H. Wayne Merritt*

Paul And The Individual: A Study In Pauline Anthropology[1]

In an article written over thirty years ago, William R. Nelson outlined the procedures by which discussions of Pauline anthropology have been traditionally carried out.[2] Although this article is now dated, the present situation in Pauline studies has changed very little.[3] Three approaches have dominated the discussion with Nelson suggesting a fourth. Although none of these approaches are pure types, they may be set out separately. First, Pauline anthropology has been approached from the point of view of the influence of Greek philosophy on Paul, especially with its dualist understanding of the structure of human personality; secondly, "On the basis of the assumption that the natural man can be understood prior to faith in Christ ... ,"[4] Protestant Scholasticism typically approaches the issue from the standpoint of man as a sinner apart from God;[5] a third approach is the psychological approach which "puts emphasis on a scientific analysis of the various terms that Paul uses to describe man."[6] Nelson's approach attempts to correlate Paul's understanding of the individual in relation to Pauline christology and eccelesiology and places stress on the theological continuity of Paul's thought.

While these approaches to the subject of Pauline anthropology are informative for the present investigation, it seems to me that the methodological reflection of African American and Liberation Theology opens up new avenues to the subject matter of Pauline anthropology. I suggest that what is needed is an analysis of the concrete terminology that Paul uses with respect

H. Wayne Merritt is Associate Professor of the New Testament at the I.T.C. He was the Copher lecturer for March 1989.

to specific individuals mentioned in the letters and the concrete terminology Paul uses with respect to himself. In this respect, I express myself in agreement with African American and Liberation theology in general in its insistence that theology be formulated from the bottom up rather than from the top down. It is one thing to carry out an investigation of the terminology that Paul uses to describe the individual in the abstract and project the results downwards on Paul's concrete relations to individuals and quite another thing to look at how he relates to concrete, specific individuals and formulate an abstract anthropology on the basis of this.[7] Thus, what I want to discuss is not the individual in the abstract, as is typical of treatments of Pauline anthropology, but Paul's mode of expression to the individuals to whom and for whom and about whom he writes. It seems to me that Paul's genuine, authentic anthropology is how he understands himself in relation to real, flesh and blood people with whom he had daily living, breathing contact: preaching, singing, praying, dining, visiting, working and, even, arguing.

There are a number of approaches to this issue but the most direct way is to begin with an examination of the salutations in the authentic Pauline letters. Here, a number of specific individuals are named and frequently they appear with personal descriptions.[8] Subsequently, we can refer to other sections in the Pauline letters, principally the closing sections,[9] where specific individuals are mentioned and round out this analysis. It will not be possible to discuss every individual specifically mentioned in the Pauline corpus,[10] but by following this approach we can identify something characteristic of the Pauline mode of address.[11]

Mode of Address Used With Specific Individuals Mentioned in the Pauline Salutations

The Pauline salutations are especially interesting for the clarity they bring to our issue. They are important also for the intriguing questions they raise. In the salutations of the authentic Pauline letters there are no less than six specific individuals mentioned. One individual, Timothy, is mentioned four times. These individuals are: Sosthenes (1 Cor 1:1), Timothy (2 Cor 1:1, Phil 1:1, 1 Thess 1:1, Phlm 1), Silas (1 Thess 1:1), Philemon, Apphia, and Archippus (Phlm 1).[12] To be sure, it is no surprise that Timothy's name is mentioned more than once in this section of the Pauline letters. Moreover, it is not surprising that his name appears more frequently than any other name. In fact, for the NT, Timothy is perceived more clearly than the majority of Jesus' disciples and certainly more clearly than any other follower of a disciple or an apostle.[13] Indeed, the special relationship that Timothy shared with Paul is witnessed not only by the authentic Pauline letters but by Acts and the deutero-Pauline tradition as well.[14] What is particularly intriguing about this is the general recognition that Paul refers to Timothy as his beloved son. Well yes![15] This is an important mode of address and it has a specific historical context that is important for us to examine and we shall return to it. This mode of address, however, is not used in the salutations of the authentic letters[16]—that part of the ancient letter where the writer states his or her name, the names of others that happen to be present with him or her, titles (of the sender as well as the recipient(s) of the letter), along with personal greetings.[17] What appears in the salutations, instead of son, is a related figure that appears five times in the seven salutations and is used not only with reference to Timothy, but Sosthenes, an indefinite number of individuals in Gal 1:2 and in the feminine form in Philemon in relation to

Apphia (Phlm 1). Its frequency and generalized use testifies to it as a distinctive and characteristic mode of address on the part of Paul. As we shall see, however, this mode of address was not restricted to Paul. Quite simply, the singlemost frequently occurring term in the Pauline salutations that is used to describe specific individuals and others is the term brother and its feminine form sister.

A. Family Metaphors in Paul
I. Brothers and Sisters

The observation that Paul refers to individuals mentioned in his letters by the terms brother and sister is certainly no breakthrough. Indeed, all of us know this. We know, for example, that the term brother and sister can be used not only in the literal sense denoting one's genetic, genealogical relation to others, but it is also used in a metaphorical, figurative sense in the ancient world. We also know that this use of the term is not restricted to Paul, although it appears some 130 times in the Pauline letters in this sense, but the usage is widespread in early Christianity,[18] Judaism,[19] and the wider Graeco-Roman society.[20] While this is generally recognized, the particular point I want to underscore is best seen from the vantage point of the Pauline salutations themselves. As noted, this part of the letter, the address and greetings, is a section of the letter where titles denoting one's social, religious and professional status are frequently introduced.[21] That Paul uses a title drawn from the family in this section of the letter is not insignificant. Its significance, rather, is seen best, perhaps, by noting what he does not say. For example, although Paul's associates are named in the salutations along with himself, Paul does not refer to them with titles or terms that denote subordinate status.[22] On the contrary,

the terms, brother and sister, by their nature are egalitarian terms that do not necessarily lend themselves to hierarchical considerations even though we know the ancient (and modern?) household to be a very stratified social unit.[23]

A further observation is also worth noting. Insofar as Paul refers to Apphia as sister (Phlm 1), the word appears in a feminine form but the root of the two words, brother and sister, is the same. The word sister in Philemon 1 is the normal Greek word for sister. It is not a diminutive term in any respect. When Paul refers to Apphia as sister, he uses the appropriate form of the characteristic word he uses to address female members of the Christian congregation as we can see elsewhere when he refers to Phoebe in Rom 16:1 as our sister.[24]

These observations on Greek word formation, raise a further observation that is important for the indefinite use of the term all the brethren who are with me which appears in Gal 1:2 (RSV). Although our remarks in this lecture are primarily concerned with specific individuals named in the Pauline letters, the RSV translation of this phrase deserves comment. Greek, admittedly, is a chauvinistic language. To designate humanity in general, one uses the masculine plural form of the Greek word for man. English usage is similar when one refers to the whole of humanity with the term mankind. Greek masculine nouns, such as brethren, thus, pose a challenge to a translator, if the translator attempts to use inclusive language in translation, and, at the same time, translate Greek. The indefinite use of brethren in Gal. 1:2, consequently, can be translated by all linguistic and grammatical rights as all the brothers and sisters who are with me. That it is not translated this way, is the result of an interpretive judgment on the part of the translator, or, the translator's determined attempt to be ambiguous. To be sure, if by the phrase all the brethren who are with me, Paul means some or all of the individuals who are specifically mentioned elsewhere

in the salutations of the canonical letters, then the masculine brethren is correct. If, however, the phrase refers to all Christians who are present with Paul at the location from which he is writing to the Galatians, then the more inclusive translation— all the brothers and sisters who are with me — is equally correct and more indicative of what Paul actually said.[25]

Further, if one objects to the more inclusive translation of Gal 1:2, arguing that the salutations in the authentic Pauline letters list only men in Paul's company as co-addressors, one can certainly agree, but note, at the same time, that Paul's undisputed letters give evidence to the fact that women, whom he refers to as sisters, are also referred to as helpers, fellow-laborers and co-workers in the gospel. Rom 16:1-2, for example, contains an exhortation of Paul to the recipients of this letter[26] that they are to receive a woman by the name of Phoebe, whom he addresses as our sister, and, also names as a deacon of the church in Cenchrea. In Paul's words, the recipients of the letter are to receive Phoebe in a manner befitting Christians and they are admonished to assist her in whatever business she needs from them for she has been a helper of many and Paul adds even of himself.[27] Rom 16:1-2, testifies, therefore, not only to the fact that Paul refers to Phoebe as sister and helper, but it also witnesses to the fact that women held titles and functioned in the recognized roles of church officials in the early church and that Paul, himself, positively acknowledged this practice and recommended such women from one church to another. This is the only grammatically, legitimate conclusion that can drawn from the fact that, in the case of Phoebe, the masculine form of the word deacon is applied to her and not the feminine form.[28]

These observations may be surprising to many, but if they are, the surprise must be mild in light of the fact that in Rom 16:7 Paul greets two persons, Andronicus and Junia/Junias, whom he refers to as kinsmen, and states that they are of high

repute among the apostles. Here, the second name may be reconstructed either as Junia or Junias, but on grammatical grounds this name is undoubtedly a feminine name. As such, Junia along with Andronicus, presumably her husband, are both recognized in the early church as apostles of high repute.[29]

These two celebrated cases, moreover, are not isolated instances. A final example will suffice to make the point. Particularly, telling for the role women played as Paul's co-workers is Phil 4:2-3. In Philippians, rather, than extending a blanket mandate to all women to keep quiet in all of the churches because some of them do cause trouble, Paul seeks reconciliation among the two women, Euodia and Syntyche, and the restoration of harmony within the church. Most importantly, he does so on the basis of their service to him and other Christian missionaries.[30] The terms brother and sister, therefore, are not only egalitarian terms for Paul, insofar as they utilize a family metaphor for describing Paul's relationship to other Christians, but they are also inclusive terms by which he binds himself to others within the church—male and female.

II. Son-Child: Children

If the terms brother and sister, are not hierarchical terms, but relational terms, grounded in the family, is not the reference to Timothy as son or beloved son an instance of Paul's use of a hierarchical designation insofar as he asserts superiority over others as father?[31] First, it is important to note the specific term that Paul uses when he refers to Timothy as his beloved son. The term used is not one of the typical Greek masculine words for son (*huios* or *pais*) but, rather, the neuter word *teknon* which literally means child.[32] As such, the term may mean son or daughter depending upon the context, or, children, as it does when Paul extends the metaphor in reference to the Christian congrega-

tions that he established through his apostolic labors.[33] This term, too, has a direct relation to family metaphors and it is important to take it up even though it does not appear in the authentic salutations.

On analogy with the terms brother and sister, the term son/child is not unique to Paul. In fact, the use of the term in a metaphorical sense is as old as Homer where it is used as an affectionate address to adults (cf., Il. 22.84; Od. 2.363). The term also occurs in Judaism and in Hellenistic popular philosophy to indicate: (1) the shared relationship among members of the same nation and religion and (2) the relation that exists between student and teacher.[34] As the NT indicates, the term is taken up in early Christianity to indicate members of the church—believers—as children of God, or, to point out the spiritual similarity between two different persons.[35] With the use of the term son/child, we see again Paul's linguistic and conceptual relatedness to the wider Hellenistic world. Insofar as Paul used this term to indicate a spiritual relation between himself and Timothy on the order of the spiritual child to teacher, as Oepke states, "we have genealogy and analogy to ancient ideas of adoption which are partly oriental, also Jewish, and partly Gk. . ."[36] Paul did not coin this usage, but it is an important one and one that he uses on more than one occasion with reference to Timothy (1 Cor 4:17; Phil 2:22).

What is often overlooked in the use of this term with Timothy, however, is that it is not restricted to Timothy alone. On the contrary, this is the same word that Paul used of one Onesimus (Phlm 10). Can the claim be made that Timothy is Paul's beloved son? Indeed it can; but the same can and must be stated for Onesimus.[37] In Philemon 10, Paul states, "I entreat you concerning my son (*teknon*) Onesimus," and he exhorts Philemon to receive him no longer as a slave but more than a slave and he even rationalizes the separation of Onesimus from

Philemon by suggesting that the separation created the possibility that Onesimus' return could be on grounds that exceeded those of a slave—even, as Paul states, as a beloved brother (Phil 16), once more drawing on family imagery.[38]

Now clearly, this is not the point to take on the whole of traditional biblical interpretation with respect to Paul's letter to Philemon. To ignore the difficulty for African Americans, as well as for others, in a lecture such as this with a subject such as this, is simply to stick one's head in the sand. There is, indeed, justification in stating that the interpretation of Paul's letter to Philemon has focused on every self-serving interest conceivable to ruling classes in Western Europe and, especially, North America. But this is precisely the point! What is remarkable, today, is that many African American theologians, and, others, typically attribute the highest degree of historical accuracy to the results of interpreters of Paul's letter to Philemon, even though they know on other grounds that the same interpreters are guilty of interpreting biblical texts in light of their own self-interests.

Any interpretation of Paul that seeks to find support in him for the theological agenda of African American and Liberation Theology, consequently, has two main tasks ahead of it: 1) to write a commentary on the commentaries of this letter and 2) to write a commentary on this letter that moves beyond the acceptance of the so-called truths of the past. Until this happens, we are all simply running in place. That both can be done—I have no doubt. A first step in this process, moreover, could well be a regaining of the significance of family imagery that Paul uses in describing his relations to those who came to faith via his own proclamation of the gospel, and its significance for their relations one to another that moves beyond the passivity of liberal paternalism. What I am suggesting is that Paul, even a Hellenized, Romanized Paul, has a profound understanding of what he refers to as the household of faith (cf., Gal 6:10) and this

understanding has for him a horizontal, social, relational dimension and not merely a metaphorical, vertical, dimension.[39]

Certainly, in using family imagery to describe the relations of individuals to himself and their relations to one another, Paul is speaking metaphorically as we do with reference to persons that are especially important to us. Again, this too is the point! One uses this mode of address when the conditions warrant it and not out of our love of metaphor as important as the latter may be. Rather than asserting hierarchy and superiority over others, Paul uses family imagery—even the imagery of father/child—because these terms are grounded in intimacy. This is the meaning of the word son/child when applied to an adult even when it accompanies exhortation, rebuke, and discipline.[40] At no point can one see this better than when Paul extends the imagery of father-children to refer to the congregations that came to faith via his preaching. In Gal 4:19,[41] for example, Paul connects the image with female labor pains accompanying childbirth; in 1 Thess 2:7 he associates it with the image of the nurse nursing her own children;[42] in 1 Thess 2:11 the image reflects a father's compassion in admonishing his children; in 2 Cor 12:14 he justifies not taking payment for preaching at Corinth on the grounds that children do not save money for parents but parents for children. Paul's mode of address to individuals, therefore, is not only egalitarian in that he refers to individuals as brother and sister, but it is intimate language used even in situations complicated by the social, political, and economic distinctions of slave and free.

In addition, when Paul refers to Timothy and Onesimus as his sons, he is speaking metaphorically, to be sure, but the metaphor describes a genuine reality that has a basis in concrete, historical reality. He makes the point clearly in Philemon 16 when he states that Onesimus is to be received no longer as a slave but more than a slave, a beloved brother, especially to Paul

and even more so to Philemon. He even adds a curious phrase that appears only once in his letters, but it is a frequent phrase in Greek literature. The construction is a both . . . and (*kai . . . kai*) construction that characteristically coordinates two elements of a clause equally.

What is coordinated in Philemon 16 is the relationship of brotherhood both in the flesh and in the Lord. The point is extremely important even if commentaries are of little help on the point. Had Paul intended the relationship of brotherhood as a metaphorical relation that existed solely as a supposedly, spiritual condition and not in the concrete historical existence of Philemon and Onesimus, he had a perfectly good way of doing so. All that is necessary is to do drop the *both . . . and* and omit any reference to *flesh*. What is certain in this instance is that the word flesh in Philemon 16 describes Onesimus in his empirical, existential self, and John Knox correctly translates the phrase as a man.[43]

Similarly, the phrase in the Lord, clearly means as a Christian, but it manifestly does not mean as a brother in the Lord! Indeed it is debatable, and in my judgment unlikely, whether Paul ever uses such a phrase as a brother in the Lord,[44] despite his characteristic designation of Christians as brothers and sisters, as we have seen. There is simply no grammatical, stylistic nor theological support in Paul for the metaphorical use of the phrase brother in the Lord to designate a Christian brother as a brother in principle but not in practice.[45] On the contrary, the fundamental core of Paul's ethical thought is forthrightly stated in Gal 5:25 where he states "If we live by the Spirit let us walk by the Spirit" and the social transformation that emerges from this is understandable only in the sense of an apocalyptic vision in which the Lordship of Christ exerts itself over the whole of the creation and not just over the interior subjectivity of the individual believer.[46]

Paul, to be sure, is a child of his age and the arena of direct social control open to him and his contemporaries in an era of Hellenistic monarchy and empire is none other than that of the family, and voluntary, religious and professional associations of which the church, itself, provided Paul with his most direct access to social power. Paul's attitude toward social change, therefore, needs re-thinking from precisely this point of view; namely, how is Paul's work and message related to social change given the identifiable means of social change in the ancient world. Moreover, the cul de sac of Paul's apocalyptic vision of the approaching end of the world as an *inhibition* toward social change needs to be seen as precisely that—a cul de sac that serves the interests of the status quo. What would be more fruitful in discussions of this type is the precise (i.e., concrete) identification of the value placed on social evil from the vantage point of an apocalypticist. Here, we are fortunate to have before us the data provided not only by Paul, but the writer of the Apocalypse of John and the apocalyptic sayings of Jesus to answer this question unequivicably. To cite but one result that such a study might have, it is suggestive to note that the most characteristic word Paul uses to describe the situation of the world alienated from God is slavery, bondage. Indeed, slavery is the concrete definition of the word sin in Paul.

Metaphors Taken From Professional Life: Co-workers

When we pass over from the family metaphors to consider the remaining titles used in the salutations, the egalitarian, intimate and inclusive motifs already encountered persist. Philemon, for example, is referred to with the title our beloved co-worker. This word, co-worker, is one that we have encountered earlier in our discussion. It is a word that appears with a wide circle of specific individuals mentioned directly by Paul in

the authentic letters.[47] It is a word that Paul not only uses with respect to other individuals, but one that he can apply to himself to indicate the nature of his relation to the various congregations (cf., 2 Cor 1:24). In addition, all of the authentic letters include a reference to some co-worker with the single exception of Galatians. As the earlier terminology with which we have been concerned, this term is a distinctive mode of address on Paul's part.[48]

Etymologically, the word co-worker is a compound of the Greek preposition with and the normal Greek word for work. By virtue of this prefix, co-worker means colleague and denotes collegiality.[49] The preposition, frequently appears in combination with other Greek words where this same sense of collegiality is present, as we see, for example, in the Greek descriptor applied to Archippus in Philemon 1 and Epaphroditus in Phil 2:25. Here, Archippus and Epaphroditus are called our fellow soldier and the synonyms compatriot and comrade in arms are equally appropriate.[50] It is this sense of collegiality and not social hierarchy that is signified by these two descriptors. In no discernible respect, does the word co-worker carry the implicit implication of inferior-superior that the English word assistant may denote.[51]

If we examine the specific individuals with whom the term co-worker is used, a number of interesting details come to light. The word co-worker is used of a variety of individuals beyond Philemon, and Epaphroditus in the authentic Pauline letters not counting Paul's use of the term with reference to himself.[52] Along with Philemon and Epaphroditus, the word co-worker appears in Rom 16:3 with reference to an important couple that we meet not only in the Pauline letters but Acts as well.[53] In Romans 16:3, Paul sends greetings[54] to Prisca and Aquila and describes both as co-workers. He further states that they have risked their lives for his and notes that he along with all the churches of the Gentiles give thanks because of them

(Rom 16:4-5). Particularly, interesting in this case is that the woman's name is mentioned first—which does not sound strange to us—but consider the historical context. In other instances where this occurs in the Graeco-Roman world, the mention of the wife's name prior to her husband's suggests that the wife is of higher social rank.[55] This observation led some interpreters to postulate a more important role for Prisca than Aquila in the missionary service to the Gentile churches of Asia Minor, but, this is likely mere speculation.

More important for our purposes, given the typical understanding of Paul as a misogynist, one should note that the female name is not the diminutive Priscilla, as we know it in Acts,[56] but the familiar and intimate Prisca.[57] Similarly, the couple is mentioned again in the list of greetings in 1 Cor. 16:19. Striking is that Paul sends greetings to the Corinthians from a church that is said to be in Aquila and Prisca's house. Again, this way of designating a church, and, a household, sounds familiar to us, but, in the social setting of the first century, it was an entirely different matter.[58] In the context of the first century the household belonged to the husband. To refer to the household as their household is a signal that non-legal considerations are determining the description. The use of the descriptor co-worker with respect to Prisca and Aquila, therefore, is consistent with what we have noted earlier; namely, Paul's collegial, egalitarian mode of address that is marked by an inclusive stance with respect to women that distinguishes him from many in his social world.

If we push further in our classification of the names of persons who are designated as co-workers in the authentic letters, this inclusive stance is further underscored with respect to the issue of ethnicity. Clearly, for the ancient world it is difficult—if not virtually impossible—to determine a person's ethnicity solely on the basis of his or her name. This is especially

true for Hellenistic society, since many persons of a variety of ethnic origins had Greek or Roman names along with ethnic names. Paul, himself, is a case in point. Along with the ethnic name, Saul,[59] occurs the name Paul (Paulos)—a Greek spelling of a Roman surname.[60] Nonetheless, if we classify the specific names of those mentioned in the authentic Pauline letters in terms of ethnicity some interesting statistics do appear.

First of all, the names are preponderantly Greek and Roman names. Secondly, where ethnic details appear, it is quite clear that this band of Paul's co-workers were a racially and ethnically diverse group. Among these, Prisca and Aquila are Jews, but have Roman names, as do Urbane, Marcus, Lucas, Titus and Clement. Euodias, Syntyche, Timothy, Philemon, Epaphroditus, Aristarchus, Demas and Apollos all have Greek names, although here, Timothy is the son of an ethnically mixed marriage—if we allow the evidence of Acts and the Pastoral Epistles. Further, Apphia is a Phrygian name.[61]

While it is not possible to go into all the details, the case of Titus and Timothy are illustrative for the point that can be made regarding Paul's attitude toward others who are ethnically different from him. In Gal 2, Paul narrates his relations with the Jerusalem church, presumably, because his apostleship has been challenged on the grounds of his dependency on Jerusalem and the Jerusalem church authorities. In his heated, polemical, defense against these charges, Paul—the Hebrew of the Hebrews, tribe of Benjamin, circumcised on the eight day, more jealous for the traditions of the fathers than his contemporaries in Judaism (Gal 1:14)[62]—points out that he took Titus on a visit to Jerusalem—a man with a Roman name—whom he specifically calls a Greek and an uncircumcised Greek at that (Gal 2:3)[63]. In this context, he also states that at this meeting with the pillars of the church, presumably Jacob (James), Cephas (Peter) and John—all Jews—he preached the gospel that he preached among

the Gentiles and Titus was not compelled to be circumcised, although a party of false brethren no doubt insisted on it (Gal 2:3-5).

Similarly, Timothy, whom we have noted had an intense relationship with Paul, happens to be the son of a Gentile father and a Jewish mother—again, if the reports in the Pastoral Epistles are historically correct.[64] The only legitimate conclusion to draw from these observations, is that the norm of Galatians 3:28, "neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither male nor female," was a concrete reality in the life of Paul insofar as he conducted himself in relation to his co-workers who were at times racially, ethnically and socially different from him as a proper Jew. Far from being a slip of the tongue, or, an attitude that only has futuristic eschatological significance, or, a baptismal slogan taken from Hellenistic Christianity of which he otherwise did not approve, Paul, himself, embodies this principle of Christian existence and, as Galatians demonstrates, he actively, publicly, opposed persons of high repute and authority in the Christian church when this principle, central to his understanding of the gospel, was violated (cf., Gal. 2:11-14).

A further brief note may be added here too. If ethnic considerations are difficult to determine on the basis of names alone, one can at least make judgments regarding regional differences among the members of this group. Among the individuals specifically mentioned as co-workers, Epaphroditus and Philemon are natives of the region of Phrygia, namely, Colossae (Western Asia Minor); Apollos, whose name is possibly an abbreviation of the Greek Apollonius, is a native of Alexandria, Egypt (Acts 18:24); Prisca and Aquila once lived in Rome but were from the Roman province of Pontus (Acts 18:2); Titus is associated with Antioch from which he, according to Acts, accompanied Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem (Acts 15:2, Gal. 2:1, 3); Timothy is from Lystra, Central Asia Minor (Acts 16:1)

and Paul, himself, is probably from Tarsus, South East Asia Minor.

Quite simply, these co-workers, along with Paul, make up a racially, geographically and sexually diverse group.[65] All of this is in keeping, however, with Paul's own words concerning the nature of his call as an apostle to the Gentiles—a word that is equally translated as an apostle to the nations. Paul's mode of address directed at specific individuals mentioned in the authentic letters, thus, only underscores the inclusive nature of his relations to others.

In conclusion, we set out in this lecture to address the issue of Paul's mode of address to specific individuals mentioned in the authentic letters. We have also admitted additional information from Acts and the Pastoral Epistles where this evidence appears corroborated by definite information in the authentic letters themselves. Our portrait of Paul's mode of address to specific individuals, thus, is secure. To argue against it, one must deal with the evidence on the basis of Paul's own letters and not simply with texts selected here and there throughout the whole of the Pauline Corpus.

Our analysis was also prompted by observations suggested initially by the salutations in the authentic letters and, thus, it is fitting that a concluding note on the salutations serve as a conclusion to this first lecture. At the outset, we noted that the salutations present the interpreter of the NT with as yet unanswered questions. A major unanswered question serves as a fitting conclusion.

The question is simply, given the typical, traditional, attitude toward Paul as a radical, authoritarian individualist, why do the names of Timothy, Titus, Silas and others accompany Paul's name as co-senders of these letters? Does this mean that they materially contributed to the contents of these letters? Is this merely a gratuitous gesture on Paul's part to list their names

alongside his own? Or, does the presence of these names in the salutations further underscore the radical, egalitarian, inclusive nature of his relations to others that must always be taken into consideration in any discussion of Paul's concrete anthropology?

NOTES

[1]In March 1989, I gave two lectures: "Paul and the Individual" and "Paul and Community." The first of these appears here in an abbreviated form. The purpose of these lectures was to stimulate discussion among ITC faculty and other African American and Liberation theologians concerning the significance of Paul and Pauline thought for the theological agenda of African American, Womanist, and Liberation Theology. The respondents to these lectures were Drs. Amos Jones, Jr. (Christian Education Department of the Sunday School Publishing Board), Abraham Smith (School of Theology, Boston University) and Vernon Robbins (Emory University). To the respondents and colleagues at the ITC, I am deeply grateful for their criticisms and to Dr. Charles B. Copher in whose honor this lectureship is named.

[2]William R. Nelson, "Pauline Anthropology: Its Relation to Christ and His Church," Int 14 (1960), 14-27.

[3]The modern discussion of Pauline anthropology was initiated by Hermann Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre* (Kiel: Universitäts-Buchhandlung P. Toeche, 1872). For primary bibliography in the nineteenth and twentieth century see Nelson. Two works that appeared following Nelson's article that continue various lines of the discussion as outlined there are: Robert Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 10 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971); and Ernst Käsemann, "On Paul's Anthropology," Perspectives on Paul (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), 1-31. Of these, the former

is a scientific analysis of the anthropological terminology in Paul that engages the basic analysis carried out earlier by Rudolf Bultmann's in his *Theology of the New Testament*, Vol. 1 (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), 191ff. The latter, is Käsemann's challenge to Bultmann's argument that the key to Pauline theology is Pauline anthropology.

[4]William R. Nelson, "Pauline Anthropology," 14.

[5]*Ibid.*

[6]*Ibid.*

[7]On this point, Alfred North Whitehead's fallacy of misplaced concreteness is relevant. As Whitehead forcefully demonstrated, one of the chief fallacies of intellectual life is the confusion of the abstract with the concrete. See Alfred North Whitehead, *Science And The Modern World* (New York: The Free Press, 1967), 51.

[8]In only one instance, 1 Thess. 1:1, are personal descriptions absent in the salutations of the authentic Pauline letters.

[9]Specific individuals are also frequently mentioned in the section of the Pauline letter commonly referred to as the apostolic parouisa; cf. 1 Cor 4:14-21, 2 Cor 2:12-14, Phil 2:19-30, 1 Thess 2:17-3:10.

[10]In all there are no less than seventy-two different individuals mentioned by name in the authentic letters. To cite but two instances which illustrate the extent to which specific individuals are mentioned in the authentic letters, note that in the Corinthian correspondence some seventeen individuals are specifically mentioned and in Rom 16 there are no less than twenty-six.

[11]The methodological principle that governs this lecture is that the undisputed, authentic Pauline letters are cited as the primary source of the analysis. The Deutero-Pauline letters and Acts are cited as secondary sources at relevant points. I consider this methodological principle as critical to any discussion of Paul and

Pauline thought, and, especially, in relation to the issue of the significance of Paul for African American and Liberation theology. It is one thing to read Romans and Galatians from the perspective of the Pastoral Epistles and quite another to read 1, 2 Timothy and Titus from the perspective of Romans and Galatians, as African American Christians understood early on and still do. For the methodological consensus in NT studies presupposed by this essay, see Leander Keck, *Paul and his Letters*, second edition, Proclamation Commentaries (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 155.

[12]Expanding the analysis to the salutations in the Deutero-Pauline letters increases the number of individuals mentioned only by the addition of Titus (Ti 1:4), but note Titus is referred to as the brother in 2 Cor 8:23. An unnamed brother, famous for his preaching, is cited in 2 Cor 8:18 along with a second in 8:22. Further expanding the analysis to the corpus at large admits: Quartos (Rom 16:23), Apollos (1 Cor 16:12), Epaproditus (Phil 2:25), Tychius (Col 4:7; Eph 6:21), and Euboulos (2 Tim 4:21).

[13]John Mark, an associate of Paul and Barnabas and traditionally regarded as the author of the Gospel of Mark, presents an interesting case for comparison.

[14] Timothy appears in Acts in the following: 16:1; 17:14,15; 18:5; 19:22; 20:4; in the authentic Pauline letters: Rom 16:21; 1 Cor 4:17; 16:10; 2 Cor 1:1,19; Phil l:1; 2:19; 1 Thess l:l; 3:2,6; Phlm 1. Scholars are divided over how much historically reliable information the Deutero-Pauline letters actually provide regarding Timothy. Among the references here see: Col 1:1; 2 Thess 1:1; 1 Tim 1:2, 18, 6:20; 2 Tim 1:2; Heb 13:23.

[15] See 1 Cor. 4:17 "who is my beloved son . . ."

[16] It does appear, however, in the salutations of the deutero-Pauline letters; cf. 1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1 (Timothy); Tit 1:1 (Titus).

[17]The Pauline salutation accords with that of the typical Helle-

nistic letter. Its form is A (sender) to B (receiver): greetings.

[18]Hans Freiherr von Soden, "*adelphos*," TDNT 1 (1979): 144-46. Luke uses this term some thirty times and it is found in all parts of the New Testament. "According to the gospels Jesus had taught that they are his brethern who do God's will and they brethern to one another who unite in recognising Jesus himself as Master. Mk 3:31-34, Mt.23:6;" see Ernest De Witt Burton, A *Critical And Exegetical Commentary On The Epistle To The Galatians*, ICC (Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 1928), 36.

[19]"Among the Jews it was customary to recognise as brethern all the members of a given family or tribe (Lev. 25:26, Num. 16:10), and indeed all members of the nation (Lev. 19:17, Deut. 1:16, 2 Mac. 1:1, Acts 7:1, Rom. 9:3). Papyri of the second century B. C. show that members of the same religous community were called *adelphoi* . . . The habit of the Christians to call one another brethern may have been the product in part of both these older usages. . .;" Burton, Galatians, 36.

[20]Plato uses *adelphos* for compatriots (Menex. 239); Xenophon for friends (An. 7.25); Plotinus uses it with reference to all things in the world (Enn. 2.9.18). "It is often used for members of a religious society, both in the papyri and inscriptions and also in literature; e.g., Vett. Val. 4.11;" cf., von Soden, "*adelphos*," 146.

[21]This is especially true of business letters and letters from governmental officials. See Adolf Deismann, *Light From The Ancient East* (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1927). It is in this sense that one should read Paul's frequent use of the term apostle applied to himself in the salutations. Cf., Rom 1:1, 5; 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:1. Evidently, the titular use of *doulos* (slave/servant) is meant, as well, since it "is a phrase applied to the prophets in a body from Amos onwards . . . ;" William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A *Critical and Exegetical Commentary On The Epistle To The Romans*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1968), 3. This title appears in Rom 1:1 (along with the

title apostle) and cojointly in Phil 1:1 with Timothy where *apostolos* does not appear. Cf., also Ti 1:1, Js 1:1; Jud 1:1, 2 Pet 1:1 for the subsequent use of the title. Prisoner in Phil 1 is not titular but indicates Paul's status.

[22]To be sure, Paul does not call Timothy, nor any of the remaining co-addressors, apostle. He does not, however, restrict the term apostle to the Twelve plus himself, but uses it for a larger group. Cf., Rom 16:7; 1 Cor 9:5-6; Phil 2:25. On this point see C. D. Barrett, *The Signs of an Apostle* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972) and Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, "*apostello*," TDNT 1 (1979): 398-486 and the literature cited there.

[23]On the ancient household cf., Abraham Mahlherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge: Lousiana State University, 1977). The stratification of the ancient household can be seen in the Haustafel-Lists in the paraenetic sections of the deutero-Pauline letters; cf., Col 3:18-4:1; Eph 5:22-6:9. See also Otto Michel, "*oikos*," TDNT 5 (1979): 119-49; John E. Stambaugh and David L. Balch, *The New Testament in Its Social Environment*, Library of Early Christianity, edited by Wayne Meeks (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), 123-124 and Robert Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches In Their Historical Setting* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980). The Haustafel-Lists in the deutero-Pauline letters stress the hierarchy of husband, wife, children, slaves, but, do not address the issue of the priority of the "older" brother nor the "male" to the female child.

[24]Cf., 1 Cor. 7:15 where the phrase "a brother or a sister" designates members of the Corinthian congregation.

[25]The comments of Hans Dieter Betz, Galatians, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 40 are helpful. Concerning "all the brothers who are with me" Betz states, "Paul does not name them, but we can *assume* that he refers to fellow missionaries known to the Galatians, and not to the whole church from

where he sent the letter" (emphasis mine). Similarly, cf., Burton, Galatians, 9-10 for consideration of who these missionaries are based on Burton's reconstruction of Paul's itenarary. Interestingly, the NRSV translates all the family of God who are with me.

[26]Scholars are divided over whether Roman 16 is an independent letter written by Paul to another church, possibly Ephesus, or, whether it was originally a part of the letter to the Romans. See Harry Y. Gamble, "The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans," (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1971) for an argument that Romans 16 is an original part of the Letter to the Romans. For an alternative view see John Knox, *Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, Vol. 9 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1954), 365-68; 653-54. According to Knox, "There are three possible views: (a) that the chapter was, as it purports to be, the conclusion of Paul's letter to the Romans; (b) that it is a note addressed originally to the church at Ephesus which has become attached to Romans; (c) that it represents a pseudonymous addition to the Letter to the Romans designed to bind the apostle more closely to Rome and to strengthen the hands of that church in its battle with the Gnostics in the second century" (*Ibid.*, 53-54).

[27]See Victor Paul Furnish, *The Moral Teaching of Paul: Selected Issues*, second edition (Nashville: Abingdon, 1985), 108. In Greek texts, the word translated helper "is often applied to a presiding officer. It could also mean a patron or benefactor, and there is evidence of its use to describe an officer in a religious association. In an inscription pertaining to one specific Hellenistic cult, the word stands first in a list of various cultic officers, the others being chief priest, scribe, custodians, and trustees. Paul's use of a feminine form of this noun has no known precedent" (*Ibid.*).

[28]The RSV translation deaconess is outright wrong as is the AV translation servant. The former suggests that Phoebe is a

member of a female office that is distinct from the male office, but, it is the masculine form of the word deacon that is applied to Phoebe. Hence, the word must be regarded as a technical term designating church office consistent with the chauvinism of the Greek language mentioned earlier.

[29]In Rom 16:7 the Greek preposition *hen* may be translated in or among, but it cannot be translated to. At the time of Paul, the term apostle was not a fixed term. See above footnote #22. The reference to Epaphroditus as your apostle in Phil 2:25 establishes this beyond doubt. Its use was not restricted to the Twelve nor, on the basis of Rom. 16:7, solely to men.

[30]The presence of the double relative in 4:3b places Euodia and Syntyche among Paul's co-workers along with Clement and the rest. See Marvin R. Vincent, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles To The Philippians and To Philemon*, ICC, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1961), 131.

[31]On the term father see Gottlob Schrenk and Gottfried Quell, "*pater*," TDNT 5 (1979): 945-1021. In Paul, the term father is used of God in all the authentic salutations as elsewhere (cf., Rom 1:7, 4:11, 12, 6:4, 9:5, 15:6; 1 Cor 1:3, 8:6, 15:2; 2 Cor 1:2, 3, 6:18 (citing 2 Sam 7:14; Jer 31:9) 11:31; Gal 1:1, 3, 4:2, 6:12; Phil 1:1, 2:11, 4:20; 1 Thess 1, 3, 3:11, 13, Phile 3); of the physical (and metaphorical) ancestors of Jews and Christians (cf., Rom 4:12, 17, 18, Abraham; Rom 9:10, Issac,); and, on occassion, of Paul's relation to the congregations and individuals who came to faith through him (cf., 1 Cor 4:15; Phil 2:22; 1 Thess 2:11).

[32]W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), 816.

[33]Cf., 1 Cor 4:14, 17; 2 Cor 6:13, 12:14; Gal 4:19; 1 Thess 2:7, 11.

[34]W. Bauer, *Lexicon*, 816.

[35]*Ibid.*

[36]Albrecht Oepke, "*pais, paidion*," TDNT 5 (1979): 639.

[37]Strikingly, apart from general references to the church at large, the term *teknon* (child) is applied only to Timothy and Onesimus in the authentic letters. Quite approriately, perhaps, it is also applied to Titus in the Pastorals (cf.,Tit 1:4) as noted above.

[38]Judging on the basis of Phile 10, it would appear that Timothy came to faith as a result of Paul's missionary activity. Acts 16:1, however, presents Timothy as a believer/disciple prior to contact with Paul.

[39]It is true that in subsequent Christian thought, the Church is perceived as a pre-existent, cosmic entity existing before the creation of the world, but this idea is not a part of Paul's mental structure. Banks' arguments to the contrary have a long history, but they are methodologically unacceptable, in the first place, and, secondly, the idea of development in Paul's thought is yet to be successfully established. See Robert Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches In Their Historical Setting* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980), 43-51. In Paul, the church always designates either the concrete, historical church as a whole or local congregations.

[40]Note especially 1 Cor 4:14-15 where the image occurs in a rebuke. Paul reminds the Corinthians that they may have many teachers but not many fathers and he asks if they prefer him to appear on his next visit in a spirit of love and gentleness or with a rod (1 Cor 4:20).

[41]Perhaps here the metaphor is mother-child. See Beverly R. Gaventa, "The Maternity of Paul: An Exegetical Study of Galatians 4:19," *The Conversation Continues: Studies In Paul & John, Festschrift for J. Louis Martin*, edited by Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990), 189-201.

[42]Abraham Malherhe, "Gentile as a Nurse: The Cynic Back-

ground to 1 Thesalonians ii," NOVT 12(1970), 203-17.

[43]John Knox, "The Epistle To Philemon," *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 11 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955), 569 who still does not read the both . . . and construction strongly enough.

[44]The argument over the phrase brother as opposed to brothers in the Lord as an element of Pauline style has been argued most forcefully with respect to Phil 2:14. Does the phrase in the Lord go with brothers or does it go with confident? For a dissenting view to the one presented here see C. F. D. Moule, *Idiom Book Of New Testament Greek*, 2nd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 108. Even if Moule is correct with respect to Phil 1:14, brother in Phlm 16 is modified by beloved and not by in the Lord.

[45]The traditional linguistic dilemma for intepreters of Philemon is not the both . . . and, but the adverb "as" (*hos*) in the phrase "no longer as a slave, but one who is much more than a slave . . ." See Eduard Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 203 note 59 for the traditional interpretation. Lohse follows von Soden who states, "The particle *hos* expresses the subjective evaluation of the relationship without calling its objective form into question . . . therefore the line of thought found in 1 Cor 7:20-24 is not exceeded." The emphasis is mine and, it goes without saying that on concrete grounds I reject the distinction between subjective and objective as well as the traditional interpretation of 1 Cor 7:20-24. On this, Knox is correct when he states, "We have no right to insert the word merely after slave, as some of the modern translators do. Paul hopes and expects that Onesimus will no longer be a slave; he will be more than a slave, a brother . . . John Knox, "The Epistle to Philemon," 569. The emphasis is Knox's. I suppose I owe Scott Bartchy a response, but this is not the occasion for it. For an alternative, see Scott Bartchy, *Mallon Chresai: First Century Slavery and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians* 7:21,

SBLDS 11 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1973.

[46]Cf., Ernst Käsemann, "On Paul's Anthropology," *Perspectives on Paul* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), 1-31. Here Käsemann formulates Paul's point of view decisively: "Man can only have the Spirit when he denies the flesh. This is not merely, or not primarily, an individual matter, however; it means being involved in the world-wide conflict between *civitas dei* and *civitas terrena*. Anthropology is cosmology *in concreto*, even in the sphere of faith" (Ibid., 27). The emphasis is Käsemann's.

[47]Specific individuals mentioned are: Prisca and Aquila (Rom 16:3), Urbane (Rom 16:9), Timothy (Rom 16:21), Epaphroditus (Phil 2:25, Phile 24), Clement, Euodia, Synteche (Phil 4:3; note the generalized use to the rest of the co-workers), Philemon (Phile 1), Demas, Lucas (Phile 24), Titus (2 Cor 8:23), Apollos (1 Cor 3:9), Stephanas (1 Cor 16:16; note the generalized use here referring to the house church and others).

[48]See Marvin Vincent, *A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On The Epistles To The Philippians and To Philemon*, 6. According to Vincent, the term occurs only in Paul and 3 Jn. 8 in this sense.

[49]W. Bauer, *Lexicon*, 795.

[50]Interestingly, our terms seem to coalesce around Epaphroditus in Phil 2:25. He is referred to as the brother, the co-worker, the fellow soldier, the apostle of the church at Philippi, and the minister of Paul's needs. See Marvin Vincent, *A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On The Epistles To The Philippians And To Philemon*, 75-76.

[51]Cf., James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982), 599 and 605. "The preposition is further applied to those engaged in the same work or office—*P. Oxy.* II.242 (A.D. 77);" Ibid., 599.

[52]See 2 Cor 1:24b where Paul refers to himself (in the first person plural) as co-workers of the Corinthian's grace. Note that

preceding this statement (1 Cor 1:24a) he rejects the presupposition that he is master/ruler of their faith.

[53]Cf. Acts 18:24-25.

[54]For a brief but enlightening discussion of the women involved in Paul's ministry see Victor Paul Furnish, *The Moral Teaching of Paul: Selected Issues*, revised ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1985), 83-114.

[55] Cf., W. M. Ramsay, Phrygia, 1, 637, no. 530; cited by Bauer, *Lexicon*, 708.

[56]William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On The Epistle To The Romans*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1968), 418. Of interest here is not only the name and its form, but note that after Prisca and Aquila arrive in Ephesus and hear Apollos preaching in the synagogue, both (the verb is plural!) take Apollos aside and explain to him the way of God more perfectly (Acts 18:26). One could not find a clearer violation of the rule of 1 Tim 2:12 than this.

[57]The diminutive Priscilla does not appear in Paul's letters. Cf., 1 Cor. 16:19 where Prisca and Aquila are also mentioned. Given the typical view of Paul as a misogynist the non-diminutive form of the name here may be significant. Similarly, note the unnamed mother of Rufus—a traditional Roman name for a slave—mentioned in Rom 16:13. Paul calls her my mother.

[58]See Victor Paul Furnish, *The Moral Teachings of Paul*, 105, but see Col 4:15: "salute the brothers and sisters in Laodecia and Nymphas and the church which is in her house."

[59]The name Saul occurs only in Acts; cf., 7:58, 8:1, 3, 9:1, 8:11, 22, 24, 11:25, 30, 12:25, 13:1, 7, 9, 22:7 (D). It never appears in the authentic letters.

[60]The name Paul never appears in Greek literature as a first name; see Bauer, *Lexicon*, 642.

[61]On the issue of the ethnicity of the names listed here see F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar Of The New Testa-*

ment and Other Early Christian Literature, translated by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 68; and A. T. Robinson, *A Greek Grammar in Light of Historical Research*, (Broadman Press, 1934), 235-36. Cf., Acts 16:1; 2 Tim 1:5. To further illustrate the significance of this issue, it is interesting to note that of the seventeen known names of Christians in the Corinthian correspondence, "eight are Latin names . . ." See A. Malherbe, "House Churches and Their Problems," *Social Aspects*, 76.

[62]Cf., Gal 2:13; Phil 3:5-6; 2 Cor 11:22.

[63]Cf., Moulton-Milligan, Vocabulary, 204. According to the decrees of Euergetes II. P Teld I. S (BCE 118) the term equals all non-Egyptian soldiers, whether Macedonians, Cretans, Persians, etc.; Ibid., 204. As such, Greeks designates not simply ethnic Greeks but those who are under the influence of Greek culture. It should not be overlooked, however, that Egyptian soldiers are singled out of this generalized group.

[64]According to the Pastorals, Timothy's mother and grandmother have Greek names. The historical question posed here is what is a "proper" Jewish woman doing married to a Gentile. Note that Acts reports that Paul had Timothy circumcised, because of the Jews in Lystra, prior to taking Timothy with him on his missionary journey. If this is historically correct, it may be explained without involving Paul in duplicity on the basis of Timothy's Jewish status. Ethnicity in Judaism is counted from the female side. See Johannes Munck, *The Acts Of The Apostles*, Anchor Bible (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc.), 155. But note also that, "As a Jewess Eunice could not according to the Mosaic law have contracted in legal marriage with a Gentile. Therefore her children must have been considered illegitimate; since such children followed their mother's nationality, they were thus Jews. For this reason Timothy was not a Gentile whom Paul had circumsiced but a Jew" (*Ibid.*, 155).

Equally, important in this regard, is that Paul does not require Jewish Christians to abandon Jewish custom, ritual and tradition but, unlike the Judiazers who oppose him, Paul does refuse to have these imposed on Gentiles as a condition of right standing in faith.

[65]See Abraham Malherbe, "Social Level and Literary Culture," *Social Aspects*, 29-59, along with the literature cited there for a discussion of social-economic class stratification in the churches of Paul that is also relevant to this discussion.