* Bassler, J. M., *ed*. Pauline theology vol.i: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon. Atlanta: SBL. p. 3-14).

Sanders, E.P. 1977. Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A comparison of patterns of religion. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Schmeller, T. 2013. No bridge over troubled water? The gap between 2 Corinthians 1-9 and 10-13 revisited. *Journal for the study of the New Testament*, 36 (1): 73-84.

Schweitzer, A. 1968. The mysticism of Paul the apostle. Literally translated by Montgomery, W.J. NY: Seabury.

Schwöbel, C. 2003. Reconciliation: from Biblical observations to dogmatic reconstruction. *(In* Gunton. C.E., ed. The theology of reconciliation. London: T&T Clack. p. 13-38).

Scroggs, R. 2002. Salvation history: the theological structure of Paul's thought (1 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Galatians). (*In* Bassler, J.M., *ed*. Pauline theology volume I: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon . Atlanta: SBL. p. 212-226).

Shultz, G.L. 2010. The reconciliation of all things in Christ. *Bibliotheca sacra*, 167 (October-December): 442-459.

Spiedell, T. S. 1987. The Incarnation as the hermeneutical criterion for liberation and reconciliation. *Scottish journal of theology*, 40(2): 249-258.

Stanley, C. D. 1996. Neither Jew nor Greek: Ethnic Conflict in Graeco-Roman Society. *Journal for the study of the New Testament*, 64: 101-24.

Stephenson, A.M.G. 1965. A defence of the integrity of 2 Corinthians. (*In* Aland, K., *ed.* The authorship and the integrity of the New Testament. London: SPCK. p.96-110).

Stowers, S.K. 2002. Friends and enemies in the politics of heaven: reading theology in Philippians. (*In* Bassler, J.M., *ed*. Pauline theology volume I: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon. Atlanta: SBL. p. 105-122).

Sumney, J.L. 1990. Identifying Paul's opponents: The question of method in 2 Corinthians. Sheffield: JSOT press.

Sumney, J.L. 2005. Studying Paul's opponents: advances and challenges. (*In* Porter, S.E., *ed*. Paul and his opponents. Boston: Brill. p. 131-152).

Taylor, N.H. 1991. The composition and chronology of second Corinthians. *Journal for the study of the New Testament*, 44:67-87.

Taylor, N.H. 2005. Apostolic identity and the conflicts in Corinth and Galatia. (*In* Porter, S.E., *ed*. Paul and his opponents. Boston: Brill. p. 99-127).

Taylor, V. 1941(1946). Forgiveness and reconciliation: A study in New Testament theology. London: Macmillan and Co.

Anon. 1985. Documentation the kairos document challenge to the church: A theological comment on the political crisis in South Africa. *Journal of theology for Southern Africa*, 53: 61-81.

Thrall, M.E. 2004. 2 Corinthians 1-7. NY: T&T Clack.

Torrance, T.F. 1992. The mediation of Christ. London: T&T Clack.

Torrance, T.F. 2008. Incarnation: the person and life of Christ ed. Walker R.T. Illinois: IVP.

Torrance, T.F. 2009. Atonement: The person and work of Christ. London: IVP.

Tull, J.E. 1982. The atoning gospel. Atlanta: Mercer university press.

Turner, D. L. 1989. Paul and the ministry of reconciliation in 2 Cor. 5: 1 1-6: 2. *Criswell theological review*, 4(1): 77-95.

Vegge, I. 2008. 2 Corinthians- a letter about reconciliation. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Verbrugge, V.D. 2000. *Καταλλάσσω. Καταλλάσσω*. (*In* Verbrugge, V.D., *ed*. New international dictionary of New Testament theology. Michigan: Zondervan. p. 292-294).

Volf, M. 1996. Exclusion & embrace: A theological exploration of identity, otherness, and reconciliation. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Volf, M. 2000. The Social meaning of reconciliation. http://int.sagepub.com/content/54/2/158.full.pdf Date of access: 15 January 2012.

Volf, M. 2001. Forgiveness, reconciliation, & justice: A Christians contribution to a more peaceful social environment. (*In* Raymond, G., Helmich, S.J. & Peterson, R.L., *eds*. Forgiveness & reconciliation. London: Templeton foundation press. p. 27-49).

Wallace, D.B. 1996. Greek grammar beyond the basic: An exegetical syntax of the New Testament. Michigan: Zondervan.

Walters, J.C. 1993. Ethnic issues in Paul's letter to the Romans: changing self-definitions in earliest Roman Christianity. Valley Forge: Trinity press international.

Waters, G.P. 2004. Justification and the New Perspective on Paul: A Review and Response. NJ: P&R publishing.

Watson, F. 1986. Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A sociological approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Watson, D.F. 2010. Rhetorical criticism. (*In* Aune, D.E., ed. The blackwell companion to the New Testament. Oxford: Blackwell puplishing. p. 166-176).

Welborn, L.L. 1995. The identification of 2 Corinthians 10-13 with the "letter of tears". *Novum testamentum*, 37 (2 April): 138-153.

Whiteley, D. 1984. Reconciliation: A study of Paul's theology by Martin, R.P. *Journal for the study of the New Testament*, 20: 123-124.

Winter, S.F. sine anno. Who and what are 'Ambassadors for Christ'?: The identity and the role of Paul's audience in 2 Corinthians 5:16-21. https://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0007546/sbl/Winter.pdf Date of access: 12 June 2012.

Winter, B.W. 1997. Philo and Paul among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian responses to a Julio-Claudian movement. Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Witherington III, B. 1993. Christology. (*In* Hawthorne, G.F. & Martin, R.P., *eds*. Dictionary of Paul and his letters. Illinois: IVP. p. 100-115).

Witherington III, B. 1994. Paul's narrative thought world: the tapestry of tragedy and triumph. Louisville: Westminster John Knox press

Witherington III, B. 1995. Conflict & community in Corinth: A socio-rhetorical commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians. Michigan: Eerdmans.

Witherington III, B. 2009. What's in the word: Rethinking the socio-rhetorical character of the New Testament. Tex.: Baylor university press.

Wolff, C. 1989. True apostolic knowledge of Christ: Exegetical reflections on 2 Corinthians 5:14ff. (*In* Wedderburn A.J.M., ed. Paul and Jesus: Collected essays. London: JSOT press. p. 81-98

Wrede, W. 1908. Paul. Translated by Lummis, E. Boston: American Unitarian Association.

Wright, N.T. 1991. The climax of the covenant: Christ and the law in Pauline theology. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Wright, N.T. 1992. The New Testament and the people of God. London: SPCK.

Wright, N.T. 1993. On becoming the righteousness of God. (*In* Hay, D.M., *ed*. Pauline Theology vol.ii: 1& 2 Corinthians. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress. p. 200-208).

Wright, N.T. 1997. What Saint Paul really said: Was Paul of Tarsus the real founder of Christianity? Michigan: Eerdmans.

Wright, N.T. 2002. On becoming the righteousness of God. (*In* Hay, D.M., *ed*. Pauline Theology vol.ii: 1& 2 Corinthians. Atlanta: SBL. p.200-208).

Wright, N.T. 2002. Putting Paul together again: towards a synthesis of Pauline theology (1 and 2 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Philemon. (*In* Bassler, J.M., *ed.* Pauline theology volume I: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon. Atlanta: SBL. p. 183-211).

Wuellner, W. 1977. Paul's rhetoric of argumentation in Romans: An alternative to the Donfried-Karris debate over Romans. (*In* Donfried, K.P., *ed*. The Romans debate: Essays on the origin and purpose of the epistle. Menneapolis: Augsburg. p. 152-174).

Yee, T-L.N. 2005. Jews, Gentiles and ethnic reconciliation: Paul's Jewish identity and Ephesians. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Soiety for New Testament studies monograph series: 130).

Young, F.M and Ford, D.F. 1987. Meaning and truth in 2 Corinthians. London: SPCK.