

Relationship between 2 Cor. 8 and 9 in Terms of Rhetoric and Ethics

Kota Yamada

Keiwa College

1. Historical Retrospect to Studies on 2 Cor. 8 and 9¹

The relationship of the so-called “collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem” chapters, 2 Cor. 8 and 9, has been discussed since J.S.Semler questioned the traditional unity theory in the 18th century. But we cannot see a consensus even today. The relationship between 2 Cor. 8 and 9 is classified into the following four types among the various partition theories.

(1) Identifying chs.8 and 9 with the letter of chs.1-7

C.K.Barrett and V.P.Furnish² think that the letter of chs.1-9 and that of chs.10-13 were different ones and written in this order, following the Semler-Windish theory,³ while A.Plummer, H.-J.Klauck and L.Aejmeleus⁴ conjecture in the reverse order, following the Hausrath-Kennedy theory.⁵

(2) Identifying ch.8 with the letter of chs.1-7

This hypothesis is based on the observation that “peri men gar” (9:1) indicates a new beginning of a letter and that ch.9 is a repetition of ch.8. R.Martin and M.E.Thrall,⁶ following J.S.Semler and H.Windish, think that the partial letters of 2 Cor. were written in the order of chs.1-8, ch.9, and chs.10-13.

K.F.Nickle and P.Lang⁷ think that the letters of chs.10-13, chs.1-8, and ch.9 were written in this order based on the Hausrath-Kennedy theory, while J.Hering and V.W.Verbrugge⁸ reverse the order of ch.8 and ch.9 and think that the partial letters were written in the order of chs.10-13, ch.9, and chs.1-8.

R.Bultmann⁹, following J.Weiss, develops the Hausrath-Kennedy theory that 2:14-7:4 was an independent section and that the letter of 2:14-7:4 + chs.10-13 + ch.9 preceded that of 1:1-2:13 + 7:5-16 + ch.8.

¹ Cf.H.D.Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985, 3-36; R.Bieringer, “Teilungshypothesen zum 2.Korintherbrief: Ein Forschungsueberblick,” R.Bieringer & J.Lambrech, *Studies on 2 Corinthians*, Leuvan: Leuvan Univ. Press, 1994, 67-105.

² C.K.Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, London: A.& C.Black, 1973; V.P.Furnish, *II Corinthians*, New York: Double Day, 1984.

³ J.S.Semler, *Paraphrasis II, Epistolae ad Corinthios*, Halae Magdeburgicae: Hemmerde, 1776; H.Windish, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924.

⁴ A.Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*, Edinburgh: T.T.Clark, 1915; H.-J.Klauck, *2.Korintherbrief*, Wuerzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986; L.Aejmeleus, *Streit und Versoehnung: Das Problem der Zusammensetzung des 2.Korintherbriefes*, Helsinki: Kirjapaino Raamattulo, 1987.

⁵ A.Hausrath, *Der Vier-Capitel-Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, Heidelberg: Bassermann, 1870; J.H.Kennedy, *The Second and Third Epistles of St.Paul to the Corinthians*, London: Methuen, 1900.

⁶ R.Martin, *2 Corinthians*, Waco: Waco Books, 1986; M.E.Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, vols.1 & 2, Edinburgh: T.T.& Clark, 1994 & 2000.

⁷ K.F.Nickle, *The Collection*, Naperville: A.R.Allenson, 1966; P.Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

⁸ J.Hering, *The Second Epistle of Saint Paul of Saint Paul to the Corinthians (ET)*, London: Epworth, 1967; V.D.Verbrugge, *Paul’s Style of Church Leadership Illustrated by His Instructions to the Corinthians on the Collection: To Command or Not to Command*, San Francisco: Mellen Research Univ. Press, 1992.

⁹ R.Bultmann, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther (2.Aufl.)*, Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987 (1975).

G.Bornkamm¹⁰ further develops the Weiss-Bultmann theory to make a distinction between 2:14-7:4 from chs.10-13 and think that the segments of 2 Cor. were written in the order of 2:14-7:4, chs.10-13, 1:1-2:13 + 7:5-16 + ch.8, and ch.9. On the other hand, Schmithals¹¹ divides and combines both 1 Cor. and 2 Cor. and he changes his hypotheses from time to time, but for 2 Cor. he conjectures that 2 Cor. was written in the order of 6:14-7:1, 2:14-6:2, 6:3-13 + 7:2-4, chs.10-13, ch.9, and 1:1-2:13 + 7:5-16 + ch.8.

(3) Identifying ch.9 with the letter of chs.1-7

J.Weiss¹² suggests that 2 Cor.ch.8 was written immediately after 1 Cor. and that the partial letters of 2 Cor. were written in the order of ch.8, 2:14-7:4 + chs.10-13, 1:1-2:13 + 7:5-16 + ch.9, while on the other hand P Vielhauer¹³ thinks that ch.8 was the last partial letter of 2 Cor. written in the order of 2:14-7:4 + chs.10-13, 1:1-2:13 + 7:5-16 + ch.9, and ch.8.

(4) 2 Cor.8 and 9 as independent letters

D.Georgi and H.D.Betz¹⁴ think that the collection is solely dealt in chs.8 and 9, which were written as independent and self-contained letters respectively, ch.8 sent to Corinth and ch.9 to Achaia, and that 2 Cor. was written in the order of 2:14-7:4, chs.10-13, 1:1-2:13 + 7:5-16, ch.8, and ch.9.

So much for the types of relationship between 2 Cor.8 and 9 in wide variety of partition theories. Recently B.-M.Kim persuasively mentions the unity of chs. 8 and 9, but he does not explicitly refer to the relationship between 2 Cor. 8 and 9 and the rest of 2 Cor.¹⁵ The traditional unity theory is also seen even today.¹⁶ But in this essay I would like to look at the problem from a new viewpoint of rhetoric.

H.D.Betz and G.Kennedy¹⁷ newly open rhetorical analysis of 2 Cor. Kennedy thinks of 2 Cor.

¹⁰ G.Bornkamm, *Die Vorgeschichte des sogenannten zweiten Korintherbriefes*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1961; idem, "The History of the Origin of the So-Called Second Letter to the Corinthians," *NTS* 8 (1962), 258-264.

¹¹ W.Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth: Ein Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen*, Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956; idem, "Die Korintherbriefe als Briefsammlung," *ZNW* 64 (1973), 263-288.

¹² J.Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917, 268-272.

¹³ P.Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975, 153.

¹⁴ D.Georgi, *Der Armen zu Gedenken: Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus fuer Jerusalem*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1994 (1965); Betz, *2 Cor.8-9*.

¹⁵ K.-M.Kim, *Die paulinische Kollekte*, Tuebingen and Basel: Francke Verlag, 2002. Cf. n.22.

¹⁶ R.Batey, "The Integrity of II Corinthians," *NTS* 12 (1965), 56-69; N.Hyldahl, "Die Frage nach der literarischen Einheit des zweiten Korintherbriefes," *ZNW* 64 (1973), 289-306; W.G.Kuemmel, *Introduction to the New Testament (ET)*, London: SCM Press, 1975, 279-293; F.Young & D.F.Ford, *Meaning and Truth in 2 Corinthians*, Grand Rapids, W.B.Eerdmans Pub.Co., 1987; C.Wolff, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1989; R.Bieringer, "Der 2.Korintherbrief als urspruengliche Einheit: Ein Forschungsueberblick," R.Bieringer & J.Lambrech, *Studies on 2 Cor.*, 107-129; J.Lambrech, *Second Corinthians*, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999; U.Schnelle, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament (4.neubearbeitete Auflage)*, Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2002 (1994), 97-106.

¹⁷ H.D.Betz, *Der Apostel Paulus und die sokratische Tradition: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu einer "Apologie" II Korinther 10-13*, Tuebingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1972; idem, *2 Cor.8-9*; G.Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, Chapel Hill & London: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1984.

made up of three parts (chs.1-7, chs.8-9, and chs.10-13), and classifies 2 Cor. as the judicial speech as a whole and finds the deliberative element in chs.8-9, while Betz thinks chs.8 and 9 were different and self-contained letters as mentioned above. F.W.Hughes¹⁸ analyses 2 Cor. based on the Schmithals-Bornkamm theory. B.Witherington, J.W.McCant and J.D.H.Amador¹⁹ defend the traditional unity theory with their rhetorical analyses. The method and conclusion of this essay is different from these rhetorical analyses, but close to that of H.-M.Wuensh,²⁰ while on chs.8 and 9 the method and conclusion of this essay is quite different from his analysis.

I would like to introduce a very new point of rhetoric and ethics in this essay. Before the analysis of 2 Cor. 8 and 9, I will briefly discuss the relationship between chs. 1-7 and chs.8-9 and the function of the rhetorical conclusion in the following sections.

2. Relationship between Chs. 1-7 and Chs.8-9

The first question before we embark on the rhetorical and ethical analysis of chs.8-9 is whether Paul changes his theme of discussion in chs.1-7 completely in chs.8 and 9.²¹ So I would like to analyse the following two types of motifs in chs.1-7 and chs.8-9.

a. Motifs of the Collection

Paul uses “diakonia” (ministry) and “charis” (grace) as the key words for the collection with several others in chs.8-9.²² But these two words are also employed as the key concepts to defend his gospel and apostleship in chs.1-7, which indicates that chs.8 and 9 are continuation and conclusion of the rhetorical discussion in chs.1-7. That is, one side of the ministry is the evangelism and the other side is the collection. Paul tries to resume the latter, because it was suspended by suspicion against him. However these two key concepts are rarely seen in the rhetorical discussion in chs.10-13.

¹⁸ F.W.Hughes, “The Rhetoric of the Reconciliation: 2 Corinthians 1.1-2:13 and 7.5-8.24,”

D.F.Watson (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George Kennedy*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991, 246-261.

¹⁹ B.Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, Grand Rapids: W.B.Eerdmans Pub.Co./ Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1995; J.W.McCant, *2 Corinthians*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academy Press, 1999; J.D.H.Amador, “Revisiting 2 Corinthians: Rhetoric and the Case for Unity,” *NTS* 46 (2000), 92-111.

²⁰ H.-M.Wuensh, *Der paulinische Brief 2 Kor.1-9 als kommunikative Handlung: Eine rhetorisch-literaturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*, Muenster: Lit Verlag, 1996.

²¹ The theme is completely changed in chs.8-9, cf. Windish, *2.Kor.*, 242-243; Bultmann, *2.Kor.*; Betz, *2 Cor.8-9*; Martin, *2 Cor.*, xlii; S.J.Hafemann, “Letters to the Corinthians”, *The Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, Leicester: Inter Varsity Press, 1993, 164-179, esp., 171.

²² The words for the collection in 2 Cor.8-9, 1 Cor.16:1-4, and Rom.15:25-28 are as follows: “diakonia,” 8:4, 9:1, 12, 13; 8:19, 20; Rom.15:25; cf.2 Cor.3:7, 8, 9[dis], 4:1, 5:18, 6:3, 11:8, [3:3], “charis,” 8:4, 6, 7, 19; 8:1, 9, 16, 9:8, 14, 15; 1Cor.16:3; cf.2 Cor.1:2, 12, 15, 2:14, 4:15, 6:1, 12:9, 13:13,

“koinonia,” 8:4, 9:13; Rom.15:27; cf.2 Cor.6:14, 13:13,

“haplotes,” 8:2, 9:11, 13; cf.2 Cor.1:12, 11:3.

“leituorgia,” 9:12; Rom.15:27,

“eulogia,” 9:5[dis]; Rom.15:28; cf.2 Cor.9:6[dis],

“hadrotes,” 8:20,

“logeia,” 1 Cor.16:1.

Kim rightly mentions “charis” and “diakonia” with “koinonia” as key concepts for the collection and refers to these motifs in other Pauline letters, but surprisingly he never mentions them in 2 Cor.1-7 and 10-13 (for “charis,” *Kollekte*, 7-11, 15-16, 21, 22-15, 28-29, 43-46, 53-54, 76-77, 85-87, 89-92, 95-96, 183-184; for “diakonia,” 13 n.30, 14-15, 17-20, 43-46, 54, 58, 86-88, 95, 113, 183-184).

Bultmann has rightly pointed out that the key word of chs.8 and 9 is “charis”, but he fails to see that this motif is already developed in chs.1-7. He also fails to recognize that Paul uses the more important key concept of “diakonia” fully in 2:14-7:4 and the same key word for the collection. Bultmann has rightly referred to “kauchema, kauchesis (cf.kauchasthai)” (pride)²³ as the key concept in chs.1-7. But he does not recognize this motif also seen in 7:14, 8:24, 9:2-4 that Paul boasted of the Corinthians to Titus and the Macedonians.

b. Motifs of Tribulation, Consolation, Sorrow and Joy

The Weiss-Bultmann theory and its development, the Schmithals-Bornkamm theory, presuppose that the section of 2:14-7:4 is independent from the rest of chs.1-7. But Bornkamm fails to see the significant contrasts of “thlipsis (cf.thlibein)” (tribulation) vs. “paraklesis (cf. parakalein)” (consolation) and “lype (cf. lypein)” (sorrow) vs. “chara (cf. chairein)” (joy) are consistently seen in 1:1-2:13, 2:14-7:4, 7:5-16, ch.8, and ch.9, but these are not seen in the main section of chs.10-13.²⁴

However the section of 2:14-7:4 is not an independent and fragmentary letter. It is apparent from the fact Bornkamm has overlooked that the chief motifs of tribulation, consolation, (sorrow) and joy in 1:3-2:13 and 7:5-16 are also seen in 7:4, the conclusion of 2:14-7:4. Thus, the section of 2:14-7:4 is a “digression” (digressio) of the rhetorical discussion, where an apology of Paul is discoursed against the criticism of Paul. These contrasting motifs of tribulation, consolation, sorrow and joy are continued in the descriptions of the obedient Macedonians (8:2) and the opposing Corinthians (8:13) and also in the appealing words to the latter (9:7b,c).

It is clarified from these observations that the rhetorical discussion of chs.1-7 continues to ch.8-9 that the theme of chs.1-7 is not completely changed in chs.8-9. In this way, it is likely that chs.8-9 take the role of the conclusion in the rhetorical discussion of chs.1-9.

3. Function of Rhetorical Conclusion in the Greco-Roman Periods

It will be apparent from a brief survey of the rhetorical handbooks that the function of the rhetorical conclusion (epilogos; peroratio) was not always the same, but there were certain kinds of trends according to the persons, periods and places of writing of the rhetorical handbooks.

a. From Aristotle to Anaximenes

Aristotle mentions four functions of the rhetorical conclusion in his *Rhetorica*,²⁵

- (1) to inspire the audience with favourable opinion of the speaker and unfavourable one of the opponents,
- (2) amplification and extenuation (auxesis, tapeinosis),
- (3) the excitement of the emotions of the audience (pathos), and
- (4) refreshing their memory by a recapitulation (anamnesis).

Aristotle reduces the number of the function from four to three in a fragment of his *Ad Theodectum*,²⁶ which is lost now, that the chief function of the conclusion is inspiring the audience favourable impression of the speaker and points out the following three functions,

²³ The motif of “pride” is seen as follows:

“kauchesis,” 1:12, 7:4, 14, 8:24, 11:10, 17,

“kauchema,” 1:14,5:12,9:3,

“kauchasthai,” 5:12, 7:14, 9:2, 10:8, 13, 15, 16, 17[dis], 11:12, 16, 18[dis], 30[dis], 12:1, 5[dis], 6, 9.

²⁴ The thematic contrasts are seen as follows:

“thlipsis,” 1:4[dis], 8, 2:4, 4:17, 6:4, 7:4, 8:2, 13; cf.1:6, 4:8, 7:5,

“paraklesis,” 1:3, 4, 5, 6[dis], 7, 7:4, 7, 13; cf.1:4[tris], 6, 2:7, 7:6, 7, 13, 13:11,

“lype,” 2:1, 3, 7, 7:10[dis], 9:7; cf.2:2[dis], 4, 5, 6:10, 7:8[dis], 9[tris], 11,

“chara,” 1:24, 2:3, 7:4, 13, 8:2; cf.2:3, 6:10, 7:7, 9, 13, 16, 13:9, 11.

²⁵ Aristotle, *Rhet.*,3.19.

²⁶ Cf. Anon. Seguerianus, 208.

- (1) the excitement of the emotions of the audience (pathos),
- (2) praise and blame (epaines, psechos), and
- (3) refreshing their memory by a recapitulation (anamnesis).

In *Ad Alexandrum*,²⁷ used to be ascribed to Aristotle, but now to Anaximenes, the following three points are mentioned,

- (1) a summary (anakephalaiosis),
- (2) to inspire the audience with the emotion of pity (eleos), and
- (3) exaggeration (deinosis).

b. From *Ad Herennium* to Cicero

In *Ad Herennium*,²⁸ used to be ascribed to Cicero until the Middle Ages, now to Cornificius, which has succeeded the Greek tradition of rhetoric and written in c.85 B.C., the functions of the conclusion are the following three,

- (1) a recapitulation (enumeratio),
- (2) amplification (amplificatio), and
- (3) to inspire the audience with the emotion of compassion (commiseratio).

Cicero, who has also succeeded the Greek tradition of rhetoric, in his *De Inventio*²⁹ written in 80 B.C. mentions the following three elements,

- (1) a recapitulation (enumeratio),
- (2) to inspire the audience with the emotion of indignation (indignatio), and
- (3) that of bewailing (conquestio).

Cicero has later simplified the elements of the function of the conclusion from three to two in his *De Partitio*,³⁰ which was written nearly 30 years later than his *De Inventio*,

- (1) amplification (amplificatio) and
- (2) a recapitulation (enumeratio).

c. From Quintilian to Apsines

Quintilian has referred to two kinds of conclusion with one the function, concerning the fact or the emotion, in his *Institutio Oratoria*,³¹

- (1) a recapitulation (enumeratio) and
- (2) to inspire the audience with the emotions (affectus).

Anonymous Seguerianus also mentions two kinds of conclusions in his *The Art of Political Speech*³² at the beginning of the 3rd century,

- (1) the practical one to summarize the discussion (to praktikon) and
- (2) the emotional one to inspire the audience with the emotions (to pathematikon).

Lastly Apsines of Gadala points out the following three but discusses the first two and refers to the third in a few words in his *Ars Rhetorica*³³ at the beginning of the 3rd century,

- (1) refreshing their memory by a recapitulation (anamnesis),
- (2) to inspire the audience with the emotions including pity (pathos, eleos), and
- (3) exaggeration (deinosis).

From the above brief survey, the function of the rhetorical conclusion reduces its number from four to two and two kinds of one function. In this process of transition, two elements are unchangeable: one is the summary of the discussion in order to refresh their memory (anamnesis,

²⁷ Anaximenes, *Rhet. Alex.*, 38.10-11.

²⁸ *Ad Her.*, 2.30.47.

²⁹ *Cicero, Inv.*, 1.52.98.

³⁰ *Cicero, Part.Orat.*, 15.52.

³¹ *Quintilian*, 6.1.1, 6.1.7.

³² *Anon.Seguirianus*, 203.

³³ *Apsines*, 10.1.

enumeratio) and the other is to inspire the audience with the emotions (pathos, affectus). The latter is classified into the one to emphasize the points (amplificatio), the one to inspire them to sympathize with the speaker (eleos, commiseratio, conquestio) and to direct against his opponents (deinosis, indignatio).³⁴

4. Rhetorical and Ethical Analysis of 2 Cor.8-9

Paul mentions the collection for the poor as the conclusion of the rhetorical discussion in chs.1-7. The question of relationship between ch.8 and ch.9 is whether that of the doublets as Windish indicates or that they constitute “independent and self-contained textual units” as Betz suggests.³⁵

The basic tones of chs.8-9 are that to praise the Macedonians, Titus and two brothers and to encourage the Corinthians in order to resume the collection (8:1-7, 16-24, 9:1-5, 11-15) or that to blame the opponents of Paul and promote the Corinthians in order to complete it (8:8-15, 9:6-10).³⁶

The main sections of chs.8 and 9 are 8:1-7, 8-15, 9:1-5, and 6-10, which will be analysed from the following four perspectives; first, the rhetorical and ethical “paradigm” to persuade the audience, second, the rhetorical devices employed in the discussion, third, the emotions inspired by these rhetorical devices and, fourth, the ethical principles based on these emotions.³⁷

(1) 8:1-7

Paul refers to the Macedonians as the first rhetorical and ethical “paradigm” (paradeigma, exemplum)³⁸ when he says of the collection in ch.8. The function of this “paradigm” is not only the praise but also the imitation (mimesis, imitatio)³⁹ of the good example of the Macedonians, who first offered themselves to God and then completed the collection (8:5), following the example of Christ that became poor in order to enrich others (8:9). Thus, praising the Macedonians, Paul encourages the Corinthians to follow their example.

Paul uses two ways of appealing to their emotions. The first is the paradoxical double “contrasts” (antitextaseis)⁴⁰ to express the Macedonians, who were filled with joy (chara) because of the “grace” (charis) in spite of many “tribulations” (thlipseis), and offered very much in their extreme “poorness” (ptocheia) with “richness” (ploutos) of their “generosity” (8:1-2). The second is the “comparison” (parathesis)⁴¹ of the Macedonians, who joined the collection in their extreme

³⁴ H.Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study* (ET), Leiden: Brill, 1998, ss.431-442.

³⁵ Windish, 2.Kor., 286; Betz, 2 Cor.8-9, 35.

³⁶ Betz (2 Cor.8-9, 38-53, 60-70, 88-93, 100-126) also finds the praising motifs in 8:1-5 and 9:1-2, ascribing them to “exordium”, and the controversy motifs in 8:9-15 and 9: 6-14, to “probatio.”

³⁷ Aristotle (Rhet., 1.2.2) says of the three elements to persuade the audience, “ethos” of the speaker, “pathos” of the audience, and “logos” of the speech. But the difference between “ethos” and “pathos” became blurred when the Greek tradition of rhetoric was transferred to the Roman society. Cicero (De Or., 2.182-184) and Quintilian (6.2.9) mention “ethos” as “mild emotions” and “pathos” as “passionate emotions” and place “ethos” as the basis of ethics. Cf. J.S.Baumlin, “Ethos,” T.O.Sloane, *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2001, 263-277.

³⁸ Aristotle, Rhet., 1.2.13, 2.20; Anaximenes, Rhet.Alex., 8.1-14; Ps.Cicero, Ad Her., 4.49.62; Quintilian, 5.11.1-12; Apsines, 8; Lausberg, ss.410-421; J.D.Lyons, “Exemplum,” *Slone, Encyclopedia*, 277-279. Plummer (2 Cor., 231-238), Windish (2.Kor., 243-249), Bultmann (2.Kor., 258), Betz (2 Cor.8-9, 41-42, esp.41, n.5), Martin (2 Cor., 255) and others rightly point out that 8:1-5 is a “paradigm” or “example” (model, Vorbild).

³⁹ Lausberg, ss.2,19.

⁴⁰ The “contrast” means the comparison with the past conduct of himself, cf. Apsines, 10.49. Windish (2.Kor., 244) notices this “contrast”.

⁴¹ The “comparison” means that with the present conduct of others, cf. Apsines, 10.50. Windish (2.Kor., 249-250), Betz (2 Cor.8-9, 53-56), Furnish (2 Cor., 415-416), Martin (2 Cor., 259-

“poorness” and offered more than expected, with the Corinthians, who surpass the Macedonians with everything, faith, words, knowledge, earnestness, and love of Paul, but they stopped the collection for the poor (8:2,7).

What kind of emotions does Paul intend to appeal with these methods? Though such emotions are not explicitly mentioned here, the first emotion is likely the “shame” (*aischyne*)⁴² of the Corinthians against their “pride” (*kauchema, kauchesis*) of their material and spiritual richness, as evident from the same comparison of the Corinthians with the Macedonians in 9:2-4. The second emotion is the “competition” (*zelos*)⁴³ of the Corinthians, who are proud of their “earnestness” (*spoude*, 8:7,8; cf.7:11,12) and “zealousness” (*zelos*, 9:2; cf.7:7,11). In this way, Paul expects them to resume their collection, appealing to their emotions of “shame” and “competition”.

What is the ethical principle of this first paradigm in ch.8 ? Paul sees the “generosity” (*haplotes*)⁴⁴ in the conduct of the Macedonians (8:2). The word “haplotes” means “generosity”, “simplicity”, “sincerity”, “plainness” etc. and its original meaning is “to live with a simple and plain heart” based on the Jewish religious ethics. The Jewish “generosity” is connected to the secular side of “grace” on one hand, and it is also equivalent to the “generosity” (*eleutherites*)⁴⁵ of the Greek ethics on the other. The ethical principles of the first “paradigm” in ch.8 are “generosity” (*haplotes*), which is based on the “grace” (*charis*) of God (8:1,9a) and its opposite, “meanness” (*aneleutheria*).⁴⁶ Paul expects the Corinthians to follow the example of the Macedonian “generosity” with the “grace” the Corinthians received.

(2) 8:8-15

Paul mentions Jesus Christ as the second rhetorical and ethical “paradigm” (*paradeigma, exemplum*)⁴⁷ in ch.8, when he urges the Corinthians to resume the collection more directly (8:9). In this example of Christ, the paradoxical double “contrasts” (*antexetaseis*) are also seen that “rich” Christ became “poor” in order to “enrich” the “poor” (8:9b,c) and this come from the act of “love” (8:8). This second paradigm is more intensified than the first one, because “the grace of Jesus Christ of our Lord” itself (8:9) is the original one of “the grace of God” given to the Macedonians (8:1). This paradigm is also for the praise and imitation of Christ.

Paul introduces a new method to appeal to their emotions, that is the “check” (*dokimasia*)⁴⁸ on their characters; that is, to check whether they have “their genuine love” (8:8) or not, other than “Paul’s love to Corinthians” (8:7). Its touchstone is the collection. Paul’s bold remark here must be related to the criticism against his project of the collection. The first negative objection is that although Paul told them to save some money at the beginning of the week (1 Cor.16:2), they did not have any (8:8). The second positive objection is that the project will make others idle and invite themselves tribulation (8:13). This objection is based on “meanness” (*aneleutheria*), which is completely opposite to “generosity”.

Paul, first, appeals to the emotions of the “competition” (*zelos*) as he mentions to check their love compared with the “earnestness” (*spoude*) of the Macedonians (8:8) and, second, to the “willingness” (*prothymia*) shown both at the beginning and completion of the collection (8:11,12).

The ethical principles based on the “competition” and “willingness” are, first, “love” (*agape*) as

262) and others, who make a paragraph of 8:1-5, 8:1-6, do not notice this “comparison”.

⁴² Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 2.6; *Eth.Nich.*, 4.9.

⁴³ Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 2.11.

⁴⁴ O.Bauernfeind, “haplous, haplotes,” *TDNT*, vol.1, 386-387; T.Schramm, “haplotes, haplous,” *EDNT* vol.1,123-124.

⁴⁵ Aristotle, *Eth.Nich.*, 4.1.

⁴⁶ Aristotle, *Eth.Nich.*, 4.1

⁴⁷ Plummer (2 Cor., 238-246,esp.240), Windish (2.Kor., 251-253), Barrett (2 Cor., 223), Betz (2 Cor.8-9, 61,esp.,n.70), Thrall (2 Cor., vol.2, 532) and others rightly point out that this is a “paradigm” or “example”.

⁴⁸ Apsines, 10.52.

already mentioned (8:8) and, second, “equality” (isotes) of the members of communities (8:13,14). In this way, “love” is interpreted by “equality”. The “equality” here is meant to fill the “deficiency” (hysterema) with the “surplus” (perisseuma) from the materialistic viewpoint. The logic lying here is that if the rich Corinthians help the poor saints in Jerusalem with their “surplus” in order to fill the “deficiency” of the saints at the moment, their future need will be fulfilled when their economical situation turns over upside down (8:14).

The concept of “equality” is not found in Palestinian Judaism and very rare in the Septuagint, but ascribed to the Greek tradition of political thought.⁴⁹ Betz says, “according to Aristotle, equality is the foundation of the city and the society, that is, it is the basic of their “concord” (hamonia) and “peace” (eirene); its opposite is greed (pleonexia) ”⁵⁰ In Aristotle’s Nichomachean Ethics, “equality” (isotes) is one form of “righteousness (or justice)” (dikaiosyne) together with “observance of law” (nomimotes).⁵¹ Paul borrows the secular concept of “righteousness”, that is “equality”, which is the foundation of the political idea of the polis, when he introduces the idea of the unity of the Christian communities, which Paul tries to construct with the collection (cf.9:9,10, dikaiosyne). This is not unrelated to the fact that Paul was criticized as “greedy” (2:11,7:2,9:5,12:17-18) by his opponents. In this way, Paul appeals to resume the collection with its opposite concept of “equality” here and cites Ex. 16:18 to confirm it.

(3) 8:16-24

This section is a recommendation letter of Titus and two brothers for the completion of the collection and the three are praised here (8:16-17,18-19,22,23). They are sent to Corinth in order to assure the collection against suspicion and confirm it (8:20,21).

First, Titus is praised for his earnestness and voluntarism to visit Corinth (8:16,17) and he is described as a trustful person as “my partner” and “co-worker” (8:23). Second, one brother sent to Corinth with Titus is praised for his reputation and it is made clear that he is elected for the collection as a travelling companion by the local churches (8:18-21). Third, another brother is also praised for his earnestness which was often checked by Paul (8:22). These two brothers are described as trustful as “the apostles of churches” and “glory of Christ” (8:23).

With the concluding words of this section Paul asks the Corinthians for showing their love (cf.8:8) in order that the “pride” of Paul over the Corinthians will not turn into “shame” (8:24, cf.7:14, 9:2,4). In this way, ch.8 is concluded with the ethics of “love” and “honour” (time). But the ethics of “love” and “pride” is not fully developed here. The ethics of “pride” is developed into the appeal to “pride” and “shame” in 9:2-4, and that of “love” is a reflection of the discussion over “equality” in 8:8-15 and also developed into the ethics of “righteousness” in 9:7c-10.

(4) 9:1-5.

Paul gives the Corinthians as the first rhetorical and ethical “paradigm” (paradeigma, exemplum)⁵² in ch.9 when he refers to the collection again (9:2). He praises the Corinthians for their “willingness” (prothymia) and “earnestness” (spoude) when they started the collection, which moved the Macedonians (9:2). But the Corinthians has not completed it yet. Thus, this “paradigm” of the Corinthians is about the beginning of their collection and it is not fulfilled yet. So, this “paradigm” is “incomplete” (ateleia) itself and it will turn into “antiparadigm” (antiparadeigma, antiexemplum) as it is.

Paul starts the discussion of the Corinthians as “paradigm”, and he uses two ways to appeal to the emotions in order not to turn into “antiparadigm”. The first one is “the contrast” (antextetasis) that

⁴⁹ G.Stahlin, “isos, isotes,” TDNT vol.3, 343-355; T.Holz, “isos, isotes,” EDNT vol.2, 201-202, Georgi, Der Armen, 97-98.

⁵⁰ Betz, 2 Cor.8-9, 68..

⁵¹ Aristotle, Eth.Nich., 5.1.

⁵² Plummer (2 Cor., 253), Windish (2.Kor., 268-271), Bultmann (2.Kor., 258), Betz (2 Cor.8-9, 93), Martin (2 Cor., 383), and others rightly recognize that this is a “paradigm” or “example”.

the Corinthians “prepared” the collection from the previous year and Paul boasted it to the Macedonians (9:2b, 3c), but it is “unprepared” yet (9:5b). The second one is “the comparison” (parathesis) that the Macedonians have already finished it while the Corinthians have not yet (9:3-5).

The emotions to be appealed by these rhetorical devices are “shame” and “competition”. First, Paul appeals to the double “shame” that he boasted to the Macedonians about the well-preparedness of the Corinthians, and it will be “their shame” as well as “his shame”, if they do not complete it (kataischynein, 9:4). Second, Paul appeals to “the competition” (zelos) of the Corinthians that he has already mentioned “the earnestness” (spoude) of the Macedonians (8:8), who responded to the first “zeal” (zelos) of the Corinthians (9:2b).

The ethical principles of this “paradigm” are “honour” (time)⁵³ and “dishonour” (atimia)⁵⁴. The emotions of “pride” and “shame” are basic to the ethics of “honour” and “dishonour”. If the collection is completed as Paul boasted, both Paul and the Corinthians will keep up their appearance, but if it is not, they will lose their face. Thus, Paul sends Titus and two brothers for the completion of the collection in order that his “pride” will not be nullified (9:3a) At the end of this section Paul expects that the collection is not for “the greed” (pleonexia) as his opponents criticized his project, but for “the blessing” (eulogia) of God and sharing it together (9:5c).

(5) 9:6-10

Paul introduces God as the second rhetorical and ethical “paradigm” (paradeigma, exemplum) in ch.9 (9:7c-8, 10). This paradigm is more intensified and it supplements the second one of Christ in ch.8. “God loves the one who offers cheerfully” (9:7c) and can fill him/her with all kinds of “grace” abundantly (9:8a). Such a person is “self-sufficient” (autarcheia),⁵⁵ and well prepared to good work (9:8b). At this point Paul combines the Stoic idea of “self-sufficiency” with the Hebrew religious way of thinking, “grace of God”. In this way, Paul modifies the materialistic idea of the collection to fill the deficiency with the surplus in ch.8 into the religious one to lead a self-sufficient life under the abundant grace of God in ch.9.

Paul uses the double “comparisons” (paratheseis) to appeal to the emotions. Corresponding to “the greed” and “the blessing (eulogia)” (9:7c), the first metaphorical one is the one who seeds sparingly and reaps sparingly and the other who seeds abundantly (ep’ eulogiais) and reaps abundantly (9:6). The second one is the one who offers “sorrowfully or compulsorily” and the other who offers “cheerfully” (9:7). These “comparisons” indicate that of the Macedonians who offered more than expected with joy and the Corinthians who suspended the collection with suspicion in 8:1-7 and 9:1-5; especially the latter reflects the conflict with the opponents of Paul in 8:12-13.

Paul appeals to the emotions of “sorrow” (lype) symbolized by a poor harvest and “joy” (chara) symbolized by a rich harvest. But the metaphorical expression of seeding and reaping parallels to the ethical principles of “meanness” and “generosity” (cf.8:2).

The ethical principles of the second “paradigm” in ch.9 are, first, “love” (agape, 9:7c), and, second, “the righteousness” (dikaiosyne; 9:9, 10).⁵⁶ Paul interprets “love” by “righteousness” here again. But returning to the original Jewish religious idea of offering, Paul cites the Septuagint version of Psalm 111:9 to say that the ethical principle of the collection is “the righteousness” (9:9). That means, replacing the Greek idea of “the righteousness”, the secular and materialistic side of “equality” in ch.8, Paul refers to the Jewish idea of abiding the grace of God by offering collections to the poor and needy, the religious and spiritual side of “righteousness”. In this way, God will increase the crop of “righteousness” (9:10).

⁵³ Aristotle, *Eth.Nich.*, 4.3; J.Schneider, “time, timao,” *TDNT* vol.8, 169-180; H.Huebner, “time,” *EDNT* vol.3, 357-359.

⁵⁴ Aristotle, *Eth.Nich.*, 4.3.

⁵⁵ G.Kittel, “autarkeia, autarkes,” *TDNT* vol.1, 466-467; “autarkeia,” *EDNT* vol.1, 179.

⁵⁶ G.Strenk, “dikaiosyne,” *TDNT* vol.2, 192-210; K.Kerterge, “dikaiosyne,” *EDNT* vol.1, 325-330.

(6) 9:11-15⁵⁷

This section is consisted of the three parts of Jewish blessing, “thanksgiving” (eucharistia, 9:11-12), “praise” (doxa, 9:13), and “a petition” (deesis, 9:14) with a concluding prayer (9:15).⁵⁸ But at the same time summaries of the ideas and meanings of the collection in ch.8 and ch.9 are briefly repeated here.

First, Paul gives thanksgiving to God with those who are “enriched in” (ploutizesthai) every kind of “generosity” (haplotes) because the collection of the materialistic side of filling the deficiency of the saints with their surplus will lead to thanksgiving to God (9:11-12). These are brief summaries of the ethical principles of the first and second “paradigms” in ch.8. Second, Paul praises God with the “check” (dokimasia) of love for the collection in order to be obedient both to the words of evangelism and the “generosity” (haplotes) of the collection (9:13). This is another summary of the essence of ch.8. Paul clearly mentions here the two sides of his ministry, one for the words of evangelism and the other for the collection, which indicate the continuation of chs.1-7(esp.2:14-7:4) and chs.8-9.⁵⁹ Third, Paul gives a petition for their surpassing “grace of God” (9:14). This is a summary of the ethical principle of the second “paradigm” in ch.9.

At the end of this section Paul thanks God for his indescribable gift, which means the origin of the “charis” (grace, collection). This suggests that this section is the conclusion of chs.8-9 as well as the end of chs.1-9.

5. Relationship between 2 Cor. 8 and 9

So much for the rhetorical and ethical analysis of 2 Cor.8-9, there are no summarizing words of the preceding discussion in chs.8-9, but many kinds of motifs to appeal to the emotions as we have seen. Paul uses the “paradigms” or “examples” to persuade the audience, those of the Macedonians and Christ in ch.8 and those of the Corinthians and God in ch.9. The emotions in the first “paradigm” in ch.8 to be appealed with the double “contrasts” and “comparison” are “shame” vs. “pride” and “competition”, in the second one with the double “contrasts” and rhetorical “check” are “competition” and “willingness”, while those in the first one in ch.9 with the “contrast” and “comparison” are “shame” vs. “pride” and “competition” and in the second one with the double “comparisons” are “sorrow” and “joy”. In this way, 2 Cor.8-9 is classified into the rhetorical conclusion of the type of inspiring the emotions (pathos, affectus), not that of the summary and memory (anamnesis, enumeratio), and it is also close to the one to inspire the emotions in order to take aside of the opponents (deinosis, indignatio) rather than to sympathize with the speaker (eleos, commiseratio, conquestio).

According to the Jewish religious tradition, the offering for the poor and needy was called “elemosyne” and “dikaiosyne”⁶⁰ but Paul calls the collection “diakonia” (ministry) and “charis” (grace) with other expressions. It is because Paul recognizes that the collection for the poor saints is another side of “ministry” and another way of expressing “the grace of God”.

But as we have already seen, Paul does not appeal to the emotions of “pity” (“eleos”, equivalent to “elemosyne”) on the one hand, but to “pride and shame”, “competition and willingness”, and “sorrow and joy”. Paul tries to make the Corinthians compete with the Macedonians in order to resume the collection, praising their former “willingness” and expecting it again, appealing to the emotions of their “pride” and “joy” positively for the Corinthians and those of their “shame” and

⁵⁷ The section of 9:11-15 makes a paragraph as Windish (2.Kor., 280-286) rightly points out as the “thanksgiving words”.

⁵⁸ Betz, 2 Cor.8-9, 120-122. Three elements of thanksgiving, praise and petitions are also seen in 2 Cor.1:3-11, Phil.1:3-11 and others; praise and thanksgiving in 2 Cor. 4 :15. .

⁵⁹ Bultmann (2.Kor., 36-50, 73, 103) has rightly pointed out that “eilikrineia” is another important word for the discussion in chs.1-7. But it is likely that Paul summarizes the essence of the discussion in chs.1-7 with “eilikrineia” (1:12, 2:17, cf.4:2) and that in chs.8-9 with “haplotes” (1:12, 8:2, 9:12, 13) as evident in 1:12-14, which is classified as the rhetorical “dispositio” in chs.1-9.

⁶⁰ K.Berger, “Almosen fuer Israel,” NTS 23 (1977), 180-204.

“sorrow” negatively against the opponents of Paul.

The ethical principles of the first “paradigm” in ch.8 are “generosity” and “meanness” and the second one “love” and “equality”, while those of the first one in ch.9 “honour” and “dishonour” and the second one “love” and “righteousness”. Particularly, Paul praises the “generosity” of the Macedonians and blames the “meanness” of the opponents of Paul. These ethical principles of “generosity” and “meanness” are related to the individual side of ethics together with those of “honour” and “dishonour”.

Paul speaks of “righteousness” (dikaiosyne) on the other hand as the ethical principle of the second “paradigms” both in chs.8 and 9 as the community creative side of ethics. But in ch.8 Paul refers to the Greek political idea of “righteousness”, “the righteousness” with the material “equality”, while in ch.9 he says of the Jewish religious idea of “righteousness”, “the righteousness” with offering as the result of the spiritual “grace of God”.⁶¹

From these observations it becomes evident that the relationship between 2 Cor. 8 and 9 is neither that of the doublets nor “different and self-contained textual units”, but they compliment one another. It is evident from the following facts. First, that the contrasting “paradigms” of the Macedonians and the Corinthians, those of Christ and God indicate that the two chapters of 8 and 9 supplement with each other. Second, the rhetorical devices and the emotions to be appealed as well as the “paradigms” are intensified gradually from ch.8 to ch.9. Third, the community creative ethics of the material side in ch.8 and the spiritual side in ch.9 are compliments to each other as evident from Rom.15:27 (pneumatikos, sarkikos). Fourth, the expression of “peri men gar” in 9:1 does not mean the beginning of a new letter, but the new beginning in the same letter as S.K.Stowers⁶² already analyses it in the Greek lexicography that it introduces the reason, cause, explanation of the things mentioned in the previous section, which means the discussion in ch.9 presupposes that in ch.8. Fifth, as already seen, the thanksgiving, praise, and petition in 9:11-14 summarize the essence of chs.8-9.

Thus, it is not likely that ch.9 was written prior to ch.8,⁶³ nor that ch.8 and ch.9 were sent to different destinations, ch.8 to Corinth while ch.9 to Achaia.⁶⁴ If so far is right, it is likely that ch.9 was added to ch.8 slightly after the composition of ch.8 in order to supplement it with its

⁶¹ See the summary of analysis in 8:1-7, 8-15, 9:1-5, 6-10 in the following diagram.

	Ch.8	Ch.9
1 st Paradigm	Macedonians (8:1-7)	Corinthians (9:1-5)
Rhetorical Devices	Double Contrasts (tribulation vs. joy; poorness vs. richness) & Comparison (Macedonians vs. Corinthians)	Contrast (preparedness vs. unpreparedness) & Comparison (Macedonians vs. Corinthians)
Emotions	Shame vs. Pride & Competition	Shame vs. Pride & Competition
Ethics	Generosity & Meanness	Honour & Dishonour
2 nd Paradigm	Christ (8:8-15)	God (9:6-10)
Rhetorical Devices	Double Contrasts (richness vs. poorness; “enrich the poor”) & Check of Love	Double Comparisons (greed vs. blessing; sorrow vs. joy)
Emotions	Competition; Willingness	Sorrow and Joy
Ethics	Love & Equality	Love & Righteousness

For the emotions in the Pauline Epistles, T.H.Olbricht J.Sumney, Paul and Pathos, Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001.

⁶² S.K.Stowers, “peri men gar and the Integrity of 2 Cor.8 and 9,” NovT 32 (1990), 340-348.

⁶³ Contra, Schmithals, “Briefsammlung”; Hering, 2 Cor, xiii; Bultmann, 2.Kor., 258; Vielhauer, Geschichte, 153; Verbrugge, Paul’s Style, 100-104, and others.

⁶⁴ Contra, Windish, 2 Kor.,286-288; Georgi, Der Armen, 57; Betz, 2 Cor.8-9, 90-97, 139-140.

modification and gradual increase of intensification (incrementum).⁶⁵ When it is repeated with its modification and a supplement, the appeal to resume the collection for the purpose of building the community is intensified and it inspires the audience much more with their emotions.

⁶⁵ Lausberg, ss.402-403