

THE DISTRIBUTIVE SINGULAR IN PAUL:
THE ADEQUACY OF A GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY

Sunny Chen

Pilgrim Theological College, The University of Divinity, Melbourne, Australia

Introduction

Paul's use of the distributive singular in his authentic letters has not been adequately explored in previous scholarship. His 'grace benediction'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).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.³ Few notes that scholarly attempts to explain this unusual combination

1. Weima uses this term. Jeffrey A.D. Weima, *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings* (JSNTSup, 101; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), p. 78.

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 ἀγαπώντων (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.

3. For example, see Robert Johnstone, *Lectures on the Epistle to the Philippians* (Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1977), pp. 477-78; F.C. Synge, *Philippians and Colossians: Introduction and Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1951), p. 48; Charles B. Cousar, *Philippians and Philemon: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), pp. 90-91.

(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 combination⁵ 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

4. Gordon D. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), p. 469.

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.

8. Blass and Debrunner call this rule ‘agreement in number’ (BDF, pp. 73-79). Others call this rule ‘congruence of number’ or ‘concord in number’. Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. III. Syntax* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), pp. 311-13; A.T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1934), pp. 403-406.

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 pronoun¹⁰ that modifies it.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.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’.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 Smyth¹⁴ note that this peculiar construct is found in the LXX and the New Testament.¹⁵ For

10. Pronoun follows noun: 175 occurrences; noun follows pronoun: 37 occurrences.

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.

12. Gundry argues that *σῶμα* (body) is a DS noun in *τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν* (in our body) (2 Cor. 4.10) and in *τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν* (of our body) (Rom. 8.23). Robert H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (SNTSMS, 29; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 76-77. Fee and Hawthorne consider *πνεῦμα* (spirit) in *τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν* (your spirit) (Phil. 4.23) as a DS noun. Gordon D. Fee, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), p. 461; Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), p. 215.

13. G.B. Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek: Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis* (trans. W.F. Moulton; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1877), p. 218.

14. Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes: First Part: The Syntax of the Simple Sentence Embracing the Doctrine of the Moods and Tenses* (New York: American Book, 1900), p. 22; Hebert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. Gordon M. Messing; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), p. 269.

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, *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).¹⁶ Conversely, the Greeks would simply write ‘they opened their mouths’.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ 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’.¹⁹ Green observes that, in the New Testament, some words like *καρδία* (heart) and *σῶμα* (body) are in singular form ‘when predicated of several individuals’,²⁰ 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.²¹ Of those that mention the DS,

16. Gesenius states that ‘the plural of persons is sometimes construed with the singular of the predicate, when instead of the whole class of individuals’. Wilhelm Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar: As Edited and Enlarged by the Late E. Kautzsch* (ed. A.E. Cowley; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), p. 464. Although Waltke and O’Connor do not discuss the DS, they provide a comprehensive explanation of the usage of the singular in biblical Hebrew language. Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), pp. 111-16.

17. BDF, p. 77. For example, סכֶרֶשׁ בָ (your flesh) (Lev. 19.28, BHS) is translated into σώματι ὑμῶν (your body) in LXX: the plural suffixed pronoun בָ (your) and the singular noun בָשָׂר (flesh) are translated into a singular σώματι (body) and a plural ὑμῶν (your).

18. Turner, *Syntax*, pp. 23-24.

19. Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 409.

20. Samuel G. Green, *Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament: Together with Complete Vocabulary and an Examination of the Chief New Testament Synonyms* (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1912), p. 202.

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.²² Given the adoption of Turner's analysis by subsequent scholars, it deserves further elucidation.²³

Turner uses *καρδία* (heart), *κεφαλή* (head), *όσφυς* (waist), *σῶμα* (body) and *χείρ* (hand) as examples of the DS in the New Testament. *καρδία*, *όσφυς* and *σῶμα* appear in the Pauline epistles,²⁴ and of these, *καρδία* and *σῶμα*, according to Turner, appear in both DS and normal plural forms.²⁵ 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).²⁶ 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.

New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach (SBG, 5; New York: Peter Lang, 1994), pp. 18-19; H.P.V. Nunn, *A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), p. 5. One mentions a failure of agreement: Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (BLG, 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2nd edn, 1994), pp. 74-75.

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.

24. Turner, *Syntax*, pp. 23-24.

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.²⁷ 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), νῶτος (back) and ἄνθρωπος (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 ἡμῶν (our father) to describe God

27. The excluded abstract nouns include ἀγάπη (love), ἀγιασμός (holiness), ἀδικία (unrighteousness), αἰσχύνη (shame), ἀκοή (report), ἀκρασία (excess), ἀπιστία (unfaithfulness), ἀπλότης (generosity), ἀποβολή (loss), ἀσθένεια (weakness), δέησις (entreaty), διακονία (service), δικαιοσύνη (righteousness), δικαιώσις (justification), δοκιμή (character), δόξα (glory), εἴσοδος (access), ἐκλογή (election), ἐλευθερία (freedom), ἐλπίς (hope), ἐπιπόθησις (longing), ἔξουσία (authority), εὐαγγέλιον (good news), εὐλογία (blessing), ζῆλος (zeal), ἥττημα (defeat), θλῖψις (tribulation), ίκανότης (sufficiency), καθαίρεσις (destruction), κανών (limit), καρπός (fruit), κατάρτισις (maturation), καύχημα (pride), καύχησις (boasting), κήρυγμα (preaching), κλῆσις (calling), κοινωνία (fellowship), κόπος (labor), λατρεία (worship), μακαρισμός (blessedness), μνεία (remembrance), νουθεσία (warning), ὁδυρμός (lamentation), ὀλοκληρία (health), ὅμολογία (confession), ὅρεξις (appetite), πανουργία (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), σπουδή (haste), στρατεία (fight), ταπείνωσις (humiliation), ὑπακοή (obedience), ὑπόκρισις (hypocrisy), ὑστέρημα (deficiency), φθόγγος (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; Phlm. 2) or Abraham (Rom. 4.12), προπάτορα ἡμῶν (our forefather) to describe Abraham (Rom. 4.1), ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν (our sister) to denote Phoebe (Rom. 16.1), συνεργὸν ἡμῶν (our co-worker) to refer to Urbanus (Rom. 16.9), συνεργῷ 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), συνέκδημος 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), ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν (our letter) (2 Cor. 3.2), ἡμῶν οἰκία (our house) (2 Cor. 5.1), οἰκητήριον ἡμῶν (our dwelling) (2 Cor. 5.2), σπορὸν ὑμῶν (your seed) (2 Cor. 9.10), ὑμῶν οἰκοδομῆς (your building) (2 Cor. 12.19), παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν (our teacher) (Gal. 3.24), ἔχθρὸς ὑμῶν (your enemy) (Gal. 4.16), λόγον ὑμῶν (your word) (Phil. 4.17), ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου (your work) (1 Thess. 1.3), ὁδὸν 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.²⁸ 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, ἢ ἂ βουλεύομαι κατὰ σάρκα βουλεύομαι, ἵνα γά παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὔ οὔ; (or do I plan according to flesh so that with me there should be ‘yes, yes’ and ‘no, no’ at the same time?), and in 1.18 expresses his thought, πιστὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ὁ πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἔστιν ναὶ καὶ οὔ (but God is

28. Ps. 69.22-23 in English versions. The LXX has ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν (their table before them) instead of ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν (their table). Paul’s quotations do not always exactly agree with the LXX. Sometimes he approximates the original text. Nonetheless, Paul, who could have corrected the ASC, chooses to retain it. See D. Moody Smith, ‘The Pauline Literature’, in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, SSF (ed. D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 265-91.

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: *ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν ὑμεῖς ἔστε* (you are our letter). Hence, *ἐπιστολὴ* (letter) is not a DS. In 2 Cor. 5.2, *οἰκητήριον* (dwelling) is also a metaphor, portraying the heavenly dwelling that is built by God. The phrase *οἰκητήριον ἡμῶν* (our dwelling) does not denote a concrete object (in this case, a literal house), and is therefore not a DS. Similarly, both *οἰκία* (house) (2 Cor. 5.1) and *οἰκητήριον* (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 πληθυνεῖ τὸν σπόρον ὑμῶν* (he supplies and multiplies your seed) describes God’s gracious provision. Nonetheless, *σπόρον* never occurs in plural form in the New Testament. Therefore, it is unlikely that *σπόρον* 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, *ἄστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν;* (therefore have I become your enemy as I am telling you the truth?). The word *ἐχθρός* (enemy) is a normal singular noun, referring to Paul himself. In Phil. 4.17, *λόγον ὑμῶν* should be translated as ‘your account’²⁹ in the clause *οὐχ 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 τοῦ 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 *ὁδόν* (way) is not a DS. Paul then teaches the Thessalonians to respect those who labor among them in 1 Thess. 5.13: *καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ 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 ή ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία (their senseless heart) (Rom. 1.21); αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως (their conscience) (Rom. 2.15); δ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν (their throat) (Rom. 3.13); δ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος (our old person) (Rom. 6.6); τῷ θηνητῷ 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); τὸν νῶτον 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); ή συνείδησις αὐτῶν (their conscience) (1 Cor. 8.7); αὐτῶν τὴν συνείδησιν (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 θηνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν (in our mortal flesh) (2 Cor. 4.11); δ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος (our inner person) (2 Cor. 4.16); τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν (our mouth) (2 Cor. 6.11); ή καρδία ἡμῶν (our heart) (2 Cor. 6.11); ή σάρξ ἡμῶν (our flesh) (2 Cor. 7.5); τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν (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 ή 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

Terms	Singular term with a plural personal genitive pronoun Total Occurrences: 26	Plural term with a plural personal genitive pronoun Total Occurrences: 23
<i>σῶμα</i>	Occurrences: 5 Rom. 6.12; 8.23; 1 Cor. 6.19, 20; 2 Cor. 4.10	Occurrences: 4 Rom. 1.24; 8.11; 12.1; 1 Cor. 6.15
<i>πνεῦμα</i>	Occurrences: 4 Rom. 8.16; Gal. 6.18; Phil. 4.23; Phlm. 25	Occurrences: 0
<i>συνείδησις</i>	Occurrences: 4 Rom. 2.15; 1 Cor. 8.7, 12; 2 Cor. 1.12	Occurrences: 1 2 Cor. 5.11
<i>χαρδία</i>	Occurrences: 3 Rom. 1.21; 2 Cor. 3.15; 6.11	Occurrences: 11 Rom. 1.24; 2.15; 5.5; 2 Cor. 1.22; 3.2; 4.6; 7.3; Gal. 4.6; Phil. 4.7; 1 Thess. 2.4; 3.13
<i>σάρξ</i>	Occurrences: 3 Rom. 6.19; 2 Cor. 4.11; 7.5	Occurrences: 0
<i>πρόσωπον</i>	Occurrences: 2 1 Thess. 2.17; 3.10	Occurrences: 0
<i>ἄνθρωπος</i>	Occurrences: 2 Rom. 6.6; 2 Cor. 4.16	Occurrences: 0
<i>στόμα</i>	Occurrences: 1 2 Cor. 6.11	Occurrences: 0
<i>λάρυγξ</i>	Occurrences: 1 Rom. 3.13	Occurrences: 0
<i>νῶτος</i>	Occurrences: 1 Rom. 11.10	Occurrences: 0
<i>ὁφθαλμός</i>	Occurrences: 0	Occurrences: 3 Rom. 3.18; 11.10; Gal. 4.15
<i>πούς</i>	Occurrences: 0	Occurrences: 2 Rom. 3.15; 16.20
<i>χείρ</i>	Occurrences: 0	Occurrences: 1 1 Thess. 4.11
<i>ψυχή</i>	Occurrences: 0	Occurrences: 1 2 Cor. 12.15

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 *σῶμα*, 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.

σῶμα (Body)

σῶμα occurs five times in the ASC, twice in 1 Corinthians. The term *σῶμα* is combined with *ὑμῶν* (your) in 6.15, 19 and 20. The two ASCs are *τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν* (6.19) and *τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν* (6.20).³¹ This seemingly contradicts the preceding phrase *τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν* (your bodies) in 6.15. Why is *σῶμα* 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 ὑμῶν* (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.³² Among those who discuss it, several advocate the use of the DS for *σῶμα*.³³

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.

33. Fee argues for the DS. Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), p. 263. Robinson refers to *καρδία* in Paul's letters and argues that this combination is purely a grammatical variation or a collective singular with an emphasis on the 'mass' contrasting with the 'individualization'. John A.T. Robinson, *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology* (London: SCM Press, 1952), pp. 29-30. Gundry repudiates Robinson's theory; he contends that this is a collective singular that does not negate individualization. Gundry, *Sōma*, p. 220.

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.³⁴ Third, the usage is coherent within its immediate context. In the preceding context, 6.14 in particular, Paul first employs the pronoun *ἡμᾶς* (us) to convey a communal focus, and then uses the singular form of *σῶμα*, in place of *ἡμᾶς*, 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.³⁵ Paul employs a singular form of *σῶμα* to emphasize the corporate and communal aspect.³⁶ 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 οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα 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.³⁷ 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.³⁸ 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: οὐκοῦν οἴδατε δότι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε 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,³⁹ 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, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους (Now you are Christ’s body and each of you is a member of it) (12.27).⁴⁰ Murphy-O’Connor argues that *σῶμα* is a normal singular that denotes the community’s identity, since both the immediate context, οὐκοῦν ἐστὲ ἑαυτῶν (you are not your own) (6.19), and the wider context, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ (but you *belong to* Christ) (3.23), elucidate the ‘authentic humanity’ that Christ embodies. Thus, the focus is on community instead of individuality.⁴¹ 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 ἴδιον *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).

41. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *I Corinthians* (New Testament Message: A Biblical-Theological Commentary, 10; Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1979), pp. 53-54.

ὑμῶν is parallel with ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν (temple that is in you). Both phrases point to a corporate understanding.⁴² Fitzmyer also contends that Paul urges the ‘community of Corinth’ to have ‘a corporate honoring of God’ in 6.20.⁴³ 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 θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν (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’.⁴⁴ 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 *ὑμῶν* is accurate. Furthermore, the term *σῶμα* in 1 Corinthians, according to Martin, assumes the microcosm of the body,

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

43. For Fitzmyer, *σῶμα* in 6.19 connotes the physical body, and *σῶμα* in 6.20 illustrates a corporate reference. Paul uses *ὑμῶν* to encourage the Corinthians to honor God in a ‘corporate’ manner and *σῶμα* to emphasize the ‘individual’ conduct of honoring. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AYB, 32; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), p. 270.

44. Nijay K. Gupta, ‘Which “Body” Is a Temple (1 Corinthians 6:19)? Paul beyond the Individual/Communal Divide’, *CBQ* 72 (2010), pp. 518-36 (531).

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

45. Dale Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 92. For Martin, the influence of popular philosophy on the early Christian communities, within which Paul ministered, was ‘more related to Stoic than Platonic concepts’. Martin, *Body*, p. 14.

46. Blass and Debrunner call this the ‘literary plural’, a common usage among contemporary Greek authors. Moule argues that this is not as common as some claim. BDF, pp. 146-47; C.F.D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930), p. 118. Robertson repudiates the popular use of the epistolary plural in Paul’s letters, since Paul sometimes associates himself with others in addressing an audience. Robertson, *Grammar*, pp. 677-78. Wallace prefers the term literary plural to epistolary plural. Wallace, *Grammar*, p. 394. Without specifying 4.10, Verhoef argues that the epistolary plural can explain some of the plural pronouns in 2 Corinthians, but each occurrence must be judged individually. Eduard Verhoef, ‘The Senders of the Letters to the Corinthians and the Use of “I” and “We”’, in *The Corinthian Correspondence* (ed. R. Bieringer; BETL, 125; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), pp. 417-25 (423).

47. Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), pp. 322-57; Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (WBC, 40; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986), p. 87; Jan Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians* (SP, 8; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), p. 74; Paul Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), pp. 229-32; F.F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), p. 198; Margaret E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), I, p. 321; Calvin J. Roetzel, *2 Corinthians* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2007), pp. 71-72.

believers. The singular form of *σῶμα* is defined by Turner as the DS, denoting individual physical bodies, which is a common argument among scholars.⁴⁸ 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 ἀμαρτία ἐν τῷ θυητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι* (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 ὑμῶν* (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.⁴⁹ 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'.⁵⁰ He claims that there is no distinction between the divine spirit and the human spirit in Paul's work, since *πνεῦμα* means

48. 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.

49. The combination of the second-person plural possessive pronoun and the plural form of *πνεῦμα* is entirely absent in the New Testament.

50. Robert Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), p. 184. Reumann shares Jewett's view. Reumann defines *πνεῦμα* in Phil. 4.23 as God's Spirit that is apportioned to one and all. John Reumann, *Philippians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AYB, 33B; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), p. 732.

‘the apportionment of the divine spirit given to each Christian’.⁵¹ This is not a common view in scholarship, however. For example, Fee argues that Jewett’s claim is not as clear as he states.⁵² 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,⁵³ denoting the ‘anthropological *πνεῦμα*’ that depicts the psychical functions of humans,⁵⁴ the ‘inner personality’, functioning as a contact point between humans and God,⁵⁵ or the individual human spirits of the readers⁵⁶ or the ‘whole personality’, emphasizing its mental and

51. Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, p. 197. According to Bauer, *πνεῦμα* actually indicates a divine spirit in the soul ($\tauὸ\; πνεῦμα\; τῇ\; ψυχῇ$) in some contemporary Greek literature. BDAG, p. 675.

52. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence*, p. 469.

53. Schweizer, Betz, Fung, Matera, Bockmuehl, Müller, Dunn, Fee, Hansen, Hawthorne and O’Brien hold this view. Schweizer, ‘Πνεῦμα’, TDNT, IV, p. 435; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), p. 325; Ronald Y.K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), p. 315; Frank J. Matera, *Galatians* (SP, 9; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), p. 227; Ulrich B. Müller, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Philipper* (THKNT, 11; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1993), p. 211; James D.G. Dunn, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), p. 349; Douglas Moo, *The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), p. 442; Markus Bockmuehl, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (BNTC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998), p. 271; Fee, *Philippians*, p. 461; Walter Hansen, *The Letter to the Philippians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), p. 332; Peter T. O’Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 554-55; Hawthorne, *Philippians*, pp. 215-16. Fung’s view is complex, referring to *πνεῦμα* in Gal. 6.18 as a human’s ‘God conscious aspect’ and simultaneously asserting the synonymy between *μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν* (with your spirit) and *μεθ’ ὑμῶν* (with you). Fung, *Galatians*, p. 315.

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 ὑμῶν* and *μεθ’ ὑμῶν*.

55. William Hendriksen, *Exposition of Galatians* (New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968), p. 249.

56. Dunn, *Colossians*, p. 349.

spiritual aspects.⁵⁷ Some proponents of this view suggest that *πνεῦμα* is a DS noun,⁵⁸ referring to each spirit.⁵⁹ However, most of these interpreters provide very little evidence of how this kind of ontological connotation is derived.⁶⁰

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,⁶¹ 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.⁶² However, this study

57. Jean-François Collange, *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians* (trans. A.W. Heathcote; London: Epworth Press, 1979), p. 155.

58. Thompson regards ὑμῶν as illustrating the church that congregates at Philemon’s house. Marianne Meye Thompson, *Colossians and Philemon* (The Two Horizons New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), p. 227.

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.

61. This study does not suggest that this view originates from John Chrysostom. John Chrysostom, *Commentary of St John Chrysostom Archbishop of Constantinople on the Epistle of St Paul the Apostle to the Galatians* (NPNF, 13; ed. Philip Schaff; New York: The Christian Literature, 1889), pp. 47-48.

62. In commenting on Gal. 6.18, McDonald and Bruce adopt this view. H.D. McDonald, *Freedom in Faith: A Commentary on Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians* (London: Pickering & Inglis, 1973), p. 157; F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), p. 277. In commenting on Phlm. 25, Bruce, Fee, Lohse and O’Brien support this view without explanation: F.F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), p. 225; Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence*, p. 635; Eduard Lohse, *A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress

supports the explanation provided by Thurston and Ryan who advocate the synonymy between $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\tau\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\sigma$ ὑμῶν and $\mu\epsilon\theta'\mu\alpha\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\sigma$. 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, $\epsilon\nu\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha$, μιᾶς ψυχῆς (one spirit, one soul) (1.27).⁶³ They argue that $\pi\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ denotes the community resembling an entire ‘person’, echoing the emphasis on the one-mindedness of the church in the epistle. Similarly, Martin considers that $\pi\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ 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 ὑμῶν, Paul uses the variant form with the singular $\pi\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ to highlight the corporate and communal unity of the believers.

The singular $\pi\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ 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 $\pi\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ were a DS, the focus would be on individual spirits. Nonetheless, it is better to understand that Paul employs $\pi\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ to highlight the single community of believers, a usage that resembles the $\pi\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ in the above-mentioned benedictions.

Press, 1971), p. 208; Peter T. O’Brien, *Colossians, Philemon* (WBC, 44; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982), p. 308. For Martin, ὑμεῖς is equivalent to $\tau\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omega\sigma$ ὑμῶν. Ralph P. Martin, *Colossians and Philemon* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), p. 170. Without explanation, Beare identifies $\pi\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ in Phil. 4.23 as the ‘one spirit’ that the Philippians are all animated by, and Reed, as the Philippians’ ‘collective spirit’. F.W. Beare, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (London: A. & C. Black, 1959), p. 158; Jeffrey T. Reed, *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity* (JSNTSup, 136; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), p. 306. For Moo, $\pi\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ in Phlm. 25 denotes the human spirit and reinforces the oneness in spirit of the congregation. Moo, *Philemon*, p. 442.

63. Bonnie B. Thurston and Judith M. Ryan, *Philippians and Philemon* (SP, 10; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005), p. 161.

64. Ralph P. Martin, *Philippians* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), p. 171.

65. O’Brien repudiates this view and asserts that $\pi\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ carries an anthropological significance in Phil. 4.23, arguing that there is no difference between $\tau\omega\pi\mu\alpha\tau\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omega\sigma$ ὑμῶν and ὑμῶν. 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 συνειδήσεως* (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 “Ελλησίν 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 Ἰουδαίω τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἔλληνι (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 Ἔλλην (Jew first and also Gentile) is repeated three times (2.9, 10; 3.9).⁶⁸ As stated in 3.9, Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἔλληνας 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 Ἔλλην, were his focus. Therefore, the phrase *αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως* (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.

67. Ben C. Dunson, ‘Faith in Romans: The Salvation of the Individual or Life in Community?’ *JSNT* 34 (2011), pp. 19–46 (27). Dunson provides a detailed discussion of this issue and concludes that for Paul, ‘individuals experience a fundamental deficiency apart from being embedded into community’. Ben C. Dunson, *Individual and Community in Paul’s Letter to the Romans* (WUNT, 2.332; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), p. 178.

68. The three occurrences of Ἰουδαῖος and Ἔλλην 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 ἔως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενῆς οὖσα 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: *διόπερ, 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 ἀσθενέσιν* (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).

70. Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), p. 367; Kenneth E. Bailey, *Paul through Mediterranean Eyes: Cultural Studies in 1 Corinthians* (Downer Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011), p. 229.

Wise) (8.10).⁷¹ ‘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 ἀνέῳγεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 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 ὑμῶν* (but you are restricted in your 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 *καρδίᾳ*: *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.

73. Many commentators fail to notice the ASC. Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, p. 329; Martin, *Corinthians*, p. 69; Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1984), p. 233; Thrall, *Corinthians*, I, p. 267; Lambrecht, *Corinthians*, p. 53.

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

σάρξ (*Flesh*)

σάρξ occurs three times in the ASC. First, in his discussion of sin, Paul writes, ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν 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.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.

77. Harris, Martin, Thrall, Lambrecht, Matera, McCant, Witherington, Keener, Roetzel, Barnett and Kijne hold this view without defining ἡμῶν as the epistolary plural. Harris, *Corinthians*, pp. 488-89; Martin, *Corinthians*, pp. 185-86; Thrall, *Corinthians*, I, pp. 468-69; Lambrecht, *Corinthians*, p. 120; Frank J. Matera, *II Corinthians* (NTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003), p. 161; David A. deSilva, *The Credential of an Apostle: Paul's Gospel in 2 Corinthians 1-7* (Biblical Monograph Series, 4; N. Richland Hills; TX: Bibal, 1998), p. 32; Jerry W. McCant, *2 Corinthians* (Readings; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), p. 61; Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), p. 400; Craig S. Keener, *1-2 Corinthians* (New Cambridge Bible Commentary; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 191; Roetzel, *Corinthians*, p. 87; Barnett, *Corinthians*, p. 335; J.J. Kijne, 'We, Us and Our in I and II Corinthians', *NovT* 8 (1966), pp. 171-79 (174).

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',⁷⁹ and employs the term *σάρξ* to illustrate human weakness and frailty.⁸⁰ 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.⁸¹ Although Scornaienchi does not analyze *σάρξ* in Rom. 6.19,⁸² 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 θνητῇ 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.

79. James D.G. Dunn, *The New Perspectives on Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), p. 72.

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*.

81. Lorenzo Scornaienchi, *Sarx und Soma bei Paulus: Der Mensch zwischen Destruktivität und Konstruktivität* (NTOA, 67; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), p. 67.

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,⁸³ with two occurrences in the ASCs (1 Thess. 2.17; 3.10).⁸⁴ 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.⁸⁵ *ἄνθρωπος* (person) occurs twice in the ASC. *ἄνθρωπος* in δέ παλαιὸς *ἡμῶν* *ἄνθρωπος* (our old person) (Rom. 6.6) does not carry an ontological orientation;⁸⁶ it illustrates 'a common humanness'⁸⁷ under the 'former "Adamic" existence under sin'.⁸⁸ In 2 Cor. 4.16, δέ *ἔξω* *ἡμῶν* *ἄνθρωπος* (our external person) contrasts with δέ *ἔσω* *ἡμῶν* (our internal person), highlighting the believers' transformation.⁸⁹ 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.⁹⁰ 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: ἐκ 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.

84. Green highlights the unique usage of the term in 1 Thess. 2.17. Green, *Grammar*, p. 202.

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.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.

91. This phrase is Ps. 69.23 in modern English versions.