

L. L. Welborn  
An End to Enmity

Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die  
neutestamentliche Wissenschaft  
und die Kunde der älteren Kirche

Herausgegeben von

James D. G. Dunn · Carl R. Holladay  
Hermann Lichtenberger · Jens Schröter  
Gregory E. Sterling · Michael Wolter

Band 185

De Gruyter

L. L. Welborn

## An End to Enmity

Paul and the “Wrongdoer” of Second Corinthians

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-026327-5  
e-ISBN 978-3-11-026330-5  
ISSN 0171-6441

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Welborn, L. L., 1953–

An end to enmity : Paul and the “wrongdoer” of Second Corinthians /  
Larry L. Welborn.

p. cm. — (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissen-  
schaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, ISSN 0171-6441 ; Bd. 185)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-11-026327-5 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Bible. N.T. Corinthians, 2nd — Socio-rhetorical criticism. 2. Paul,  
the Apostle, Saint — Adversaries. I. Title.

BS2675.52.W44 2011

227'.3067—dc23

2011018150

*Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek*

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;  
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2011 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/Boston

Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

[www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com)



An End to Enmity:  
Paul and the 'Wrongdoer' of Second Corinthians  
L. L. Welborn

In  
Honorem  
Edwin A. Judge

## Contents

Acknowledgements .....	IX
Abbreviations .....	XIII
Preface .....	XIX
Chapter One: Introduction .....	1
Chapter Two: History of Scholarship .....	3
Chapter Three: Inferences from Exegesis .....	23
Chapter Four: Social and Rhetorical Conventions .....	212
Chapter Five: Prosopography .....	289
Chapter Six: History of a Friendship .....	382
Bibliography .....	485
Index of Ancient Sources .....	529
Index of Modern Authors .....	559



## Acknowledgements

It is a joy to be able to thank all those whose insight, criticism, and generous support have contributed to this book. At the top of the list is the person to whom the book is dedicated: Edwin Judge. In the spring of 2006, I was invited to present lectures as the Visiting Fellow at the annual conference of the Society for the Study of Early Christianity at Macquarie University. The knowledge that Edwin Judge would be my respondent on this occasion lent a special intensity to the preparation of lectures in which I sought to build upon the insights of Edwin Judge and his student Peter Marshall into the social and rhetorical conventions that governed friendship, enmity, and reconciliation in the Greco-Roman world. My anxiety at facing Edwin Judge as respondent proved to be as fruitful as it was unfounded. On the long flight back from Sydney, Australia, to Dayton, Ohio, I found myself perusing a manuscript of 120 pages and assumed (wrongly, as it turned out) that I would soon be able to transform the manuscript into a little book on the episode of Paul's conflict with the "wrongdoer" of 2 Corinthians. Over the past four years, Edwin Judge has become the most significant influence upon my development as a historian of early Christianity, generously devoting hours to discussion of the questions that animate my research. I now owe Edwin Judge as much gratitude as I feel towards my old mentor Arnaldo Momigliano, who first taught me how knowledge of Greco-Roman history can be made useful for the study of the New Testament.

Readers of this book will surely discern that its origin, and hence my indebtedness, lies farther back than the spring of 2006. I first encountered the enigma of the ἀδικήσας when serving as a research assistant for Hans Dieter Betz in the preparation of his *Hermeneia* commentary on 2 Corinthians 8 and 9. In composing the footnotes for the present book, I was pleased to be reminded that Hans Dieter Betz had already proposed the most plausible solution to the problem of the nature of the offense of the ἀδικήσας against Paul. While a student at the University of Chicago, I also profited from several conversations with David Epstein, then assistant to President Hannah Gray, about personal enmity in Roman politics.

Like other students of 2 Corinthians, my research took direction from insights in the epilogue to the English edition of Dieter Georgi's *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*. I found special inspiration in Georgi's suggestion that "the problem of the ἄδικήσας in 2 Cor. 2 and 7 may yield more information...Paul's preceding negative experience, a painful visit (2 Cor. 2:1–4), is commonly understood as being an insult. But the style and form of communication are remarkable. Paul's 'evasive' approach by way of circumlocution needs to be more carefully analyzed. The results of that analysis may further clarify the conflict itself." Conversations with Dieter Georgi in the fall of 2001 encouraged me to pursue a better understanding of the social conventions that guided Paul's employment of the rhetorical figure of *periphrasis* in approaching the subject of the one who did wrong and caused pain in 2 Cor. 2 and 7.

My friend and teacher John Fitzgerald illuminated aspects of Paul's pursuit of reconciliation with the Corinthians through his essay on "Paul and Paradigm Shifts." In my attempt at a partial prosopography of mid first-century Roman Corinth, I received extraordinary assistance from Glen Bowersock, who tirelessly corrected my efforts until the results appeared "somewhat more plausible." I am grateful to my friend Donald Dale Walker for stimulating correspondence on 2 Cor. 10:10, and especially for his insight into the term ἐξουθενήμενος.

Several scholars made their own work available to me before publication: Jon Hall sent an advance copy of his *Politeness and Politics in Cicero's Letters*; David Konstan shared his essay on "Remorse, Repentance and Forgiveness in the Classical World"; Steven Friesen sent his study of "The Wrong Erastus" at the most timely moment.

Several colleagues and friends read portions of the manuscript, or responded to papers based upon the manuscript delivered at meetings of the Society of Biblical Literature in Auckland, Boston, and New Orleans. I am especially grateful to Helmut Koester, who read and commented on the entire manuscript, to Dale Martin, who read drafts of several sections, and to Robert Jewett, who offered constructive criticism and encouragement. I also wish to thank John Barclay, Paul Barnett, Jeremy Barrier, Bernard Barsky, Ward Blanton, Alexandra Brown, Cavan Concannon, Susan Eastman, Neil Elliott, Christopher Forbes, Paul Holloway, Israel Kamudzandu, Yung Suk Kim, Gerd Lüdemann, Peter Marshall, Brent Nongbri, Daniel Patte, Thomas Schmeller, and Ekkehard and Wolfgang Stegemann.

At Fordham University I have found the supportive and stimulating academic community I have sought throughout the years. I have drawn

special inspiration from conversations with my colleagues Ben Dunning, George Demacopoulos, Brad Hinze, Karina Hogan, Patrick Hornbeck, Elizabeth Johnson, Matthew McGowan, Robert Penella, Michael Pppard, John Seitz, and Maureen Tilley, among others. I am grateful for the work of graduate assistants who have contributed to the completion of this project: Michael Azar, Allan Georgia, and Brett Kendall. All of my projects in recent years have blossomed under the leadership of my department chair, Terrence Tilley.

I return to the invitation to deliver the lectures at Macquarie University that provided the occasion for the composition of this book. Four friends associated with Macquarie University and the Society for the Study of Early Christianity showed unwarranted confidence in my abilities: Alanna Nobbs (Head of the Department of Ancient History), Don Barker (Secretary of SSEC), Mark Harding (Dean of the Australian Colleges of Theology), and Jim Harrison (Professor of New Testament at the Wesley Institute); their advocacy and friendship created the conditions for an extraordinarily productive period in my research. I am grateful to Rachel Yuen-Collingridge of Macquarie University for gracious assistance with searches through the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. I recall with pleasure stimulating conversations with Brad Bitner and Julien Ogereau, PhD students in New Testament at Macquarie.

Some of the material in Chapter 3 was previously published in the *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (2009) 39–56 and in *Novum Testamentum* 52 (2010) 207–220. I thank the editors for permission to republish this material here.

My commitment to this project has been sustained through four years of research and writing by the lively interest of my mother Ann Welborn, the affection of my wife Diane, and the advice of my sons Locke (who crafted the wording of the title) and Mark (who improved my literary style), for all of whom I feel an inexpressible gratitude.

Nerantza, Greece, June 29, 2010

L. L. Welborn



## Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANF	Ante-Nicene Fathers
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> . Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin, 1972-
AusBR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BDAG	Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3d ed. Chicago, 1999.
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BDF	Blass, F., A. Debrunner and R. W. Funk, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Chicago, 1961
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BGU	Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Museen zu Berlin: Griechische Urkunden I-VIII 1895–1933.
BHTh	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BibInt	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
BR	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BSac	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>

<i>CIG</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum graecarum</i> . Edited by A. Boeckh. 4 vols. Berlin, 1828–1877
<i>CIJ</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Judaicarum</i>
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum latinarum</i>
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Classical Journal</i>
<i>CP</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>CPSP</i>	<i>Cambridge Philological Society Proceedings</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CNT</i>	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
<i>CW</i>	<i>Classical World</i>
<i>EA</i>	<i>Epigraphica Anatolica</i>
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
<i>EBib</i>	Etudes bibliques
<i>EDNT</i>	<i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by H. Balz, G. Schneider. ET. Grand Rapids, 1990–1993
<i>EKKNT</i>	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>FGH</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> . Edited by F. Jacoby. Leiden, 1954–1964
<i>FRLANT</i>	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>GCS</i>	Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte
<i>GRBS</i>	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>HDR</i>	Harvard Dissertations in Religion
<i>HNT</i>	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
<i>HNTC</i>	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
<i>HR</i>	<i>History of Religions</i>
<i>HSCP</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>ICC</i>	International Critical Commentary
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones graecae</i> . Editio minor. Berlin, 1924–
<i>IGR</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes</i>
<i>ILLRP</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Res Republicae</i> . Edited by A. De-grassi. Rome, Vol. 1 <sup>2</sup> (1965), Vol. 2 (1963)
<i>ILS</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Latinae Selecta</i> . Edited by H. Dessau. Leipzig, 1892–1916
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JAARSup</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion Supplement</i>
<i>JAC</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>

<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JGRChJ</i>	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JRH</i>	<i>Journal of Religious History</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JSHRZ</i>	<i>Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer)
KJV	King James Version
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9 <sup>th</sup> ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996
LXX	Septuaginta
<i>MAMA</i>	<i>Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua</i> . Manchester and London, 1928–1993
<i>MRF</i>	<i>Mimorum Romanorum Fragmenta</i> . Edited by M. Bonaria. Geneva, 1955
NEB	New English Bible
<i>NewDocs</i>	<i>New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity</i> . Edited by G. H. R. Horsley and S. Llewelyn. North Ryde, N.S.W., 1981–
NHC	Nag Hammadi Codices
<i>NHL</i>	<i>Nag Hammadi Library in English</i> . Edited by J. M. Robinson. 4 <sup>th</sup> rev. ed. Leiden, 1996
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
<i>NZK</i>	<i>Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i> OCD</i>	<i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> . Edited by S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth. 3 ed. Oxford, 1996
<i>OGIS</i>	<i>Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae</i> . Edited by W. Dittenberger. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1903–1905

PG	Patrologiae cursus completes...Series graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 166 vols. Paris, 1857–1883
PGM	<i>Papyri graecae magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri</i> . Edited by K. Preisendanz. Berlin, 1928
PL	Patrologia cursus completes...Series prima [latina]. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 221 vols. Paris, 1844–1865
PW	Pauly, A. F. <i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> . New edition G. Wissowa. 49 vols. Munich, 1980
RE	<i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> . Edited by August Friedrich von Pauly and Georg Wissowa. Stuttgart, 1894-
RESuppl	Supplement to Pauly-Wissowa
RAC	<i>Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum</i> . Edited by T. Klauser, et al. Stuttgart, 1950-
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
REA	<i>Revue des etudes anciennes</i>
RGG	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> . Edited by K. Galling. 7 vols. 3d ed. Tübingen, 1957–1965
RhM	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
SBB	Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSS	Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SC	Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Cerf, 1943-
SCHNT	Studia ad corpus hellenisticum Novi Testamenti
SEÅ	<i>Svensk exegetisk årsbok</i>
SEG	<i>Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum</i>
SHAW	Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften
SIG	<i>Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum</i> . Edited by W. Dittenberger. 4 vols. 3d ed. Leipzig, 1915–1924
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTU	Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
SO	Symbolae osloenses
SP	Sacra Pagina
Str-B	Strack, H. L., and P. Billerbeck. <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch</i> . 6 vols. Munich, 1922–1961
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments

<i>SVF</i>	<i>Stoicorum veterum fragmenta</i> . Edited by H. von Arnim. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1903–1924
<i>TAM</i>	<i>Tituli Asiae Minoris</i> . Edited by E. Kalinka and R. Herberdey. Vienna: Hoelderli, 1901.
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964–1976
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>TRE</i>	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> . Edited by G. Krause and G. Müller. Berlin, 1977–2007.
<i>TU</i>	Texte und Untersuchungen
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>WBC</i>	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WUNT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>YCS</i>	Yale Classical Studies
<i>ZAC</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
<i>ZThK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>
<i>ZwTh</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie</i>



## Preface

Any attempt to reconstruct the history of Paul's relationship with the Corinthians necessitates a hypothesis regarding the composition of the two canonical letters to Corinth, a desideratum reflected in the subtitle of a recent essay on Paul's letters to Corinth: "The Interpretive Intertwining of Literary and Historical Reconstruction."<sup>1</sup> The necessity of literary-critical hypotheses resides not only in the historical quest of contemporary scholars,<sup>2</sup> but also in the problematic nature of the canonical epistles themselves, which exhibit abrupt transitions, changes in tone and content, repetitions, inconsistencies in reports of events, and differences in outlook and judgment. Especially problematic is the impression that different portions of canonical 2 Corinthians reflect different situations in the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians. Indeed, the composition of 2 Corinthians is so problematic that the unity of 2 Corinthians must be regarded as a hypothesis in need of demonstration.<sup>3</sup>

A majority of scholars regard 2 Corinthians as a composite text, differing only with respect to the number and sequence of the letters.<sup>4</sup> A preface is not the place to examine the evidence for various partition theories in detail.<sup>5</sup> Rather, we must content ourselves with a summary of the

---

1 Margaret M. Mitchell, "Paul's Letters to Corinth: The Interpretive Intertwining of Literary and Historical Reconstruction" in *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth*, ed. by Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005) 307–338.

2 Johannes Weiss in his review of Halmel in *TLZ* 19 (1894) 513.

3 So already Philipp Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975) 151.

4 See the extensive *Forschungsberichte* in Hans Dieter Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9: A Commentary on Two Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985) 3–36; Reimund Bieringer and Jan Lambrecht, *Studies on 2 Corinthians* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994) 67–130; Margaret E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994) 1.3–49.

5 See the scrupulous examination of the evidence by Max Krenkel, *Beiträge zur Aufhellung der Geschichte und der Briefe des Apostels Paulus* (Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1895) 154–377.

textual features which lead scholars to conclude that 2 Corinthians is a collection of letters.

First, the discrepancy between chs. 10–13 and other portions of the canonical epistle is conspicuous. It is not so much the reversal in tone between 9:15 and 10:1 as the contrast in content that leads scholars to doubt that chs. 10–13 originally formed the continuation of chs. 1–9. One need only compare Paul's reference to "the obedience of you all" in 7:15 with his readiness "to punish every disobedience" in 10:6 to see that these statements presuppose different situations. One might also contrast Paul's account of the "godly grief" that has produced "repentance" in 7:10–11 with his fear that he will have "to mourn over many who previously sinned and have not repented" in 12:20–21. The various attempts at harmonization of these discrepancies have not proven convincing—from Lietzmann's famous "sleepless night,"<sup>6</sup> to recent appeals to the rhetorical structure of 2 Corinthians,<sup>7</sup> or to Paul's psychagogical purposes.<sup>8</sup> That statements so contrary originally stood in the same epistle seems to me impossible, and necessitates the partition of 2 Corinthians.

Second, chs. 8 and 9 are discrete appeals for partnership in the collection.<sup>9</sup> After a lengthy discussion of the collection in ch. 8, Paul introduces the subject anew in ch. 9, and treats it thoroughly, as if it had not been previously mentioned.<sup>10</sup> Although both chapters treat the collection, they do not relate to one another, differing in tone, purpose, strategy and style. Ch. 8 holds up the churches of Macedonia as models of generosity for the Corinthians, while ch. 9 boasts of the readiness of the Achaïans in an appeal to the people of Macedonia. Thus, chs. 8 and 9 must have been originally independent pieces of correspondence.

---

6 Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I/II* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1949) 139: "Mir genügt z. B. die Annahme einer schlaflos durchwachten Nacht zwischen c. 9 und c. 10 zur Erklärung."

7 E.g., Frederick J. Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology: The Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

8 Ivar Vegge, *2 Corinthians—a Letter about Reconciliation: A Psychagogical, Epistolographical and Rhetorical Analysis* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

9 As demonstrated by Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, pursuing an insight that goes back to Johann Salomo Semler.

10 The general point remains valid, despite the observations on the connecting particles in 9:1 by Stanley K. Stowers, "Περὶ μὲν γάρ and the Integrity of 2 Cor. 8 and 9," *NovT* 32 (1990) 340–348.

Third, the passage 2:14–7:4 interrupts the account of Paul’s search for Titus in 2:12–13 continued seamlessly in 7:5–6. As Johannes Weiss observed, “This separation of what belongs together is unheard-of and intolerable from a literary point of view, since 2:13 and 7:5 f. fit onto each other as neatly as the broken pieces of a ring.”<sup>11</sup> The attempt to construe Paul’s apology for his apostolic office in 2:14–7:4 as a “digression” within the narrative<sup>12</sup> fails to convince, since the apology has no point of departure in what precedes, and makes no connection with what follows.<sup>13</sup> An excursus of such length (6 pages in Nestle-Aland!) has no parallel in the letters of Paul.<sup>14</sup> The judgment of Dieter Georgi remains valid: “The seams in 2:13/14 and 7:4/5 are the best examples in the entire New Testament of one large fragment secondarily inserted into another text. The splits in 2:13/14 and 7:4/5 are so basic, and the connections between 2:13 and 7:5 so obvious, that the burden of proof now lies with those who defend the integrity of the canonical text, and they have not brought any good new arguments to support their claims.”<sup>15</sup>

Finally, the paragraph 6:14–7:1 tears apart the context of what is demonstrably the strongest peroration in the Pauline corpus in 6:11–13; 7:2–4.<sup>16</sup> The passage contains *hapax legomena* and stylistic peculiarities.<sup>17</sup> The thought has more in common with the Qumran literature than with

11 Johannes Weiss, *The History of Primitive Christianity*, 2 vols., trans. by F. C. Grant (New York: Wilson-Fredrickson, 1937) 1.349.

12 An explanation which goes back to J. A. Bengel, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (1742); Eng. trans. *Gnomon of the New Testament*, 3 vols., trans. by A. Fausset (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1877) 2.361; followed by a number of subsequent interpreters, e. g., C. F. G. Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900) 36, 251–52; Nils Hyldahl, “Die Frage nach der literarischen Einheit des Zweiten Korintherbriefes,” *ZNW* 64 (1973) 289–306.

13 L. L. Welborn, “Paul’s Letter of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 1:1–2:13; 7:5–16 and Ancient Theories of Literary Unity” in *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistles* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1997) 95–131, esp. 114–18.

14 Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 152.

15 Dieter Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986) 335; similarly, Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 152.

16 See the discussion of this passage, with extensive bibliography, in Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.22–36.

17 Nils A Dahl, “A Fragment and Its Content: 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1” in *Studies in Paul* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977) 62–91.

the letters of Paul.<sup>18</sup> Hence, 6:14–7:1 has long been recognized as an interpolation,<sup>19</sup> probably non-Pauline in authorship.<sup>20</sup> A redactor has inserted an exhortation to separation from unbelievers into a Pauline appeal for openness between followers of Christ.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, five authentic letters of Paul and one non-Pauline interpolation emerge from literary criticism of 2 Corinthians. The compelling rationale for the partition of canonical 2 Corinthians was clearly articulated by Philipp Vielhauer a generation ago: “The characteristic of 2 Corinthians which more than any other makes a literary-critical analysis necessary is that the incoherence lies in the composition of the whole, while the individual large sections, e. g., 2:14–7:4 and 10–13, are within themselves exceptionally well disposed.”<sup>22</sup>

The single criterion for determining the original sequence of the letters collected in 2 Corinthians is the phenomenon of the “cross-references”: that is, passages in later letters which refer back to earlier ones. On the basis of the most conspicuous of these cross-references, Adolf von Hausrath identified 2 Cor. 10–13 as the “letter of tears” mentioned in 2:3–4.<sup>23</sup> With subtle insight, James Kennedy disclosed the numerous cross-references that connect chs. 1–2 and 7 with chs. 10–13.<sup>24</sup> Consider, for example, 1:23 (“it was to spare you that I did not come again to Corinth”) and 13:2 (“if I come again, I will not spare”). Or, compare 2:3 (“I wrote as I did, so that when I came, I might not suffer pain...”) with 13:10 (“So I write these things while I am away from you, so that when I come, I may not have to be severe...”). Or, compare 2:9 (“I wrote for this

---

18 Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1,” *CBQ* 23 (1961) 273–280.

19 Christian Emmerling, *Epistola Pauli ad Corinthios posterior* (Lipsiae: Barth, 1823) 77; Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 332–33.

20 Hans Dieter Betz, “2 Cor. 6:14–7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?” *JBL* 92 (1972) 88–108.

21 Stephen J. Hultgren, “2 Cor. 6:14–7:1 and Rev. 21:3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians,” *NTS* 49 (2003) 39–56; Richard I. Pervo, *The Making of Paul; Constructions of the Apostle in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010) 40.

22 Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 151.

23 Adolf Hausrath, *Der Vier-Capitel-Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (Heidelberg: Bassermann, 1870).

24 James H. Kennedy, “Are There Two Epistles in 2 Corinthians?” *The Expositor* 6 (1897) 231–238, 285–304; idem, *The Second and Third Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (London: Methuen, 1900); idem, “The Problem of Second Corinthians,” *Hermathena* 12 (1903) 340–376.

reason: to test you and to know whether you are obedient in everything”) with 10:6 (“We are ready to punish every disobedience when your obedience is complete”). As Kennedy observed, “in each of these pairs—the act, or purpose, or feeling, which in 2 Cor. 10–13 is present or future, in 2 Cor. 1–9 is spoken of as belonging to the past.”<sup>25</sup> In a number of instances, Paul can be seen to soften the harsh language of chs. 10–13 by a conciliatory use of the same terms in chs. 1–2 and 7: for example, in 10:1–2 Paul boasts “I have confidence against you,” but in 7:16 asserts “I have complete confidence in you.”

Utilizing the criterion of the cross-references, Margaret Mitchell has recently argued that Paul’s defense of the conduct of Titus and an unnamed brother in 12:18 refers back to the mission of Titus and the brother in 8:6, 22,<sup>26</sup> reviving an insight of Johannes Weiss.<sup>27</sup> Thus, Mitchell has concluded, rightly, in my view, that 2 Cor. 8 is the earliest of the letters which make up our 2 Corinthians.<sup>28</sup>

A consequent application of the criterion of the cross-references would lead us to place 2:14–7:4 (minus the interpolated passage) after 10–13.<sup>29</sup> An older generation of scholars including Adolf von Hausrath, Paul Schmiedel, James Kennedy, Kirsopp Lake and Alfred Plummer, among others recognized several instances in 2:14–6:13; 7:2–4 where Paul refers back to statements in 10–13.<sup>30</sup> Thus, in 3:1 and 5:12, where Paul asks “Are we beginning again to recommend ourselves” (ἀρχόμεθα πάλιν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστάνειν), and asserts “We are not commending ourselves to you again” (οὐ πάλιν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστάνομεν ὑμῖν), Paul is clearly referring back to passages in chs. 11 and 12 where he felt obliged to engage in “self-commendation” (cf. 12:11).<sup>31</sup> As Kennedy

25 Kennedy, “Are There Two Epistles in 2 Corinthians?” 234.

26 Mitchell, “Paul’s Letters to Corinth,” 326–333.

27 Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.353, 357.

28 Mitchell, “Paul’s Letters to Corinth,” 324, 328.

29 See already N. H. Taylor, “The Composition and Chronology of Second Corinthians,” *JSNT* 44 (1991) 67–87, esp. 71–75.

30 Hausrath, *Der Vier-Capitel-Brief des Paulus*, 22, 23, 26; Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1891) 61; Kennedy, *The Second and Third Epistles*, 81–89; idem, “The Problem of Second Corinthians,” 350–351; Kirsopp Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul. Their Motive and Origin*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Rivingtons, 1914) 154; Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1915) xxxi–xxxiii.

31 Hausrath, *Der Vier-Capitel-Brief des Paulus*, 22; Schmiedel, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 61.

observed, "The word *πάντι* implies that Paul has done on a recent occasion that very thing which he now assures them that he will do no more."<sup>32</sup> In 5:13, where Paul alludes apologetically to a previous moment when he appeared to be "beside himself," he is probably referring to the experience described in 12:1–6.<sup>33</sup> In 4:2, where Paul underlines his refusal to "practice cunning" (*μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν πανουργίᾳ*) or to "falsify (*δολοῦντες*) the word of God," he is likely recalling his earlier rebuttal of the charge of being "crafty" (*πανουργος*) and taking the Corinthians in "by deceit" (*δόλω*) in 12:16.<sup>34</sup> Paul's retrospective assertion that "we defrauded no one" (*οὐδένα ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν*) in 7:2 recalls his earlier denial that he had "defrauded" (*ἐπλεονέκτησα*) the Corinthians through Titus and the brother in 12:17–18.<sup>35</sup> All of these cross-references were apparent to interpreters of previous generations, along with numerous, less conspicuous instances of "softening" of words and phrases, such as *καύχησις* and *πεποιθήσις*, used in a harsh and uncomplimentary fashion in chs. 10–13, but upon which Paul confers a new, conciliatory sense in 2:14–7:4.<sup>36</sup>

That the cross-references between 2:14–7:4 and 10–13 are no longer recognized by scholars, and are largely ignored, is owing, in my view, to a wrong direction taken by scholarship, when Günther Bornkamm supported the suggestion of his student Walter Schmithals that 2:14–7:4 preceded 10–13.<sup>37</sup> Schmithals' suggestion regarding the posi-

32 Kennedy, "The Problem of Second Corinthians," 350–351.

33 Hausrath, *Der Vier-Capitel-Brief*, 23; Schmiedel, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 61; Kennedy, "The Problem of Second Corinthians," 361, calling attention to the past tense of *ἐξέστημεν* in 5:13.

34 Plummer, *Second Epistle*, xxxi.

35 Plummer, *Second Epistle*, xxxiii.

36 Kennedy, "The Problem of Second Corinthians," 340–346; Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 161; Plummer, *Second Epistle*, xxxi. Cf. Taylor, "The Composition and Chronology of Second Corinthians," 74–75.

37 Günther Bornkamm, *Die Vorgeschichte des sogenannten Zweiten Korintherbriefes*. SHAW.PH 1961, 2. Abhandlung (Heidelberg: Winter, 1961) 7–36, esp. 23: "So sprechen gute Gründe für die jüngst vertretene Annahme, dass zwischen der ersten Apologie und dem Schmerzenbrief abermals unterschieden werden muss. Die erstere wäre dann noch früher geschrieben, in einem Augenblick, wo Paulus erstmals Kunde von den neuen Aposteln und der Bedrohung der Gemeinde bekommen hatte, aber von einem Sieg der Gegner über sie noch nicht die Rede sein könnte." Bornkamm's only argument for placing 2:14–7:4 before 10–13 is the reference in 10:10 to "weighty and strong letters" of Paul, which he takes to be a reference to 2:14–7:4. But Bornkamm must concede: "Gewiss kann sich das auf unsern I. Korintherbrief beziehen."

tion of 2:14–7:4 within the Corinthian correspondence was based upon the highly questionable assumption that Paul “misunderstood” the situation in Corinth, and that the “cautious polemic” of 2:14–7:4 reflects Paul’s misunderstanding.<sup>38</sup> A preface is not the place for an analysis of a misstep in the history of scholarship, even when that misstep has had major consequences.<sup>39</sup> But it would repay the efforts of scholars who, as Johannes Weiss eloquently confessed, “have come to love the highly personal, truly human, psychologically interesting and religiously profound writing known as 2 Corinthians, and who know that they will have no rest until they have understood its composition to some extent,”<sup>40</sup> to re-read the relevant pages of Bornkamm’s influential essay on the pre-history of 2 Corinthians, and to observe with what tortured arguments Bornkamm endeavored to dispel the appearance of the cross-references between 2:14–7:4 and 10–13, once he had decided to support the assumption of his student Schmithals regarding the placement of 2:14–7:4 within the Corinthian correspondence.<sup>41</sup>

---

38 Walter Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1971) 99. In comparison with the explicit Auseinandersetzung of chs. 10–13, Schmithals finds the polemic of 2:14–6:13; 7:2–4 “cautious”: “The cautious polemic cannot be without reason. It fits into a time in which Paul was compromised by recent prejudiced utterances in Corinth and had received information about this exposure.” Thus, Schmithals bases his argument for the placement of 2:14–6:13; 7:2–4 on the supposition that 1 Corinthians “contained inaccurate or misinformed statements of the apostle on the situation in Corinth.” Paul received a report of this from the returning Timothy, in consequence of which he became more cautious in his next letter.

39 Bornkamm was followed by Dieter Georgi, *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief: Studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964); Hans Dieter Betz, *Der Apostel Paulus und die sokratische Tradition: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu seiner Apologie in 2 Kor 10–13* (Tübingen: Mohr-siebeck, 1972); idem, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*; Mitchell, “Paul’s Letters to Corinth,” 333–335; among others.

40 Weiss, review of Halmel in *TLZ* 19 (1894) 513.

41 Bornkamm, *Vorgeschichte*, 23 n.88: “Keinesfalls darf man aus *πάλιν* (3:1; 5:12) schliessen, dass II Kor 10–13 vorangegangen sein müssen, da dort das Motiv der Selbstempfehlung eine so bedeutende Rolle spielt.” [But why not?] Bornkamm goes on to explain: “Was II Kor 10–13 als Selbstempfehlung begegnet, ist in Wahrheit ja eine Parodie und also in den Augen der Gegner keine Empfehlung für Paulus.” [One might counter that parody is indicative of Paul’s attitude toward the requirement of “self-commendation,” but Paul still felt obliged to engage in self-commendation, as he acknowledges in 12:11.] Consequently, Bornkamm is left without a referent in 2 Corinthians for 3:1 and 5:12, and must seek it in 1 Corinthians: “Der Vorwurf und Verdacht der Selbstempfehlung, den Pau-

Consistent application of the criterion of the cross-references establishes the following sequence of letters and letter-fragments within 2 Corinthians (I append generic titles for purposes of identification):

- 2 Cor. 8, Appeal for Partnership in the Collection
- 2 Cor. 10–13, Polemical Apology
- 2 Cor. 2:14–6:13; 7:2–4, Conciliatory Apology
- 2 Cor. 1:1–2:13; 7:5–16, Therapeutic Epistle
- 2 Cor. 9, Appeal for Partnership in the Collection

I readily concede that the order of the fragments could be different than that given here: passages such as 10:6 (“being ready to punish every disobedience”) might refer back to 7:15 (“remembering the obedience of you all”). Terms such as *καύχησις* and *πεποιθήσις* might first have been used in commendation and affection in 2:14–6:13; 7:2–4, and later in a bitter and ironic sense in 10–13. But there are consequences of reversing the direction of the cross-references: Paul would then seem to mock at his own terms of endearment. Employing an apt metaphor, James Kennedy observed: “They are like the valves of the heart which revealed to Harvey the secret of the circulation of the blood by opening in one direction only.”<sup>42</sup>

With a minority of critics,<sup>43</sup> I am unable to persuade myself that 1 Corinthians is a unified composition. In 1 Corinthians, as in 2 Corinthi-

---

lus 3:1; 5:12 abwehrt, weist allerdings auf frühere seiner Äusserungen zurück, mit denen er seiner Gemeinde lastig fallen konnte.” Then, Bornkamm asserts that the whole search is useless: “Doch ist es müßig, sie näher zu bestimmen,” and proceeds to generalize the act of self-commendation throughout 1 Corinthians: “Tatsächlich hat Paulus ja niemals auf solche ‘Selbstempfehlungen’ verzichten können und schon der I. Kor ist von ihnen durchzogen (I, 3:10; 4:1 ff.; 4:15 f.; 8:13; bes. 9:1 ff.; 9:26 f.; 11:1; 14:18 f.; 15:10).” [But if 1 Cor. is “durchzogen von Selbstempfehlungen,” why is the same not true of 2 Cor. 10–13?] Thus, Bornkamm’s argument that 2 Cor. 3:1 and 5:12 cannot refer to 2 Cor. 10–13 collapses under its own weight.

42 Kennedy, “Are There Two Epistles in 2 Corinthians?” 299.

43 Johannes Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910) xxxix–xliii; Wolfgang Schenk, “Der 1. Korintherbrief als Briefsammlung,” *ZNW* 60 (1969) 219–243; Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 140–141; Christophe Senft, *La première épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens* (Neuchâtel: Neuchâtel-Delachaux, 1979) 17–25; Michael Bunker, *Briefformular und rhetorische Disposition im 1. Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983) 51–59; Robert Jewett, “The Redaction of 1 Corinthians and the Trajectory of the Pauline School,” *JAARSup* 46 (1978) 389–444; Hans Josef Klauck, *1. Korintherbrief* (Würzburg: Echter, 1984).

ans, one encounters abrupt transitions, frequent changes of theme, and generally loose construction.<sup>44</sup> Assigning portions of 1 Corinthians to separate letters would be justified only if the passages in question presupposed different situations. This appears to be the case in three instances: Paul's attitude toward the factions (contrast 11:18–19 with 1:10–12), Paul's advice on food sacrificed to idols (contrast 10:1–11 with 8:1–13), and Paul's announcement of his travel plans (contrast 16:5–9 with 4:17–21).<sup>45</sup> Hence, I divide 1 Corinthians into three letters, composed in the following order:

- 1 Cor. 10:1–22; 6:12–20; 10:23–11:34, On Association with the Immoral and Idolaters
- 1 Cor. 7–9, 12–16, Response to the Corinthians' Questions
- 1 Cor. 1:1–6:11, Counsel of Concord

The strongest argument for the unity of canonical 1 Corinthians derives from rhetorical analysis, which identifies 1 Corinthians as a deliberative appeal for concord (1:1–4:21), with advice on divisive issues organized under subheadings (5:1–16:24).<sup>46</sup> Yet a single letter is not consistent with the several occasions and sources of information evident in the text of 1 Corinthians: an anonymous report (11:18), the Corinthians' letter (7:1), a visit by Stephanas and his colleagues (16:17), and a report from Chloe's people (1:11).

I freely acknowledge the hypothetical character of my literary analysis of Paul's Corinthian correspondence. Other theories can be made plausible, including those which defend the unity of canonical 1 Corinthians. But there are a finite number of interpretive possibilities, and not every theory provides a satisfactory explanation of the textual evidence. I emphasize once again the necessity of some theory of literary composition for any attempt to reconstruct the history of Paul's relationship with Corinth. Given the reciprocal nature of literary analysis and historical reconstruction in the case of Paul's letters to Corinth, I would like to think that my investigation of Paul's relationship with the wrongdoer may contrib-

<sup>44</sup> Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 140–141.

<sup>45</sup> Similarly, Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 141.

<sup>46</sup> Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1991). For critique of the hypothesis that all of 1 Corinthians qualifies as deliberative rhetoric, see R. Dean Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996).

ute something to a better understanding of the compositional history of Paul's Corinthian correspondence.

## Chapter One

### Introduction

*Cum ad Corinthios ejusdem apostoli  
litterae iterantur, venia fit plane,  
sed incertum cui, quia nec persona  
nec causa proscribitur.*

Tertullian *De pudicitia* 14

In 2 Corinthians chapters 2 and 7, Paul refers to an individual who has done him “wrong” and has caused him “pain.”<sup>1</sup> The gravity of the incident is indicated by the consequences, to which allusion is made in the context: Paul postponed his planned visit to Corinth (1:15–16, 23; 2:1), and instead wrote a tearful letter (2:3–4), which he feared would cause the Corinthians pain (7:8).<sup>2</sup> Given the importance of the episode,<sup>3</sup> one might assume that scholars would devote much effort to the discovery of the nature of the offence and the identity of its perpetrator. But in the past generation, only three articles treated the subject thematically.<sup>4</sup> The reason for the neglect of the subject is not hard to find, and was already suggested by Tertullian: in the interest of forgiveness and reconciliation, Paul draws a curtain of anonymity over the wrongdoer and discreetly avoids description of his wrong. Thus, prudent historians of the

---

1 2 Cor. 2:5; 7:12. That Paul is dealing with the same situation and the same individual in 2 Cor. 2:5–11 and 7:5–12, see ch. 3 below, pp. 23–25.

2 Hans Conzelmann, *Geschichte des Urchristentums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969) 87; Günther Bornkamm, *Paul* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971) 77.

3 Frances Young and David F. Ford, *Meaning and Truth in 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 22: “One suspects that the person concerned lies at the root of the crisis of confidence between Paul and the church.”

4 C. K. Barrett, “Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ (2 Cor. 7.12)” in *Verborum Veritas*, eds. O. Böcher and K. Haacker (Wuppertal: Theologischer Verlag-Brockhaus, 1970) 149–57; repr. in idem, *Essays on Paul* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982) 108–17; Margaret E. Thrall, “The Offender and the Offence: A Problem of Detection in 2 Corinthians” in *Scripture: Meaning and Method*, ed. B. P. Thompson (Pickering: Hull University Press, 1987) 65–78; Colin G. Kruse, “The Offender and the Offence in 2 Corinthians 2:5 and 7:12,” *EvQ* 88.2 (1988) 129–39.

twentieth century were prepared to admit that this was a case where they were unable to reach safe conclusions because the evidence was insufficient. Kirsopp Lake asked, "Who was the offender, and what was his offence?" and answered, "The one thing that is certain here is that no confident answer can ever be given."<sup>5</sup> And T. W. Manson conceded, "What exactly happened on this occasion we do not know and have no means of discovering."<sup>6</sup>

We shall see that close reading of the text of 2 Corinthians, and study of the words that Paul chooses to describe the wrong, will lift the veil of Pauline discretion to a considerable degree, disclosing, in broad outline, the type of offence that was committed, and the relationship of the wrongdoer both to Paul and to the Corinthians. But no amount of exegetical artistry will reveal the identity of the one who did Paul wrong. If progress is to be made in detection, it can only result from taking Paul's silence seriously and asking about its cause.

This book will argue that Paul does not mention the name of his enemy because he is following a rhetorical convention well established in the Greco-Roman world. Later, when reconciliation is achieved, Paul is at liberty to mention his erstwhile opponent. We shall argue that Paul does so in another context, and again in accordance with social convention. Thus the conventions that conceal the identity of the wrongdoer reveal him in the end.

The prosopographic data supplied by Paul's epistles permit us to assign the individual who has done Paul wrong to the upper class—indeed, he is the Christian of highest social standing at Corinth. The archaeological record of Roman Corinth enables us to form some estimate of the career and influence of a man such as the one who became the leader of the opposition to Paul in Corinth.

Thus, a close reading of the text of Paul's epistles in the context of the social conventions that governed friendship, enmity, and reconciliation in the Greco-Roman world makes it possible to reconstruct the history of Paul's conflict and reconciliation with a powerful convert to Christianity at Corinth.

---

5 Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 169.

6 T. W. Manson, *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, ed. M. Black (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962) 213.

## Chapter Two

### History of Scholarship

For eighteen-hundred years, there was no doubt as to the identity of the wrongdoer of 2 Cor. 2 and 7: he was equated with the incestuous man of 1 Cor. 5.<sup>1</sup> Tertullian was the exception in the history of interpretation. Tertullian argued that the two cases could not be identical, because Paul's accounts of the situations, and especially his verdicts in the two cases, were entirely different: in 1 Cor. 5 Paul speaks explicitly of one who has committed fornication and defiled his father's marriage bed, but in 2 Cor. 2 Paul speaks discreetly, indeed almost obscurely, of one who has caused pain and should now be forgiven;<sup>2</sup> the former case is placed under a sentence of "condemnation" (*condemnatio*), while the latter is subject only to "censure" (*inrepatio*).<sup>3</sup> Having dissociated the wrongdoer from the incestuous man, Tertullian sought for another whom Paul could have intended when he spoke in 2 Cor. 2 of one who had pained the Corinthian church, and found him among the factions of 1 Cor. 1–4 who were inflated with pride against the apostle.<sup>4</sup> As

- 
- 1 John Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor. 15:1* (MPG 61.121); *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:3* (MPG 61.421), with other ancient commentators, including Ambrosiaster, Theodoret, and Theophylact. See the judgment of G. Estius, *In Omnes Divi Pauli Apostoli epistolas commentariorum Tomus Prior* (Douai, 1614), cited in C. F. Georg Heinrich, *Das zweite Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Korinther* (Berlin: Hertz, 1887) 14: "transit ad mentionem hominis qui praecipuam tristitiae causam dederat... Eundem hunc esse cum illo quem prius ob incestum iusserat tradi Sata-nae, nullus est commentatorum qui dubitet." Representatives of the traditional view in the 20<sup>th</sup> century include: Heinrich, *Der zweite Brief*, 12; Philip E. Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962) 59–65; Kruse, "The Offender and the Offence," 129–39.
  - 2 Tertullian, *Pud.* 13–14, ed. Franciscus Oehler, *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Quae Supersunt Omnia* (Leipzig: Weigel, 1853) 1.817–21. On Tertullian as the exception in the history of interpretation, see Heinrich, *Das zweite Sendschreiben*, 14–15; Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 66.
  - 3 Tertullian, *Pud.* 14; cf. Heinrich, *Der zweite Brief*, 11–12.
  - 4 Tertullian, *Pud.* 14; cf. Heinrich, *Der zweite Brief*, 12.

remarkable as Tertullian's insights seem to us today,<sup>5</sup> his interpretation remained without effect upon the tradition, because his views were held to be tainted by Montanism, in the service of whose rigorous discipline Tertullian sought to remove any scriptural foundation for the authority of the Catholic bishops to absolve penitent fornicators and adulterers.<sup>6</sup> Thus the history of interpretation followed the path marked out by Chrysostom rather than Tertullian, seeing in 2 Cor. 2 and 7 Paul's expression of gratitude for the punishment which the church had inflicted upon the incestuous man.<sup>7</sup>

A new chapter in the history of interpretation of 2 Corinthians opened in 1830, with the publication by Friedrich Bleek of two hypotheses which had implications for the identity of the wrongdoer.<sup>8</sup> Bleek sought to demonstrate that the letter to which Paul refers in 2 Cor. 2:3–4 as a "painful epistle" is not, as customarily assumed, 1 Corinthians, but a letter written between 1 and 2 Corinthians, a letter which is now lost.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, on the basis of 2 Cor. 12:14 and 13:1, Bleek contended that Paul must have been in Corinth a second time before the composition of 2 Corinthians, and that it is to such an occasion that Paul refers in 2 Cor. 2:1 as a "painful visit."<sup>10</sup> Thus Bleek ventured a suggestion in the direction of Tertullian's interpretation: Paul's painful epistle was written in response to a grave insult which a member of the Corinthian community gave to Paul on his second visit.<sup>11</sup> Bleek grasped the implications of this reconstruction for the traditional identification of the

---

5 See the judgment of Plummer, *Second Epistle*, 54: "Tertullian's vigorous argument almost suffices without any others."

6 On the role of Tertullian's Montanism, see Heinrici, *Das zweite Sendschreiben*, 14–15; E.-B. Allo, *Saint Paul: Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens* (Paris: Gabalda, 1956) 57–58; Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 62–63; Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 66.

7 Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief*, 12; Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 62–64.

8 Friedrich Bleek, "Erörterungen in Beziehung auf die Briefe Pauli an die Korinther," *ThStKr* 3 (1830) 614–32. For Bleek as the first in the modern era to question the traditional identification of the wrongdoer with the incestuous man, see Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 293; Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief*, 12, 14–15.

9 Bleek, "Erörterungen," 625–32.

10 Bleek, "Erörterungen," 614–24.

11 Bleek, "Erörterungen," 629, concluding "dass irgend ein Einzelner sich auf besonders auffallende Weise gegen die Anordnungen des Paulus—im Allgemeinen oder in einer besonderen Hinsicht—widersetzt hätte, der aber nach dem durch Titus überbrachten Schreiben durch die Gemeinde bestraft und in die gehörigen Schranken zurückgeführt ware."

wrongdoer with the incestuous man: in Paul's discussion of the letter that he wrote and the wrongdoer who occasioned it, everything turns upon a *personal relationship* between Paul and an unnamed individual, something that would not have been true with a case of incest.<sup>12</sup> Yet, Bleek was not prepared to give up the traditional identification, and evidently saw no alternative. Bleek imagined a scenario in which, after the incestuous man had received Paul's judgment in 1 Cor. 5, he hardened his heart and persisted in the practice, and the community did nothing to hinder him. Paul learned of this development from Timothy, and wrote another letter in which he gave the church grief and moved them to take action against the sinner.<sup>13</sup>

With the rise of historical consciousness in the nineteenth century, it became more and more difficult to reconcile the differences between the incestuous man of 1 Cor. 5 and the wrongdoer of 2 Cor. 2 and 7. Reconstructions of developments between 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians in the service of the traditional identification became more speculative and complex. The account that finally provoked a reaction and led to a decisive break with tradition was, ironically, that of the great historian of the early church, F. C. Baur.<sup>14</sup> Baur explained that Paul's demand for the expulsion of the incestuous man from the community in 1 Cor. 5 went unheeded in Corinth and only served to expose Paul to criticism by opponents who disparaged his authority. Later, Titus arrived in Corinth and carried out a less drastic punishment. Realizing that his measures had been too hasty and daring, Paul wrote in 2 Cor. 2 to retract his demands in principle, seeking to efface the negative impression he had produced by indulgence and appeasement.<sup>15</sup> In sharp debate with Baur, Heinrich Ewald argued that Paul could not have granted personal forgiveness such as he expresses in 2 Cor. 2:10 to one who was guilty of the sin of

12 Bleek, "Erörterungen," 630. Bleek was followed by Heinrich Ewald, *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1857) 226–27; August Neander, *Auslegung der beiden Briefe an die Korinther* (Berlin: Reimer, 1859); Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Leipzig: Fues, 1875) 286, among others.

13 Bleek, "Erörterungen," 630.

14 Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi: Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre, ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristentums* (Stuttgart: Becher & Müller, 1845, <sup>2</sup>1866) 1.334–35.

15 Baur, *Paulus*, 335; followed by Albert Klöpfer, *Kommentar über das zweite Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Gemeinde zu Korinth* (Berlin: Reimer, 1874) 59, 163–64; Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, "Das gegenseitige Verhältnis der beiden Korintherbriefe," *ZwTh* 22 (1879) 467–68.

incest and whose expulsion from the community he had clearly demanded.<sup>16</sup> Ewald proposed that, on the occasion of Paul's second visit to Corinth, one of the Corinthians, probably a leader of the church, openly accused Paul of misconduct so serious that, had it been proven, would have sufficed to deprive Paul of his apostolic legitimacy.<sup>17</sup>

Ewald's arguments for the distinction of the wrongdoer from the incestuous man were accepted by a number of scholars and became the basis for further research.<sup>18</sup> As attention shifted from 1 Corinthians to 2 Corinthians, scholars discovered clues to the status of the wrongdoer, the nature of his offence, and his role in the opposition to Paul. Analysis

---

16 Heinrich Ewald, "Bemerkungen über die Paulusbriefe," *Jahrbücher der biblischen Wissenschaft* 2 (1850) 229–30: "Er [Baur] meint z.b., der Apostel habe bei dem 2 Cor, 2,5 ff. bezeichneten manne jenen blütschänder 1 Cor. 5,1–5 im sinne: indem er nach 1 Cor. 5 dessen ausstossung aus der Gemeinde gefordert, habe er, wie er 2 Cor. 2 selbst einsehe, einen zu gewagten und übereilten schritt gethan, durch welchen er, weil er die beabsichtigte folge nicht hatte, sich nur eine blösse gegeben habe und den er nun 2 Cor. 2 im grunde selbst zurücknehme; jene forderung habe in Corinth einem sehr übeln eindruck gemacht, den der Apostel jetzt durch nachgiebigkeit und begütigung zu verwischen suche. Jawohl, wenn der Apostel ein mann etwa wie Dr. Baur erster prof. der ev. theologie in Tübingen gewesen wäre, so liesse sich solcherlei zeug erdichten und mitanhören! Zumglück war er ein ganz anderer mann, und zumglück haben seine worte nicht im geringsten einen solchen sinn. Einen Christen der ihn persönlich beleidigt hatte konnte der Apostel gern verzeihen: von einem blütschänder konnte, nachdem er einmal dessen ausstossung gefordert, bei ihm garnichtmehr die rede seyn. Ist den unsern Kirchengeschichtern der geist der apostolischen Kirche so gänzlich unfassbar? Aber dann sollten sie wenigstens den sinn der worte der quellen nicht verdrehen."

17 Ewald, "Bemerkungen," 230; idem, *Sendschreiben*, 226–27.

18 Adolf Hilgenfeld, "Die Christusleute in Corinth," *ZwTh* 3 (1865) 241–43; idem, "Paulus und die korinthischen Wirren," *ZwTh* 9 (1871) 103–104; idem, "Paulus und Corinth," *ZwTh* 26 (1888) 193–94; Willibald Beyschlag, "Über die Christuspartei in Corinth," *ThStKr* 38 (1865) 253–54; idem, "Zur Streitfrage über die Paulusgegner des zweiten Korintherbriefes," *ThStKr* 44 (1871) 670; Karl Heinrich von Weizsäcker, "Paulus und die Gemeinde in Corinth," *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 19 (1873) 643–45; idem, *Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1886, <sup>2</sup>1892) 306–309; Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel, *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 2 (Freiburg: Mohr, Siebeck, 1891, <sup>2</sup>1892) 46, 79–80, 220–21; Otto Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang beschrieben* (Berlin: Reimer, 1887, <sup>2</sup>1902) 103–104; Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 257, 283–96; Johannes Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, ed. R. Knopf (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917); English trans. *The History of Primitive Christianity*, 2 vols., trans. by F. C. Grant (New York: Wilson-Erickson, 1937) 1.342–44.

of Paul's argument and rhetoric in 2 Cor. 1:1–2:13 and 7:5–16 led to the conclusion that the occasion both of Paul's absence from Corinth and of his painful epistle was an incident in Corinth in which two individuals were involved: Paul was wronged by a prominent member of the Corinthian church, and had something of which to forgive.<sup>19</sup> Yet the community could not be entirely excused of complicity: indeed, the wrong of 2:5 and 7:12 was an insult in which the tensions between Paul and the community culminated.<sup>20</sup> Although Paul never says precisely in what the invective against him consisted, chapters 10–13 contain much polemical material. The speaker for the opposition against Paul was discovered behind the indefinite pronouns and the third-person verbs in 10:7, 10:10, and 10:11.<sup>21</sup> Calumnies against Paul reverberate throughout the apologetic of these chapters: accordingly, Paul was represented as weak, a contemptible speaker, a boastful fool, crafty and deceitful, one in whom the power of Christ was not present.<sup>22</sup> It was clear that the wrongdoer could not be one of the Jewish apostles who had entered the Corinthian community from outside, since such a person would not have stood under the jurisdiction of the Corinthian church, and would not have been brought to grief and repentance by Paul.<sup>23</sup> Yet the whole of 2 Corinthians makes it likely that the wrongdoer was a Corinthian Christian who had been influenced by the Judaizers: in this sense, the affair of the wrongdoer could be said to belong to the history of the Jewish-Christian opposition to Paul.<sup>24</sup> Such was the new understanding of the

19 Ewald, *Sendschreiben*, 227; Neander, *Auslegung*, 293: "dass etwa einer aufgetreten sei, der dem apostolischen Ansehen Pauli übermütig trotzte und dadurch eine Spaltung in der Gemeinde hervorzurufen drohte"; Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 257; Wilhelm Bousset, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1908) 175; Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.342–43.

20 Ewald, *Sendschreiben*, 227; Neander, *Auslegung*, 293; Schmiedel, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 46, 220–21; Richard Drescher, "Der zweite Korintherbrief und die Vorgänge in Korinth seit Abfassung des ersten Korintherbriefs," *ThStKr* 70 (1897) 49; Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.342–43.

21 Karl König, "Der Verkehr des Paulus mit der Gemeinde zu Korinth," *ZwTh* 40 (1897) 514; Weiss, *Primitive Christianity* 1.343.

22 Hilgenfeld, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung*, 286: "In der korinthischen Gemeinde wird jemand öffentlich erklärt haben, Paulus, der vorgebliche Apostel rühme sich masslos und sei vor lauter Einbildung ganz von Sinnen gekommen, ein reiner Narr geworden." See also König, "Verkehr," 516, 520–21; Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.343–44.

23 König, "Verkehr," 516; Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.343–44.

24 Weizsäcker, "Paulus und die Gemeinde in Korinth," 643, who concludes, "dass der ganze Vorfall in die Geschichte der jüdaistischen Agitation gehört, wenn auch

offender and his offence which emerged by the end of the nineteenth century in the succession of Bleek and Ewald.<sup>25</sup>

Nevertheless, a minority of eminent scholars maintained the identity of the wrongdoer with the incestuous man, even in the face of a new, critical consensus.<sup>26</sup> It is important to grasp their reasons for doing so, because their resistance ultimately sharpened understanding of the nature of the offence against Paul. First, some weight must be granted to tradition: especially in cases where the evidence seems insufficient, preference is naturally given to the form in which knowledge has been transmitted.<sup>27</sup> Second, the new hypothesis regarding the offender and the offence had become intertwined in the history of scholarship with a critique of the integrity of 2 Corinthians, so that some scholars felt obliged to reaffirm the traditional identification of the wrongdoer, in order to defend the unity of the canonical text.<sup>28</sup> It will be recalled that Ewald's proposal to distinguish the wrongdoer from the incestuous man rested upon Bleek's critique of the assumption that 1 Corinthians is the "letter of tears" mentioned in 2 Cor. 2:3–4.<sup>29</sup> Once the equation of the "painful epistle" with 1 Corinthians was given up, it was inevitable that scholars would search for the letter elsewhere in the Pauline corpus. Within a generation, Adolf Hausrath found the "lost" letter in 2 Cor. 10–13,<sup>30</sup> a proposal which has garnered much support in the history of scholarship,<sup>31</sup> and which remains

---

der Mann nicht einer von den auswärts Gekommenen, sondern ein Mitglied der Gemeinde gewesen zu sein scheint." See also Hilgenfeld, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung*, 283–86; König, "Verkehr," 516.

- 25 Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.342–44, summarizing the development in scholarship of the preceding century.
- 26 Hausrath, *Der Vier-Capitel-Brief des Paulus*, 7, 28; Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, "Das gegenseitige Verhältnis der beiden Korintherbriefe," *ZwTh* 22(1879) 466–68; Julius Ferdinand Rübiger, *Kritische Untersuchungen über den Inhalt der beiden Briefe des Apostels Paulus an die korinthische Gemeinde mit Rücksicht auf die in ihr herrschenden Streitigkeiten* (Breslau: Morgenstern, 1886) 230; Heinrich, *Das zweite Sendschreiben*, 13–22; idem, *Der zweite Brief*, 11–16; Carl Holsten, "Einleitung in die Korintherbriefe," *ZwTh* 44 (1901) 355–56.
- 27 Heinrich, *Der zweite Brief*, 11, 16; cf. Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 62.
- 28 E.g., Klöpper, *Kommentar*, 9, 27; Holtzmann, "Das gegenseitige Verhältnis," 455–92, esp. 464–68; Heinrich, *Der zweite Brief*, 5–32, esp. 11–16.
- 29 Bleek, "Erörterungen," 625–32; Ewald, *Sendschreiben*, 226–27.
- 30 Hausrath, *Der Vier-Capitel-Brief des Paulus*; see also idem, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 4 vols. (Heidelberg: Bassermann, 1875) 3.302–14.
- 31 Schmiedel, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 2.74–80; Carl Clemen, *Die Einheitlichkeit der paulinischen Briefe, an Hand der bisher mit bezug auf sie angestellten Interpolations- und Compilationshypothesen geprüft* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ru-

for many the most convincing explanation of the internal references in Paul's Corinthian correspondence.<sup>32</sup> Third, defenders of the traditional identification of the wrongdoer with the incestuous man called attention to a certain "resonance" between the language of 1 Cor. 5:1–5 and 2 Cor. 2:5–11: in both passages, the person in question is denoted circumspectly by means of indefinite (τις) and correlative (τοιούτος) pronouns; in both passages, there is mention of Satan and of Christ.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, Paul's declaration that the Corinthians had proven themselves

---

precht, 1894) 19–68; Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.347–49; J. Héring, *La seconde Épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens* (Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux et Niestle, 1958); Rudolf Bultmann, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther*, ed. E. Dinkler (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976) 20–23; Walter Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969) 84–94; Dieter Georgi, *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief: Studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike* (Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964), English trans. *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986) 9–13; Bornkamm, *Vorgeschichte*, esp. 172–78, revised and reprinted, with an addendum, in idem, *Geschichte und Glaube*, vol. 2 (Munich: Kaiser, 1971) 162–94; Vielhauser, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 142–56; Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, 3–25; L. L. Welborn, "The Identification of 2 Corinthians 10–13 with the 'Letter of Tears,'" *NovT* 37 (1995) 138–53; Mitchell, "Paul's Letters to Corinth," 307–38; Calvin Roetzel, *2 Corinthians* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2007) 32–33 and *passim*.

32 Kennedy, "Are There Two Epistles in 2 Corinthians?" 231–38, 285–304; idem, *The Second and Third Epistles*; James Moffatt, *The Historical New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1901) 174–91; Gerald H. Rendall, *The Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians* (London: Macmillan, 1909) 4–6; Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 151–64; Plummer, *Second Epistle*, xxii–xxvi, xxxi–xxxiii; R. H. Strachan, *The Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper, 1935) xiv–xx; Francis Watson, "2 Cor. x–xiii and Paul's Painful Letter to the Corinthians," *JTS* 35/2 (1984) 324–46; Welborn, "The Identification of 2 Corinthians 10–13," 138–53.

33 Baur, *Paulus*, 1.333; A. Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul. Esquisse d'une histoire de sa pensée* (Strasbourg: Treuttel et Wurtz, 1870) 142; Klöpper, *Kommentar*, 157; Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 2.700–701; Johann Christian Karl von Hofmann, *Die heilige Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht*, 2. Theil, 3. Abteilung: *Der zweite Brief Pauli an die Korinther* (Nördlingen: Beck, 1877) 105–106; Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief*, 16; Theodor Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1909) 1.348; Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 64 n.6; G. W. H. Lampe, "Church Discipline and the Interpretation of the Epistles to the Corinthians" in *Christian History and Interpretation*, eds. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967) 353–54.

“guiltless in the matter” (ἀγνοὶ τῷ πράγματι) of the wrongdoer in 2 Cor. 7:11 was construed as a reference to the “immorality” (πορνεία) of the incestuous man in 1 Cor. 5:1.<sup>34</sup> We shall see that the verbal similarities between these passages are too general to support an identification of the individuals involved, and that when the common vocabulary is examined in context, it highlights the differences, and even contradictions, between the two cases. Yet, for scholars who were inclined to defend the traditional identification of the wrongdoer with the incestuous man, the occurrence of similar expressions in 1 Cor. 5 and 2 Cor. 2 furnished a thread of continuity between the two cases.

More consequential than the arguments advanced in support of the traditional identification was a criticism of the new understanding of the offence against Paul as an “insult.”<sup>35</sup> Several scholars questioned whether the punishment imposed upon the one who had caused pain in 2 Cor. 2:6 was not a disproportionate use of force, if Paul were merely dealing with a personal insult,<sup>36</sup> and wondered aloud whether it would not be “petty” of the apostle to respond to an insult in such a severe manner.<sup>37</sup> Eventually, Theodor Zahn focused attention on the verb Paul uses in 2 Cor. 7:12 to describe the nature of the offence.<sup>38</sup> Zahn demonstrated that the verb ἀδικεῖν (“to wrong”) is nowhere used in the Septuagint or the New Testament with the unambiguous meaning “to insult” or “to slander.” Rather, “to wrong someone” (ἀδικεῖν τινά) is defined as “voluntarily causing injury contrary to the law.”<sup>39</sup> While an injury to reputation might fall into this category, Zahn questioned why Paul would not have written “the insulter” (ὁ ὑβρίσας) and “the insulted” (ὁ ὑβρισθεὶς), or “the

---

34 Klöpper, *Kommentar*, 54, 361; Holtzmann, “Das gegenseitige Verhältnis,” 466; James Denney, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: Armstrong, 1894) 2–3; Hughes, *Paul’s Second Epistle*, 64 n.6.

35 Klöpper, *Kommentar*, 156–57; Holtzmann, “Das gegenseitige Verhältnis,” 466; Heinrici, *Das zweite Sendschreiben*, 15; Zahn, *Introduction*, 1.349; Hans Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924, repr. 1970) 238.

36 Klöpper, *Kommentar*, 156–57; Holtzmann, “Das gegenseitige Verhältnis,” 466; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238.

37 Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief*, 15; C. Holsten, “Einleitung in die Korintherbriefe,” *ZwTh* 44 (1901) 355; Zahn, *Introduction*, 1.349; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 61–62.

38 Zahn, *Introduction*, 1.349; cf. Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief*, 16.

39 Zahn, *Introduction*, 1.349, citing Aristotle *Rhet.* 1.10.3.

reviler" (ὁ λοιδορήσας) and "the reviled" (ὁ λοιδορηθείς), had he intended to speak of a personal insult.<sup>40</sup>

Thus, the attempt to maintain the traditional identification of the wrongdoer with the incestuous man produced one truly valuable insight into the nature of the offence against Paul: the wrong was more than a personal insult, however grave, public, and calumnious; the kind of action denoted by ἄδικεῖν was an injury with a legal aspect.<sup>41</sup> Beyond this, the defense of the traditional identification served to illustrate the hypothetical character of the new proposal that emerged in consequence of Bleek and Ewald, and the greater intellectual satisfaction of being able to identify the wrongdoer with another figure in the Corinthian correspondence.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, the debate between the critics and the traditionalists revealed that every attempt to reconstruct the events and persons to which allusion is made in the text involves a theory of the literary unity of the writings known to us as 1 and 2 Corinthians. Finally, the similarity of vocabulary between 1 Cor. 5:1–5 and 2 Cor. 2:5–11 proved intriguing to a number of scholars and seemed to leave open the possibility that the persons in question might be the same, even if the offences described were different.

The attempt to maintain the traditional identification of the wrongdoer with the incestuous man was abandoned at the beginning of the twentieth century,<sup>43</sup> and has been revived only as a subsidiary argument within defenses of the unity of 2 Corinthians.<sup>44</sup> It is important to comprehend the reasons why the traditional view was finally abandoned, despite its attractions, because the debate and its resolution delineate the pa-

40 Zahn, *Introduction*, 1.349; followed by Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975) 198.

41 Already emphasized by Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 305; followed by Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238.

42 Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief*, 16; cf. Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.65.

43 James Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1910) 122: "It should no longer require to be proved that this offender is not the incestuous person of 1 Cor. V.1, but someone who had wronged Paul himself."; Plummer, *Second Epistle*, xv, 54, who mentions only Zahn, among major scholars, as a defender of the traditional identification of the wrongdoer with the incestuous man.

44 Alan M. G. Stepheson, "A Defence of the Integrity of 2 Corinthians" in *The Authorship and Integrity of the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1965) 86; Hyldahl, "Die Frage nach der literarischen Einheit," 305–306; David R. Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence* (London: T & T Clark, 2003) 227–35.

rameters within which the identity of the wrongdoer may be fruitfully investigated.

First, it is clear that Paul regards *the wrong* that has been committed in the two cases very differently. In 1 Cor. 5, Paul deals with a report of “sexual immorality” (πορνεία), indeed “a kind of immorality that is not found even among the pagans” (5:1). But in 2 Cor. 2 and 7, there is no evidence that the wrongdoer has engaged in an immoral act; neither the verb λυπεῖν (“to cause pain”) nor ἁδικεῖν (“to inflict injury”) possesses the specificity or intensity necessary to designate such a shameful act as incest.<sup>45</sup> The incestuous man of 1 Cor. 5 has sinned against God and has transgressed God’s law; not so the wrongdoer of 2 Cor. 2 and 7, who has caused pain to Paul and the Corinthians, and whose forgiveness comes from his fellow Christians, rather than God.<sup>46</sup>

Second, Paul’s account of *the response* of the Corinthians to the two incidents is strikingly different, indeed antithetical. In 1 Cor. 5, Paul is indignant with the Corinthians because they have tolerated the presence of the sinner in the community; they are arrogant, when they should have been sorrowful.<sup>47</sup> But in 2 Cor. 2 and 7, it is the Corinthians who are sorrowful and indignant and eager to clear themselves of complicity;<sup>48</sup> Paul approves the punishment which the Corinthians have imposed upon the wrongdoer, and finds that the church has proven its obedience in everything.<sup>49</sup>

Third, *the attitude* that Paul adopts in the case of the wrongdoer in 2 Cor. 2 is incommensurate with the judgment passed upon the incestuous man in 1 Cor. 5. Would Paul not have fallen into self-contradiction, had he advised the Corinthians to forgive and restore the one whom he had earlier commanded to be expelled from the church and handed over to Satan? The absolution of the incestuous man would have amounted to a repudiation of his earlier instructions regarding fornicators and adulter-

---

45 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 285–86; Plummer, *Second Epistle*, 54; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 55, 57–58.

46 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 285–86.

47 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 290; Plummer, *Second Epistle*, 54; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 58; Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1984) 164–65.

48 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 290; Plummer, *Second Epistle*, 55; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 55; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 164–65.

49 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 290; Plummer, *Second Epistle*, 55.

ers in 1 Cor. 5, and would have given new life to the immoral practices among the Corinthians.<sup>50</sup>

Fourth, *the penalty* that is imposed in the two instances is fundamentally different. In 1 Cor. 5, Paul decrees that the incestuous man is to be expelled from the community: in solemn assembly, the Corinthians are “to hand the man over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh” (5:5). While it is not clear precisely what was involved in the execution of this sentence, Paul’s language suggests a punishment that is drastic and permanent, such as excommunication.<sup>51</sup> In 2 Cor. 2:6, by contrast, Paul declares himself satisfied with a much less severe penalty, a “rebuke” or “censure,” judging from the term that Paul uses (ἐπιτιμία).<sup>52</sup> Paul’s subsequent appeal to the Corinthians to forgive and console the wrongdoer in 2 Cor. 2:7–8 is simply inconceivable, if the same case is in view as in 1 Cor. 5.<sup>53</sup>

Fifth, *the outcome* that is envisioned in consequence of the penalties is mutually exclusive. In 1 Cor. 5, any hope for the salvation of the incestuous man awaits the coming of the day of the Lord (5:5). No provision is made for the repentance of the incestuous man, and indeed, the possibility seems to be excluded by the permanence of his expulsion from the community.<sup>54</sup> But in 2 Cor. 2, Paul appeals to the Corinthians to forgive and console the wrongdoer, “lest he be overwhelmed by excessive sorrow” (2:7). It is clear that Paul aims at the restoration of the wrongdoer to the fellowship of the community, and that no special absolution is needed beyond a reaffirmation of love (2:8). As Tertullian observed long ago, Paul would doubtless have expressed his pardon very differently, had the one whom he condemned with special indignation in 1 Cor. 5 repented, contrary to expectation.<sup>55</sup>

50 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 287–89; Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I-II*, 105; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 59–60; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 165; R. P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (Waco: Word, 1986) 38; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.64.

51 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 290–91; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 57; F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (London: Oliphants, 1971) 185; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 165.

52 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 302; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973) 90–91. Further on ἐπιτιμία, see below, ch. 3, pp. 42–43.

53 Ewald, “Bemerkungen,” 229; Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 289; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 57–58; Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 185; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 165.

54 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 290; Philipp Bachmann, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1922) 113; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 92; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 166; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.64.

55 Tertullian, *Pud.* 13; cf. Plummer, *Second Epistle*, 54.

As suggested earlier, the verbal similarities between 1 Cor. 5:1–5 and 2 Cor. 2:5–11, which held such attraction for defenders of the traditional identification of the wrongdoer, are discovered, upon closer inspection, to be superficial, and actually indicative of fundamental differences between the two cases, when the vocabulary is examined in context. Note the different role assigned to Satan in the two passages: in 1 Cor. 5:5, Satan is the agent of destruction of the flesh; the realm of Satan's activity is circumscribed; he claims as his prey only the gross sinners. But in 2 Cor. 2:11, Satan threatens to outwit and plunder the entire community, if the wrongdoer is not forgiven and comforted.<sup>56</sup> The authority of Christ is invoked in the two passages, but to very different effects: in 1 Cor. 5:4, the Lord Jesus provides the sanction and warrant for the judgment that is executed upon the incestuous man, whereas in 2 Cor. 2:10, Christ bears witness to the altruistic motive for Paul's forgiveness.<sup>57</sup> In both passages, Paul uses the pronouns *τις* and *τοιοῦτος* to refer to an unnamed individual (1 Cor. 5:1, 5; 2 Cor. 2:5, 6, 7), but the reasons are distinct in each instance: in 1 Cor. 5, Paul aims to ostracize the sinner, while in 2 Cor. 2, anonymity serves the goal of reconciliation.<sup>58</sup> Finally, the attempt to construe the term *πράγμα* in 2 Cor. 7:11 as an allusion to the *πορνεία* of 1 Cor. 5:1 overlooks the fact that in his only other use of the word *πράγμα* in the Corinthian correspondence, in 1 Cor. 6:1, Paul refers to a lawsuit, or to the occasion for litigation.<sup>59</sup>

The greater part of these arguments against the identification of the wrongdoer with the incestuous man were forcefully articulated by the scrupulous exegete Max Krenkel at the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>60</sup> Subsequently, no major commentator on 2 Corinthians has attempted to defend the traditional identification.<sup>61</sup> In the final edition of his Meyer commentary, Georg Heinrici retreated from the robust, psycholo-

56 Schmiedel, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 221; Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 290–91; Bachmann, *Der zweite Brief*, 113; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 92; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 57; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 165; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.62.

57 R. V. G. Tasker, *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (London: Tyndale Press, 1958) 55; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 165; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.62–63.

58 Bachmann, *Der zweite Brief*, 133; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 164; Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 67.

59 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 292; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 165; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.63.

60 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 284–92. The impact of Krenkel's careful exegesis can still be traced in Thrall's commentary.

61 Numbered in this group: Allo, Bachmann, Barrett, Betz, Bousset, Bruce, Bultmann, Furnish, Grässer, Héring, Lietzmann, Martin, Plummer, Roetzel, Strachan, Thrall, Wendland, Windisch, and Wolff.

gizing explanations by which he had earlier sought to fill in the gaps between 1 Cor. 5 and 2 Cor. 2,<sup>62</sup> and took refuge in a prudent agnosticism in the face of textual ambiguities.<sup>63</sup> Thus one hears no more about the anxiety of the Corinthian Christians lest their own hidden sins be brought to light as a motive for their procrastination in carrying out the punishment of the incestuous man.<sup>64</sup> Gone is the colorful, dramatic portrait of the transformation of an impenitent sinner, who had scorned divine law and human taboo, into “a bruised reed in danger of completely breaking.”<sup>65</sup> Instead, Heinrici contented himself with exposing the weaknesses of all hypotheses, and finally expressed his preference for the traditional identification of the wrongdoer as the simplest solution.<sup>66</sup>

Attempts to revive the traditional identification of the wrongdoer with the incestuous man during the past century have mostly taken the form of subsidiary arguments within defenses of the literary unity of 2 Corinthians, as already noted.<sup>67</sup> These attempts have not produced any

---

62 Heinrici, *Das zweite Sendschreiben*, 19–21.

63 Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief*, 26, 28–30, resolving “dass Sichere zu ermitteln, und wenn die Briefe, wie sie überliefert sind, in den Grundzügen ein klares Bild der Kämpfe des Paulus um das Seelenheil seiner Gemeinde, um die Autorität seines Apostolats und die Lauterkeit seines Characters ergeben, sich in bezug auf die Undeutlichkeiten und Möglichkeiten von secundärer Bedeutung zu bescheiden.”

64 Heinrici, *Das zweite Sendschreiben*, 20: “Dazu kommt, dass die Forderung, ein Gemeindeglied, dessen Frevel man doch wohl um seiner sonstigen Verdienste oder Vorzüge willen übersehen hatte, auszuschliessen, nicht nur beschämte, sondern auch mannichfache Interessen kreuzte und verletzte. Wer weiss es nicht, wie jedes auch noch so berechtigte Eingreifen gegen eine irgendwie geschätzte oder angesehene Person Gegenströmungen hervorlockt, zumal wenn die That des in Anspruch Genommenen die verwandten Schossünden anderer nach ihrer Verwerflichkeit empfindlich beleuchtet? Auch macht der schliessliche Erfolg der Strafe es wahrscheinlich, dass der Schuldige sofort das Seine dazu gethan habe, die That als weniger straffällig hinzustellen, um seinen Einfluss in der Gemeinde nicht einzubüssen. Hieraus erklärt sich dann das Zögern, wo nicht die Abneigung, dem Willen des Apostels sich zu fügen. Wie viel Beschönigungen findet das böse Gewissen! Und die starke Neigung zu geschlechtlichen Sünden war nicht mit einem Schläge zu tilgen.”

65 Heinrici, *Das zweite Sendschreiben*, 19: “Nicht mehr sprach ein verstockter Sünder, den die Gemeinde in ihrer Mitte duldete, göttlichem und menschlichem Rechte Hohn, sondern das geknickte Rohr drohte ganz zu zerbrechen.” Cf. idem, *Der zweite Brief*, 93.

66 Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief*, 16.

67 Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 59–65; Stepheson, “Defence of the Integrity of 2 Corinthians,” 82–97, esp. 86; Hyldahl, “Die Frage nach der literarischen Ein-

new arguments in favor of the traditional identification, nor have they engaged the difficulties which the traditional identification encountered in historical criticism.<sup>68</sup> Instead, it is now asserted that the focus of scholarship on the offender and the offence fundamentally mistakes Paul's purposes, both in 1 Cor. 5 and in 2 Cor. 2 and 7: Paul's principal concern throughout his correspondence was to test the obedience of the Corinthians, who were puffed up with pride in their own wisdom and knowledge; Paul's insistence upon the punishment of the incestuous man was a test of the Corinthians' submission to his apostolic authority, a test which they passed, when they punished the offender and brought him to repentance.<sup>69</sup> But this attempt to dispose of the problem by redefining the issue fails to take account of differences between 1 Cor. 5 and 2 Cor. 2 and 7, precisely in regard to Paul's concern for the spiritual well-being of the congregation as a whole: in 1 Cor. 5, Paul is concerned about the moral purity of the community, and the Corinthians are commanded to remove the incestuous man from their midst; in 2 Cor. 2 and 7, by contrast, Paul's concern is for the healing of a broken community, and this can be achieved by restoring the penitent wrongdoer to fellowship.<sup>70</sup> Precisely when one focuses upon Paul's concern for the Corinthians in the relevant passages, two very different situations come into view.

Two major, new hypotheses regarding the identity of the wrongdoer in 2 Corinthians were put forward in the twentieth century.<sup>71</sup> Both hypotheses have their roots in the critique of the traditional interpretation during the nineteenth century, and thus seek clues to the identity of the wrongdoer in the pages of 2 Corinthians, without recourse to the case of the incestuous man. Both hypotheses are informed by analyses of pertinent features of the argument and language of 2 Corinthians, and draw legitimate exegetical inferences. Yet each proposal is in its own way highly speculative, positing events for which there is no evidence

---

heit," 298–306, esp. 305–306; Hall, *Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, 100–101, 202–203, 223–35.

68 These are the principal defects of the studies by Kruse, "The Offender and the Offence," 129–39 and Hall, *Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, 227–35. See the comments of Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 164.

69 D. R. Hall, "Pauline Church Discipline," *TynBul* 20 (1969) 3–26, esp. 15–17; idem, *Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, 227–35.

70 Rightly, Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 92; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 166.

71 Barrett, "Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ," 149–57; repr. in idem, *Essays on Paul*, 108–17; Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 65–78; summarized in idem, *Second Epistle*, 1.61–69.

in the text. And neither hypothesis provides the satisfaction of identifying the wrongdoer with any precision, the principal attraction of the traditional interpretation. Nevertheless, it is essential to engage these hypotheses in detail, because each embodies insights that contribute to a positive identification of the wrongdoer and a plausible reconstruction of events.

C. K. Barrett's essay of 1970, entitled "Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ," seeks to resolve an apparent tension in Paul's account of the complicity of the Corinthians in the affair of the wrongdoer, by positing that the offender was a visitor to Corinth, whose challenge to Paul's apostolic authority and insult to his person at first went unanswered by the Corinthian Christians, who failed to show the proper zeal in defending their apostle, but who later, under the good influence of Titus, repented of having listened to the intruder, punished the offender, and vindicated themselves in the matter.<sup>72</sup> Barrett's hypothesis arises out of close exegesis of two verses in particular, 7:9 and 7:11. In the former passage, Paul rejoices in the fact that his painful epistle has moved the Corinthians to repentance. If the Corinthians had something of which to repent, then they must have shared in the guilt of the wrongdoer in some fashion. The complicity of the Corinthians is confirmed by consideration of the words Paul uses to describe the Corinthians' attitude toward the situation in which they found themselves: ἀπολογία ("eagerness to clear oneself"), ἀγανάκτησις ("indignation"), and ἐκδίκησις ("punishment"). As Barrett recognized, these are "defensive words" which imply an underlying charge.<sup>73</sup> On the other hand, Paul pronounces the Corinthians' innocence emphatically and unequivocally at the end of vs. 11: "In every way you have proved yourselves guiltless in the matter."<sup>74</sup> The desire of the Corinthians to vindicate themselves is likewise indicated by other terms that Paul uses to describe their response, especially ζήλος ("zeal") and σπουδή ("earnestness"). How is one to resolve the apparent contradiction in Paul's statements about the Corinthians? Barrett sought to restore balance to our understanding of the role of the Corinthians by locating the wrongdoer outside the Corinthian church, as a kind of fulcrum upon which the response of the Corinthians turned. Barrett speculated that the wrongdoer was the leader of an ad-

---

72 Barrett, "Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ," 108–17, esp. 113–15; followed by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) 293–94.

73 Barrett, "Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ," 112–13.

74 Barrett, "Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ," 112–13.

vance contingent of Judaizing opponents who make their full appearance in the last four chapters of 2 Corinthians.<sup>75</sup>

It is easy to expose the weakness of Barrett's hypothesis. Barrett constructs his proposal out of materials from chapter 7. But Paul's instructions concerning the punishment and forgiveness of the wrongdoer in 2:5–11 make clear that the person in question is a member of the Corinthian church.<sup>76</sup> The wrongdoer is subject to the discipline of the Corinthians and submits to the penalty which they impose, conditions which would hardly have been accepted by a visitor to Corinth, an interloping apostle.<sup>77</sup> It is impossible to imagine that the leader of the group of apostles opposed to Paul would have experienced such remorse over the insult he had given to Paul that he would be in danger of drowning in excessive sorrow, as Paul fears in 2:7. The polemics of 2 Cor. 10–13 make clear that Paul's apostolic rivals had considered theological and ecclesiastical reasons for challenging the legitimacy of Paul's apostleship.<sup>78</sup> Moreover, the concern that Paul displays for the welfare of the wrongdoer, whom the Corinthians are to forgive, console, and love (2:7–8), is appropriate to one of his own converts, a member of the Corinthian church, but difficult to understand in relation to an intruder who had claimed superior rights for himself as an apostle and had belittled the authority of Paul.<sup>79</sup>

Because Barrett's hypothesis is encumbered by defects, there is a danger that one may overlook two genuine insights embodied in his interpretation. First, Barrett perceives a connection between the wrongdoer's challenge to Paul's authority and the Jewish-Christian opposition to Paul. Thus Barrett revives an understanding of the situation which goes back to the Tübingen School of the nineteenth century: the affair of the wrongdoer belongs to the history of Jewish Christian agitation against Paul. For Adolf Hilgenfeld and Carl Weizsäcker, this much was clear,

---

75 Barrett, "Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ," 113–15; similarly, Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul*, 293–94.

76 So, already, König, "Verkehr," 516; Kümmel, *Introduction*, 208. In criticism of Barrett on this point, Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 396; C. Wolff, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1989) 43; Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 71; Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 225.

77 Gerd Lüdemann, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel Band II: Antipaulinismus im frühen Christentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989) 126 n.78.

78 Ernst Käsemann, "Die Legitimität des Apostels. Eine Untersuchung zu II Korinther 10–13," *ZNW* 41 (1942) 33–71; Betz, *Der Apostel Paulus*; Georgi, *Opponents of Paul*, 83–238.

79 Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 71.

even if the wrongdoer was not a Jewish-Christian apostle who had entered the community from without, but rather a member of the Corinthian church.<sup>80</sup> Such an assumption alone does justice to the polemic against Paul that reverberates throughout 2 Corinthians, especially in chs. 10–13, and whose final echoes are audible in the cautious apologetic of chs. 1–2 and 7. Only such an assumption suffices to explain how an insult done to Paul, even one which challenged his apostolic authority, could have acquired such importance that it became the occasion for Paul's prolonged absence from Corinth and a letter written "with many tears."<sup>81</sup>

Second, and perhaps more importantly, Barrett uncovers a certain tension between the wrongdoer and the rest of the Corinthian Christians. There is an unmistakable ambiguity in their relationship: on the one hand, the Corinthians have proven their innocence by punishing the wrongdoer; in this respect, the wrongdoer stands over against the Corinthian church. But on the other hand, the Corinthians have something of which to repent, even if their complicity consisted merely in acquiescence; in this respect, the wrongdoer stands within the Corinthian congregation, or is closely associated with it. Barrett sought to reflect this ambiguity by placing the wrongdoer at the boundary of the Corinthian community, as a visitor, an intruder, but not himself a Corinthian. We have identified the flaws in Barrett's proposal, but ambiguity remains and demands an explanation. If the wrongdoer is not to be sought outside the Corinthian church, then perhaps he stands above the congregation, as a person of higher social status, the patron of the Christian groups at Corinth.<sup>82</sup>

The second new hypothesis of the twentieth century regarding the identity of the wrongdoer was that of Margaret Thrall.<sup>83</sup> Thrall postulated that the wrongdoer was a member of the Corinthian church who, on the occasion of Paul's second visit to Corinth, robbed Paul of money that

80 Hilgenfeld, "Die Christusleute in Korinth," 243; idem, "Paulus und die korinthischen Wirren," 103–104; Weizsäcker, "Paulus und die Gemeinde in Korinth," 643–44.

81 So, already, Drescher, "Vorgänge in Korinth," 49; König, "Verkehr," 512–14; Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.342–43.

82 Presciently, Ewald, *Sendschreiben*, 227: "ja einer der angesehensten, vielleicht ein mitglied des vorstandes, vergass sich so weit das ser ihm offen in der gemeinde unwürdiges vorwarf"; similarly, Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.342–43.

83 Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 65–78; summarized in idem, *Second Epistle*, 1.61–69.

had been entrusted to him by another Corinthian Christian as a contribution to the collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem. When Paul confronted the wrongdoer with his crime, he denied the charge, and questioned the apostle's motives. The congregation as a whole was uncertain whom to believe, and hence did not immediately accept Paul's version of events. Unable to persuade the Corinthians to take action against the wrongdoer, and fearing that some in the congregation might have been accomplices in the theft, Paul departed from Corinth in grief. Upon returning to Ephesus, Paul wrote a severe epistle which caused such revulsion of feeling among the Corinthians that they were moved to investigate the crime more thoroughly and to impose a punishment upon the wrongdoer.<sup>84</sup>

Thrall acknowledged that her reconstruction was "pure hypothesis."<sup>85</sup> And, indeed, her proposal is so speculative that one could be excused for omitting it from a history of critical scholarship on the subject. But then, one might fail to recognize the importance of two pieces of textual evidence to which Thrall's hypothesis is an ingenious response. The idea that the wrongdoing involved a robbery was suggested to Thrall by the verb ἄδικεῖν, whose meaning was clarified by exegetical research following Zahn.<sup>86</sup> It will be recalled that Zahn established, appealing to Aristotle, that ἄδικεῖν is to be defined as "voluntarily causing injury contrary to the law."<sup>87</sup> Subsequently, research by Max Krenkel and Hans Windisch made the sense of ἄδικεῖν more precise: in a number of relevant instances, ἄδικεῖν is used in reference to an illegal injury in which money was involved: thus in Philemon 18, Matt. 20:13, and Lev. 6:2–5 (LXX).<sup>88</sup> This is probably also the sense of the term in 1 Cor. 6:7–8, where the lawsuits in question seem to be civil in nature, concerned with money or property.<sup>89</sup> Thrall's hypothesis was strongly influenced by a passage

---

84 Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 71–76. Thrall asserts that she is building upon the suggestions of Krenkel and Windisch.

85 Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 75.

86 Zahn, *Introduction*, 1.349; followed by Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238.

87 Aristotle *Rhet.* 1.10.3: ἔστω δὴ τὸ ἀδικεῖν τὸ βλάπτειν ἐκόντα παρὰ τὸν νόμον.

88 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 305–307, who speaks of a "Schädigung an Hab und Gut"; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238.

89 So, already, Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 305; followed by Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238–39. On the civil nature of the lawsuits, see now Bruce W. Winter, "Civil Litigation: 1 Corinthians 6:1–11" in idem, *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 105–22, esp. 107.

in Philo's *Special Laws* where the term ᾠδικεῖν seems to refer to the pilfering of a deposit entrusted to a friend by a third party.<sup>90</sup> We may leave on one side Thrall's robbery scenario which, because it is "pure hypothesis," can neither be proved nor disproved. But we should hold fast to Thrall's inference that, in the wrong done to Paul by an unnamed individual, money was somehow involved.

Less speculative, but more original, was Thrall's intuition regarding the collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem as the context for the action of the wrongdoer.<sup>91</sup> Unfortunately, Thrall did not elaborate this insight or seek to ground it in exegesis of passages in 2 Corinthians where Paul responds to allegations of misconduct in the administration of the collection. 2 Cor. 8 and 9 reveal how much importance the collection had assumed in Paul's thinking about the legacy of his apostleship to the Gentiles, how crucial the contribution of the wealthy Corinthians had become to the success of the collection, and how much difficulty Paul encountered in allaying suspicions and persuading the Corinthians to complete their gift.<sup>92</sup> In 2 Cor. 12:16–18 Paul denies the accusation that he sought to "defraud" the Corinthians through his emissary Titus.<sup>93</sup> As we shall see, this statement is best understood as a reference to the mission of Titus to Corinth in connection with the collection, discussed in 2 Cor. 8.<sup>94</sup> Thus, Thrall's suggestion that the collection was the occasion for the offence against Paul has far-reaching implications.

The history of research into the identity of the wrongdoer in 2 Corinthians has produced mainly negative results. By "negative," what is meant is that the labor of almost two centuries has been expended on the demolition of the traditional identification, the separation of the wrongdoer from the incestuous man. Only when this critical task was

90 Philo *Spec.* 4.34; Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 73–74. The text was already discussed in connection with 2 Cor. 7:12 by Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238.

91 Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 74–76. A connection between the action of the wrongdoer and Paul's collection for the poor in Jerusalem was already posited by Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, 97.

92 Dieter Georgi, *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem* (Hamburg: Reich, 1965; English trans. *Remembering the Poor: The History of Paul's Collection for Jerusalem* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1992); Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, esp. 37–86.

93 See the discussion of the charge of πλεονεξία in 2 Cor. 12:16–18 below in ch. 3.

94 So, already, Barrett, *Second Epistle*, 325; followed by Mitchell, "Paul's Letters to Corinth," 326–27. See the discussion of 2 Cor. 12:18 as a retrospective reference to 2 Cor. 8:6, 18 in ch. 3 below, pp. 173–177.

complete, could scholars turn to a constructive search for evidence in 2 Corinthians, and establish the following facts: the wrongdoer was a member of the Corinthian church; he was influenced by Jewish-Christian opponents of Paul; his offence took place on the occasion of Paul's second visit to Corinth; the wrong was an injury in which money was somehow involved; the context of the injurious action was the collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem; the Corinthians were somehow complicit in the wrong done to Paul.<sup>95</sup> These facts are not insignificant, and yet, they do not lead to a positive identification of the wrongdoer. And attempts to go beyond these basic facts have resulted in speculative hypotheses that are not capable of confirmation. In retrospect, it is clear that what was lost when the traditional identification was abandoned was a control outside the text of 2 Corinthians, an instance with which the evidence of 2 Corinthians could be correlated, and by which the results could be verified. Our study will seek to establish a control outside the text by invoking the social and rhetorical conventions in which Paul and the Corinthians participated, and by which their relationships were governed. Only when such a framework has been articulated will it be possible to verify a hypothesis regarding the identity of the wrongdoer. But first, we must turn back to the text of 2 Corinthians, to make sure that we have extracted all the relevant information, that we have isolated every trait that might contribute to a positive identification of the wrongdoer.

---

95 Compare the list of "traits précis" in Allo, *Saint Paul*, 55.

## Chapter Three

### Inferences from Exegesis

2 Cor. 1:1–2:13; 7:5–16

We begin with a point that has been assumed throughout the history of scholarship, but which is so fundamental, and has such far-reaching implications, that it must be stated explicitly: Paul is dealing with the same situation in 2 Cor. 2:5–11 and 7:5–12.<sup>1</sup> In both passages, Paul speaks of “pain” (λύπη) that has been caused to the Corinthians. In 2:1–11, Paul defends himself against the charge that he wrote as he did in a previous epistle in order to cause pain to his readers; his intention was rather to prove his love and to test their obedience (2:4, 8). Paul sets opposite the community as a whole an individual member who has pained not only Paul but all the Corinthians, and has been punished by a verdict of the majority (2:5–6). In 7:5–12, Paul concedes that he has pained his readers by means of a letter; but the letter has also had the good effect that the Corinthians have been moved to repentance and have carried out the punishment of the wrongdoer, and thus have given proof of their obedience. When two paragraphs in the same writing present so many conspicuous points of contact, there can be no doubt that in both places we are confronted with the same situation, and that we are justified in combining the evidence of the two passages, supplementing the statements of the one passage with the other.<sup>2</sup> Naturally, the connections would be closer and more significant if, as Johannes Weiss proposed, 2 Cor. 1:1–2:13; 7:5–16 was originally an independent letter.<sup>3</sup> But even without this hy-

---

1 The identity of the situations in 2 Cor. 2:5–11 and 7:12 is recognized by all interpreters, including those who equate the wrongdoer with the incestuous man of 1 Cor. 5. Cf. Holtzmann, “Das gegenseitige Verhältnis,” 465; Bultmann, *Der zweite Brief*, 52.

2 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 252–53.

3 Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.345–53; followed by A. Loisy, “Les épîtres de S. Paul,” *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses* 7 (1921) 213–50; Bultmann, *Der zweite Brief*, 20–23; Bornkamm, *Vorgeschichte*, 21–23, 29–31; Georgi, *Opponents of Paul*, 9–13, 335; Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, 141–44; L. L. Welborn, “Like Broken Pieces of a Ring: 2 Cor. 1:1–2:13; 7:5–16 and Ancient Theories

pothesis, it is clear that the two texts treat the same painful incident under slightly different aspects: ch. 2 seeks to conciliate the sorrowful wrongdoer; ch. 7 conciliates the penitent Corinthians.

The first and most obvious implication of the fact that chs. 2 and 7 deal with the same situation is that the one who caused pain (ὁ λελυπηκώς) and the one who did wrong (ὁ ἀδικήσας) are the same individual.<sup>4</sup> This point has seldom been disputed in the history of interpretation, but, as we shall see, its consequences have not been fully appreciated.<sup>5</sup> It should also go without saying that the offence was committed by a single individual. So much is clearly indicated by the singular pronouns in ch. 2 and the singular participle in ch. 7: thus, 2:5, “if someone (τις) has caused pain”; 2:6, “sufficient for such a one” (τῷ τοιούτῳ); 2:7, “lest such a one (ὁ τοιοῦτος) be overwhelmed”; 2:8, “reaffirm your love for him (εἰς αὐτόν)”; 2:10, “to whom (ᾧ) you forgive anything”; and 7:12, “the one who did the wrong (τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος).”<sup>6</sup> A few scholars have sought to construe the singular pronouns in these verses as references to a class of individuals, and the singular participle, ὁ ἀδικήσας, as a general or collective singular covering a group of sinners.<sup>7</sup> Even if a few of the singulars—that is, the indefinite and correlative pronouns—might be taken as designations of a category of persons—thus, “anyone” and “such a person”—the personal and relative pronouns—“to him” and “to whom”—cannot easily be understood in this way.<sup>8</sup> If Paul had intended to speak of a group of wrongdoers and their unjust acts in 7:12, there is no reason why Paul should not have used the plural participle; indeed, a collective singular would seem to be out of place.<sup>9</sup> Thus we may regard it as estab-

---

of Literary Unity,” *NTS* 42 (1996) 559–83; Mitchell, “Paul’s Letters to Corinth,” 318–35; Roetzel, *2 Corinthians*, 26–32.

4 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 283; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 237.

5 The failure to keep this identity in mind leads Barrett (“Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ,” 112–15) to search for the wrongdoer outside the Corinthian community; conversely, Allo (*Saint Paul*, 55) fails to place sufficient emphasis upon the λύπη caused by the wrongdoer in his list of “traits précis.”

6 Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 237; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 56–57; Barrett, “Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ,” 109; Betz, *Der Apostel Paulus*, 11 n.40; Thrall, “The Offender and the Offence,” 72.

7 Joseph Sickenberger, *Die beiden Briefe des heiligen Paulus an die Korinther* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1921) 35–37; Eduard Golla, *Zwischenreise und Zwischenbrief* (Freiburg: Herder, 1922) 41–42.

8 Drescher, “Vorgänge in Korinth,” 49; Barrett, “Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ,” 116 n.7; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 164.

9 Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 237 n.2.

lished that a single individual was responsible for the painful and injurious act, even if others were somehow involved. Before letting go of this point, we should not fail to notice the source of whatever ambiguity attaches to the question of whether the one who caused pain and the one who did wrong are one and the same individual: the source is Paul's rhetoric, that is, his evasive manner of speaking, his determined use of circumlocutions.

A second, less obvious, but no less certain implication of the identity of the situations in chs. 2 and 7 is that "the one who was wronged" (ὁ ἀδικηθείς) in 7:12 is none other than Paul himself.<sup>10</sup> To be sure, this point was obscured for most of the history of interpretation by the force of the traditional identification of the wrongdoer with the incestuous man. According to the traditional view, the wronged party was the father of the perpetrator of incest, whose marital bed was defiled and whose rights were injured by the shameful act of his son.<sup>11</sup> The difficulties with this interpretation were noted long ago and were among the reasons why the traditional identification was abandoned: the father is mentioned in 1 Cor. 5:1 only in passing, and without any indication of concern for his "rights"; instead, Paul devotes all of his attention to the punishment of the son.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, if the one who was wronged were the father of the incestuous man, one would expect some mention of him in 2 Cor. 2:5–11, where the forgiveness of the penitent is discussed; surely the father would have had more to forgive in this situation than Paul, whose forgiveness is explicitly granted in 2:10.<sup>13</sup>

10 So, the majority of interpreters: e.g., Bleek, "Erörterungen," 630; Ewald, *Sendschreiben*, 227; Schmiedel, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 46; Drescher, "Vorgänge in Korinth," 49; König, "Verkehr," 514–16; Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.342–43; Plummer, *Second Epistle*, xvi, 54–55, 225; Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I-II*, 105; Bachmann, *Der zweite Brief*, 112; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 56; Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 164, 185; Barrett, "Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ," 111; idem, *Second Epistle*, 89; Bultmann, *Der zweite Brief*, 51; Georgi, *Opponents of Paul*, 339–40; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 166; Reimund Bieringer, *The Corinthian Correspondence* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996) 11–12.

11 Baur, *Paulus*, 1.335; Klöpper, *Kommentar*, 59, 163–64; Holtzmann, "Verhältnis," 467–68; Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief*, 16, 93; Zahn, *Introduction*, 1.349; Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 64; Kruse, "The Offender and the Offence," 131–36; Hall, *Unity*, 228–29.

12 Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 237.

13 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 286–87; Bachmann, *Der zweite Brief*, 307; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.65.

Although the majority of interpreters since the beginning of the twentieth century have rightly taken Paul to be “the one who was wronged,” a minority look for another person in the congregation, or among Paul’s associates.<sup>14</sup> It is important to grasp the cause of this ambiguity, since it points the way toward an understanding of Paul’s rhetoric and the social conventions by which his rhetoric was governed. A group of scholars, giving full weight to the legal connotations of the verb ἄδικεῖν, posit that the offence was an injury done to one member of the Corinthian church by another, perhaps in respect to property or possessions, through a civil lawsuit like those against which Paul warned in 1 Cor. 6:1–11; the injured party turned to Paul for redress, when the Corinthian church failed to take up his cause against the avaricious wrongdoer.<sup>15</sup> The problems with this suggestion come readily to mind: if the one who was wronged were a member of the Corinthian church, why does Paul not urge him to forgive the offender, when he appeals to the rest of the congregation to do so in 2:7–8? And if the wronged party had already pardoned the offender, why does Paul not say as much in 2:10? Why is the only mention of personal forgiveness Paul’s own?<sup>16</sup> We should not fail to notice that what debilitates this hypothesis is the failure to take full account of the identity of the situations in chs. 2 and 7.

A second group of scholars propose that the ἄδικηθεὶς was one of Paul’s close associates, such as Timothy or Titus, the only named individuals who are known to have been sent to Corinth by Paul as envoys.<sup>17</sup> On the occasion of one such mission, whether to instruct the Corinthians (1 Cor. 4:17) or to organize the collection (2 Cor. 8:6, 16, 23), Paul’s representative was gravely maligned.<sup>18</sup> To be sure, the attack was really

14 Beyschlag, “Christuspartei,” 254; Pfleiderer, *Urchristentum*, 106–107; Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 305–307; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238–39; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 55–56, 62; K. Prümm, *Diakonia Pneumatos I: Theologische Auslegung des zweiten Korintherbriefs* (Freiburg: Herder, 1967) 403–404.

15 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 305–307; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238–39; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 55–56, 62.

16 Thrall, “The Offender and the Offence,” 69; idem, *Second Epistle*, 1.68.

17 Identifying Timothy as the ἄδικηθεὶς, Beyschlag, “Christuspartei,” 254; Pfleiderer, *Urchristentum*, 106–107; perhaps Timothy, Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 396; Frank J. Matera, *II Corinthians* (Louisville: Westminster, 2003) 18; a close co-worker of Paul, so Allo, *Saint Paul*, 55–56, 62; Prümm, *Diakonia Pneumatos*, 403–404.

18 Beyschlag, “Christuspartei,” 254.

aimed at Paul, but Timothy or Titus was the immediate object of insult.<sup>19</sup> This theory would have the seeming advantage of reconciling Paul's unusual manner of speaking about the injured party in 7:12, as if he were some third person, with the clear implications of other statements in the context, that a challenge to Paul's apostolic authority was involved.<sup>20</sup> But this hypothesis is vulnerable to objections like those which ruled out of consideration the identification of the ὀδικηθεὶς with a member of the Corinthian church. Timothy cannot be the one who was wronged, because he is the nominal co-author of 2 Corinthians, or better of 2 Cor. 1:1–2:13; 7:5–16. In any case, Timothy should have been mentioned in 2:5–11, and especially in 2:10, where Paul declares his personal forgiveness, for otherwise it appears that Timothy was not yet ready to be reconciled.<sup>21</sup> Nor can Titus have been the injured party, since he is mentioned repeatedly in the epistle (2:13; 7:6, 13, 14), and his readiness to forgive the offender would surely have been made clear in 2:5–11.<sup>22</sup>

Reflecting upon the various hypotheses regarding the identity of the one who was wronged, several factors seem to be involved in the reluctance of scholars to acknowledge what the texts of chs. 2 and 7 make obvious and unavoidable: namely, that Paul himself is the only one who could have been wronged (7:12), such that he would be individually pained (2:5) and have cause for the expression of personal forgiveness (2:10). First, there is an unwillingness by certain scholars to countenance the diminution of Paul's authority and the humiliation of his person entailed in the notion that Paul was the one wronged; for such scholars, the apostle must always have been in control and could never have suffered such a humiliating defeat.<sup>23</sup> Second, the term ὀδικηθεὶς is felt to be too objective as a self-designation for a writing as intensely personal as 2 Corinthians.<sup>24</sup> Heinrici asserts that it is not Paul's manner to speak of himself

19 Pfeleiderer, *Urchristentum*, 107.

20 Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238.

21 Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 62; Barrett, "Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΘΕΑΣ," 116 n.19; Thrall, "The Offender and the Offence," 69.

22 Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 62; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.66.

23 R. Mackintosh, "The Brief Visit to Corinth," *Expositor* 6 (1908) 226–34, esp. 226; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 55, 61, 62; Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 59; Harris, *Second Epistle*, 226–27.

24 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 303; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 238; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.68.

in the third person.<sup>25</sup> The latter observation directs our attention to the third and most significant source of ambiguity regarding the identity of the one who was wronged: the rhetorical figure of *periphrasis* (περίφρασις) which Paul employs throughout 2 Cor. 1–2 and 7, but especially whenever he approaches the subject of the one who caused pain and did wrong.<sup>26</sup> At this point, we need not explore the social convention that guided Paul's choice of this figure, but may simply note the presence of the figure and seek to define its role in Paul's unusual manner of speaking of himself as the ἀδικηθείς. We shall see that Paul's objective reference to himself in the third person is only the most extreme instance of a pattern of circumspection that characterizes every reference to the wrong that he has suffered.

The paragraph in which the subject of “the one who caused pain” is cautiously broached (2:5–11) begins with a conditional sentence so general that it almost suggests a hypothetical assumption, “But if (εἰ) someone has caused pain,...”, except that the apodosis goes on to reveal that pain has certainly been caused and that it has touched “all” of the Corinthians (2:5).<sup>27</sup> Yet, Paul's reserve in speaking about the matter is so complete that one questions, for a moment, whether anything has occurred—the style is so suspended, the expression so inexact. Out of reluctance to give the incident its proper name, the action is denoted only by its effect, “pain” (λύπη), and this is immediately mitigated by two qualifying phrases—“to some degree” (ἀπὸ μέρους), and “not to exaggerate it” (ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ).<sup>28</sup> Above all, Paul's caution in approaching the guilty party is so great that he refers to him only where the sentence structure makes it necessary, and then only by means of the most indefinite expressions—“someone” (τις), “such a one” (τοιοῦτος), “him” (αὐτόν), “whom” (ὃν)—so that, not only do we remain ignorant of his name, but we are scarcely able to discover his status in the community, or his

25 Heinrici, *Das zweite Sendschreiben*, 21; idem, *Der zweite Brief*, 93.

26 Georgi, *Opponents of Paul*, 340; Peter Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987) 342. See the discussion of this figure in ch. 4 below.

27 H. A. W. Meyer, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1870) 169; Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief*, 92–93; Plummer, *Second Epistle*, 55–56; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 84.

28 See the discussion of various constructions of these phrases in Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief*, 94–95, with references to older scholarship; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 85; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 36; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.172–73.

relationship to Paul.<sup>29</sup> Even in granting forgiveness to the wrongdoer, Paul is entirely indirect: the penitent must receive Paul's *κεχάρισμαι* out of the mouth of the Corinthians—"to whom you forgive anything, I too" (*ὃ δέ τι χαρίζεσθε, καὶ γώ*). But this is immediately qualified by another conditional—"if I have forgiven anything" (*εἴ τι κεχάρισμαι*). And finally, Paul's forgiveness is deflected and dispersed by reference to the welfare of the community as its motive and goal—"[it was] for your sake in the presence of Christ" (2:10).<sup>30</sup>

The remarkable evasiveness of Paul's rhetoric in this paragraph must be borne in mind, when seeking to assess Paul's apparent denial that he has been caused pain in 2:5. For clearly, the statement, *οὐκ ἐμὲ λελύπηκεν*, is not meant to be taken literally; otherwise Paul could not acknowledge, as he does very gingerly in 2:10, that he has something of which to forgive.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, the preceding verses, 2:1–4, speak very poignantly of the renewed pain that Paul sought to avoid by not coming to Corinth, and of the "anguish of heart" and "many tears" with which he wrote to the Corinthians.<sup>32</sup> Clearly Paul has been caused pain, and has apparently suffered a great deal. How, then, should we understand Paul's statement "he has not pained me"? Max Krenkel already grasped the mechanism of Paul's rhetoric in 2:5, as well as in 7:12: Krenkel observed that when a negative statement is followed by a positive assertion introduced by the strong adversative *ἀλλά*, then the first statement is in no sense intended to be an unqualified negation, rather the combination gives expression to the thought, "not the one thing is the principal point upon which everything depends, but the other."<sup>33</sup> A good example of this usage outside the Pauline corpus is found in John 6:32, "Truly, truly I say to you, it was not Moses who gave you the bread from heaven, but it is my Father who

29 Meyer, *Der zweite Brief*, 169; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 83–84.

30 Plummer, *Second Epistle*, 62; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 84, 90–91.

31 Bachmann, *Der zweite Brief*, 112; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 85; Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I-II*, 105; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 38, 56; Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 185; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.171; Harris, *Second Epistle*, 223.

32 Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, 1.345; Plummer, *Second Epistle*, 50–51; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 82; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.170.

33 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 298–99; see already Heinrici, *Sendschreiben*, 134. Cf. M. Zerwick, *Analysis Philologica Novi Testamenti Graeci* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966) §445: "In disjunctive propositions, it is a Semitic peculiarity to express one member negatively so as to lay more stress on the other, saying 'not A but B' where the sense is 'not so much A as B'," citing as examples Matt. 10:20; Mark 9:37; Luke 10:20; John 7:16; 12:44; 1 Cor. 1:17; similarly, BDF §448 (1).

gives you the true bread from heaven.” It is not the intention of the evangelist here to deny the reality of the manna miracle; indeed, it is recognized only a few verses later in John 6:49.<sup>34</sup> Thus, in 2 Cor. 2:5, Paul is to be understood as saying, “It is not the pain which has been caused me that is the principal focus of attention and the occasion for discipline, but the pain caused you.”<sup>35</sup> And in 7:12, Paul would say, “It was not consideration of the one who did wrong nor the one who suffered wrong which primarily motivated me to write, but in order to make manifest the zeal which you have for us before God.”<sup>36</sup> Beyond Paul’s circumspect rhetoric, we catch a glimpse of the real situation: an ordinary view of the incident would have suggested that it was, in fact, Paul who had been personally pained.<sup>37</sup> About the social relationship that evoked this extraordinary rhetoric, and Paul’s objective in employing this figure, there will be much discussion later.<sup>38</sup>

Thus, Paul’s unusual, third-person reference to himself as “the one who was wronged” (ὁ ἀδικηθεὶς) may now be recognized as the most extreme instance of a rhetoric of circumspection that pervades the relevant paragraphs of chs. 2 and 7. Indeed, we can now see that Paul’s language is more evasive the closer the proximity to the epicenter of wrong, and correspondingly more self-revealing at a greater distance from the injurious act. Paul’s forgiveness is expressed explicitly in 2:10, though with care not to be too direct. The personally painful consequence of the wrong is covered by a rhetorical disclaimer in 2:5, but not in such a way as to negate the fact. When the offence is finally mentioned in 7:12, Paul adopts an objective form of self-reference, which almost effaces his person from the incident. Yet, when full account is taken of the similarity of the situations in chs. 2 and 7, and when the relevant paragraphs are read

---

34 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 298–99.

35 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 299; Moffatt, *Introduction*, 122; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 84–85; Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 185; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 389; Wolff, *Der zweite Brief*, 42; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.171; Harris, *Second Epistle*, 223.

36 Krenkel, *Beiträge*, 299.

37 Ewald, *Sendschreiben*, 227; Schmiedel, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 221; Hilgenfeld, *Historische-kritische Einleitung*, 286; Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I-II*, 105; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 84–85, 236–39; Bachmann, *Der zweite Brief*, 112; Allo, *Saint Paul*, 56; Barrett, *Second Epistle*, 89; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 160, 166, 389–90; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.171.

38 See ch. 4 below.

with sensitivity to Paul's rhetoric, there is no mystery about the identity of "the one who was wronged"—it was Paul himself.

A third implication of a close, comparative reading of chs. 2 and 7 is that the Corinthian church was somehow involved in the wrong done to Paul.<sup>39</sup> It must be acknowledged, from the outset, that the part played by the Corinthian church in the affair of the wrongdoer was a complicated one. This can be grasped immediately by considering the two very different roles that are assigned to the Corinthians: according to 2:5–11, the Corinthians have been pained; they have imposed punishment upon an individual, and are now urged to forgive; but in 7:5–12, the Corinthians have repented; they have experienced mourning, eagerness to clear themselves, longing and zeal. In the one instance, the Corinthians serve as judge and jury; in the other, they are somehow complicit in the offence. Yet, the two depictions of the Corinthians are not unrelated: the motif of vindication that dominates ch. 7 is already sounded in 2:9; and, conversely, the hurtful individual, whose punishment is ordered in ch. 2, reappears at the close of the latter paragraph in 7:12.<sup>40</sup> Thus, it is clearly a single, complex incident to which reference is made in chs. 2 and 7, an incident in which the Corinthians are variously involved. Several aspects of the Corinthians' involvement emerge from analysis of the relevant texts.

First, the vocabulary that Paul chooses to describe the Corinthians' response to his painful epistle in 7:7 and 7:11 leaves no room for doubt about their complicity in the affair of the wrongdoer.<sup>41</sup> Paul's severe letter had awakened in the Corinthians "longing" (ἐπιπόθησις), "mourning" (ὀδυρμός), "zeal" (ζήλος), "earnestness" (σπουδή), "eagerness to clear oneself" (ἀπολογία), "indignation" (ἀγανάκτησις), "alarm" (φόβος), "longing" (ἐπιπόθησις), "zeal" (ζήλος), and "vengeance" (ἐκδίκησις). Paul's account of the Corinthians' response focuses on their emotions, rather than their actions, because he seeks to provide therapy for the pain that his previous epistle has caused.<sup>42</sup> But for our purposes, Paul's report is useful, because it opens a window into the Corinthians' conscience, and reveals that, at the time of Titus' visit, and after receiving

39 Drescher, "Vorgänge in Korinth," 49; König, "Verkehr," 512–14; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 84; Bornkamm, *Vorgeschichte*, 9.

40 Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 84.

41 Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 234–35; Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 267, 274–75; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 386–89, 395.

42 L. L. Welborn, "Paul's Appeal to the Emotions in 2 Corinthians 1.1–2.13; 7.5–16," *JSNT* 82 (2001) 31–60.

Paul's severe epistle, the Corinthians had suffered a shock and were in considerable distress.<sup>43</sup> Taken in isolation, some of the words used to describe the Corinthians' attitude might be regarded as "neutral," as far as their innocence or complicity is concerned: thus, ἐπιπόθησις might be construed as longing for Paul's presence, or σπουδή as sincere commitment to Paul's cause.<sup>44</sup> But as expressions of "godly grief," and as fruits of "repentance" (7:9–10), these terms must all be understood as descriptive of the Corinthians' concern to amend a wrong in which they have been involved.<sup>45</sup> ὁδυρμός, "mourning," is a particularly strong expression for the sorrow of a community that has gained remorseful insight into the consequences of its actions, and that now regards its previous conduct toward the apostle as an offence.<sup>46</sup> ἀπολογία, "eagerness to clear oneself," presupposes that the Corinthians have been charged with something, that they feel compelled to defend themselves, and that they now seek vindication.<sup>47</sup> ἀγανάκτησις, "indignation," is not only anger at the wrongdoer who has caused so much pain, but, as an aspect of the Corinthians' "repentance," must be understood as anger against themselves, as discontent over their involvement in the matter.<sup>48</sup> The term φόβος furnishes the clearest indication that the Corinthians suffer from a guilty conscience, for it is best understood as "fear" at the prospect that the apostle might come to Corinth and make severe use of his authority to punish, as he

43 Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 234.

44 Barrett, "Ο ΑΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ," 113; Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 228. BDAG 377 s.v. ἐπιπόθησις, 939–40 s.v. σπουδή.

45 Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 228, 235; Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 267; Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 218; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.498.

46 LSJ 1199 s.v. ὁδυρμός, "lamentation": γήξας ὁδυρμῶν πενθίμων τε δακρύων Euripides *Phoen.* 1071; θρήνων ὁδυρμοί Euripides *Tro.* 609; ὁδυρμοὺς καὶ οἶκτους Plato *Resp.* 387D. See also BDAG 692 s.v. ὁδυρμός: TestSol 4:2; Matt. 2:18; Josephus *B.J.* 5.31; *A.J.* 2.238; 2 Macc. 11:6. Cf. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 228; Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 267; Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 218; Thrall, *Second Epistle*, 1.489.

47 LSJ 208 s.v. ἀπολογία: Lysias 14.29; see also BDAG 117 s.v. ἀπολογία. *Diccionario Griego-Español III* (Madrid: Instituto de Filología, 1991) 434 s.v. ἀπολογία. Cf. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 235; Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 274; Harris, *Second Epistle*, 542.

48 LSJ 6 s.v. ἀγανάκτησις II; BDAG 5 s.v. ἀγανάκτησις: Appian *Bell. civ.* 1, 10 §39; 4, 124 §521; *PGrenf II.* 82.17–18; Josephus *B.J.* 4.342; *Diccionario Griego-Español I* (Madrid: Instituto de Filología, 2008) 17 s.v. ἀγανάκτησις; Thucydides 2.41; Dio Cassius 36.43.1. Cf. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 235; Plummer, *Second Epistle*, 223; Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle*, 274; Harris, *Second Epistle*, 542.