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Introduction

Paul’s use of the distributive singular in his authentic letters has not been adequately explored in previous scholarship. His ‘grace benediction’\(^\text{1}\) in Galatians, Philippians and Philemon serves as a good illustration. Paul always ends his epistles with the phrase ἡ χάρις τοῦ κύριου (the grace of the Lord) followed by different variants: μεθ’ ὑµῶν (with you) (Rom. 16.20; 1 Cor. 16.23; 1 Thess. 5.28); μετὰ πάντων ὑµῶν (with all of you) (2 Cor. 12.14); or μετὰ τοῦ πνεύµατος ὑµῶν (with your spirit) (Gal. 6.18; Phil. 4.23; Phlm. 25).\(^\text{2}\) In regard to μετὰ τοῦ πνεύµατος ὑµῶν, the most problematic element is arguably the combination of a singular genitive noun τοῦ πνεύµατος (the spirit) and a plural possessive pronoun ὑµῶν (your). Many scholars ignore or provide little grammatical and syntactical analysis of this combination.\(^\text{3}\) Fee notes that scholarly attempts to explain this unusual combination


2. The benedictions in the disputed letters do not have μετὰ τοῦ πνεύµατος ὑµῶν (with your spirit). Instead, ἡ χάρις (the grace) is employed with μετὰ πάντων ὑµῶν (with all of you) in 2 Thessalonians and Titus, μεθ’ ὑµῶν (with you) in 1 and 2 Timothy, or μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγιασµάτων (with all of those who love) in Ephesians. The absence of any anthropological terms in their benedictions might illustrate stylistic difference between the authentic and the disputed letters.

(in Gal. 6.18) have ‘tended to draw blanks’.\(^4\) In these attempts, the singular form is usually interpreted as the ‘distributive singular’.

This study will first survey the occurrence of the combination\(^5\) between a plural possessive pronoun and a singular noun in Paul’s letters.\(^6\) It will then examine the validity of the concept of the distributive singular,\(^7\) with special reference to Paul’s anthropological terms. This study will demonstrate that the DS is not applicable to account for many ASCs, and will show that the ASCs can be explained by other grammatical categories. In relation to Paul’s anthropological terms in an ASC, some terms can be understood as carrying an abstract and metaphorical sense, pointing to the corporate essence of a community.

_Abnormal Singular Construct and Distributive Singular_

In Koiné Greek grammar, the combination of a singular noun and a singular personal possessive pronoun (normal singular construct), and the combination of a plural noun and a plural personal possessive pronoun (normal plural construct) follow the basic rule of agreement, as expected constructions.\(^8\) Unless the noun is abstract in nature, wherein it takes a singular form, for example, ἐλπίς (hope), the combination of a singular noun and a plural personal possessive pronoun is abnormal, because it violates the rule of agreement.\(^9\)

In the Pauline authentic letters, there are 212 occurrences of the ASC, in which a singular noun, either anarthrous or articular, is immediately

---

5. This combination is called the Abnormal Singular Construct in this study, abbreviated as ASC.
6. Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy and Titus are excluded from this study because of questions about authorship.
7. Distributive Singular is abbreviated as DS in this study.
9. For example, in the New Testament, ἐλπίς (hope) and πίστις (faith) always appear in the singular form, and as such appear in the ASC.
followed or preceded by a plural possessive pronoun\textsuperscript{10} that modifies it.\textsuperscript{11} Of these occurrences, most of them contain an abstract noun. Only 37 occurrences have a concrete noun, and 26 occurrences contain an anthropological term. In explaining this peculiar construct with an anthropological term, some modern scholars define the singular anthropological term as the DS.\textsuperscript{12} Therefore, it is important to define the DS. The DS is defined as ‘the use of the singular in reference to a plurality of objects’.\textsuperscript{13} As such, the singular is employed when a noun representing something belonging to each person in a group of people is expressed in the singular form, even though the object is plural in number. Although the DS with concrete nouns is extremely rare in classical Greek literature, both Gildersleeve and Smyth\textsuperscript{14} note that this peculiar construct is found in the LXX and the New Testament.\textsuperscript{15} For

\textsuperscript{10} Pronoun follows noun: 175 occurrences; noun follows pronoun: 37 occurrences.

\textsuperscript{11} This study has excluded the occurrences where the pronoun does not grammatically modify the noun. For example, ὑμῶν ὁ λόγος (your word) in 1 Cor. 14.36 is excluded, as ὑμῶν (your) is connected with ἀφ’ (from) instead of λόγος (word) in the context.


\textsuperscript{15} Take σῶμα (body) in the LXX as an example; there are seven occurrences of the ASC ( Lev. 19.28; Sir. 7.24; Num. 8.7; Ep. Jer. 6.21; Neh. 9.26; Ezek. 1.11; Dan. 3.94) and seven occurrences of normal plural construct (Gen. 34.29; Sir. 44.14; Ezek. 1.23; Dan. 3.95; Neh. 9.37; Sir. 41.11; Nah. 3.3). For Conybeare and Stock, the singular is used in the sense of the plural in imitation of Hebrew idiom. F.C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, \textit{A Grammar of Septuagint Greek} (repr. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), §48.
example, the phrase ‘they opened their mouth’ is acceptable in ancient Hebrew literature. Here the plural object (mouths) is constructed in the singular form (mouth). Conversely, the Greeks would simply write ‘they opened their mouths’. Blass and Debrunner explain that the DS is an Aramaic concept, and Turner similarly suggests that the usage is mainly due to Aramaic and Hebrew influence, since it departs from basic Greek grammatical rules. Robertson calls this concept the idiomatic singular, and maintains that ‘the N. T. writers merely follow in the beaten track of Greek usage with proper freedom and individuality’. Green observes that, in the New Testament, some words like καρδία (heart) and σῶμα (body) are in singular form ‘when predicated of several individuals’, but that the plural is more common on these occasions.

From the literature reviewed regarding Greek grammar and syntax, very few grammarians discuss the DS. Of those that mention the DS,


17. BDF, p. 77. For example, מ DISCLAIMS (your flesh) (Lev. 19.28, BHS) is translated into σώματι υἱῶν (your body) in LXX: the plural suffixed pronoun μοι (your) and the singular noun χρόνος (flesh) are translated into a singular σώματι (body) and a plural υἱῶν (your).


21. Twenty-seven works on Greek grammar have been reviewed. One mentions the distributive singular, calling it the ‘distributional sg.’ and explaining it as a singular that refers to ‘a thing possessed by each one of a specific group’. Gerald L. Mussies, The Morphology of Koine Greek, as Used in the Apocalypse of St John: A Study in Bilingualism (Leiden: Brill, 1971), pp. 80, 84. Four of them discuss the collective singular: Daniel B. Wallace, Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), pp. 400-406; J.W. Wenham, The Elements of New Testament Greek (London: Cambridge University Press, 1965), pp. 32, 244; K.L. McKay, A New Syntax of the Verb in
only Turner provides a comprehensive analysis and cites copious examples, including a number of Pauline passages. Given the adoption of Turner’s analysis by subsequent scholars, it deserves further elucidation.

Turner uses καρδία (heart), κεφαλή (head), ὀσφύς (waist), σῶμα (body) and χεῖρ (hand) as examples of the DS in the New Testament. καρδία, ὀσφύς and σῶμα appear in the Pauline epistles, and of these, καρδία and σῶμα, according to Turner, appear in both DS and normal plural forms. Turner’s findings claim that the occurrences of καρδία in Paul’s letters are prominent examples of the DS by citing 29 examples of καρδία with a personal plural possessive pronoun in Paul’s work. However, only 16 of them are drawn from Paul’s undisputed letters. Out of these 16 examples, only three occur in the ASC (Rom. 1.21; 2 Cor. 3.15; 6.11). Even if all three occurrences were DSs, the limited occurrence would hardly prove that the DS is Paul’s popular grammatical choice. In fact, it will be shown below that there are better explanations to account for these ASCs.


22. Robertson identifies several examples, including three Pauline examples (1 Cor. 1.27; 2 Thess. 2.6; Eph. 6.14). Blass and Debrunner identify several examples from Acts and Luke, with one example from the Pauline tradition (Eph. 6.14). Green does not provide examples of the DS of σῶμα and καρδία. Robertson, Grammar, p. 409; BDF, p. 77; Green, Grammar, p. 202.

23. For example, see Gundry, Sōma, pp. 76-77; Fee, Philippians, p. 461.


25. καρδία appears as a DS noun (Rom. 1.21; 2 Cor. 3.15; 6.11; Eph. 1.18; 4.18; 5.19; 6.5; Phil. 1.7; Col. 3.16) and a plural noun (Rom. 1.24; 2.15; 5.5; 16.18; 2 Cor. 1.22; 3.2; 6.22; Phil. 4.7; Col. 2.2; 3.15; 3.16; 4.8; 1 Thess. 2.4; 3.13; 2 Thess. 2.17; 3.5). σῶμα appears as a DS (Rom. 8.23; 1 Cor. 6.19, 20; 2 Cor. 4.10) and as plural (1 Cor. 6.15; Eph. 5.28). Turner, Syntax, pp. 23-24.

26. Turner’s example of καρδία in Phil. 1.7 is invalid. First, there is no plural possessive pronoun in διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς (because I have you in my heart). Second, my heart, as an implied pronoun, is preferred over your heart because με (me/I) is placed in closer proximity with the infinitive ἔχειν (to have) than ὑμᾶς (you). See Wallace, Grammar, p. 196; Jeffrey T. Reed, ‘The Infinitive with Two Substantival Accusatives: An Ambiguous Construction’, NovT 33 (1991), pp. 1-27 (9-10).
Concrete Nouns in Abnormal Singular Construct

A brief and preliminary analysis of the 37 concrete nouns will first be conducted, offering a more adequate explanation by exploring other grammatical categories to account for the ASC. This is then followed by a detailed analysis of the anthropological terms that occurred in the ASC by examining each individual anthropological term to demonstrate that the ‘corporate essence’ is a better explanation than the DS.

As previously mentioned, there are 212 occurrences of the ASC in Paul’s letters. To effectively conduct this examination, first, all abstract words, such as ἐλπίς (hope), ἐλευθερία (freedom) and δόξα (glory) are excluded from the 212 occurrences. Second, all the anthropological terms, including σῶμα (body), ψυχή (soul), πνεῦμα (spirit), σάρξ (flesh), καρδία (heart), νοῦς (mind), συνείδησις (conscience), πρόσωπον (face), στόμα (mouth), λάρυγξ (throat), νότος (back) and ἀνθρώπος (human), which will be examined later, are also excluded.

These exclusions reduce the occurrences of the ASC to 37. Of these 37, there are 22 occurrences that contain a noun that clearly depicts a singular object, including πατρὸς ἴμων (our father) to describe God

27. The excluded abstract nouns include ἀγάπη (love), ἁγιασμός (holiness), ἀδικία (unrighteousness), αἰσχύνη (shame), ἀκοή (report), ἀκρασία (excess), ἀπίστια (unfaithfulness), ἀπλότης (generosity), ἀποβολή (loss), ἀσθένεια (weakness), δέησις (entreaty), δικαιοσύνα (service), δικαιοσύνη (righteousness), δίκαιος (justification), δοκιμή (character), δόξα (glory), εἰσόδος (access), ἐκλογή (election), ἐλευθερία (freedom), ἔλειψις (hope), ἐπιπόθησις (longing), ἐξουσία (authority), εὐαγγέλιον (good news), εὐλογία (blessing), ἔζησις (zeal), ἔτημα (defeat), δίψα (tribulation), ἰκανότης (sufficiency), καθαρίσεις (destruction), κανών (limit), καρπός (fruit), κατάρτισις (maturation), καύχημα (pride), καύχησις (boasting), κήρυγμα (preaching), κλῆσις (calling), κοινωνία (fellowship), κόσμος (labor), λατρεία (worship), μακαρισμός (blessedness), μνεία (remembrance), νουθεσία (warning), ὀδυρμός (lamentation), ὀλοκλήρωσις (health), ὁμολογία (confession), ὁρείς (appetite), πανοργία (craftiness), παράκλησις (encouragement), παράπτωμα (trespass), πάσχα (Passover lamb), πειρασμός (temptation), περίσσευμα (abundance), πίστις (faith), πλάνη (error), πλήρωμα (fullness), προθυμία (goodwill), προκοπή (progress), πτωχεία (poverty), σοφία (wisdom), στουδή (haste), στρατεία (fight), ταπείνωσις (humiliation), ὑπακοή (obedience), ὑπόκρισις (hypocrisy), ὑπερήφανος (deficiency), φθόνος (sound), χαρά (joy), χάρις (grace), and χρεία (necessity). καρπός is included; Paul uses it figuratively (instead of elucidating edible fruit). All these nouns are always in singular form when they combine with a plural personal possessive pronoun, except for παράπτωμα on two occasions (Rom. 4:25; 2 Cor. 5:19). In addition, θεός (God) and κύριος (Lord) are excluded.
(Rom. 1.7; 9.10; 1 Cor. 1.3; 2 Cor. 1.2; Gal. 1.3, 4; Phil. 1.2; 4.19; 1 Thess. 1.3; 3.11, 13; Philm. 2) or Abraham (Rom. 4.12), προπάτορα ἡμῶν (our forefather) to describe Abraham (Rom. 4.1), ἀδελφήν ἡμῶν (our sister) to denote Phoebe (Rom. 16.1), συνεργὸν ἡμῶν (our co-worker) to refer to Urbanus (Rom. 16.9), συνεργῶ ἡμῶν (to our co-worker) to describe Philemon (Phlm. 1), ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν (our brother) to denote Titus or Timothy (2 Cor. 8.22; 1 Thess. 3.2), συνεκδήμος ἡμῶν (our traveling partner) to denote Titus (2 Cor. 8.19), μήτηρ ἡμῶν (our mother) to refer to Sarah (Gal. 4.26) and συστρατιώτη ἡμῶν (to our fellow soldier) to portray Archippus (Phlm. 2). The remaining 15 occurrences require close examination, including τράπεζα αὐτῶν (their table) (Rom. 11.9), οἶκον αὐτῶν (their house) (Rom. 16.5; 1 Cor. 16.19), λόγος ἡμῶν (our word) (2 Cor. 1.18), ἐπιστολή ἡμῶν (our letter) (2 Cor. 3.2), ἡμῶν οἰκία (our house) (2 Cor. 5.1), οἰκητήριον ἡμῶν (our dwelling) (2 Cor. 5.2), σπορόν ὑμῶν (your seed) (2 Cor. 9.10), ὑμῶν οἰκοδομῆς (your building) (2 Cor. 12.19), παιδαγωγός ἡμῶν (our teacher) (Gal. 3.24), ἔχθρος ὑμῶν (your enemy) (Gal. 4.16), λόγον ὑμῶν (your word) (Phil. 4.17), ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου (your work) (1 Thess. 1.3), ὀδὸν ἡμῶν (our way) (1 Thess. 3.11) and ἔργον αὐτῶν (their work) (1 Thess. 5.13).

In Rom. 11.9, the phrase τράπεζα αὐτῶν (their table) is a direct quotation from Ps. 68.23-24 in the LXX, and τράπεζα (table) is a metaphor. Thus, this is arguably not Pauline. Both Rom. 16.5 and 1 Cor. 16.19 use οἶκον (house) to portray the church gathered in a house. The word is not a DS noun denoting many houses. In 2 Cor. 1.15-18, Paul discusses his original plan and desires to visit the Corinthians despite a failed attempt. Responding to his unsuccessful attempt, in 1.17b, he asks a rhetorical question, ὃ ὑπέθεσες ἐκεῖ; ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ διήρκεισαν ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖ ὑπέθεσαν πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτὸν καὶ οὐδὲν γίνεται ἐκεῖ (but God is

faithful that our word to you is ‘yes’ and ‘no’). Thus, λόγος (word) is not a DS noun, and ἡμῶν (our) is an epistolary plural pronoun, referring to Paul himself. In 2 Cor. 3.2, ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν (our letter) is a metaphor in the clause: ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν ὑμεῖς ἐστε (you are our letter). Hence, ἐπιστολὴ (letter) is not a DS. In 2 Cor. 5.2, σικετήριον (dwelling) is also a metaphor, portraying the heavenly dwelling that is built by God. The phrase σικετήριον ἡμῶν (our dwelling) does not denote a concrete object (in this case, a literal house), and is therefore not a DS. Similarly, both σίκια (house) (2 Cor. 5.1) and σικετήριον (dwelling) (2 Cor. 12.19) are metaphors, with the former describing earthly life and the latter referring to spiritual growth. Both words are not DS nouns, since they are abstract metaphors. In 2 Cor 9.10, Paul uses seed sowing as a metaphor to discuss offering. The phrase χορηγήσει καὶ πληθυνέων τῶν σπόρων ὑμῶν (he supplies and multiplies your seed) describes God’s gracious provision. Nonetheless, σπόρων never occurs in plural form in the New Testament. Therefore, it is unlikely that σπόρων is a DS. In Gal. 3.24, ὁ νόμος (the law) is portrayed as παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν (our teacher). παιδαγωγός (teacher) is not a DS. In Gal. 4.16, Paul questions the Galatians, ὥστε ἔχθρος ὑμῶν γέγονα ἄληθευών ὑμῖν; (therefore have I become your enemy as I am telling you the truth?). The word ἔχθρος (enemy) is a normal singular noun, referring to Paul himself. In Phil. 4.17, λόγον ὑμῶν should be translated as ‘your account’ in the clause ὅτι ἐπιζητῶ τὸ δόμα, ἀλλὰ ἐπιζητῶ τὸν καρπὸν τὸν πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν (not that I am seeking the gift, but I am seeking the fruit that abounds to your account). Paul does not discuss individual accounts, and instead indicates a communal benefit. Thus, the word λόγον (account) is not a DS. In 1 Thess. 1.3, Paul praises the Thessalonians: μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν τὸ ἔργον τῆς πίστεως (remembering your work of faith). ἔργον (work) illustrates the corporate expression of faith, instead of the individual concrete works done by each member. In 1 Thess. 3.11, Paul expresses a wish: ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (our Lord Jesus to guide our way to you). Paul does not mention the ‘ways’ that he and his associates take, and therefore ὁδὸν (way) is not a DS. Paul then teaches the Thessalonians to respect those who labor among them in 1 Thess. 5.13: καὶ ἱερεύσατε αὐτοὺς ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ἐν ἄγαπῃ διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν (and to esteem them very highly in love because of their work). ἔργον is seemingly a

29. BDAG, p. 478.
DS noun, depicting the laborers’ ‘works’. However, whether ἔργον is a concrete noun is debatable.

In summary, the ASC with a concrete noun is rare in Paul’s letters. Of all the 15 concrete nouns discussed above, only one is a possible DS noun: τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν (their work) in 1 Thess. 5.13. As to the rest, there are other grammatical categories that can offer a better explanation than the DS: the use of a normal singular noun, as in the cases of Rom. 16.5, 1 Cor. 16.19, 1 Thess. 3.11, Gal. 3.24 and Gal. 4.16; the quotation of the Old Testament (LXX), as in the case of Rom. 11.9; the use of the epistolary plural, as in the case of 2 Cor. 1.18; the metaphorical usage, as in the cases of 2 Cor. 3.2, 5.2 and 9.10; and the use of a singular noun to denote corporate and relational dimensions of the community, as shown in Phil. 4.17 and 1 Thess. 1.3.

**Anthropological Terms in Abnormal Singular Construct**

As previously mentioned, out of the 212 occurrences of the ASC in Paul’s letters, there are 26 occurrences that contain an anthropological term:30 ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία (their senseless heart) (Rom. 1.21); αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως (their conscience) (Rom. 2.15); ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν (their throat) (Rom. 3.13); ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος (our old person) (Rom. 6.6); τῷ θυντῷ ὑμῶν σώματι (in your mortal body) (Rom. 6.12); τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν (your flesh) (Rom. 6.19); τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν (in our spirit) (Rom. 8.16); τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν (of your body) (Rom. 8.23); τῶν νότων αὐτῶν (their back) (Rom. 11.10); τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν (your body) (1 Cor. 6.19); τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν (in your body) (1 Cor. 6.20); ἡ συνειδήσις αὐτῶν (their conscience) (1 Cor. 8.7); αὐτῶν τὴν συνειδήσιν (their conscience) (1 Cor. 8.12); τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν (our conscience) (2 Cor. 1.12); τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν (their heart) (2 Cor. 3.15); τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν (in our body) (2 Cor. 4.10); τῇ θυγατρίσει ἡμῶν (in our mortal flesh) (2 Cor. 4.11); ὁ ἐξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος (our inner person) (2 Cor. 4.16); τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν (our mouth) (2 Cor. 6.11); ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν (our heart) (2 Cor. 6.11); ἡ σάρξ ἡμῶν (our flesh) (2 Cor. 7.5); τοῦ πνεύματος ἡμῶν (your spirit) (Gal. 6.18; Phil. 4.23; Phlm. 25); τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν (your face) (1 Thess. 2.17); ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον (your face) (1 Thess. 3.10). Table 1 presents an overview of the findings.

30. This study excludes the tripartite formula, ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα (your spirit and soul and body), in 1 Thess. 5.23 due to the immense scope of analysis that it would entail.
Table 1: Anthropological Terms with Plural Personal Genitive Pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Singular term with a plural personal genitive pronoun</th>
<th>Plural term with a plural personal genitive pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Occurrences: 26</td>
<td>Total Occurrences: 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σῶμα</td>
<td>Occurrences: 5</td>
<td>Occurrences: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. 6.12; 8.23; 1 Cor. 6.19, 20; 2 Cor. 4.10</td>
<td>Rom. 1.24; 8.11; 12.1; 1 Cor. 6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πνεῦμα</td>
<td>Occurrences: 4</td>
<td>Occurrences: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. 8.16; Gal. 6.18; Phil. 4.23; Phlm. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνείδησις</td>
<td>Occurrences: 4</td>
<td>Occurrences: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. 2.15; 1 Cor. 8.7, 12; 2 Cor. 1.12</td>
<td>2 Cor. 5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καρδία</td>
<td>Occurrences: 3</td>
<td>Occurrences: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. 1.21; 2 Cor. 3.15; 6.11</td>
<td>Rom. 1.24; 2.15; 5.5; 2 Cor. 1.22; 3.2; 4.6; 7.3; 6.11; 2 Cor. 5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σάρξ</td>
<td>Occurrences: 3</td>
<td>Occurrences: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. 6.19; 2 Cor. 4.11; 7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρόσωπον</td>
<td>Occurrences: 2</td>
<td>Occurrences: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Thess. 2.17; 3.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄνθρωπος</td>
<td>Occurrences: 2</td>
<td>Occurrences: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. 6.6; 2 Cor. 4.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στόμα</td>
<td>Occurrences: 1</td>
<td>Occurrences: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Cor. 6.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λάρυγξ</td>
<td>Occurrences: 1</td>
<td>Occurrences: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. 3.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νότος</td>
<td>Occurrences: 1</td>
<td>Occurrences: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. 11.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁφθαλμός</td>
<td>Occurrences: 0</td>
<td>Occurrences: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. 3.18; 11.10; Gal. 4.15</td>
<td>Rom. 1.24; 16.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πούς</td>
<td>Occurrences: 0</td>
<td>Occurrences: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. 3.15; 16.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χείρ</td>
<td>Occurrences: 0</td>
<td>Occurrences: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Thess. 4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψυχή</td>
<td>Occurrences: 0</td>
<td>Occurrences: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Cor. 12.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, the existence of both the normal plural construct and the ASC indicates a degree of lexical selection. Therefore, Paul does not randomly or haphazardly choose one expression over another. The following section investigates the singular anthropological terms that are combined with a plural personal possessive pronoun. Specific focus will be given to σῶμα, πνεῦμα, συνείδησις,
καρδία and σάρξ, as these terms occur three times or more in the ASC. In particular, a detailed analysis of σώμα, the most frequently used term in the ASC, and πνεῦμα and συνείδησις, the second most frequently used terms in the ASC, will first be conducted as a test case, demonstrating that the DS is not applicable to account for many ASCs. The findings will then serve as a reference point to inform the subsequent study of καρδία and σάρξ, which is then followed by a very brief analysis of the remaining terms that only occur once or twice in the ASC. A short study of καρδία and σάρξ will also show the invalidity of employing the DS to explain the ASC.

σώμα (Body)

σώμα occurs five times in the ASC, twice in 1 Corinthians. The term σώμα is combined with ύμων (your) in 6.15, 19 and 20. The two ASCs are τὸ σῶμα ύμων (6.19) and τῷ σώματι ύμων (6.20). This seemingly contradicts the preceding phrase τὰ σώματα ύμων (your bodies) in 6.15. Why is σώμα used in the plural form instead of the singular form? Two reasons are offered. First, the predicate nominative in 6.15 is a plural noun, μέλη (members). The two phrases, τὰ σώματα ύμων (your bodies) and μέλη Χριστοῦ (members of Christ), are joined by a singular copula verb ἐστιν (is). Therefore, it is grammatically sound for the nominative to use a plural noun (and in this case, τὰ σώματα) to highlight the parallel. Second, 6.15 emphasizes that each member of the Corinthian community (suggested by the plural σώματα) is also a member of Christ (suggested by the plural μέλη).

This ASC in 6.19-20 is not widely mentioned by scholars. Among those who discuss it, several advocate the use of the DS for σώμα.

31. Of interest is τὰ σώματα as a textual variant that appears in some manuscripts. This variant, a plural noun, could possibly be a scribal correction to harmonize it with the phrase in 6.15.

32. Collins, Fee, Thiselton, Conzelmann, Orr and Walther, Ciampa and Rosner do not mention this abnormality in their commentaries.

Nonetheless, the use of the DS can be refuted on three grounds. First, the use of a normal singular form of σῶμα is consistent with the letter’s central theme. This argument is further explained below. Second, the ASC is Paul’s deliberate expression, since its use deviates from his normal style. In Paul’s letters, of all the occurrences of σῶμα in combination with ὑµῶν, σῶμα is always in plural form. Third, the usage is coherent within its immediate context. In the preceding context, 6.14 in particular, Paul first employs the pronoun ἥµᾶς (us) to convey a communal focus, and then uses the singular form of σῶµα, in place of ἥµᾶς, to highlight the corporate connotation.

Concerning the first reason, the central theme in this letter is the corporate unity and communal relationship of the Corinthians. Paul employs a singular form of σῶµα to emphasize the corporate and communal aspect. The discussion in 6.12-20 concerns the immoral conjugal union between the Corinthians and prostitutes. Near the end of his argument, Paul asks a rhetorical question in 6.19: ἢ σῶ ὑµῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑµῖν ἀγίου πνεύµατός ἐστιν (or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit in you). σῶµα in this verse denotes the physical body, symbolizing the physical union between a man and a woman, or serves as a metaphor, alluding to the Christian community. Although Paul discusses sexual union, when considering the letter as a whole, his real concern is with the community in which

34. This combination occurs twice in the authentic letters besides 1 Corinthians. Furthermore, σῶµα is always in its plural form (Rom. 8.11; 12.1).

35. Mitchell persuasively argues that ecclesial unity is the central theme of 1 Corinthians, which is introduced in 1.10, with Paul discussing schism before other topics. Margaret M. Mitchell, Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1993), pp. 1, 301-302.

36. This is not a common view. Commentators do not have a common conclusion. For Thiselton and Collins, the phrase τὸ σῶμα ὑµῶν carries an individual dimension. Thiselton argues for the corporate aspect of σῶµα based on his comparison between 6.19 and 3.16. Thiselton and Conzelmann contend that the community focus in 3.16 has shifted to an individual application. Anthony C. Thiselton, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), pp. 316, 474; Hans Conzelmann, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (ed. George W. MacRae; trans. James W. Leitch; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 112.

37. Fee suggests that Paul takes the imagery of the church (denoted by σῶµα) in 3.16 and applies it as a depiction of an individual person in 6.19. Fee, Corinthians, p. 264.
God dwells instead of the individual physical body. Interestingly, a strikingly similar clause occurs in 3.16. In ch. 3, Paul compares himself to a builder who has laid a good foundation; the building is a metaphor that connotes the Corinthian community. In concluding his argument, Paul asks a rhetorical question in 3.16: οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἔστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; (Do you not know that you are a temple of God and the Spirit of God dwells in you?). The physical temple (the tabernacle or the temple in Jerusalem), which is now represented by the church, is realized in the Christian community as a dwelling in which God resides through his Holy Spirit. The parallel between 3.16 and 6.19 must be considered together.

Although many commentators argue that σῶμα in ch. 6 illustrates the individual physical body, several scholars argue for its corporate and communal connotation. Kempthorne contends that the σῶμα refers to the ‘corporate body’, with the peculiar singular construct providing this ‘corporate allusion’; he observes that the phrase in 6.19 echoes with another phrase in the letter, ύμείς δέ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους (Now you are Christ’s body and each of you is a member of it) (12.27). Murphy-O’Connor argues that σῶμα is a normal singular that denotes the community’s identity, since both the immediate context, οὐκ ἐστε ἑαυτῶν (you are not your own) (6.19), and the wider context, ύμείς δέ Χριστοῦ (but you belong to Christ) (3.23), elucidate the ‘authentic humanity’ that Christ embodies. Thus, the focus is on community instead of individuality. Newton suggests that τὸ σῶμα

38. Conzelmann argues the opposite; the focus of community in 3.16 is now ‘transferred to the individual’. Conzelmann, Corinthians, p. 112.

39. For example, Fee, Collins, and Fitzmyer support this view. Thiselton defines the singular form of σῶμα as the DS. Fee, Corinthians, pp. 263-64; Raymond F. Collins, First Corinthians (SP, 7; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), pp. 249-50; Thiselton, Corinthians, p. 474.

40. For Kempthorne, σῶμα is used in parallel with the temple, illustrating the corporate dimensions. Referring to a similar usage in contemporary Greek literature, he defines the pronoun as appositional, meaning ‘the Body that you are members’, alluding to the corporate body of Christ. The phrase τὸ ἑαυτὸν σῶμα (one’s own body; 6.18) carries a corporate allusion. R. Kempthorne, ‘Incest and the Body of Christ: A Study of I Corinthians VI. 12–20’, NTS 14 (1968), pp. 568-74 (572-73).

ὑµῶν is parallel with ναὸς τοῦ ἐν υµῶν (temple that is in you). Both phrases point to a corporate understanding. Fitzmyer also contends that Paul urges the ‘community of Corinth’ to have ‘a corporate honoring of God’ in 6.20. This study agrees with the view of Kempthorne and Murphy-O’Connor. By considering the wider textual context, it is evident that Paul first addresses the issue of sexual immorality (6.12-18) and then shifts his focus to the impact of sexual immorality on the Christian community (6.19-20). The concluding remark of this passage, δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν θεόν ἐν τῷ σώματι υµῶν (therefore glorify God in your body) (6.20), should also be understood accordingly.

Gupta provides one of the most recent and revolutionary explanations regarding this combination. Although in favor of the DS, he suggests two speculative possibilities. First, Paul attempts to create a ‘more direct engagement with the readers by addressing the whole but communicating vividly to the individual’. Second, Paul draws attention ‘to the corporate while speaking particularly about each individual’. After considering the singular/plural oscillation in the context, Gupta argues that v. 19 demonstrates Paul’s concern for ‘both the embodied person and the corporate body’. Interestingly, Gupta’s conclusion repudiates his own assumption of the DS. According to his interpretation, σῶµα appears as a normal singular noun instead of a DS noun, since he speculates that the singular σῶµα highlights the corporate connotation of a community, and the plural pronoun emphasizes the individual within the community. Thus, Gupta’s identification of the DS is incorrect, while his speculative conclusion of the use of the singular with υµῶν is accurate. Furthermore, the term σῶµα in 1 Corinthians, according to Martin, assumes the microcosm of the body,


whereby the human body is an analogy for human society and ‘unity can exist in diversity within the macrocosm of society’. 45

In 2 Cor. 4.1-15, Paul purposefully contrasts ἡµεῖς (we) with ὑµεῖς (you). However, the inclusion of ‘we’ and the repeated use of first-person plural verbs throughout function as the so-called epistolary plural. 46 Describing his ministry and suffering, Paul mentions in 4.10, ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡµῶν φανερωθῇ (the life of Jesus may be made visible in our body) (4.10). Many scholars regard 4.1-15 as a portrayal of Paul’s sole experience despite not mentioning the epistolary plural. 47 In summary, ἡµῶν is an epistolary plural pronoun given the context, wherein the singular σῶµα refers to Paul.

In Rom. 8.18-25, Paul discusses the future eschatological glory and the virtue of patience. The phrase τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώµατος ἡµῶν (the destruction of our body) (8.23) depicts the eventual hope for


believers. The singular form of σῶμα is defined by Turner as the DS, denoting individual physical bodies, which is a common argument among scholars.\(^4\) However, the context of Romans 8 indicates otherwise. Paul encourages his audience, who are believers, to persevere during suffering as they await future glory. Paul’s concern is not with their individual physical bodies. Instead, he employs the singular form of σῶμα to highlight the transformation of the corporate body of believers—as one single group. The same argument also applies to Rom. 6.12. Paul writes, μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ύμῶν σῶματι (Therefore do not let sin reign in your mortal body). The singular form of σῶμα is not a DS, since the focus is not on individual physical bodies. Instead, the term elucidates the corporate body of believers who are waiting for the ultimate transformation.

πνεῦμα (Spirit)

πνεῦμα occurs four times in the ASC. Three of them appear in an identical phrase μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ύμῶν (with your spirit) in Pauline benedictions (Gal. 6.18; Phil. 4.23; Phlm. 25). This combination is not found in the New Testament except in Paul’s letters.\(^4\) There are three views in treating the πνεῦμα in these instances.

The first view treats πνεῦμα as a normal singular noun, denoting the Holy Spirit. In interpreting the πνεῦμα in Gal. 6.18 and Phil. 4.23, Jewett argues that the reference to πνεῦμα ‘is clearly being made to the single divine spirit’.\(^5\) He claims that there is no distinction between the divine spirit and the human spirit in Paul’s work, since πνεῦμα means

\(^4\) Byrne links Rom. 8.23 to 8.11, suggesting that σῶμα denotes the ‘mortal bodies’. For Dunn, σῶμα is the future resurrected bodies; and for Moo, it is the transformed bodies. Brendan Byrne, Romans (SP, 6; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), pp. 246, 265; James D.G. Dunn, Romans (2 vols.; WBC, 38; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1988), I, p. 491; Douglas Moo, The Epistle to the Romans (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), p. 521.

\(^5\) The combination of the second-person plural possessive pronoun and the plural form of πνεῦμα is entirely absent in the New Testament.

‘the apportionment of the divine spirit given to each Christian’. This is not a common view in scholarship, however. For example, Fee argues that Jewett’s claim is not as clear as he states. If the singular πνεῦμα were a normal singular noun denoting the Holy Spirit, it would be theologically absurd to interpret that Paul wishes Christ’s grace to be with the Holy Spirit.

The second view is a common view. πνεῦμα indicates the human spirit, denoting the ‘anthropological πνεῦμα’ that depicts the psychical functions of humans, the ‘inner personality’, functioning as a contact point between humans and God, or the individual human spirits of the readers or the ‘whole personality’, emphasizing its mental and


54. Schweizer, ‘Πνεῦμα’, p. 435. For Schweizer, πνεῦμα carries the same meaning in Phil. 4.23, Phlm. 25 and Gal. 6.18. While suggesting an ontological connotation of πνεῦμα, Schweizer emphasizes the synonymy between μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ύμῶν and μεθ’ ύμῳ.


spiritual aspects. Some proponents of this view suggest that πνεῦμα is a DS noun, referring to each spirit. However, most of these interpreters provide very little evidence of how this kind of ontological connotation is derived.

The third view is that the phrase μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν (with your spirit) is synonymous with the phrase μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν (with you). This view can be traced back to John Chrysostom in the fourth century AD, who argues that Paul deliberately uses μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν instead of μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν for the purpose of redirecting the Galatians away from ‘carnal things’ that sprang from their ‘judaizing error’. Chrysostom’s attempt in connecting the benediction with the letter content is admirable, although his conclusion of ‘judaizing error’ may be problematic. Some modern scholars hold that μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν is simply an abbreviation of μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν or μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν (with all of you), but they fail to provide a good explanation. However, this study

59. Bockmuehl, Fee, Hansen, Hawthorne and O’Brien consider the πνεῦμα in Phil. 4.23 as a DS. Bockmuehl interprets Phil. 4.23 as ‘God’s grace to be with the people’s individual human spirits as united in Christ’s fellowship’. Bockmuehl, Philippians, p. 271; Fee, Philippians, p. 461; Hansen, Philippians, p. 332; O’Brien, Philippians, pp. 554-55; Hawthorne, Philippians, pp. 215-16.
60. For instance, Betz contends that πνεῦμα denotes the Holy Spirit throughout Galatians. Without any explanation, he then claims that only the πνεῦμα in 6.18 connotes the human spirit. See Betz, Galatians, p. 325.
supports the explanation provided by Thurston and Ryan who advocate the synonymy between μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ύμῶν and μεθ’ ύμων. Thurston and Ryan first examine the wider context of Philippians and then connect the benediction in Phil. 4.23 with another text in the letter body, ἕν πνεύματι, μιᾶ ψυχῇ (one spirit, one soul) (1.27).\(^63\) They argue that πνεύμα denotes the community resembling an entire ‘person’, echoing the emphasis on the one-mindedness of the church in the epistle. Similarly, Martin considers that πνεύμα refers to ‘the unity of the body of believers in which one spirit is to be found’,\(^64\) pointing to the entire person of the believers assembled as a congregation, as indicated by the singular use of the noun.\(^65\) Instead of using ύμῶν, Paul uses the variant form with the singular πνεύμα to highlight the corporate and communal unity of the believers.

The singular πνεύμα in Rom. 8.16 should be understood in light of its context. As previously mentioned, Paul discusses future eschatological glory in 8.18-25. If πνεύμα were a DS, the focus would be on individual spirits. Nonetheless, it is better to understand that Paul employs πνεύμα to highlight the single community of believers, a usage that resembles the πνεύμα in the above-mentioned benedictions.


65. O’Brien repudiates this view and asserts that πνεύμα carries an anthropological significance in Phil. 4.23, arguing that there is no difference between τοῦ πνεύματος ύμῶν and ύμῶν. O’Brien, *Philippians*, p. 555.
συνείδησις (Conscience)

συνείδησις occurs four times in the ASC. In Rom. 2.15, it appears in the phrase αὐτῶν τῆς συνείδησεως (their conscience). To analyze this ASC, it is necessary to understand that Paul focuses on two communities in Romans: the Jews and the Gentiles. At the beginning of the letter, Paul describes himself as indebted to Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις (to the Greeks and the barbarians) (1:14), and articulates his intention to proclaim the gospel, that is, the power of God for salvation Ἰουδαῖω τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι (to the Jew first and also to the Greek). In other words, the central concern of Paul is the salvation of these two corporate groups: the Jews and the Gentiles.

66 Dunson advocates a similar view. He connects 1.16-17 with other passages in Romans (3.21–5.2; 9.30–10.17), and demonstrates that Paul employs the ‘faith-righteousness relationship’ to articulate the gospel’s power to break down the partition between the Gentiles and the Jews, highlighting the communal aspect.67 This communal motif recurs in 1.18–3.20, the major section and discussion in which συνείδησις occurs. Paul states that both the Greeks and the Jews are equally in need of salvation. The phrase Ἰουδαῖος τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλην (Jew first and also Gentile) is repeated three times (2.9, 10; 3.9).68 As stated in 3.9, Ἰουδαῖος τε καὶ Ἑλληνας πάντας ὑφ᾽ ἀμαρτίαν εἶναι (Jews and Greeks alike are all under sin), both groups are depicted as sinful. Hence, Paul is not concerned with the sinfulness of individual human beings in his discussion. Instead, the two corporate groups, Ἰουδαῖος and Ἑλλην, were his focus. Therefore, the phrase αὐτῶν τῆς συνείδησεως (their conscience) should be understood in light of this context. The plural αὐτῶν, which refers to the Gentiles, is combined with a singular form of συνείδησις, underlining the Gentiles as a corporate group that is

66. Jewett similarly argues that the phrase παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι (to everyone who believes) does not denote individual believers. Instead, it refers to different ‘cultural groups’ in the schema of God’s salvation. Robert Jewett, Romans: A Commentary (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), p. 146.


68. The three occurrences of Ἰουδαῖος and Ἑλλην are different in case (genitive in 2.9, dative in 2.10, and accusative in 3.9).
distinguished from the other group, the Jews. In other words, συνείδησις is not a DS. Rather, the singular term emphasizes the corporate identity of the Gentiles.69

συνείδησις, which occurs twice in 1 Cor. 8, is also not a DS here, as Paul does not discuss individual consciences of the former idolaters. In discussing idol worship, Paul comments on the practice of offering food to idols: τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἐως ἅρτη τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἁσθενής οὕτω μολύνεται (and some, by being accustomed to idols in former times, eat this food as an idol sacrifice, and their conscience, because it is weak, is defiled) (8.7). The phrase καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν (and their conscience) clearly identifies them as former idol worshippers. However, understanding the wider context would further illuminate the connotation of συνείδησις in this ASC. In 1 Corinthians 8, Paul discusses the issue of food and idols, an issue that impacts the whole community, which is related to the conflict among the Corinthians. The whole discussion is written in the form of chiasm. The issue of food and idols is discussed in 8.1-13 and 10.1–11.1, with the topic of freedom appearing at the center of the chiastic structure, 9.1-27.70 The issue is obviously a concern for the entire community. For example, Paul mentions τινὲς (some people) (8.7) are accustomed to idol worship, but his emphatic call addresses the whole community: διὸ περ, ἀγαπητοί μου, φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας (So then, my beloved, flee from idolatry.) Furthermore, the conflict between two parties within the community is subtly portrayed throughout the discussion. Paul attends to the underlying conflict between τοῖς ἁσθενέσιν (the Weak) (8.9) and σὲ τὸν ἔχοντα γνῶσιν (the

69. Of interest is this kind of corporate dimension that Paul alludes to throughout the book of Romans. For example, Schreiner and Abasciano disagree on the interpretation of Rom. 9–11. For Abasciano, the focus of these two chapters is upon the corporate election of Israel. However, for Schreiner, it is both upon the corporate election and the individual election, as he contends that these two kinds of election are inseparable. Despite their differences, both scholars affirm the corporate aspect in Rom. 9–11. Brian J. Abasciano, ‘Corporate Election in Romans 9: A Reply to Thomas Schreiner’, JETS 49 (2006), pp. 351-71 (353-58); Thomas R. Schreiner, ‘Corporate and Individual Election in Romans 9: A Response to Brian Abasciano’, JETS 49 (2006), pp. 373-86 (376-77).

The Wise’ (also known as ‘the Strong’) believe that they possess the true knowledge, and they despise the Weak. In light of this context, the discussion of food and idols does not concern the individual conscience, but the entire community that is in conflict. As previously mentioned, this epistle is centered on one key theme: ecclesial unity. Therefore, συνείδησις is a normal singular noun, highlighting a particular group of people in the community.

Lastly, συνείδησις occurs in the ASC in 2 Cor. 1.12. As previously argued, this letter is marked by the substantial usage of the epistolary plural. The first-person plural pronouns and the first-person plural verbs in 1.3-12 refer to Paul himself. Therefore, in the phrase τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν (the testimony of our conscience) (1.12), the singular συνείδησις is not a DS noun, and the plural ἡμῶν is an epistolary plural.

The analysis of σῶμα, πνεῦμα and συνείδησις has shown that the three anthropological terms in the ASC are not DSs. These terms are usually either a normal singular noun, carrying a metaphorical sense to highlight the communal and corporate connotation, or an epistolary plural, referring to Paul alone. In the following section, a short analysis of καρδία and σάρξ will further support these findings.

καρδία (Heart)
καρδία occurs three times as a singular form in the ASC. In Rom. 1.21, Paul states that ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία (their senseless heart) is darkened. In 1.24, the text discusses ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν (to the lusts of their hearts). Semantically, καρδία is connected with either ἀσύνετος (senseless) or ἐπιθυμία (lust), words depicting emotion and mind. Both cases display an agreement in number. In ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία, the singular substantival adjective is correlated with the

71. This is a common view held by various scholars. ‘The Wise’ is also known as ‘the Strong’. For Mitchell, the concern for food and idols is a divisive issue. Mitchell, Corinthians, p. 237. There are two groups in the community, ‘the Strong’ and ‘the Weak’ (Thiselton, Corinthians, p. 606; Fee, Corinthians, pp. 358-62; Conzelmann, Corinthians, pp. 140-41). Murphy-O’Connor argues that the phrase πάντες γνῶσιν ἔχομεν (8.1) denotes ‘the Strong’, and suggests that ‘the Weak’ is under the oppression of ‘the Strong’. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 88, 97. Fee further contends that Paul uses his own example regarding the discussion of freedom to illustrate the problematic attitudes held by both groups. Fee, Corinthians, pp. 358-59.
singular καρδία. In ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν, the plural noun is modified by the plural καρδία. It would be relatively forced to interpret καρδία in 1.21 as a DS noun. Rather, it is more convincing to perceive it as a normal singular, given the singular use of the substantival adjective, despite the presence of a plural pronoun αὐτῶν (their).\(^72\)

In 2 Cor. 3.15, καρδία occurs in a context where Paul draws on the Old Testament text to argue his point. He refers to the event at Mount Sinai where Moses receives the old covenant from God on behalf of the ancient Israelites. The phrase τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν (their heart) refers to the Israelites.\(^73\) Based on the context, the most natural explanation for the singular form of καρδία in 3.15 is that the Israelites were regarded as having one heart, highlighting their corporate identity and their common mindset of rebellion, the mindset that disables their ability to see the Lord’s glory (3.16-18). This corporate identity illustrated by καρδία is further exemplified by the contrast between αὐτῶν (their) (3.15), the Israelites and ἡμεῖς (we) (3.18) and the Christian community. If καρδία were treated as a DS, it would only refer to the individual hearts of the people instead of their corporate attitude, a view that contradicts the context.

Paul expresses in 2 Cor. 6.11: τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν ἀνέψυχον πρὸς ύμᾶς, Κορίνθιοι, ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτυνται (Our mouth has opened to you, Corinthians; our heart has been enlarged). There are two ASCs—τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν and ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν. First, this verse is located at 2.14–7.4, a section in which Paul defends his apostolic ministry. As previously discussed, the epistolary plural is employed extensively in this section. Second, in the following verse, στενοχωρεῖσθε δὲ ἐν τοῖς σπλάγχνοις ύμῶν (but you are restricted in you affections) (6.12), it is evident that

72. Barrett, Cranfield, Byrne, Moo and Dunn do not mention the singular use of καρδία nor use of the ASC. Byrne and Dunn refer to the similarity between 1.21 and Ps. 75.6 (76.5 in the LXX). However, in the LXX a plural ἀσύνετος is combined with a singular dative καρδία: οἱ ἀσύνετοι τῇ καρδίᾳ (the senseless ones in the heart). Paul may allude to the LXX; it is certainly not a direct quotation. Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, p. 332; Byrne, *Romans*, p. 74; Dunn, *Romans*, p. 60; C.K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1991), p. 37; C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975–79), I, p. 118; Moo, *Romans*, p. 107.

the word σπλάγχνον (affection), which portrays affection and love,\textsuperscript{74} is closely associated with καρδία.\textsuperscript{75} In light of this, the ASC, ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν, depicts Paul’s appeal to the Corinthians by expressing his affection towards them.\textsuperscript{76} The plural pronoun ἡμῶν is an epistolary plural, depicting Paul’s own heart. This view is commonly held by scholars.\textsuperscript{77}

σάρξ (Flesh)

σάρξ occurs three times in the ASC. First, in his discussion of sin, Paul writes, ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἁσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑµῶν (I speak in human terms because of the weakness of your flesh) (Rom. 6.19). In this context, σάρξ should not be interpreted as a DS; otherwise, the term could connote the ‘fleshes’ (meats) of the Romans. Instead, the term is a metaphor for human limitation or human weakness, as argued by many scholars.\textsuperscript{78} This understanding of human weakness echoes with

74. BDAG, p. 763.
75. καρδία, in both 6.11 and 7.3, is related to emotion. See Furnish, Corinthians, p. 360; Martin, Corinthians, p. 219; Thrall, Corinthians, I, p. 484; Lambrecht, Corinthians, p. 119.
76. Although Paul includes Timothy (Παῦλος ... καὶ Τιμόθεος) in 1.1, the ἡµῶν in 6.11 does not automatically include Timothy, who is not the key character in this passage.
78. Human weakness is taken by different scholars as ‘intellectual difficulty’ (Byrne), ‘inadequacy of human perception’ (Dunn), ‘weakness in understanding’ (Moo), ‘failure to understand’ (Jewett), and ‘weak human nature’ (Fitzmyer). Byrne, Romans, p. 206; Dunn, Romans, p. 345; Moo, Romans, pp. 403-404; Jewett, Romans, p. 420; Fitzmyer, Romans, p. 450.
Dunn’s argument. According to Dunn, Paul does not insist on adopting Hebraic or Greek thoughts, but rather occasionally creates a new usage that would modify the original Hebraic mindset or Greek philosophy for his own purpose. For Dunn, Paul synthesizes elements of Hebrew and Greek anthropology, concurrently affirming a holistic Hebrew concept of human embodiment, including capturing a ‘negative Greek attitude to existence in the flesh’, and employs the term σάρξ to illustrate human weakness and frailty. Nevertheless, Scornaienchi highlights the communal aspect of σάρξ in Paul’s work. In his study of σάρξ, Scornaienchi argues that Paul uses σάρξ to denote a destructive community, pointing to the people who actively pursue their own desires and contributing to the destruction of a community. Although Scornaienchi does not analyze σάρξ in Rom. 6.19, his findings do support the communal connotation behind this anthropological term.

As previously mentioned, many scholars regard 4.7-15 as Paul’s own experience as he defends his apostolic ministry. Therefore, the singular σάρξ in τῇ ἐνθνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡµῶν (in our mortal flesh) (2 Cor. 4.11) is not a DS. The pronoun ‘we’ in 4.12, the first-person plural verbs and the pronoun ἡµῶν in this ASC are epistolary plurals, referring to Paul himself. The singular form of σάρξ portrays Paul’s weakness. The same argument applies to the ASC in 2 Cor. 7.5. σάρξ in 2 Cor. 7.5 is not a DS, referring to the exhausted physical bodies of the people visiting Macedonia. Instead, the focus of 7.1-16 is Paul who is comforted by the later coming of Titus (7.6). Thus, the plural pronoun ἡµῶν is an epistolary plural, depicting Paul himself.

80. Dunn, Perspectives, 78. Dunn astutely surmises that Paul’s concept of the human person comprises several dimensions, wherein each reflects one or more anthropological terms, and each anthropological term imbues a spectrum of meaning; nonetheless, Paul’s anthropology is coherent, as a human person can be understood as having frailty as illustrated by σάρξ.
82. He focuses on various Pauline passages, including Rom. 7.7-25; 12.3-8; 1 Cor. 6.12-20; 11.17-34; 12.1-31; 2 Cor. 5.1-10; and Gal 5.13-23.
Minor Terms
The singular form of πρόσωπον, λάρυγξ, στόμα, νῶτος and ἄνθρωπος only appear once or twice in the ASC. Therefore, a very brief analysis will be provided instead. πρόσωπον (face) nearly always occurs in singular form in the Pauline epistles, with two occurrences in the ASCs (1 Thess. 2.17; 3.10). In both occurrences, the term is not a DS noun, as it would literally mean that Paul desires to see the Thessalonians’ faces. The singular form is better understood as metaphorical, depicting the Thessalonian community that Paul wants to visit.

As discussed in the analysis of καρδία in 2 Cor. 6.11, the term στόμα, which occurs in the same verse with καρδία is not a DS. It is a normal singular noun that expresses Paul’s own emotion and love. The plural ἡμῶν is an epistolary plural. ἄνθρωπος (person) occurs twice in the ASC. ἄνθρωπος in ὁ παλαίδος ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος (our old person) (Rom. 6.6) does not carry an ontological orientation; it illustrates ‘a common humanness’ under the ‘former “Adamic” existence under sin’. In 2 Cor. 4.16, ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος (our external person) contrasts with ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν (our internal person), highlighting the believers’ transformation. In both cases, ἄνθρωπος is a metaphor and does not denote a concrete being that dwells in each individual believer as the DS would suggest. λάρυγξ (throat), which occurs in Rom. 3.13, is a direct quotation from Ps. 5.10 in the LXX. This ASC does not illustrate Paul’s literary style. νῶτος (back) occurs in Rom. 11.10. This

83. πρόσωπον occurs 21 times in Paul’s letters, with only one plural construct: ἐξ πολλῶν προσώπων (from many faces; 2 Cor. 1.11). The plural form is likely the result of being constrained by its modifier, πολλῶν (many), a plural adjective.


85. Many scholars consider 2 Cor. 6.11 as a description of Paul’s relationship with the Corinthians, which supports the use of the epistolary plural. Barrett, Corinthians, pp. 191-92; Bruce, Corinthians, p. 213; Lambrecht, Corinthians, p. 117; Martin, Corinthians, p. 185, Thrall, Corinthians, I, pp. 468-69; Matera, Corinthians, pp. 160-61; Keener, Corinthians, pp. 190-91; Roetzel, Corinthians, pp. 86-87; Harris, Corinthians, pp. 487-88.

86. Moo, Romans, p. 373.
87. Dunn, Romans, p. 318.
88. Byrne, Romans, p. 196.
89. Lambrecht, Corinthians, pp. 80-81.
90. This phrase is Ps. 5.9 in modern English versions.
passage is also a direct quotation from Ps. 68.24 in the LXX.\textsuperscript{91} Therefore, this construct is not indicative and cannot illustrate Paul’s literary style.

Conclusion

This study has shown that the concept of DS is not a good and valid explanation to account for the ASC in Paul’s letters. The abnormal construct can be better explained by other grammatical categories, including the normal singular (denoting corporate and social dimensions), the epistolary plural, some type of metaphor and the use of the Old Testament. When employing anthropological terms, Paul does not seem to have the idea of the DS in view, which is a grammatical expression found in both the Hebrew Scripture and the LXX. To convey his message to the Christian communities in the Greco-Roman world with a sizeable non-Jewish audience, his usage was consistent with the Koiné Greek grammar of the time. Sometimes he highlighted his emphasis on the community by combining a singular anthropological term with a plural possessive pronoun. Reflecting on the corporate and communal aspect expressed by these singular anthropological terms shows that Paul’s anthropology and ecclesiology are inseparable. A pragmatic implication is that Christian identity should not be understood in light of an individualistic dimension, but rather that identity should be understood and accomplished in and through a community.

\textsuperscript{91} This phrase is Ps. 69.23 in modern English versions.