

# Friedrich Gustav Lang

## Remarkable Proportions in the Disposition of 2 Corinthians

(pre-peer-review-version of 17 May 2018,  
definite version published in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 82 [2020] 649–669)

*Abstract:* A new aspect is added to the discussion of the unity of 2 Corinthians: stichometrical analysis. Application of the ancient standard line for prose texts, the *stichos* of 15 syllables, reveals that the two great apologias in 2:14–7:4 and 10:1–13:10 are of the same length, and the section 8:1–9:15 is exactly half of that. In fact, the composition as a whole appears to be disposed in a uniform way. This conclusion contradicts the several hypotheses dividing the epistle into different parts written at different times. Arguments presented to justify these divisions are contrasted with counter-arguments supporting the epistle’s integrity.

*Keywords:* 2 Corinthians, stichometry, concentric composition, Paul’s opponents, 2 Cor 6:14–7:1

Paul’s Second Letter to the Corinthians has been transmitted to us as the shortest of his three long letters, about two-thirds of Romans in length and about double the size of Galatians. In the Middle Ages it was divided into the 13 chapters we have today.<sup>1</sup>

### 1. “2 Corinthians” – a Compilation?

The unity of the writing has been challenged for almost 250 years.<sup>2</sup> Johann Salomo Semler in 1776 was the first to separate the last chapters, 10–13, from the rest;

---

<sup>1</sup> Revised version of a paper prepared for the International SBL-Meeting in Berlin, 11 August 2017, Section “Paul and Pauline Literature.” I wish to thank Dr. Beverly Olson-Dopffel, Heidelberg, for linguistic assistance.

<sup>2</sup> For the early history of research see: Hans Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (KEK 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1924) 11-21; for a comprehensive survey see: Reimund Bieringer, “Teilungshypothesen zum 2. Korintherbriefe: Ein Forschungsüberblick,” in *Studies in 2 Corinthians* (ed. *idem* and Jan Lambrecht; BEThL 112; Leuven: University Press, 1994) 67-105, here 96-7. – The partition hypothesis has been presented extensively by: Günther Bornkamm,

in his opinion this “Four-chapter-letter” was written later than 2 Cor 1–7. These chapters have been segmented as well by quite a few scholars since around 1900; they distinguish two different letters (1:1–2:13 + 7:5-16 and 2:14–7:4) and an additional interpolation in 6:14–7:1.<sup>3</sup> The remaining chapters 8 and 9 have also been divided into two parts since Semler’s remarks about the question. The result is a very fragmented picture of 2 Corinthians.

|                |                          |              |              |            |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| 1:1–2:13       | 2:14–6:13<br>6:14–7:1    |              |              |            |
| 7:5-16         | 7:2-4                    | 8:1-24       | 9:1-15       | 10:1–13:10 |
| 13:11-13       |                          |              |              |            |
| Reconciliation | Apologia A Urgent appeal | Collection A | Collection B | Apologia B |

*Table 1. Segments of 2 Corinthians*

The thematic outline is rather lucid. Two main parts (2:14–7:4 and 10:1–13:10) contain Paul’s apologies and the dispute with opponents, whereby the short section 6:14–7:1 is often regarded as a non-Pauline insertion.<sup>4</sup> Bracketing all parts (1:1–2:13 + 7:5-16 + 13:11-13) is the so-called reconciling letter. The two chapters in between (8:1-24 and 9:1-15) deal with the collection for the congregation in Jerusalem.

---

“Die Vorgeschichte des sogenannten Zweiten Korintherbriefes” (1961), in *idem, Geschichte und Glaube 2* (BEvTh 53; München: Kaiser, 1971) 163-94; it is condensed in: M.M. Mitchell, “Korintherbriefe,” *RGG 4* (4th ed.; 2001) 1688-94; for a recent example of the letter’s division see Calvin J. Roetzel, *2 Corinthians* (ANTC; Nashville: Abington, 2007), esp. 8-10.

<sup>3</sup> A different combination (letter A = 2 Cor 1:1–7:4; B = 7:5-16) is proposed by: Eve-Marie Becker, “2. Korintherbrief,” in *Paulus* (ed. Oda Wischmeyer; UTB 2767; 2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 2012) 204-31, here 222-3; a further partition (between 1:3–2:11 and 2:12-13; 7:5-16) in: Andreas Lindemann, “‘... an die Kirche in Korinth samt allen Heiligen in ganz Achaja.’ Zu Entstehung und Redaktion des ‘2. Korintherbriefs,’” in *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (FS Dietrich-Alex Koch; ed. Dieter Sängler; FRLANT 250; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 2012) 131-59, here 152.

<sup>4</sup> See the survey of the various positions on authenticity and integrity of these verses from Meyer (1840) to Schmeller (2006) in: Emmanuel Nathan, “Fragmented Theology in 2 Corinthians: The Unsolved Puzzle of 6:14–7:1,” in *Theologizing in the Corinthian Conflict: Studies in the Exegesis and Theology of 2 Corinthians* (ed. R. Bieringer *et al.*; BTS 16; Leuven: Peeters, 2013) 211-28, here 212-23.

The interpreters dividing 2 Corinthians in this way disagree on the chronological order of the several parts, that is, on the reconstruction of Paul's relations with the congregation in Corinth. These questions will not be discussed here. This article is rather interested in a formal aspect, in the length and the proportions of the segments.

## 2. The *Stichos*, the Standard Line of Ancient Prose

How do we measure the size of classical texts? In poetry, it is easy to count the number of verses. For every book of Homer's two great works or Vergil's Aeneid, we know the exact number of hexameters. This is useful when an interpreter wants to refer to a certain line of a poem. It seems that already the authors took note of the number of lines when disposing their *opus*. In Vitruvius (1st c. B.C.E.) we read that Pythagoras and his disciples liked to dispose their books according to mathematical rules, using the cube number of 216 *versūs* (= 6x6x6) and the size of three times this number as a maximum.<sup>5</sup> It is not totally clear what Vitruvius or Pythagoras meant, but at any rate, it is an explicit instruction – the only one I know – that an author should count verses in order to give his book proper proportions.

We have, however, implicit proofs. Horace (1st c. B.C.E.) in his *Ars poetica* divided the 476 hexameters into two parts using an old approximation to the golden ratio: the first 294 = 14x21 verses deal with poetry as art, the following 182 = 14x13 verses deal with the poet.<sup>6</sup> The ratios  $21/34 = 0.6176470$  and  $13/21 = 0.6190476$  come very close to the irrational value of the golden ratio = 0.6180339... These three numbers belong to a series of numbers known in antiquity, though we name it today after the medieval mathematician Fibonacci.<sup>7</sup> The

---

<sup>5</sup> Vitruvius, *Arch.* 5.preface.3: *Etiamque Pythagorae quique eius haeresim fuerunt secuti, placuit cybicus rationibus praecepta in voluminibus scribere, constitueruntque cybum CCXVI versus eosque non plus tres in una conscriptione oportere esse putaverunt* (tr. M.H. Morgan, 1914: "Pythagoras and those who came after him in his school thought it proper to employ the principles of the cube in composing books on their doctrines, and, having determined that the cube consisted of 216 lines, held that there should be no more than three cubes in any one treatise").

<sup>6</sup> See Francesco Sbordone, "La poetica oratione alla luce degli studi più recenti," *ANRW* 2.31.3 (1981) 1866-1920, here 1902.

<sup>7</sup> The name was given to the series only in the 19th c. by Édouard Lucas, after Fibonacci's, i.e. Leonardo's book had been printed the first time; see Leonardus [Pisanus], *Il liber abbaci* (ed. B. Boncompagni; Rome: Tipogr. delle Scienze Matematiche e Fisiche, 1857) 283-84; É. Lucas, "Recherches sur plusieurs ouvrages de Léonard de Pise," *Bulletino di bibliografia e di storia delle scienze matematiche e fisiche* 10 (Rome 1877) 129-93, 239-93, here 135.

oldest reference we can date is characterized by the numbers 3, 5, 8 and is found in Nicomachus of Gerasa (2nd c. C.E.). It is the last of ten numerical sequences presented as an old tradition.<sup>8</sup> Each number of this series is the sum of the two previous numbers, and the ratio of two following numbers is approximating the irrational golden ratio: 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34 ...

For prose texts, the ancients used a standard line of the same length as a hexameter verse.<sup>9</sup> It is usually called *stichos*, sometimes *στίχος ἠρωικός* or *ἔπος ἑξάμετρον* ('heroic line' or 'hexameter verse').<sup>10</sup> The hexameter is defined by feet and syllables, four feet with 2-3 syllables, the fifth foot with 3 and the sixth foot with 2 syllables. These make 13-17 syllables together. Thus the average hexameter is 15 syllables, which we can conclude was the original Greek *stichos*.<sup>11</sup> In Latin prose, the standard *versus* had 16 syllables. This is explicitly stated in a note probably from the 4th century C.E. that was discovered and described by T. Mommsen.<sup>12</sup> In late antiquity the Greek *stichos* had also 16 syllables, as we can deduce from Galen (late 2nd century).<sup>13</sup> It is well documented that the *stichos* was used by publishers for paying the scribes and calculating the prices. Librarians used it for determining the original size of a book. There are also quite a few ref-

---

<sup>8</sup> See Nicomachus, *Introd. arithm.* 2.28.6, 10; cf. Iamblichus (c. 300), *In Nicom. arithm. intr.* (ed. Pistelli/Klein) 117.20-23; 118.9-18: the tenth place is chosen by Nicomachus not by chance, for ten is supposed to be a "perfect number" in Pythagorean tradition. – The Nicomachus reference is quoted with German translation by: Felix Pachlatko, *Das Orgelbüchlein von Johann Sebastian Bach: Strukturen und innere Ordnung* (Musikwissenschaft 9; Marburg: Tectum, 2017) 88-9.

<sup>9</sup> For a more detailed introduction with more ancient references see: Friedrich G. Lang, "Schreiben nach Maß: Zur Stichometrie in der antiken Literatur," *NovT* 41 (1999) 40-57; *idem*, "Adam – Where to Put You? The Place of Romans 5 in the Letter's Composition," in *Textual Boundaries in the Bible: Their Impact on Interpretation* (ed. Marjo C.A. Korpel and Paul Sanders; Pericope 9; Leuven: Peeters, 2017) 189-218, here 195-204.

<sup>10</sup> Both terms are used by: Galen, *Plac.* 8.1.22-25 (CMG 5.4.1.2); see Hermann Diels, "Stichometrisches," *Hermes* 17 (1882) 377-84, here 378-79.

<sup>11</sup> See Diels, "Stichometrisches," 379-80: calculated on the basis of *stichoi* totals preserved in some manuscripts of Herodotus and Demosthenes and of the number of syllables counted in modern print editions.

<sup>12</sup> Theodor Mommsen, "Zur lateinischen Stichometrie," *Hermes* 21 (1886) 142-56, here 146; addendum: *Hermes* 25 (1890) 636-38 (= *Ges. Schriften* 7, 283-97): ... *per singulos libros computatis syllabis posui numero XVI versus Virgilianum omnibus libris numerum adscripsi* ("... in counting the syllables through the single [Biblical] books, I have set the *versus Vergilianus* by the number 16 [syllables] [and] added the number to all books").

<sup>13</sup> See above n. 10.

erences indicating that stichometry helped the readers to find a particular passage.<sup>14</sup>

In the manuscripts, the stichometrical information appears at three places:<sup>15</sup> The subscription of a writing very often contains the total of its *stichoi*, i.e. the so-called “total stichometry”. Secondly, stichometrical sums are also given within a document, for instance in bibliographical texts as in Diogenes Laertius’ biographies of philosophers or in old lists of the biblical canon. Thirdly, in old manuscripts a letter of the alphabet is put on the left margin after units of 100 lines, i.e. the so-called “marginal stichometry”.

The oldest New Testament example of total stichometry is Papyrus 46 (early 3rd c.) in the subscriptions of the Pauline letters; the one of 2 Corinthians is illegible.<sup>16</sup> In Codex  $\aleph$  01 Sinaiticus (4th c.) the number 612 is subscribed, in later manuscripts mostly the number 590.<sup>17</sup> In old lists of biblical books, the number 653 is transmitted once; in other lists the Pauline letters are summarized without giving the numbers of the single epistles.<sup>18</sup> Most differences between these numbers can be explained in three ways. First, the *stichos* was used at the same time with 15 and with 16 syllables.<sup>19</sup> Second, the number of abbreviated *nomina sacra* varies in different manuscripts.<sup>20</sup> Third, major differences in textual versions may also influence the total of *stichoi*. Besides, some numbers of the stichometrical

---

<sup>14</sup> See Lang, “Schreiben,” 43-44.

<sup>15</sup> See Lang, “Schreiben,” 45-49.

<sup>16</sup> Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, vol. 3 Suppl., Pauline Epistles: Text* (London: Walker, 1936), XII; cf. XV: “The stichometrical notes [...] are in a hand which can be assigned to the third century and may be early in it.”

<sup>17</sup> See Theodor Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* (II/1; Erlangen/Leipzig: Deichert, 1890) 394-5, with notes in which variants of some minuscules are registered (508, 600, 770). For 612 see also Erich Klostermann, *Analecta* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1895), 82 (Cod. Barberini gr. 317, 11th c., containing commentaries to the Biblical books).

<sup>18</sup> See Christoph Marksches, “Haupteinleitung,” in *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung I/1* (ed. *idem* and J. Schröter; Tübingen: Mohr, 2012), 1-180, here 123 (*Canon Mommsenianus*: only sum), 125 (*Catalogus Claromontanus*: number “[.]70” corrupt), 133 (Syriac list from Sinai: 653), 143 (Nicephorus: only sum).

<sup>19</sup> Concerning 2 Corinthians see the following calculation:  $612 \times 16/15 = 652.8$ ;  $653 \times 15/16 = 612.2$ . The first number seems to refer to *stichoi* of 16 syllables, the second to those of 15.

<sup>20</sup> The four most important *nomina sacra* are  $\Theta\text{E}\text{O}\Sigma$ ,  $\text{X}\text{P}\text{I}\Sigma\text{T}\text{O}\Sigma$  (2 syllables),  $\text{I}\text{H}\Sigma\text{O}\Upsilon\Sigma$ ,  $\text{K}\Upsilon\text{P}\text{I}\text{O}\Sigma$  (3 syllables). If the abbreviations are counted as 1 syllable each, the text of 2 Cor is reduced by 220 syllables or 14:10 *stichoi* of 15 syllables or 13:12 *stichoi* of 16 syllables.

tradition are obviously corrupt.<sup>21</sup> For marginal stichometry, the oldest biblical reference is Codex B 02 Vaticanus (4th c.) in some books of the Old Testament; in the New Testament the codices of Euthalius' edition (perhaps late 4th c.) number every fiftieth *stichos*.<sup>22</sup>

So far, this description of stichometry is accepted among classical philologists. Yet not all of them are aware that the *stichos* was also used by the authors. It served as the standard measure in rhetorical instruction and in literary production.<sup>23</sup> Three important proofs may suffice here. Menander Rhetor (3rd c. C.E.) gives recommendations explicitly about the length of three types of epideictic speeches: The so-called "garlanding speech" (στεφανωτικός λόγος) should not exceed 150-200 *stichoi*, the farewell speech (συντακτικός) 200-300 and the lament (μωνοδία) 150 – "and nobody who is well disposed will blame you" (so verbatim concerning farewell).<sup>24</sup> Pliny the Younger (1st/2nd c.) writes to a penfriend that he expects a letter in response at least as long as his letter: "I will count not the pages only, but the *versūs*, too, and the syllables"<sup>25</sup> – counting lines as playful pleasure for leisure hours! Finally, Josephus (1st c.) estimates the size of his 20 books of Antiquities at 60,000 *stichoi*.<sup>26</sup>

The evidence based also on a number of other proofs seems to be strong enough so that I have begun to analyze the books of the New Testament in terms of stichometry. Some of the results have already been published.<sup>27</sup> What can we observe about the segments of 2 Corinthians?

<sup>21</sup> See n. 17 (numbers 508 or 770) and n. 18. The number 292 for 2 Cor (Zahn, *Geschichte*, 395, col. 7 with note) apparently belongs to Gal.

<sup>22</sup> See L. A. Zacagnius, *Collectanea Monumentorum Veterum Ecclesiae Graecae, Ac Latinae Quae hactenus in Vaticana Bibliotheca delituerunt* (Roma: Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fidei, 1698) 615-24: the marginal numbers 150 and 250 are missing, line 308 is numbered at 8:1 (300 is missing), the total in the subscription is 590; p. 539: the sum of the four *lectiones* (beginning in 1:1; 4:7; 8:1; 10:1) is 152 + 156 + 94 + 187 = 589 *stichoi* (the variant in one manuscript, number 204 for *lectio* 3, is obviously a reading error: σδ' instead of ϑδ').

<sup>23</sup> See Lang, "Schreiben," 49-54; *idem*, "Disposition und Zeilenzahl im 2. und 3. Johannesbrief: Zugleich eine Einführung in antike Stichometrie," *BZ* 59 (2015) 54-78, here 74-76; *idem*, "Adam – Romans 5," 199-200.

<sup>24</sup> See Menander Rhet. (ed. D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson, Oxford: OUP, 1981) 423.3-5 (garlanding); 434.6-9 (farewell); 437.1-4 (lament); own translation.

<sup>25</sup> Plinius, *ep.* 4.11.16: *ego non paginas tantum, sed versūs etiam syllabasque numerabo.*

<sup>26</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 20.267: 20 books of 60,000 *stichoi* (ἕξ δὲ μυριάσι στίχων), i.e. 3,000 *stichoi* for one book on average (rounded up generously!).

<sup>27</sup> See Friedrich G. Lang, "Maßarbeit im Markus-Aufbau: Stichometrische Analyse und theologische Interpretation" I/II, *BN* 140 (2009) 111-34; *BN* 141 (2009) 101-15; *idem*, "Adam – Romans 5," 189-218; *idem*, "Ebenmaß im

### 3. The Stichometry of 2 Corinthians

If we divide the text on screen into lines of 15 syllables and count the *stichoi*, the results are as follows. The last four chapters, the second apologia in 10:1–13:10, have exactly 205 *stichoi* and 6 additional syllables. The comparable segment, the apologia of Paul’s apostleship in 2:14–7:4, has almost the same size of 203:05 *stichoi* – if the debated verses 6:14–7:1 are included. The difference is just 31 syllables or 2 *stichoi* and 1 syllable. It seems that the two segments were intentionally adjusted in length. If this is true, we have to regard the urgent appeal in 6:14–7:1 with its 16:14 *stichoi* as part of Paul’s apologia – and have to explain the theological difficulties.

We can make a similar stichometrical observation when we combine chapters 8 and 9. They have 101:08 *stichoi* together, almost exactly half the size of the two polemical segments in 2:14–7:4 and in 10–13.<sup>28</sup> This appears to be intentional, too, and the two chapters 8 and 9 seem to belong together from the beginning. To round this up, there is a fourth section of comparable length: the beginning of the letter in 1:1–2:13 together with its very end in 13:11–13. The two parts have 102:07 *stichoi* together; it is half the length again of Paul’s two apologies. We can put it also this way: these two smaller segments, the frame of the letter and the collection parts, have exactly 204:00 *stichoi* together, which is very accurately the same size as each of the two apologies. Only the remaining segment of 7:5–16 does not fit these observations at first sight. Its length is 39:14 *stichoi*.

How to explain these results? It is hard to believe that these parts are practically identical by chance. The letter was disposed by somebody who wanted the main parts to be of the same length. He could achieve this goal only by working on the written draft, certainly not by dictating. Why, however, did the author or redactor calculate with the numbers 203 or 205 for his disposition? They do not seem to have any mathematical or even a mystical sense. I suggest that the calculation is not based upon the totals of the main sections, but upon the paragraphs composing the sections. The last line of a paragraph is incomplete in most cases, some syllables are usually missing. If we assume that the first draft was written down paragraph by paragraph, not as *scriptio continua* as later in the manuscripts, then the missing syllables add up to several *stichoi*, depending on the number of paragraphs.

---

Epheserbrief: Stichometrische Kompositionsanalyse,” *NovT* 46 (2004) 143–63; *idem*, “Disposition,” 54–78 (*ad* 2–3 John).

<sup>28</sup> See the following calculation: 203:05 / 2 = 101:10 *stichoi*, 205:06 / 2 = 102:10/11; the difference is only 2 and 17.5 syllables respectively.

|                 |                |                                |            |                  |            |
|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------------|------------|
| Segments:       | 1.1–2.13       | 2.14–6.13<br>6.14–7.1<br>7.2–4 | 7.5–16     | 8.1–24<br>9.1–15 | 10.1–13.10 |
|                 | 13.11–13       |                                |            |                  |            |
| Topics:         | Reconciliation | Apologia A + Urgent appeal     | Collection | Apologia B       |            |
| <b>Stichoi:</b> | 102:07 39:09   | 203:05 (incl. 16:14)           | 101:08     | 205:06           |            |
| <b>32x21</b>    | 5x21 2x21      | 10x21                          | 5x21       | 10x21            |            |
| <b>= 672</b>    | = 105 = 42     | = 210                          | = 105      | = 210            |            |

Table 2. Segments and stichometry of 2 Corinthians

Certainly, this is a hypothetical consideration. We do not know how exactly the authors wanted to calculate. We have no information about disposing prose books according to mathematical aspects. The following considerations are an attempt to explain the stichometrical data. A plausible way, I think, is to look for a common denominator in the diverse sections of a book. In 2 Corinthians, the modulus of the formal disposition seems to be the number 21. We have come across this number already in Horace's *Ars poetica*, together with the numbers 13 and 34, all belonging to the so-called Fibonacci series of numbers that was already known in antiquity.<sup>29</sup>

When we apply the modulus of 21 *stichoi* to the segments of 2 Corinthians, each of the two apologies can be regarded as product of 10x21. In the first apology, 15 paragraphs are needed to reach this number of *stichoi*, one less than in the *Greek New Testament*.<sup>30</sup> In the second apology, eleven paragraphs are sufficient, two less than in the *GNT*.<sup>31</sup> Our analysis produced comparable results in two other segments. The letter's beginning and end (1:1–2:13 + 13:11–13) as well as the section on the collection (8:1–9:15) are 5x21 *stichoi* each, with no additional paragraphs or with two, respectively.<sup>32</sup> Only in the remaining part about Titus' reconciling arrival (7:5–16) are three paragraphs needed in addition to the two of the

<sup>29</sup> See above n. 6–8.

<sup>30</sup> See *The Greek New Testament* (ed. B. Aland *et al.*; 5th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2014). Over against the *GNT*, a paragraph is deleted before 5:1, another one is transposed from 5:16 to 5:18.

<sup>31</sup> Over against the *GNT*, four paragraphs are deleted (before 10:7; 11:12, 30; 13:5), two are added (before 11:21b; 12:14).

<sup>32</sup> Over against the *GNT*, paragraphs are added before 8:10; 9:11 and transposed from 1:23 to 2:1 and from 8:8 to 8:7.



*GNT* in order to achieve the proposed goal of  $2 \times 21 = 42$  *stichoi*.<sup>33</sup> According to this analysis, the letter's total is  $32 \times 21 = 672$  *stichoi*. That is exactly double the size, by the way, of the 336 or  $16 \times 21$  *stichoi* we obtain as the total of Galatians.<sup>34</sup> There is no doubt: the two apologias are the letter's most important parts, not only in their theological impact but also in their length. In relation to the rest of the letter, there is another remarkable proportion. The sum of the two apologias is  $20 \times 21 = 420$  *stichoi* according to our analysis, the sum of the rest is  $12 \times 21 = 252$  *stichoi*. If we understand the numbers 12 and 20 as products of 4, we come to the relation  $4 \times 3 / 4 \times 5$ . Again, 3 and 5 are numbers of the Fibonacci series. They are at the beginning of the series, therefore their ratio (= 0.6) is only roughly close to the irrational golden ratio. We cannot exclude, however, that the author was aware of the mathematical impact of the disposition. When he wanted to issue a writing in good proportion, he may have come to this old series of numbers.

Who is responsible for this elaborate disposition? Is it a later redactor gluing together the different fragments of different Pauline letters written at different times? How could he achieve sections of identical length without working on the wording and without changing the formulations? Most supporters of one of the compilation hypotheses maintain that the fragments – perhaps with the exception of 6:14–7:1 – were delivered as Paul has written them. In view of the stichometrical observations, it is hard to believe in a redactor simply copying without re-writing. On the other hand, if Paul is the responsible author, together with his assistant Timothy, how do we explain the obvious shifts in tone and breaks in his argumentation? This kind of stichometrical disposition can be realized only by working on the written draft. Therefore it is not possible to refer to a dictating apostle who paused for a while or had sleepless nights.<sup>35</sup> We must explain these breaks and shifts as parts of the overall rhetorical design, unless we ignore the stichometrical facts that can scarcely be denied.

---

<sup>33</sup> Before 7:8, 9b, 12, in addition to 7:5, 13b.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. J.C. O'Neill, "Paul Wrote Some of All, but not All of Any," in *The Pauline Canon* (Pauline Studies 1; ed. S.E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 169-88, here 171: observations on the size of Paul's letters: 11,080 characters for Galatians, 22,257 for 2 Corinthians; similarly Lindemann, "Kirche in Korinth," 154 n. 89: ca. 4450 words in 2 Cor, ca. 2220 in Gal.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I/II* (ed. Werner G. Kümmel; HNT 9; 4th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1949) 139: "Mir genügt z.B. die Annahme einer schlaflos durchwachten Nacht zwischen c. 9 und c. 10 zur Erklärung."

#### 4. The Integrity of 2 Corinthians

To begin with chapters 8 and 9, the thesis that they have to be separated became plausible only after the letter's integrity had been questioned in other chapters.<sup>36</sup> There are certainly repetitions, but redundancy is not a compelling reason for literary criticism.<sup>37</sup> The two chapters, however, can be understood as an elaborated concentric composition (*Ringkomposition*)<sup>38</sup> in seven paragraphs. In the middle (8:16-24), three persons are commissioned with the collection, Titus and two others. This center is composed concentrically in itself: 8:16-17 / 8:23-24 dealing with Titus, 8:18-19 / 8:22 with the two additional brothers, and 8:20-21 with the procedural principle. The three paragraphs at the beginning and the three at the end are arranged in parallel order: first (8:1-6 / 9:1-5) the status of the collection, in Macedonia as well as in Achaia; in the center of each section (8:7-9 / 9:6-10) the theological reasons, Christ's poverty that makes rich, and God's generosity that makes generous; finally (8:10-15 / 9:11-15) the purposes of the collection, the balance of needs and the common thanksgiving to God. Why should we tear apart such a beautiful composition?

Two main reasons for dividing chapters 8–9 are discussed.<sup>39</sup> One is the new beginning in 9:1.<sup>40</sup> It sounds like the introduction of a new topic: "About the ministry to the saints, it is really superfluous that I write to you" (own translation). After Paul has written a whole chapter about the collection, this seems to be a strange remark in the same letter. Not only the following verses are declared as superfluous, but also the preceding paragraphs, though, of course, it is a rhetorical phrase. Even interpreters adhering to the letter's unity think of a "Diktierpause".<sup>41</sup>

<sup>36</sup> See Hans-Dieter Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9: A Commentary on Two Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 3-36; German translation: *2. Korinther 8 und 9* (Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1993), 25-77: The thesis of the partition of the two chapters is developed by a history of the scholarship on 2 Corinthians.

<sup>37</sup> Explicitly introduced as argument e.g. by: Mitchell, *Korintherbriefe*, 1690; Roetzel, *2 Corinthians*, 25, 34.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Walter Klaiber, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (Botschaft des NT; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2012) 171: chaps. 8–9 are regarded as a "Ringkomposition" as well, but structured differently, without middle part (8:1–6: introduction; 8:7-15 / 9:6-15: theological reasons; 8:16-24 / 9:1-5: practical procedure); the correspondence of the collections in Macedonia (8:1-5) and in Achaia (9:2-5) is ignored.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Friedrich Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (NTD 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1986) 323.

<sup>40</sup> See e.g. Betz, *2 Cor 8–9*, 90 (German tr., 165-66).

<sup>41</sup> See Klaiber, *2. Korintherbrief*, 171; cf. Windisch, *2. Korintherbrief*, 269: "Ganz ausgeschlossen ist die Meinung, Kap. 9 sei mit 8 in einem Zug diktiert."

The solution, I think, lies in the little word μέν (translated here by “really”). In 9:2 Paul explains why there is no need to write, looking back to the good beginning of the collection in Achaia since last year. Then, in 9:3-5, he justifies his decision to send the commission introduced in 8:16-24 before he comes himself. This could be a reason why he is writing anyway, δέ (“but”) in 9:3 referring back to μέν in 9:1.<sup>42</sup> Yet it is possible, too, to dissolve the μέν of 9:1 only by τοῦτο δέ in 9:6, a rhetorical phrase as well: There is really no need to write, “but this (I want to say)”. Paul wants to remind them of God’s generosity in order to motivate them to give generously (9:6-10). In this understanding, δέ of 9:3 refers back to 9:2, to the previous Corinthian eagerness he wants to incite anew,<sup>43</sup> not to 9:1, to the question of writing about this topic.

The other reason to separate the chapters is seen in the fact that Paul first tells about the Macedonians’ eager participation in the collection in order to motivate the Corinthians (8:1-4) and later about the Corinthian eagerness promised a year ago and used by him to stimulate the Macedonians (9:2). Yet the mutual ambition Paul wants to arouse is quite acceptable in the same letter.<sup>44</sup> If we suppose the unity of the two chapters, there is also no reason to distinguish between the Christians in the city of Corinth (see 1:1) and in the province Achaia (9:2), as often suggested in partition hypotheses.<sup>45</sup>

Concerning chapters 1–7, it is not true that the two seams after 2:12-13 and before 7:5 fit together like the two parts of a broken ring.<sup>46</sup> Paul writes first: “When I came to Troas [...] my mind could not rest [...], and I went on to Macedonia.” And at the end: “When we came into Macedonia, our bodies had no rest [...].” There are obvious shifts: from Troas to Macedonia, from “I” to “we”, and from the rest of the “mind” (τῷ πνεύματί μου) to the rest of the “body” (ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν). It is easier to assume that Paul, when picking up the thread again, varied his first wording than that a redactor, inserting a whole letter here, clumsily tried to disguise his traces. Therefore the section in between should be regarded as an excursus, admittedly a very long excursus, longer than the rest of these seven chapters

---

<sup>42</sup> So the common understanding; see e.g. Christian Wolff, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (ThHK 8; Berlin: EVA, 1989) 181; Klaiber, *2. Korintherbrief*, 172.

<sup>43</sup> So also Windisch, *2. Korintherbrief*, 271.

<sup>44</sup> As admitted by Windisch, *2. Korintherbrief*, 270 – though he then prefers the division of the two chapters (271).

<sup>45</sup> So already J.S. Semler 1776; see Windisch, *2. Korintherbrief*, 20 – also Windisch’s own position (288).

<sup>46</sup> See Johannes Weiß, *Das Urchristentum* (ed. Rudolf Knopf; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1917) 265: “Die beiden Stellen [...] passen genau auf einander, wie die Bruchstellen eines Ringes.” Approvingly quoted by Bornkamm, *Vorgeschichte*, 176 n. 82.

as we have seen, but inserted into the narration of Paul's journeys.<sup>47</sup> How can we explain this excursus? I think it is a highly sophisticated rhetorical trick. Paul wants the Corinthians to participate in his internal unrest during the long time he had to wait, first in Troas, then in Macedonia, until Titus eventually has come back from his difficult mission in Corinth. The excursus fills the waiting period, so to speak. It is an extensive dialogue with the congregation in Corinth. Paul recapitulates the issues he has been discussing in his mind during the wait and before Titus' positive report. Thus he tries to regain a relationship of mutual trust. The special passage 6:14–7:1 belongs to the last part of this excursus. The overall topic is Paul's debated qualification as a "minister of the new covenant" (3:6), introduced by a *prooemium* (2:14–3:6)<sup>48</sup> whose surprising beginning, the hymnic thanksgiving (2:14–16a), seems to be a rhetorical device to attract attention.<sup>49</sup> Paul writes about the glory of his ministry (3:7–4:6), about the fragility of his missionary existence (4:7–5:10), and he invites the Corinthians to become co-workers in the ministry of reconciliation (5:11–6:10). The last part functions as a *peroratio* in this well-designed outline.<sup>50</sup> Its beginning and its end (6:11–13; 7:2–4) are very emotional appeals for confidence, connected with the statement that Paul wronged no one.<sup>51</sup> In the middle, however, these puzzling verses: a reminder of the brusque alternative between Christ and Beliar, believers and non-believers, leading to the urgent appeal: "Beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from every defilement of body and of spirit, making holiness perfect in the fear of God" (7:1).<sup>52</sup> The many hapaxlegomena in 6:14–7:1 are striking, but is this *argumentum e silentio* a compel-

---

<sup>47</sup> See Quintilian, *Inst.* 4.3.4: The *excursus* may follow the *narratio* "if the digression fits in well with the rest of the speech and follows naturally on what has preceded" (tr. H.E. Butler).

<sup>48</sup> See Quintilian, *Inst.* 4.1.8: *dicentis auctoritas* (the speaker's personal authority and integrity) as a theme of the *prooemium*, functioning in this case as a *commendatio* (but as a *tacita* recommendation); 4.1.34: the *prooemium* may shortly indicate the *summa rei* of the case, as Paul does in 2.16b: "Who is qualified (ἰκανός) for these things?" (own translation).

<sup>49</sup> See Quintilian, *Inst.* 4.1.5: the *prooemium* has to make the audience *attentum* (attentive), as well as *benevolum* and *docilem* (benevolent and eager to learn).

<sup>50</sup> See J.D.H. Amador, "Revisiting 2 Corinthians: Rhetoric and the Case of Unity," *NTS* 46 (2000) 92–111, here 105: 2 Cor 6:11–7:4 as "peroration".

<sup>51</sup> See Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.1.1: the *peroratio* has a double *ratio*, it is based in facts or in emotions (*aut in rebus aut in adfectibus*) – here we have both.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.2.8: distinction between two *speciēs* of *adfectūs* applied in perorations: *πάθος* and *ἠθος*, translated as *adfectus* in the proper sense and as *mores* (though the Latin word does not fit exactly). Perhaps the two points of Paul's *peroratio*, the appeal for an affectionate relationship and the appeal for holiness, are due to this kind of distinction.

ling reason against Paul's authorship?<sup>53</sup> The strict ethical decidedness – must we really regard it as un-Pauline?<sup>54</sup> I think, the passage results from the same rhetorical sandwich technique as between 2:13 and 7:5. Here Paul switches from an emotive declaration of love to a demanding baptismal exhortation.<sup>55</sup> He wants to bring back the status of the newly baptized Corinthians in order to begin an undisturbed new relationship of confidence with them. If we understand it this way, then these verses are the peak of the excursus, just before its end<sup>56</sup> – and certainly not a strange insertion of a non-Pauline text made by a later hand.<sup>57</sup>

The careful styling of these chapters can also be seen in some stichometrical observations (see table 3). In the apologia 2:14–7:4, the 210 *stichoi* in five parts seem to be disposed in the Fibonacci ratio 8 / 13. In the following narration 7:5-16 the five little parts with 42 = 2x21 *stichoi* together follow the same ratio. Finally, the first narration (1:3–2:13) and the second one together with the letter's beginning and end (1:1-2; 7:5-16; 13:11-13) result in the ratio 13 / 8, too. Thus we have the same proportion three times. If it would occur once, we could explain it by chance. If it occurs repeatedly, we would rather think of an intentional design.

| Major parts / paragraphs       | <i>Stichoi</i> : rounded up | exact number |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| 2:14–3:6 + 4:7–5:10            | 27 + 53 = 80 = 10x 8        | 77:00        |
| 3:7–4:6 + 5:11–6:10 + 6:11–7:4 | 49 + 51 + 30 = 130 = 10x13  | 126:05       |
| 7:5-7 + 7:8-9a                 | 10 + 6 = 16 = 2x 8          | 14:06        |
| 7:9b-11 + 7:12-13a + 7:13b-16  | 10 + 5 + 11 = 26 = 2x13     | 25:03        |
| 1:3–2:13                       | = 91 = 7x13                 | 89:04        |
| 1:1-2 + 7:5-16 + 13:11-13      | 6 + 42 + 8 = 56 = 7x 8      | 52:12        |

Table 3. Remarkable proportions in 1:1–7:16 together with 13:11-13

<sup>53</sup> Against (among others) Lang, *Briefe*, 310.

<sup>54</sup> Against e.g. Dieter Georgi, *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief* (WMANT 11; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1964) 22; for an interpretation fitting to Paul's theology see Klaiber, *2. Korintherbrief*, 149.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Hans-Josef Klauck, *2. Korintherbrief* (NEB 8; Würzburg: Echter, 1986) 61: "Taufunterweisung" as "Sitz im Leben," referring, however, to a "Fragment eines qumran-nahen Judenchristentums" (60); Franz Zeilinger, *Krieg und Frieden in Korinth 2: Die Apologie* (Wien: Böhlau, 1997) 420: the passage is from Paul himself, but based on "Materialien einer gängigen judenchristlichen Taufparänese."

<sup>56</sup> See George H. Guthrie, *2 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015) 27: "climax of the apostle's call."

<sup>57</sup> Cf. the extreme opinion of Andreas Lindemann, "Der unüberbrückbare Gegensatz: Ethos und Theologie in der Argumentation in 2Kor 6,14–7,1," in *Ethos und Theologie im NT* (Wolter-FS; ed. J. Flebbe and M. Konradt; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2016) 185-215, here 213: "als betont antipaulinischer Text tatsächlich in Korinth verfasst."

Concerning the last four chapters (10:1–13:10), how do we explain the shift in tone, if we suppose the unity of the whole writing? In my opinion, we have to distinguish clearly between two fronts. It is a different conflict.<sup>58</sup> There is a shift in Paul’s opponents. The origin of the conflict is different, as well as its present status and its objective. The first conflict comes from inside the congregation; one of the members has offended Paul in a way not known to us (2:5; 7:12). Now the opponents are intruders, itinerant preachers coming from outside (11:4).<sup>59</sup> When Paul writes the letter, the first conflict has been happily concluded by the past mission of Titus (as stated in 7:5-16). Upon returning to Paul, however, Titus has to inform him about new developments in Corinth: the congregation is disturbed by the arrival of rivalling apostles (11:12). Therefore the objective has changed. In the past conflict Paul wants the congregation to accept him as its spiritual leader again after the critical incident (7:11). Now Paul himself is the theme: “I myself, Paul” (10:1: Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος). He has to defend his apostleship against “false apostles” (as he calls them in 11:13) and wants the congregation to return to a relationship of trust and mutual appreciation (12:11).

The two conflicts are obviously interlinked.<sup>60</sup> The opponents of the last chapters are already mentioned three times in the first apologia. In 2:17 Paul dissociates himself from “the many” who are “peddlers of God’s word” – as he later has to apologize for not taking money from the Corinthians (11:8-9; 12:16-18). According to 3:1 he does “not need, as some do, letters of recommendation to you or from you” – as he later argues against “those who commend themselves” (10:12-18). In 5:12 he criticizes “those who boast in outward appearance and not in the heart” – as he later quotes the reproach: “His letters are weighty and strong, but

---

<sup>58</sup> A different solution is suggested by: Thomas Schmeller, “No Bridge over Troubled Water? The Gap between 2 Corinthians 1–9 and 10–13 Revisited,” *JSNT* 36 (2013) 73-84, here 80: In chaps. 1–9 Paul prepares for the visit of Titus, in 10–13 for his own visit – but is this a sufficient reason for explaining the shift from “gentle” to “harsher means”?

<sup>59</sup> For a survey on the research see: Reimund Bieringer, “Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief,” in *Studies on 2 Corinthians*, 181-221, with two different statements; on the one hand 185: “Es scheint allgemeine Übereinstimmung darüber zu herrschen, daß es sich [...] um dieselben Gegner handelt”; on the other hand 220: “Am wahrscheinlichsten ist, daß sie [sc. Zwischenfall und Gegnerfrage] verschiedene Problemkreise darstellen.”

<sup>60</sup> Cf. e.g. Reimund Bieringer, “Plädoyer für die Einheitlichkeit des 2. Korintherbriefes: Literarkritische und inhaltliche Argumente,” in *Studies on 2 Corinthians*, 131-79, here 166: the reconciliation of 7:5-16 as *captatio benevolentiae* in preparation of a sharper dispute and as “eine Art Modell” for the conflict of chaps. 10–13; Ivar Vegge, *2 Corinthians – a Letter About Reconciliation* (WUNT 2.239; Tübingen: Mohr, 2008) 71: 7:5-16 as “idealized praise with a hortative objective,” with function for the whole letter.

his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible” (10:10). However, those opponents are rather marginal in the discussions of 2:14–7:4. There is no indication that the congregation is about to accept them as authority.<sup>61</sup>

Conversely, in chapters 10–13, the opponents are in the center of the controversy, and the congregation, though its solidarity with Paul has just been stated (7:7), runs partly the risk of falling for those super-apostles (11:4-5; 12:19-21). Paul fights for his congregation. He can still distinguish between the congregation and the opponents, between “you” and “some” others (10:1-2). He writes this very personal apologia in order to convince them of his apostolic authority and to win their hearts, and he sends Titus with the new letter to Corinth again. Titus has to corroborate the reconciliation by reading the chapters 1–7 to them, and he has to interpret Paul’s heavy criticism of the chapters 10–13. It seems that his second mission is successful as well. Later on, Paul is staying in Corinth for a while and writes Romans from there.

To round off the analysis, the second apologia in itself is also a nicely concentric composition. The so-called “fool’s speech” (11:16–12:10) is the rhetoric peak and forms the center. The two polemic parts before and after this center (10:12–11:15 and 12:11-21) are related in their motifs: Paul derides the opponents as “super-apostles” (11:5 / 12:11), and he has to apologize because he has not taken money from the congregation (11:7-11 / 12:13-16). At the beginning and at the end (10:1-11 and 13:1-10), he writes about his authority to build up and not to tear down (10:8 / 13:10).

Therefore it is no wonder that this apologia with its five parts is well-proportioned as well in several respects (see table 4). The first two (10:1–11:15) and the three other parts (11:16–13:10) have a relation of 2 / 3 – the numbers 2, 3, and 5 being numbers of the Fibonacci series. The first part (10:1-11) is half the size of the second part (10:12–11:15). The ratio between second and fourth parts (10:12–11:15 and 12:11-21) is 8 / 5, Fibonacci numbers again, and the sum of second and fourth parts is  $7 \times 13 = 91$ , as well as the sum of third and fifth parts (11:16–12:10 and 13:1-10). We do not know, of course, whether all these proportions have been worked out intentionally. At least some of them seem to be the result of the author’s careful disposition. If he wanted to realize predefined proportions between the main parts of the letter, he had to begin with the individual paragraphs that are supposed to build up the whole.

---

<sup>61</sup> Against Georgi, *Gegner*, 24: he sees already in 2:14–7:4 “die Gefahr des Abfalls der Gemeinde zu den Gegnern.”

| Major parts                      | <i>Stichoi</i> : rounded up | exact number  |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 10:1-11 + 10:12-11:15            | = 28 + 56 = 84 = 4x21       | 82:06         |
| 11:16-12:10 + 12:11-21 + 13:1-10 | = 65 + 35 + 26 = 126 = 6x21 | 123:00        |
| 10:1-11 / 10:12-11:15            | = 28 / 56 = 1 / 2           | 27:11 / 54:10 |
| 10:12-11:15 / 12:11-21           | = 56 / 35 = 7x8 / 7x5       | 54:10 / 33:02 |
| 10:12-11:15 + 12:11-21           | = 56 + 35 = 91 = 7x13       | 87:12         |
| 11:16-12:10 + 13:1-10            | = 65 + 26 = 91 = 7x13       | 89:13         |

Table 4. Remarkable proportions in 10:1-13:10

## 5. Conclusion

The stichometrical analysis of Paul's Second Letter to the Corinthians brings to light striking proportions. The main parts are of equal length or are half that, having 210 or 105 *stichoi* (standard lines in the length of 15 syllables). The letter is carefully designed and disposed in its three main sections, as also within these. It is a composition in one piece. The table in the appendix demonstrates the elaborate, often concentric composition; the number of *stichoi* in each of the letter's 48 paragraphs is given in the last column.

An important insight concerns the writing technique, for such a sophisticated stichometrical disposition cannot be achieved by dictation, but only on the basis of a written draft. The image of an apostle carefully counting lines or syllables may seem somewhat odd at first. Yet the stichometrical data can scarcely be denied and cannot be explained as chance. Analysis on the basis of Fibonacci numbers offers a possible explanation of these data. The stichometrical hypothesis for 2 Corinthians must be confirmed by comparable analyses. Corresponding results have been published for several other books of the New Testament.<sup>62</sup>

If we regard 2 Corinthians as transmitted as being a uniform composition, the several breaks and shifts long noted have to be interpreted as the result of intentional rhetorical styling.<sup>63</sup> Some of the difficulties of the interpretation may be due to situations or contexts about which we know too little. We may assume, however, that Titus has been commissioned by Paul with the letter in order to ex-

<sup>62</sup> See above n. 27. – In classical literature several remarkable proportions, some approximately in the golden ratio, have also been detected in, for example, Plato, Isocrates, Thucydides (5th/4th c. B.C.E.) or Lucian (2nd c. C.E.), but so far only on the basis of print lines in modern editions, see the overview in Lang, "Adam – Romans 5," 200-202, beginning with: Friedrich Pfister, "Ein Kompositionsgesetz der antiken Kunstprosa," *Philologische Wochenschrift* 42 (1922), 1195-1200.

<sup>63</sup> For a general criterion see: James M. Scott, *2 Corinthians* (NIBC 8; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998) 7: The assumption of the letter's unity "works with fewer unknowns."



plain Paul's intention to the Corinthian congregation, especially as Titus is personally involved in its three topics: the reconciliation (chapters 1–7), the collection (8–9) and Paul's new confrontation there (10–13).

**Appendix:**  
**Table of Contents and Stichometry of 2 Corinthians**

| <b>2 Corinthians</b> |            |  |                |
|----------------------|------------|--|----------------|
| Chapters             | Parts      | Contents   | <i>Stichoi</i> |
| <b>1:1-2</b>         | <b>0.</b>  | <b>Beginning</b>   | <b>6</b>       |
| <b>1:3–7:16</b>      | <b>1.</b>  | <b>Conflict I: Reconciliation after previous offence</b>                       | <b>343</b>     |
| <b>1:3–2:13</b>      | <b>1.1</b> | <b><i>Narratio I: Titus' journey to Corinth with the "letter of tears"</i></b> | <b>91</b>      |
| 1:3-7                | 1.1.1      | Prooemium: Thanksgiving for God's consolation in distress                      | 16             |
| 1:8-11               | 1.1.2      | Report: Paul's rescue from a deadly peril in Asia                              | 13             |
| 1:12-14              | 1.1.3      | Purpose of the present letter: Restoration of mutual appreciation              | 11             |
| 1:15-24              | 1.1.4      | Change of plans: No duplicity on Paul's side                                   | 23             |
| 2:1-4                | 1.1.5      | Purpose of the "letter of tears": Restoration of a relation of love            | 10             |
| 2:5-11               | 1.1.6      | Effect: Forgiveness of the offender after punishment                           | 13             |
| 2:12-13              | 1.1.7      | Travel report: Troas–Macedonia, Paul worried about Titus                       | 5              |
| <b>2:14–7:4</b>      | <b>1.2</b> | <b><i>Apologia I: Paul's qualification as a minister of God's word</i></b>     | <b>210</b>     |
| 2:14–3:6             | 1.2.1      | <i>Prooemium: Paul's debated qualification as the objective</i>                | 27             |
| 2:14–17              | 1.2.1.1    | Thanksgiving: Paul's missionary success and his qualification                  | 10             |
| 3:1–3                | 1.2.1.2    | Paul's recommendation: The Corinthians as his letter read by all               | 10             |
| 3:4–6                | 1.2.1.3    | Thesis: Paul's competence as gift of God, not coming from him                  | 7              |
| 3:7–4:6              | 1.2.2      | <i>Propositio 1: The glorious ministry of the Gospel</i>                       | 49             |
| 3:7-11               | 1.2.2.1    | Comparison: Ministry of the Spirit more glorious than Moses'                   | 13             |
| 3:12-18              | 1.2.2.2    | Reason: Unveiled view at God's glory as granted by Christ                      | 18             |
| 4:1-6                | 1.2.2.3    | Conclusion: Paul's tireless engagement in proclaiming Christ                   | 18             |
| 4:7–5:10             | 1.2.3      | <i>Propositio 2: The fragility of Paul's existence</i>                         | 53             |
| 4:7-15               | 1.2.3.1    | Presupposition: Sufferings as participation in Christ                          | 22             |
| 4:16–5:5             | 1.2.3.2    | Conclusion 1: Hope of eternal glory  | 20             |
| 5:6-10               | 1.2.3.3    | Conclusion 2: For the time being, living a life pleasing to God                | 11             |
| 5:11–6:10            | 1.2.4      | <i>Conclusio: Paul's self-understanding as servant of God</i>                  | 51             |
| 5:11-17              | 1.2.4.1    | Criterion: The new status in Christ, not the outward appearance                | 18             |
| 5:18-21              | 1.2.4.2    | Definition: Paul's ministry as ministry of reconciliation                      | 11             |
| 6:1-10               | 1.2.4.3    | Description: Paul's existence in sufferings, yet always rejoicing              | 22             |
| 6:11–7:4             | 1.2.5      | <i>Peroratio: Call for regaining a relation of mutual trust</i>                | 30             |
| 6:11-13              | 1.2.5.1    | Personal appeal: Emotive invitation to open the hearts                         | 5              |
| 6:14–7:1             | 1.2.5.2    | Ethical appeal: Call for holiness in Christ and against Beliar                 | 17             |
| 7:2-4                | 1.2.5.3    | Personal appeal: Corroboration of Paul's undisturbed love                      | 8              |
| <b>7:5-16</b>        | <b>1.3</b> | <b><i>Narratio II: Titus' return from Corinth with a positive report</i></b>   | <b>42</b>      |
| 7:5-7                | 1.3.1      | Report: Paul being consoled by Titus' arrival in Macedonia                     | 10             |
| 7:8-9a               | 1.3.2      | Reason: Grief for repentance as effect of the "letter of tears"                | 6              |
| 7:9b-11              | 1.3.3      | Explanation: Distinction between godly and worldly grief                       | 10             |
| 7:12-13a             | 1.3.4      | Result: Zeal for Paul as effect of the "letter of tears"                       | 5              |
| 7:13b-16             | 1.3.5      | Report: Paul's joy about Titus' praise of the Corinthians                      | 11             |

|                   |              |   |            |
|-------------------|--------------|---|------------|
| <b>8:1–9:15</b>   | <b>2.</b>    | <b>Collection: Completion of the commenced undertaking</b>            | <b>105</b> |
| 8:1-15            | 2.1          | <i>Solicitation 1: Collection for the “saints” as action of grace</i> | 37         |
| 8:1-6             | 2.1.1        | Report: Successful collection in Macedonia                            | 14         |
| 8:7-9             | 2.1.2        | Reason: Rich participation as thanks for Jesus’ enriching poverty     | 9          |
| 8:10-15           | 2.1.3        | Purpose: Fair balance between abundance and need                      | 14         |
| 8:16-24           | 2.2          | <i>Organisation: Titus and two reliable brothers commissioned</i>     | 23         |
| 9:1-15            | 2.3          | <i>Solicitation 2: Plea for generous participation</i>                | 45         |
| 9:1-5             | 2.3.1        | Report: Commission sent ahead for completing the collection           | 17         |
| 9:6-10            | 2.3.2        | Reason: God’s generous blessing in sowing and harvest                 | 14         |
| 9:11-15           | 2.3.3        | Purpose: Common thanksgiving to God                                   | 14         |
| <b>10:1–13:10</b> | <b>3.</b>    | <b>Conflict II: Apologia II against opponents from outside</b>        | <b>210</b> |
| 10:1-11           | 3.1          | <i>Theme: Criticism of Paul’s weak personal appearance</i>            | 28         |
| 10:12–11:15       | 3.2          | <i>Polemics 1: Criticism of the “super-apostles”</i>                  | 56         |
| 10:12-18          | 3.2.1        | Issue 1: The opponents as intruders into an alien mission field       | 19         |
| 11:1-6            | 3.2.2        | Issue 2: Seduction to another gospel than Paul’s                      | 15         |
| 11:7-15           | 3.2.3        | Issue 3: Paul’s waiver of Corinthian support as token of his love     | 22         |
| 11:16–12:10       | 3.3          | <i>Fool’s speech: Praise of weakness as praise of Christ’s power</i>  | 65         |
| 11:16-21a         | 3.3.1        | Paul’s leadership style: “Weak” since not enslaving or exploiting     | 11         |
| 11:21b-33         | 3.3.2        | Paul’s glory: “Minister of Christ” in hardships and sufferings        | 27         |
| 12:1-10           | 3.3.3        | Paul’s visions: “Thorn in the flesh” instead of rapture to paradise   | 27         |
| 12:11-21          | 3.4          | <i>Polemics 2: Paul’s hope for recognition from the congregation</i>  | 35         |
| 12:11-13          | 3.4.1        | Issue 1: Question of the “signs of an apostle”                        | 9          |
| 12:14-18          | 3.4.2        | Issue 2: Defence against the reproach of financial irregularities     | 14         |
| 12:19-21          | 3.4.3        | Issue 3: Paul’s fear of failure on his third visit in Corinth         | 12         |
| 13:1-10           | 3.5          | <i>Paul’s intention: Self-examination in Corinth before his visit</i> | 26         |
| <b>13:11-13</b>   | <b>4.</b>    | <b>Ending</b>   | <b>8</b>   |
| 13:11-12          | 4.1          | Conclusion: Urgent appeal for peace and greetings                     | 5          |
| 13:13             | 4.2          | Blessing: Christ’s grace, God’s love, the Spirit’s communion          | 3          |
| <b>1:1–13:13</b>  | <b>1.–4.</b> | <b>2 Cor: The fragility of the apostle and his powerful Gospel</b>    | <b>672</b> |

*Explanation of the appendix.* The table lists the letter’s 48 paragraphs, also the headings of the major and main parts. The numbers of *stichoi* in the last column refer to the standard line of Greek prose texts with 15 syllables. The numbers of the single paragraphs are rounded up to full *stichoi*, though usually the last line is incomplete.