

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1950

The Meaning of **KOINΩNEΩ** in Galatians 6:6

Karl F. Breehne

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_breehnek@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Breehne, Karl F., "The Meaning of KOINΩNEΩ in Galatians 6:6" (1950). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 311.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/311>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE MEANING OF KOINΩNEΩ IN GALATIANS 6:6

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of New Testament Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by

Karl F. Breehne

June 1950

Approved by: W. Amst
Advisor

C. F. Mueller
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. DEFINITIONS OF THE SIMPLE AND COMPOUND VERBS	8
III. DEFINITIONS OF THE COGNATE WORDS	17
The Adjective	17
The Personal Nouns	18
The Abstract Noun	19
IV. TRANSLATIONS ACCORDING TO MODERN VERSIONS.	23
V. EXEGESIS OF PASSAGES CONTAINING THE VERBS.	29
VI. EXEGESIS OF PASSAGES CONTAINING THE ABSTRACT NOUN	39
VII. EXEGESIS OF PASSAGES CONTAINING THE PERSONAL NOUNS AND THE ADJECTIVE.	55
VIII. EXEGESIS OF GALATIANS 6:6	67
IX. CONCLUSION	84
INDEX OF BIBLE PASSAGES	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	88

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The problem treated in this thesis arose in an exegetical course on the Epistle to the Galatians when a sharp divergence of interpretations was noticed among several commentators who were consulted in collateral reading. Luther, L. Fuerbringer and William Arndt (the last two in class lectures at Concordia Seminary¹) held what may be termed the traditional view. According to this view the passage calls for material support of the ministry on the part of the parishioners. It is in this sense, too, that the passage is ordinarily explained in the exposition of Dr. Luther's Small Catechism under the Third Commandment.²

Over against this position the united divergence of three other commentators made a striking impression. These three were chosen only because they, together with the other trio, were available in the pastoral library at hand. One of these

¹L. Fuerbringer, "Exegetical Notes on Galatians," unpublished student notes from classroom lectures, Concordia Seminary, 1931-32, and student notes from a post-graduate course on Galatians given by Wm. Arndt in the spring semester of 1949.

²A Short Exposition of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1943), p. 62.

was Lenski³ who considered the traditional view utterly out of harmony with the context. An appeal for money under the circumstances seems to be completely tactless. In general agreement with Lenski are Kenneth Wuest⁴ and Frederic Rendall.⁵ What the passage urges, according to these three commentators, is full participation, full acceptance by the hearers of all the spiritual benefits which the teachers have to offer.

Here, then, was a clash of opinions. Three authorities were arrayed against three. All were held in esteem by the student; whom was he to believe? With whom could he side? Above all, who was right? What does the passage say? Each authority, of course, had his reasons and grounds for the position which he expounded, yet there was this contrasting set of interpretations. The matter was one to arouse curiosity and a desire to investigate farther and, if possible, to find a solution to the problem, "What is the meaning of Galatians 6: 6?" This was the origin of the present effort.

The issue centers chiefly on the meaning of koinoneitoo,

³R.C.H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, to the Ephesians and to the Philippians (Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1946), pp. 302-4.

⁴Kenneth S. Wuest, Galatians in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1944), pp. 169-71.

⁵Frederic Rendall, "The Epistle to the Galatians," The Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d.), IV, 189.

let him share. What does it mean? Sharing can consist of giving, of receiving or of both. What does it consist of here? Who is the giver and who is the recipient? Is the hearer, the catechuman, the receiver or the giver? Is the subject of the verb active or passive? Who should give and who should receive? There is, of course, a third alternative. This takes koinooneoo in a reciprocal, mutual or joint sense. The sharer both gives and receives. Evidently the meaning of koinooneoo must be established if we are to understand what the Apostle says in Galatians 6:6.

A related issue involves the phrase en pasin agathois, in all good things. If we can determine what is to be shared, then we will be well on our way toward determining who is the giver and who the receiver. If the expression refers to material good, to money, food-stuffs, clothing, houses, etc., then it is obvious that the preacher or teacher is on the receiving end, since few, if any, of his kind could very long share with or impart such things to, the many hearers. If, on the other hand, the good things are spiritual benefits - knowledge of God's word, nuggets of religious wisdom, gems of encouragement and of comfort - which a wise teacher is able to dispense to his hearers, then it is clearly the teacher who is the giver. The issue is well stated by the International Critical Commentary.

It seems probable, indeed, that the word (koinooneoo) itself is always, strictly speaking, neutral in meaning, as in the English verb "share" and the noun "part-

ner". It is the context alone that indicates which aspect of the partnership is specially in mind. In the present passage the chief determinative element is the phrase en pasin agathois. If this referred exclusively to spiritual goods, koinoneitoo would have reference to the receptive side, if to material goods, to impartation.⁶

While the investigation of these issues may prove an interesting scholastic excursion, does the question offer any practical implications or applications? We must answer in the affirmative. Reference was made above to the traditional use of the passage under the Third Commandment. Judging from the position this passage occupies in the Catechism, it appears that it was inserted to prove that the hearer must "pay the preacher". The question is asked, "What does God require of us in the Third Commandment?" Part C of the answer replies, "We should honor and support the preaching and teaching of the Word of God." Then follows, as relevant to this part of the answer, the quotation from Heb. 13:17 and Gal. 6:6.7 with the "Note: See I Cor. 9:11." The last passage clearly speaks about monetary support of the pastors, and is very much in place as a proof passage. It distinctly calls on the hearers of God's word to give material things to their teachers. The Hebrews passage, however, points out what the pastors do for the parishioners. The hearers are urged to respond to the

⁶Ernest De Witt Burton, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians," The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), s.v. Gal. 6:6.

ing of their soul-guardians. On the printed page of the Catechism Gal. 6:6 stands between these two. To which is it allied? Is it a parallel to the preceding or to the following verse? In short, is Gal. 6:6 a proof passage for this part of the Third Commandment, and if it is, what does it prove, the advisability of benefiting all we can from what the pastors tell us or our duty of providing them a decent and comfortable living for their work?

The passage may very well be in place in the Catechism and it may very well have been properly explained originally and by the contemporaries and immediate successors of those who introduced it into its place. In the course of time a transition may have been made to what we now call the traditional view, so that what was originally the tradition is no longer so. The situation is analogous to that existing in reference to the pastor's own reception of the Sacrament of Communion. Whereas the original, normal and traditional practice saw the pastor communing himself or receiving the Sacrament from a lay assistant in his own parish, today the accepted practice sees the pastor communing only in a conference of pastors, sometimes organized just for this purpose! The "emergency" has become the status quo while the originally normal custom has come to be regarded as abnormal, or even viewed as bordering on the heretical. Perhaps Gal. 6:6 has undergone a similar treatment as a proof passage under the Third Commandment.

A further implication may be found in the wide concept of

fellowship. What does the word koinooneoo - or, better, koinoonia - mean in the department of church union, of pulpit- and altar-fellowship? Is fellowship a matter of giving or of receiving or does it imply a mutual exchange, a reciprocal giving and taking? Assuming it means one or the other of the first two, what is permitted? If "to share" means "to receive", certainly the orthodox party, the possessor of Bible truth, cannot fellowship with the heterodox. The orthodox, already possessing the truth, cannot receive anything more; the heterodox has nothing to give which the orthodox does not already have. If koinooneoo means only to receive, then the possessor of the truth cannot morally fellowship with the heterodox. On the other hand, if the verb means to give, then the orthodox is just as morally bound to have fellowship with his less endowed brother. He has the duty of imparting the truth under his missionary commission, "preach the Gospe", "speak the truth". In the third case, that of reciprocal action, the first two actions being combined, the same questions are involved.

Owing to the fact that church fellowship is not spoken of in the Bible exclusively with the word koinooneoo and its cognates, but with many other words, it seems impossible and useless to attempt any conclusions concerning church fellowship from the use of koinooneoo. Hence no attempt to do so will be made in this thesis. The scope of the thesis in this direction will be limited to the matter of the use of the passage in explaining and teaching the Third Commandment.

This thesis is primarily a word study. Its aim is to investigate the authorities as to the meaning of the verb koi-nooneo and to check their offerings against the use of the word in the Bible. Thus the work is very largely also an exegetical study. While attention will be given to the cognate forms of the simple and compound verbs, such as the adjectives and abstract and concrete nouns, chief stress will be laid on the use of the verb. Exegetical treatment will be accorded a few other passages if occasion requires; chief emphasis will be centered on the passage in question, Gal. 6:6, and its context. Very little attention will be given to the synonyms of the words of the koino- stem for reasons which will appear in the thesis.

The procedure followed in this thesis is simple. First there is an examination of the authorities, viz. lexicons, dictionaries and word studies. More concretely the commentaries and translations of pertinent passages will be treated. From this point onward the study becomes as nearly original as a thesis of this type can be. By means of exegesis the findings of the authorities will be tested and evaluated. All of this effort will still be only preliminary to the thetical question, "What is the meaning of koinooneo in Gal. 6:6?" The study of the authorities and the exegesis of parallel passages have as their aim the establishment of the meaning of the verb. Then only will the findings be turned to the specific passage. What has been determined from the previous study will be applied in the exegesis of the passage in question.

CHAPTER II

DEFINITIONS OF THE SIMPLE AND COMPOUND VERBS

The Greek words koinooneoo, sugkoinooneoo, koinoonia, koinoonos, sugkoinoonos and koinoonikos are rendered in the Authorized Version with great variety. Thus the words "partake", "distribute", "have fellowship" and "communicate" are all used for the simple verb and its compound. The abstract noun is translated "communion", "fellowship", "communication" and "distribution". The noun for the person finds equivalents in "partaker", "partner" and "companion", while the adjective of I Tim. 6:18, a hapaxlegomenon, is rendered with the phrase, "willing to communicate". For some unknown reason the English word "share" and its cognates, while listed by the lexicographers and commentators, is nowhere used in the Authorized Version of the English Bible to translate any of these Greek words.¹

The difficulty in getting an exact definition of koinooneoo and related words lies in the ambiguity of most of the single words which are employed. Alone and without paraphrasing, the words primarily used are inadequate for drawing out the nuances of the subject word. To say that I share something with someone suggests nothing as to whether I gave or received. Hence the more complete and thorough lexicons must list two or

¹According to Cruden's Concordance the word "share" occurs only in I Sam. 18:20 in the sense of "plowshare".

more meanings for the word. Even these definitions are not as clear as one could wish them to be, inasmuch as they still leave unanswered the question, "Does the word imply receiving or giving?"

An example of this inadequacy is found in Berry's Lexicon. He defines koinooneoo as "to have common share in, to partake in . . . to be associated in," citing Gal. 6:6 as an example of the last meaning of the word. None of these definitions answers our theme question, "What does koinooneoo mean?" Moulton and Milligan³ make koinooneoo practically synonymous with metechoo, thus expressing a sharing without implying how the sharing is done, i.e. whether the subject imparts or accepts something.

Abbott-Smith simply has "to have a share of, go share in (something) with (someone), take part in."⁴ Thayer likewise fails to join the issue. Under a) he gives: "to come into communion or fellowship, to become a sharer, be made a partner" and under b) "to enter into fellowship, join one's

²George Ricker Berry, A New Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament (Chicago: Wilcox and Follett Co., 1944), s.v. koinooneoo.

³James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949), s.v. koinooneoo.

⁴G. Abbott-Smith, A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1929), s.v. koinooneoo.

self as an associate, make one's self a sharer or partner."⁵ Vincent's "Word Studies" is valuable only in its comment on Rom. 12:13. This he renders as follows: "sharing in the necessities; taking part in them as one's own."⁶ According to this comment Vincent implies that koinooneoo stresses the act of receiving. The necessities are not the possessions of the subjects of the verb; the subjects of the verb share by accepting as their own the necessities of others.

In spite of the fact that Liddell and Scott list not less than seven definitions of koinooneoo they do not offer a clean distinction as far as our question of giving and receiving is concerned. In general, all of their definitions revolve around the idea of joint participation, common, united action or condition. If there is any leaning, it is toward the side of receiving. Point 6 in Liddell and Scott, although they do not make it so, could be a very interesting rendering of Gal. 6:6. This defines the word as "share in an opinion, agree".⁷ Applied to Gal. 6:6 the passage would read, in paraphrase, "You Galatians who are being taught by faithful teachers of the truth of God should accept their teaching. Agree with them

⁵Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Corrected edition; Chicago: Harper and Brothers, American Book Company, 1889), s.v. koinooneoo.

⁶Marvin R. Vincent, Word Studies in the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1905), II.

⁷Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (Revised edition;

and share their faith in all the excellent doctrines which they teach." We mention this meaning here because of its interesting suggestion and because it seems to be unique.

Of more value to the question at hand are the definitions of another group of lexicographers. One of these is W. E. Vine. He says "koinooneoo is used in two senses, a) to have a share in; b) to give a share to, go shares with."⁸ He cites the Authorized Version of Gal. 6:6 for the translation of "communicate". Vine's second definition clearly pictures an impartation, a giving. Unless we are to infer backward that his first meaning implies receiving, the first definition in itself leaves the question open. A person can have a share in something either because he has divided his possessions, thus reducing himself from sole proprietor to the level of a partner, or because he has received something which raised him from a have-not to the level of a partner.

The contribution of the late Southern Baptist scholar, A. T. Robertson, is limited to his comment on two Bible verses which contain the word koinooneoo. One of them is our subject passage, Gal. 6:6. Robertson writes, "The active . . . joined with the passive is interesting as showing how early we find paid teachers in the church."⁹ Very patently Robertson takes

⁸W. E. Vine, Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words (London: Oliphants, 1944), II, s.v. koinooneoo.

⁹Archibald Thomas Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament (Nashville, Tenn.: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1931), IV, s.v. koinooneoo.

koinooneoo here in the sense of giving. Quoting Heb. 2:14 which contains both the subject verb and metechoo, Robertson calls the latter "a practical synonym for" the former. Granting that metechoo describes only a joint possession, its use as a synonym here throws no light on our search to determine whether koinooneoo emphasizes giving or receiving.

That koinooneoo does have two sides is evident also from the definition of E. Robinson. He defines the word as "to partake of, or in, a thing or person." Here the idea of receiving is brought to the fore. In Gal. 6:6 the verb, according to Robinson, has the sense of giving. He uses the word "share" to translate the verb and then paraphrases: "let him communicate to his teacher of his good things."¹⁰ The two prepositions make plain that, in Robinson's opinion, the catechumen gives (some) of his (the catechumen's) good things to the teacher.

Alexander Souter plainly ascribes the idea of giving to the word in his first listing, thus: "communicate", "contribute", "impart". His second definition is not as clear in expressing the idea of receiving, but rather holds to the general thought of joint partnership or common interest. He gives the second definition as follows: "I share in, I have a share of, I have fellowship with."¹¹

Erwin Preuschen, Heinrich Ebeling and Gerhard Kittel

¹⁰E. Robinson, Lexicon of the New Testament (n.p. 1850).

¹¹Alexander Souter, A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament (London and New York: Oxford University Press), s.v. koinooneoo.

make some worthy contributions. Whether or not it is mere coincidence or significant of anything, these three scholars whose offerings are most valuable are all Germans, and their works were published in a span of twenty-five years. All the other authorities thus far quoted were English-speaking. The range of their works covers a full century.¹²

Turning to the earliest of these German works, Ebeling's Griechisch-deutsches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testamente of 1913, we find a distinct double meaning of koinooneoo, that of giving and that of receiving. Thus Ebeling offers: "nehme Teil, habe Anteil oder Gemeinschaft" and "mache teil haftig, teile mit." It is true that the meaning "habe Anteil" in itself describes nothing more than the general joint interest or partnership, but the definitions "nehme Teil" and "teile mit" give the definite ideas of receiving and giving.

The edition of Preuschen's Griechisch-deutsches Woerterbuch zu dem Schriften des Neuen Testamente which was used in this study is the second revised edition by Walter Bauer of 1928.¹³ Here one can see the three senses of koinooneoo. For the first Preuschen's "Anteil haben" expresses the indefinite community of property, quality, action or condition. His second, "Anteil erhalten, Anteil nehmen" definitely brings out

¹²The old Latin work of H. Stephanus, Thesaurus Graecae Linguae, Vol. IV, adds nothing with its definition: "In communionem venio, commune aliquid habeo, particeps sum."

¹³Published in Giesen, Germany by Alfred Toepelmann.

the receiving sense of the word, while his third definition "Anteil gewahren, beteiligen" just as definitely expresses the sense of giving.

Most arresting and note-worthy of all the authorities is Gerhardt Kittel. His definitions are satisfying and complete.

We quote them:

Koinooneoo: 1. mit jemand Anteil haben (koinoonos sein) an etwas, was er hat, Anteil nehmen.
2. Weit seltener: mit jemand Anteil haben (Genosse sein) an etwas, was er vorher nicht hatte - Anteil geben, mitteilen ... Die Seltenheit dieser Gebrauchsweise erklart sich wohl daher dass hier-fuer das gelauefige metadidonai zur Verguegung steht.¹⁴

While we have so far not given attention to the cognate forms, what Kittel says about koinoonia may be worth quoting here. He says, under koinoonia:

Wie bei koinooneoo kann dabei entweder mehr die gewaehrende oder die empfangende Seite der Gemeinschaft im Vordergrund stehen, koinoonia ist 1. Anteil haben, 2. Anteilgeben und 3. Gemeinschaft.¹⁵

On our subject passage Kittel says,

Dieselbe Gegenseitigkeit fordert Paulus Gal. 6:6. Der Lernende welcher in Unterricht die wertvollen geistlichen Gueter hinnimmt, soll dem Lehrenden Anteil geben an den ihm eignenden materiellen Guetern ... Auch in Heb. 13:16 ist koinoonia neben eupoiia deutlich aktive Teilgeben, Mit-teilsamkeit.¹⁵

With this word from Kittel we may summarize our findings among the lexicographers, at least as far as the verbs are

¹⁴Gerhardt Kittel, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament (Stuttgart, Germany: n.p. 1938), III, s.v. koinooneoo.

¹⁵Ibid., s.v. koinoonia.

concerned. The word is used in three, possibly four ways. 1. In a general, indefinite sense koinooneoo refers to an action or condition whereby a community of interests and possessions is established or expressed. In this sense nothing is said as to how the community arises, whether the subject of the verb imparts what he has to another or whether he receives from another what he did not previously have. For this meaning we could translate with some neutral, non-committal, even ambiguous wording such as "share", "be, or become, a partner", "associate with", "come to an agreement", "form an alliance". While we have not cited the authorities, except Liddell and Scott's Point 6, for these last three meanings, such translations have been made, especially in secular writings.

2. Where any indication of one-sidedness is made, the sense is usually that of receiving. Anticipating an exegetical study of the verb, it will be sufficient to note here that in the ten occurrences of the simple and compound verbs, not including Gal. 6:6 the predominating idea is that of receiving. The subject shares or becomes a partner or has fellowship by taking or being given what he did not have but what belonged to another. Two examples will serve for the present. When Paul urges Timothy "neither be partakers of other men's sins," (I Tim. 5:22) and when God likewise warns His people against partaking of the sins of Babylon (Rev. 18:4), it is evident that the sins belong originally to others than the people addressed, the subjects of the verbs. The subjects would be par-

takers if they received the sins of others and made them their own by committing them.

3. "Weit seltener", says Kittel, does the word suggest giving. The reason for this lies in the fact that when giving is meant the Greek writer or speaker would use the common words for giving, such as didoomi.

4. A fourth possible meaning combines the other three. According to this sense koinooneo is a reciprocal action involving both giving and receiving. In this sense it describes a partnership or action or state in which both parties give and receive benefits or handicaps. The things need not be the same but may be diverse, i.e. they may be exchanged, one thing for something else. Thus, as Kittel explains Gal. 6:6 the pupil receives spiritual good from the teacher who imparts such good in his teaching. The teacher receives material good which the pupil gives.

1. social, sociable, ready and apt to share and maintain communion and fellowship.
2. inclined to share others shares in one's possessions, inclined to impart, free in giving liberal.

CHAPTER III

DEFINITIONS OF THE COGNATE WORDS

The fact that the verbs of a family of words may be defined according to a specific sense does not guarantee that the related nouns and adjectives will also bear the exactly corresponding meaning. Corollarily, one cannot always establish the meaning of verbs from the related forms. The one may help in the study of the other, but a strict parallelism of sense is not to be expected in every instance. This is true of the words of the koino- stem. While we have determined the four possible meanings of koinooneo, it is not a foregone conclusion that the substantives and adjectives will have exactly coincident or similar meanings.

Little can be expected from a word appearing only once or very seldom in literature of a particular age. Hapaxlegomena, rather than throwing light on related words, need related words to illuminate them. In New Testament writings there is a hapaxlegomenon of the koino- group. This is koinoonikos, found in I Tim. 6:18. It is translated by Thayer as

1. social, sociable, ready and apt to form and maintain communion and fellowship.
2. inclined to make others sharers in one's possessions, inclined to impart, free in giving, liberal.¹

¹Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Corrected Edition; Chicago: Harper and Brothers, American Book Company, 1889), s.v. koinoonikos.

Berry says it means "ready to communicate, liberal".² From the context in which it is used, it seems that koinoonikos is a synonym for a preceding word, eumetadidous, which plainly indicates the idea of giving. The rich would hardly be urged to a sharing as recipients. They would be encouraged to form partnerships by dispensing of their wealth to others. However, to accept a word as a synonym while attempting to define the meaning of words is a *petitio principii*. The exegesis of this passage will be treated in its place. Regardless of what the exegesis may show, unless it very, very plainly permits only one possible interpretation, the lone occurrence of a word can hardly be used with any force.

Koinoonos, sugkoinoonos, a partner, are used eight times in the New Testament. Berry, Thayer, Vine, Robertson and others give its meaning as "partner, sharer, partaker, associate, comrade, companion" without suggesting whether a person becomes such by giving or by receiving. In the case of Simon, Andrew, James and John (Lk. 5:7.10) it is pure speculation to assert that the latter or the former pair of brothers became partners of the others by contributing to or receiving benefits from a prior established fishing business. Even assuming that one pair of brothers had already been engaged in the business with certain marine and marketing rights together with capital, skill and equipment, any additional partners would contribute to the business as well as draw profits from it.

²George Ricker Berry, A New Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament (Chicago: Wilcox and Follett Co., 1944), s.v. koinooneoo.

In this passage metochos is clearly an interchangeable synonym of koinoonos, but metochos means only "one who has with" another. Other passages easily allow the meaning of koinoonos to be "one who receives" something that existed outside and away from himself, i.e. the materiale of the partnership was not something which he divided with others actively but something that he receives passively. In I Pet. 5:1 it is the "glory that shall be revealed"; in I Cor. 10:18 it is the altar in the temple; in II Pet. 1:4 "the divine nature" and in II Cor. 1:7 "sufferings" and "consolation".

Koinoonos therefore has two meanings: 1. In the neutral sense it refers to a partner or associate without inferring whether one becomes a partner by making a contribution or receiving a part. 2. Where there is a definite one-sidedness, koinoonos describes a person who becomes a partner by receiving.

The most prevalent derivation from the koino- stem is the abstract noun koinoonia.³ This word has a plethora of definitions, which may be summarized under three heads. The primary meaning of the word as an abstract noun must be that which names the state or condition resulting from a sharing, regardless of who gives or who receives. It expresses the relationship between sharers. In this sense koinoonia is defined as "fellowship, association, community, communion,

³This is used 16 times, excluding the Textus Receptus of Eph. 3:9.

joint participation, intercourse". So Thayer.⁴ In secular writings the term is used widely for the marriage relation, thus approaching the Scriptural "one flesh".

The second definition of koinoonia is usually given with some modification. This is the meaning of "contribution, alms, help". The collection of money for the poor saints in Judea is thus called a koinoonia, II Cor. 8:4; 9:13; Rom. 15:26 and even Acts 2:48 and Heb. 13:16. The lexicographers, however, hedge this definition around with explanations. Thayer says,

By a use unknown to profane authors koinoonia in the New Testament denotes ... a benefaction jointly contributed, a collection, a contribution, as exhibiting an embodiment and proof of fellowship.⁵

W. E. Vine paraphrases "that which is the outcome of fellowship, a contribution",⁶ while E. Robinson allows this definition only "by metonymy" in the New Testament.⁷ While this definition makes fellowship a matter of giving, it does so only with reservations. Although Kittel lists "1. Anteilhaben, 2. Anteilgeben und 3. Gemeinschaft",⁸ the first and third

⁴Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Corrected edition; Chicago: Harper and Brothers, American Book Company, 1889), s.v. koinooneo.

⁵Ibid.

⁶W. E. Vine, Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words (London: Oliphants, 1944), II, s.v. koinooneo.

⁷E. Robinson, Lexicon of the New Testament (n.p. 1850), s.v. koinooneo.

⁸Gerhardt Kittel, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament (Stuttgart, Germany: n.p., 1938), III, s.v. koinooneo.

meanings may be combined.

Among the lexicographers koinoonia has the primary meaning of partnership relation. Their secondary definition of a contribution of money is surrounded by so many modifications as to make it doubtful.

To summarize our findings in the dictionaries and lumping all of the cognate words of the koino- stem together we may accept three or possibly four senses in which the words are used: 1. that of a sharing relationship; 2. that of a relationship established by receiving; 3. that of a relationship established by giving, and 4. that of a sharing relationship which is expressed in both giving and receiving.

For the present purpose the basic words koinos and koino-oo are irrelevant. These branch off on a different semantic road. The adjective does indeed have the meaning of "common, shared by two or more" and is thought by some to be the basic word of the koino- stem, derived from ksun. It is used in the sense of the Latin "vulgaris" and as the Greek opposite of idios and, among the Jews and in the New Testament as the opposite of hagios, hehagiasmenos, katharos (holy, sanctified, dedicated, as for service to God). In this sense koinos means "profane, ordinary, impure".⁹

Koino-oo is simply the verbalized adjective. Accordingly, it means "to make unclean, render unhallowed, defile, pro-

⁹Thayer, op. cit., s.v. koinos.

CHAPTER IV

TRANSLATIONS ACCORDING TO MODERN VERSIONS

The material in this chapter is presented with the cognizance that its nature does not greatly enhance the thesis. Words used in a translation are a conclusion already drawn. They are the finished product of some one's study and deliberation. As far as establishing the meaning of a word in an original language is concerned they give only the opinion or judgment of one or more scholars. They do not advance any reasons for the judgment. They are like the completed edifice; the scaffolding, plans, workmen and piles of material have been removed so that one does not know how the building came to be what it is. For completeness and for whatever value it may have this chapter is included. It presents the conclusions arrived at by four translators or groups of translators, viz. those of the Authorized Version, the Revised Standard New Testament, Luther's German Bible and one Vulgate based French version.

Common to all these four versions is a certain freeness of translation. As an example, the abstract noun koinoonia is translated with a relative clause in the German of Philem. 6. Hee koinoonia tees pisteoos, dein Glaube, den wir mit einander haben, or verbally in the German of Gal. 2:9, wurden mit uns eins. The Authorized Version renders the personal noun and verb sugkoinoonos ... egenou with a verb only, "partak-

est" (Rom. 11:17). Similarly to the German of Gal. 2:9 the French of Philem 17 gives ei oum echeis koinoonon as "si done tu me regardes comme uni avec toi". Heb. 13:16 is in all four versions translated with some imperative verbal form.

The utter freedom of translation of these versions makes it somewhat practically difficult to derive any fixed meaning of koinooneo and its cognates from these versions. On the other hand the remarkable renderings (verb, relative clauses and prepositional phrases for nouns or adjectives) illustrate in what sense the translators understood the originals. The results of the writer's tabulation of the many translations are herewith given, multiple occurrences being indicated by numbers.

KOINOONEOO and SUGKOINOONEOO

A.V.	R.S.V.	Luther	French
be partaker 6	share 6	haben	faire part
communicate 3	participate	teilhaftig werden 2	prendre part 2
have fellowship	contribute	mit & a verb	avoir part 3
distribute	enter into partnership	teilen 2	participer 4
	take part 2	teilhaftig machen 2	
		Gemeinschaft haben	
		annehmen	

KOINOONIA

communion 3	participation 3	Gemeinschaft 15	communion 3
fellowship 12	fellowship 8	mit haben	union
communication	share (verb) 2	eins mit sein	communication
communicate	sharing	Steuer 2	affection
distribution	taking part	mitteilen	cordiale
contribution	partnership		
	contribution		

KOINOONOS and SUGKOINOONOS

partner 3	partner 7	Geselle 3	avoir part 2
companion	take part	Gemeinschaft haben	avec & vb.
partaker 6	share, vb. 3	in Gemeinschaft 2	participant 3
partake	partaker	teilhaftig sein 6	prendre part
have fellowship			etre uni avec
			compagnons
			etre joint
			participer
			avoir societe

When we compare the ratio of occurrences of these translations we note that they bear out the conclusions we drew from a study of the lexicographers. At that time the first meaning of the verbs was given as "to be or be made a partner, share". In the foregoing table this meaning occurs in the aggregate of seven times in the Authorized Version, at least the same number of times in the Revised Standard Version, possibly the same number in the German and in the French. The second meaning, according to the dictionaries, is that of sharing by receiving. We find this meaning not at all clearly indicated in the Authorized Version, three times in the modern version, twice in Luther and in the French. The third meaning which implies a giving, occurs four times in the Authorized Version, once clearly in the Revised Standard Version, twice clearly in German and once in French. In these four translations the first meaning, which is neutral, prevails by almost two to one. The second and third meanings, in which the issue lies, are practically evenly divided. As far as the simple and compound verbs are involved the four translations offer no clean decision of our issue.

The picture is slightly different in regard to the abstract noun. In our popular version the first, or general, meaning of joint relationship occurs fifteen times, while a clear leaning to the giving side is found twice and the two remaining instances are ambiguous. The Revised Standard Version gives a score of sixteen for the first meaning and two

for the third meaning. Luther records seventeen and three; the French uses the first meaning four times and the other two meanings not once with any definiteness. Koinoonia therefore predominates in its role of expressing a general joint relationship but gives some support to the idea of sharing by contributing or distributing.

Aside from supporting the first definition the translations of the personal nouns are too ambiguous to help in determining whether the giving or receiving idea is dominant.

One may argue that four versions are barely sufficient to establish the meaning of any given word or words. At best they can only illustrate or serve as examples. That has been the purpose to which they were put here. Assuming that a bigger variety of versions had been compared, even they would still leave the question open because they express only final judgments without presenting the reasons for arriving at them. Since the proof of the pudding is the eating thereof the ultimate judge will be the queen of theology, exegesis. What the lexicographers and translators - and even the commentators - say will have to be subjected to an examination of each pertinent passage or text. If a definition or translation stands up under this scrutiny, it may be accepted, provided no better suggestion supersedes it. If a meaning will not fit into a passage and context, it must be summarily

rejected. That is the task to which we now turn.²

REMARKS ON PHRASES CONTAINING THE VERB

The Greek verb *κοινωνῶ* is found eight times in the Epistle to the Galatians, including the debated verse, Gal. 6:6.

The Greek verb *κοινωνῶ* is found three times. For *κοινωνῶ* see the list of words at the end.

2. *κοινωνῶ*. Treating the changes to local construction as being of the same kind as those which will be left to last. In it we find the local case to be used. What does *κοινωνῶ* mean? Does it mean a giving or a receiving? Our accepted English translation is "participating in the necessity of saints". In English Standard Version we have "participate in the needs of the saints". The French, anticipating the result, translates *κοινωνῶ* "participer" - "participer pour soulager les besoins des saints". Luther has "Theist auch der Heiligen Notwendigkeit". The last is not literally correct; the French is more or less, almost pragmatic, rendering. The use English translation is equally inadequate. The idea that the *κοινωνῶ* is *κοινωνῶ* is not correct.

²The reader might expect some consideration to be given to the syntax or grammatical construction of the *κοινο-* words before an attempt at exegesis is made. In the preparation of this thesis this matter was studied but found to have no bearing on the thesis topic. The verb is followed once by the Genitive of the thing shared, Heb. 2:14, once by *eis* and the Accusative of the thing shared, Phil. 4:15, and eight times by the simple Dative of the thing shared. Only in the disputed passage (Gal. 6:6) is there a Dative of the person with whom one shares and *en* with the Dative of the thing shared.

CHAPTER V

EXEGESIS OF PASSAGES CONTAINING THE VERBS

The simple verb koinooneoo is found eight times in the Greek New Testament, including the debated verse, Gal. 6:6. The compound verb sugkoinooneoo is found three times. For our purposes the two may be treated as one.¹

Rom. 12:13. Treating the passages in local succession we begin with one which might well be left to last. In it we meet the issue face to face: what does koinooneoo mean? Does it imply a giving or a receiving? Our accepted English translation here reads, "distributing to the necessity of saints".² The Revised Standard Version has "contribute to the needs of the saints". The French, anticipating the result, translates - rather, paraphrases - "charitables pour soulager les necessites des saints". Luther has "Nehmet euch der Heiligen Notdurft an". The last is most literally correct; the French is a very free, almost periphrastic, rendering. The two English versions are really unfortunate. The idea that the Apostle is seeking to put over is Christian sympathy and brotherly love

¹The same procedure will be followed with the nouns koinoonos and sugkoinoonos.

²In spite of the original plural tais chreiais the Authorized Version translates with the singular and omits the article before "saints".

exercised in a practical way. Note the injunction to "pursue hospitality". Due to persecutions many of the saints had pressing needs - food, clothing, shelter, medicine, transportation. To contribute to these needs was exactly what the persecutors were doing. Paul wants the other Christians to detract from those needs, to lighten the burden borne by the persecuted brethren. The more affluent Christians were to do this by making the needs of the persecuted their own. When one has needs of his own he tries to assuage them, as the French puts it. Consequently, when the more fortunate Christians take the necessities of the poorer ones upon themselves they will do something to mitigate or eliminate those needs; they will give or send something to the poor. This giving, however, is not contained in the word koinoonountes; it is an action resulting from the "sharing". The sharing is done when the more fortunate Christians receive, as their own and by making their own, the needs which press the persecuted. Koinoonountes here definitely does not mean "contribute to" or "distribute to", but "to receive" or "to share as a recipient". The addressees are called upon to share the needs of the saints by taking some of the needs upon themselves. Thayer interprets this passage "so as to make another's necessities one's own as to relieve them".³ Meyer rejects the transitive use of koinooneoo as if

³Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Corrected edition; Chicago: Harper and Brothers, American Book Company, 1889), s.v. koinooneoo.

it were equal to koino-oo which, he says, "cannot be conclusively established in the New Testament, not even in Rom. 12:13."⁴ With him agrees Alford who says on Rom. 12:13 at Gal. 6:6: "Koinooneoo (is) most likely intransitive, as there does not appear to be an instance of its transitive use in the New Testament (certainly not Rom. 12:13). But the two senses come nearly to the same; he who shares in the necessities of the saints can only do so by making that necessity his own; i.e. by depriving himself to that extent, and communicating to them."⁵

Rom. 15:27. The history of the early Church makes clear what koinooneoo means here. The Gentiles became "partakers of the spiritual things" of the Jewish Christians when Paul and others preached the Gospel to the former, ordained by Jewish Christians to that work. The Gentiles became sharers by receiving the Gospel dispensed by the Jews. Now, in justice, it was only fair that the Gentiles should in turn give to the Jews of their bodily things, even as Paul argued that it was not unfair for those who had sowed spiritual things to reap bodily things from those among whom they had sowed (I Cor. 9:11). In charitable, grateful reciprocity the Gentiles should serve their spiritual benefactors. They had received

⁴N.A.W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Galatians, translated by G. H. Venables (Fifth edition; New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884), s.v. Gal. 6:6.

⁵Henry Alford, The Greek Testament (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1865), III, s.v. Gal. 6:6.

great things; now they should give lesser things. Their first sharing had been as recipients.

Eph. 5:11. The Apostle here warns Christians against returning to their former sins of heathenism. The Christians at Ephesus "were sometime darkness" but had been made light in the Lord, vs. 8. Other Ephesians had continued in heathenish darkness and sinful works of darkness. The Christians should maintain the difference; they should have no part or fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. Translations here ("take no part", R.S.V.; "habt nicht Gemeinschaft", Luther; "ayez aucune part", French; "have no fellowship", A. V.) indicate that the believers had a choice. They could establish fellowship by committing works of darkness or remain separate by continuing to walk in the light of holiness. The fellowship would arise if they accepted the sinful spirit and motives of the unbelievers. Inasmuch as "the unfruitful works of darkness" were not then the possessions of the believers, any fellowship with the heathen would arise only as the Christians received what they did not possess. There is nothing, however, in the passage to mark plainly that the fellowship might be one in which the Christians were the recipients, although the possibility of such reception is there. In short, the passage seems to put nothing more into sugkolnooneoo than the idea of partnership without indicating how it is formed, i.e. whether the subjects receive or give something.

Phil. 4:14.15. The first of these two verses is closely

parallel to Rom. 12:13. There it was the simple verb with the Dative, "sharing the needs"; here it is the compound verb with the Dative, "sharing my tribulation". The construction is the same in both places. The Philippians shared in the Apostle's tribulation by taking it upon themselves as if it were their own. It had belonged to Paul only; they became partners by receiving a part of it. As a consequence they relieved his tribulation by giving something to Paul, but this is stated in the following verse, not in the passage itself. The first sharing was as receivers. The Revised Standard Version "share my troubles", Luther's "annehmen" and the French "prendre part" indicate this.

Verse 15 is made more difficult of understanding by the phrase logon doseoos kai leempseoos. This term is taken from the bookkeepers. It refers to the debits and credits of an account, the money paid out and the money received. Eliminating the Genitives which are dependent on logon, makes the task of interpretation less complicated. This leaves the main clause "No church shared with me in the account". How was this sharing done? Did the Philippians give something to Paul or receive something from him in the account? Certainly the Philippians presented Paul with material gifts as vs. 16 and II Cor. 11:8.9 indicate. But this text does not say that they shared money with Paul; it says only that they shared in regard to the account, eis logon. Could it be that the benevolent Philippians took Paul's account upon themselves in con-

sequence of which they balanced his debits by the credits of their generosity, or at least performed some deed by which Paul's account became their account? The text does not say. The most that can be said, therefore, in regard to koinooneoo in vs. 15 is that it expresses a joint relationship. Both Paul and his grateful converts in Macedonia had a part in a joint account. The fact that Paul recorded the debits while they accounted for the credits does not show in the passage itself. (Note: It must be admitted that a possible translation is, "No church sent me contributions on a regular financial basis excepting you." A.)

I Tim. 5:22. This verse is similar to Eph. 5:11 in construction and general thought. It is a warning to the Christian not to have a joint share in the sins of others. This would be the case with Timothy, says John T. Mueller in The Concordia New Testament With Notes, "if through (Timothy's) negligence or sinful partiality improper men were raised to office in the Church."⁶ The sins of such improper men already existed; by ordaining them through carelessness or sinful negligence Timothy would receive a partnership in their sins. His sharing would then be that of one who received what he did not have before. This would be Kittel's "Anteil haben

⁶ John T. Mueller, The Concordia New Testament with Notes (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House,), p.

(koinoonos sein) an etwas, was er hat; Anteil nehmen."⁷ With this view agree the French "ne participe point", Luther's "mache dich nicht teilhaftig" and the Revised Standard Version's "nor participate in" . By an improper ordination Timothy would receive the guilt and condemnation of sins already existing outside of himself. He would share as a recipient.

Heb. 2:14. Here is a passage containing the questioned word and one of its synonyms, viz. metechoo. Metechoo literally means "to have with". It describes only a joint possession, a common ownership. If the two verbs were transposed one might stress the receiving side of koinooneoo on the basis that the pre-existent Son of God did not possess flesh and blood. Consequently, if He became a joint owner, it would be in the role of one who receives what He did not previously have. The words, however, are not inverted. The tenses of the verbs offer something of interest. The first is a Perfect, the second an Aorist. The first describes a state which existed in the past and continues down to and including the present. "The children have become, or have been sharers." To say that they were not always possessors is to run the argument of the connotation of the tense to an absurdity. The Perfect can mean only that the children have always been pos-

⁷Gerhardt Kittel, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament (Stuttgart, Germany: n.p., 1938), III, s.v. koinooneoo.

sessors of flesh and blood. It is the contrast between the Perfect and Aorist that throws light on the meaning of both verbs. Jesus became a partaker at a definite point of time. He was not always a sharer; millions of "the children" had possessed flesh and blood when He first became a possessor. Metechoo therefore may mean "to become a sharer by receiving" but this meaning cannot be attached to koinooneoo in this place. Here the first meaning alone can be the right one, that which expresses a condition or state of common ownership. The Present tense translation "are partakers", "share", "participate" and "haben" are all proper renderings of the Greek Perfect tense.

I Pet. 4:13. Again Kittel's attention to something not previously possessed by the subject of koinooneoo enters the picture. Christians should "rejoice, inasmuch as (they) are partakers of Christ's sufferings". The things shared are the sufferings of the Savior. One does not share them by adding to them; least of all the Spirit-moved Christian does not do so. Rather, the disciple becomes a sharer by accepting some of the reproaches and sufferings that the Master first endured. Koinooneoo here stresses the receiving side of fellowship.

II John 11. The construction and meaning here is the same as in Eph. 5:11 and I Tim. 5:22. To sympathize with, to aid and abet the preacher of heterodoxy is to join him in his evil deeds. The nominal or backsliding Christian can do so only by receiving and entertaining the false doctrines and

evil practices of the false preacher, not by adding anything to the latter's heterodox words and deeds.

Rev. 18:4 in addition to being similar to the preceding passage and others, has the extra feature of having parallel clauses, one of which contains a synonym to sugkoinooneoo. God warns His people to come out of spiritual Babylon lest a double misfortune befall them. Continued association with the wicked city will make God's people partners in her sins and bring upon them the punishment reserved for her. In other words, anyone disregarding God's warning will share with Babylon in two accounts, her sins and her plagues. The second clause verb is lambanoo, the ordinary word meaning "to receive". From the parallelism it would seem that partnership in the sins of Babylon is also a matter of receiving.

In summary we count seven of these ten passages favoring the receptive side of sharing. They are: Rom. 12:13, 15:27; Phil. 4:14; I Tim. 5:22; I Pet. 4:13, II John 11 and Rev. 18:4. Two verses (Phil. 4:15; Heb. 2:14) contain no more than a reference to a state or action of partnership with no suggestion of how the partnership is formed. The remaining passage, Eph. 5:11, hesitates between the two meanings. Not once are the verbs used to denote a partnership established by the subject conveying something that he has to someone who does not have it.

If Gal. 6:6, therefore, designates a giving fellowship, it stands alone in such usage. The science of exegesis and

semantics suggests that when a word is used in a certain sense ten times, it very likely has that same sense in the eleventh instance. One could thus conclude in this case and so end the research at this point. But since the use of cognates may strengthen or weaken this deduction it will be good to examine their usages.

CHAPTER VI

EXEGESIS OF PASSAGES CONTAINING THE ABSTRACT NOUN

The abstract noun koinoonia occurs nineteen times in seventeen passages in the Greek New Testament.¹ From the nature of the word - an abstract noun - one cannot expect it to indicate much that has any bearing on the issue. Abstract nouns usually designate some quality or condition of being without suggesting the action which produced the quality or condition. Although the translations "contribution", "distribution", "communication" imply the act of giving or imparting, they are usually hedged about with modifying doubts and uncertainties, as was noted in Chapter III.² Hence, the giving side of koinoonia is at once subject to questioning. Our task in this chapter is to determine by exegesis whether or not this definition is at all justified, as well as to test the first or general meaning of the word, and second which implies giving.

Acts 2:42. The research historian, Luke, here gives a brief summary of the habits and practices of the first Christians in Jerusalem. The Dative hee koinoonia is not dependent on toon apostolon, which would be the case if it preceded. Neither is koinoonia in opposition to tee klasei tou arton

¹Following Nestle we do not include the reading of koinoonia for oikonomia in Eph. 3:9.

²Pp. 20f.

kai tais proseuchais, i.e. it does not refer to the Lord's Supper. All four Datives are governed by the verb. This "communion" or "fellowship" then, is an association of all the believers with one another. It denotes nothing more than a community of interests, a spiritual harmony manifested in association of the people with one another. Even if the community of property, mentioned in vv. 44f., were included in this fellowship, that was a mutual, reciprocal action; some contributed and some withdrew. Koinoonia is used here in its widest meaning, that of a condition or state of common interests, joint activities. It indicates nothing as to who imparted or who accepted anything in creating that relationship. Whatever giving and receiving was involved was of a reciprocal nature, a mutual sharing.

Rom. 15:26. Here is a use of koinoonia which the lexicographers surround with reservations. The action spoken of is certainly one of giving (II Cor. 8:1ff., 9:2.12). The object of the Infinitive is koinoonia. The Greeks formed a fellowship, a company, an association. They did this by giving money. They united their donations, made a collection and did not individually forward their gifts to the ultimate beneficiaries. Their joint action of giving made the koinoonia. Here the partnership was established by giving. All the givers - not the givers and recipients - were united. The common characteristic of this fellowship was the act of giving. The noun, though, does not mean "fellowship by giv-

ing" and certainly not "giving", but simply "fellowship". The translation "contribution" is justified only as one stresses the prepositional prefix, a nuance which today is quite often ignored. Luther's "gemeine Steuer", Thayer's "benefaction jointly contributed"³ and Souter's "contributing help"⁴ with the emphasis on the adjectival force of the participle come closer to the thought of united action.

I Cor. 1:9. G. G. Findlay says "Nowhere else has (koinoonia) an objective genitive of the person".⁵ Tou huouiu is a possessive genitive. The fellowship belongs to Jesus, the founder thereof. It is therefore pre-existent in relation to the believers. The fact that believers were called into this fellowship shows that it was there before them. They entered it as beneficiaries, not as contributors, since the sinner is brought into union with Jesus by His grace through faith and not by any effort of his own. If there is any connotation here in koinoonia apart from the general idea of union, it will have to be on the side of receiving. Believers

³Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Corrected edition; Chicago: Harper and Brothers, American Book Company, 1889), s.v. koinoonia.

⁴Alexander Souter, A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament (London and New York: Oxford University Press, n.d.), s.v. koinoonia.

⁵G. G. Findlay, "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians," The Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.), II, s.v. I Cor. 1:9.

have fellowship with Jesus because of what they receive from Him, not because of anything which they give to Him.

I Cor. 10:16. The abstract noun is used twice in this verse. The wine of the Lord's Supper is called "the communion of the blood of Christ", the bread is called "the communion of the body of Christ". The earthly elements are joined with the crucified Savior: the wine to His blood, the bread to His body. In creating this union which pair contributed and which pair received? The subjects of estin are to poteerion and to arton. What did they do to become joined to the Lord's blood and body? In themselves they have no power to remit sins, yet when joined with the blood and body they are a means of grace. On the other hand, the body and blood of Jesus are the price and seal of forgiveness. As they were given and shed on the cross they paid the ransom to redeem sinners. The power resides in them. Whatever union there is between these and the earthly elements is brought about by the former. They have reached out and imparted power to bread and wine. Bread and wine, the subjects of which koinoonia is the predicates, are in union with the body and blood as receiving factors. The primary meaning of koinoonia here is that of union. If there is any tendency toward either side, it must be toward the receptive side. (Note: It should be mentioned that koinoonia is here quite commonly translated "communication", "imparting". A.)

II Cor. 6:14. If any passage can establish the meaning

of koinoonia, this one should be able to do so; it has one contrasting and five parallel phrases. The Imperative forbids a mismatching (Revised Standard Version) of Christians with unbelievers. A union of these two parties is a misnomer; it is a joining of people whose natures are different (heteros in the Participle). The five rhetorical, parallel questions show how unequal such a yoking together is. The five nouns in the Nominative are synonyms: sharing, koinoonia, harmony, part and agreement. The other four tell us what koinoonia means. It is a unity, a harmony, a oneness. To ask which qualities (light, darkness, justice, lawlessness, etc.) receive and which give is to meet with silence. The passage speaks of nothing more than the total lack of any union or harmony between opposing camps. There is nothing which either party can give to or receive from the other. They simply have nothing in common so that koinoonia between them is negated. Here koinoonia is closest to the original word koinos, common, joint.

II. Cor. 8:4. Again the word is used in connection with the collection of money among the Macedonian Christians for the relief of the equally poor or poorer fellow Christians in Judea. The Apostle commends the spirit of the donors. They themselves were "in a great trial of affliction" and "deep poverty", v. 2. Nevertheless they insisted on joining in the drive for relief funds. These poor Macedonians might have been excused from taking part, but they begged of Paul the

permission to do what they could. Lenski takes the Accusatives teen charin and teen koinoonia as objects of deomenoi.

He says,

The Greek is like the English: "begging of us... this grace and this fellowship of the ministry for the saints"... "And" is explicative; it adds what they considered a grace of God to themselves, namely, "this fellowship" in giving, being in one communion with all the many other churches who were being vouchsafed the same grace.⁶

According to this view the variant dexasthai humas, which has little textual warrant, is not needed to make clear the meaning of the sentence. While indeed the Macedonians may have pressed upon Paul the money they had donated, the text states that they asked him to give them something. They wanted a part in that gift of God, i.e. the gift of generous, voluntary giving and a part in the community of action and motive which united the other churches. This charis and koinoonia were already existent; the Macedonians wished to be included in them, to have them extended in their direction also. Koinoonia definitely does not refer to the collection itself but to the oneness of action and motive which united the other donating congregations. Its meaning here must be that which designates a oneness, a unity.

II Cor. 9:13. The wider subject is still the relief collection. Paul is now appealing to the Corinthians by pro-

⁶R.C.H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians (Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1946), p. 1129.

voking a brotherly rivalry between them and the Macedonians and Achaians. In this verse Paul extols the Corinthian brethren for glorifying God through the generous help they gave to the Judean believers. Specifically the verse states that the latter glorify God because of, or on the occasion of (epi with Datives) the Corinthian subjection to the Gospel and their haploteeti tees koinoonias. What is this? The Authorized Version translates "liberal distribution", giving to haplotees a definition which Thayer doubts.⁷ The Revised Standard Version likewise renders the phrase "generosity of your contribution". Luther is correct with "einfaeltigen" for haplotees but not with "Steuer" for koinoonia. Lenski summarily and correctly says, "Haplotees ... does not mean 'liberality' or 'liberal' ... but 'single-mindedness'. And koinoonia means 'fellowship' or 'communion' ... and not 'contribution'."⁸ The phrase "for all" rules out the translation of "contribution" since the collection was made only for the brethren in Judea. The simplicity of their fellowship, or their sincere, single-minded community of feeling, however, did extend "for all". While the Macedonian and other Achaians may have praised the Corinthian disciples at some time for raising relief funds this text says one of the grounds for such praise was "the sincere fellowship". If Paul had meant

⁷Thayer, op. cit., s.v. haplotees.

⁸Lenski, op. cit., p. 1185.

to speak of the collection itself, he had already used the words diakonia and eulogia; why should he now suddenly employ koinoonia, a word which was unknown among the Greeks in the sense of "collection" or "distribution"? (The R.S.V. rendering, however, deserves careful study. A.)

In verse 12 the Apostle passed onward from the matter of the collection when he said "not only ... but also". The collection had accomplished certain things, viz, supplying the needs of the saints. In addition there were other aspects to this matter. One further result was to show the other Christians that the Corinthian brethren had submitted to the Gospel. A third was the demonstration of the oneness of mind - a sincere oneness - which characterizes true Christians. Koinoonia is used here in its primary sense of union, agreement, harmony. Whether the Corinthians entered this union as distributors or receivers is simply irrelevant.

II Cor. 13:14. This familiar blessing which concludes the vesper service and is heard frequently as the preacher enters the pulpit bespeaks "the communion of the Holy Ghost" upon Christians. What is this "communion of the Holy Ghost"? By analogy of the first two phrases, "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ" and "the love of God" tou hagiou pneumatos is a Genitive of possession. Koinoonia is a quality, like "love" and "grace", which belongs to the Holy Ghost. It is the spirit of oneness generated by the Holy Spirit. As the Holy Ghost calls, enlightens and sanctifies individual sinners He unites

them with God and with one another. This union is the communion of saints. This part of the benediction is an invocation or prayer aiming at the true spiritual unity of the readers. Koinoonia goes no farther than its first meaning, denoting in this place only the general relationship of God and believers to one another in a community of interests.

Gal. 2:9. This verse occurs in a section of Pauline biography. It tells of Paul's acceptance by the other apostles in Jerusalem, particularly James, Peter and John, the apparent pillars of the Church. In recognition of Paul's apostleship and orthodoxy these former apostles extended to Paul "the right hand of fellowship." The gesture was one of harmony. As the men were joined by a hand-clasp so they were united as brothers and fellows in joint principles and endeavors - the acceptance and propagation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Holding the same views they were partners with and of one another. They agreed in doctrine and practice. They spoke the same thing. There was, in short, a bond, a unity holding them together. The proper word for this relationship is koinoonia. The situation contains not the faintest inkling of any imparting or receptive partnership; only the fact of being united is expressed.

Phil. 1:3-5. Considering the beautiful, harmonious relations that existed between the Apostle Paul and the Philippians one might expect the word koinoonia, koinoneo and cognates to dominate this letter as agapee and elpis dominate,

respectively, the epistles of John and of Peter. As a matter of fact the verb occurs twice, the abstract noun three times and the personal noun, sugkoinoonos, once. Lenski would extend the fellowship spoken of here to go beyond Paul and his Philippian converts and make it universal.⁹ H.A.A. Kennedy's limitation of the fellowship to Paul and Philippians is supported by the context. Kennedy writes

On what does epi depend? Surely it follows charas ... rather than eucharistoo... It is, at least, awkward to take epi twice with the same verb. M. Charas has an emphatic position. Now he gives the reason for his joy - tee koinoonia. At first glance K. seems to refer to their mutual fellowship and harmony as Christians. A closer examination reveals that this whole passage is concerned with Paul's personal relation to them. And so K. anticipates sugkoinoonous (ver. 7) and will mean their common participation with Paul in spreading the Gospel. This really includes the idea of united action on the one hand, and the concrete expression of their helpfulness, their gift to the Apostle, on the other. ... This concrete notion in K. (almost equivalent to "contribution") is supported by the use of eis, which is employed technically in contexts like this, to denote the destination of money-payments, collections, etc.¹⁰

Koinoonia therefore denotes the community of interests and joint efforts of Paul and the Philippians for (eis) the Gospel. Paul was joyous over the kindred feeling which the

⁹R.C.H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, to the Ephesians and to the Philippians (Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1946), p. 708.

¹⁰H.A.A. Kennedy, "The Epistle to the Philippians," The Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.), III

Philippians had in regard to the Gospel. From the first preaching thereof in their city they had believed it and united in spreading it. Three times they had supported Paul's work with material gifts (4:10.15.16). There was certainly a oneness of aim and purpose uniting the Apostle and these beloved people. Koinoonia properly expresses this relation. As to the question of whether this fellowship implies giving or receiving, the circumstances require us to include both. It was a reciprocal partnership; Paul had dispensed the Gospel to the Philippians and they had contributed to the further preaching of that good news.

Phil. 2:1. Over against the words of the text, obviously the protasis of a condition with pleeroosate of verse 2 beginning the apodosis, Lenski follows Von Hofmann and Ewald when he says, "Verses 1 and 2 are separate sentences; v. 2 is not the apodosis."¹¹ Lenski observes that "Greek is not English" and sees a series of ellipticism in verse 1. He takes his position on the strength of overwhelming manuscript evidence for tis splanchna, an apparent solecism according to our versions. (On the analogy of the three preceding indefinite pronouns the fourth should be tina.) Lenski refuses to grant a solecism and renders: "If there is any ... let it in Christ ... of love ... of spirit."¹² In order to erase

¹¹Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, to the Ephesians and to the Philippians, p. 761.

¹²Obid.

the solecism Lenski has to supply words and generally garble the entire passage.

Taking the third phrase as part of a protasis we read ei tis koinoonia pneumatos, "if there is any fellowship of spirit". The Apostle is extolling his beloved Philippians. They are blessed with many virtues. One of these is spiritual fellowship, in French "affection cordiale". The term describes the lovely, cordial harmony produced by the Holy Spirit or demonstrated in spiritual matters. This fellowship is certainly a mutual and reciprocal attitude. Whatever giving or receiving is involved is two sided; each contributes to and enjoys from the contribution of the other.

Phil. 3:10. What, for the Christian, is gain and what is loss? With Paul all the prestige and accomplishments of a strict, Pharisaic Jew were but as dung, a total loss. The one profit of his life was finding and knowing Christ, the Savior of sinners, verses 5-9. Paul's aim was to know Christ not intellectually and historically, but in a personal, saving way, cum affectu et effectu. In this verse kai is epexegetical and means: "according to his power as the resurrected Savior and our fellowship with his sufferings." Paul wants to experience the fruits of Christ's resurrection and have a partnership in His sufferings (all of them, not only those of the last Thursday and Friday). Koinoonia patheematon is explained by summorphizomenos too thanatoo autou. The Apostle wishes his sanctification resulting from justification to be

complete; he intends that his own life and death shall parallel those of the Savior as closely as possible. This is his "fellowship". The noun expresses the harmony of aims and ambitions that the devout Christian hopes to achieve between himself and the Savior. There is nothing in the text or context to indicate whether the harmony shall be established actively or passively. Probably both phases will play a part. *Koinoonia* here has its first meaning, that of a community of interests.

Philem. 6. Luther's translation of this passage would make koinoonia equivalent to the adjective koinee, "dein Glauben, den wir mit einander haben". This is in accord with a common rendering as, e.g. "holy hill" for "hill of holiness" and "His rich grace" for "the riches of His grace". If this translation be accepted, then koinoonia is used in its primary sense of partnership, joint possession. In this letter Paul is going to ask a great favor of Philemon, viz. the pardon and restoration of the runaway slave, Onesimus. In his prayerful remembrances of Philemon Paul thanks God for Philemon's love and faith. He also prays for something, namely that hee koinoonia tees pisteoows ... energees genetai. The question arises: what does Paul pray to be active, the faith which Philemon holds in common with others, or the oneness of that faith? Does Paul stress the desire that Philemon prove his faith is the same as that of other Christians? Or does he emphasize the desire that Philemon's faith (which others also

hold) be active? In short, is it the faith or the unity that comes to the fore? The initial position of hee koinoonia puts the emphasis on the Nominative.

One might continue to ask questions. Lacking definite textual or contextual support for any argument, Luther's way of handling the phrase may be accepted. Koinoonia in itself designates only the community of Christian belief. This unity has resulted from an acceptance of God's grace and results in contributing action, i.e. it embodies both giving and receiving.

Heb. 13:16. Christians are here enjoined to offer sacrifices of praise to God. One form of such offerings is "the fruit of the lips, confessing His name". Another form is that of not forgetting or overlooking eupolias kai koinoonias. On this passage Lenski, who consistently refuses to accept the meaning of "collection, contribution, communication" categorically says, "The word does not have this meaning. It means 'fellowship'."¹³ The versions with almost the same consistency insist upon making koinoonia denote an impartation of material goods. The two English versions referred to before and Luther translate the noun with a verb: "to communicate", "to share" and "mitzuteilen". The free, Vulgate-based French is very free, indeed. It translates: "de faire part de vos

¹³R.C.H. Lenski, The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Epistle of James (Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1946), p. 488.

biens aux autres." If these are correct translations, then the Holy Ghost or the inspired writer is guilty of redundancy since eupoiias already includes a charitable distribution of material goods to the needy. Disclaiming redundancy one must look for an advance in the thought. The word koinoonia was inspired. It was added in order to say something that was not said by eupoiias. Lenski has good reason for holding out for the native meaning of koinoonia. God would have us do good, including the practice of charity in its narrow sense. In addition He would have us united, not only in our eupoiias but in all matters. Koinoonia is the union of believers, the harmony and agreement that pervades their spiritual life, thinking and actions. (Note: Eupoia may be the general term, koinoonia may refer to a subdivision. A.)

I John 1:3. John was an eye and ear witness of what Jesus did and spoke. These things he reported "to you, that ye also might have fellowship with us". This fellowship, John hastens to clarify, is a fellowship with God. The doctrine of the means of grace is contained in this verse. By means of the Bible, God's power unto salvation, Rom. 1:16, sinners are introduced into fellowship with God - and with one another. The word itself expresses the union of believers with God and with one another. When we ask how this union is produced, whether by giving or by receiving on the part of the subjects, the very nature of the union supplies the answer. We sinners offer nothing to this alliance, this rapport with God. Scripture amply

testifies to our inability (I Cor. 2:14, Eph. 2:1.3, Rom. 8:7), and to the fact that salvation is of God (Eph. 2:8.9, I Cor. 12:3, II Thess. 2:14, II Tim. 1:9, Tit. 3:5). Man can be only the beneficiary, the recipient; God is the benefactor, the giver of all good. While the expression of the community of saints will have its manifestation in sanctified giving and expending, its establishment, from man's viewpoint - he is the subject here - is effected by faithful acceptance.

I John 1:6.7. The koinoonia mentioned in each of these verses is the same as that of verse 3, a fellowship characterized by receptive faith.

A summary of the foregoing passages reveals the following count: for the first meaning (joint relationship, community of interests, etc.) nine times; for the second meaning (the relationship established or entered into by a receptive act of the subject) four times; for the third meaning (the relationship established by an act of impartation by the subject) once; for the fourth meaning (a reciprocal giving and taking relationship) twice. For practical purposes the fourth meaning may be combined with the first, so that the score reads: first meaning - thirteen; second - four; third - one. Even in the lone instance (Rom. 15:25) where the koinoonia is created or characterized by giving, the word itself definitely does not have the meaning of "to give". The primary meaning is maintained in almost every case. If there is any tendency to one-sidedness, it is slightly toward the side of receiving.

CHAPTER VII

EXEGESIS OF PASSAGES CONTAINING THE PERSONAL NOUNS AND THE ADJECTIVE

Derived from the verbs koinooneoo and sugkoinooneoo are the corresponding nouns for the persons, koinoonos and sugkoinoonos. In the aggregate these are used twelve times in the New Testament. What does their use show in respect to the question of whether the idea of koinooneoo implies a giving or a receiving action? In this chapter we attempt to find the answer by an exegetical study of the passages concerned.

Matt. 23:30. The circumstances surrounding the use of koinoonos here are those of the prolonged dispute between Jesus and the leading Jews. After their many tricky questions designed to trip Him up and His silencing answers, the Savior turned to the opponents with searching questions and vehement denunciation. He especially excoriated their hypocrisy. In their protests of piety these men disclaimed any kinship of feeling or motive with their ancestors who had killed the prophets of God. "If we had been in the days of our father," they protested, "we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets." By this the enemies of Jesus meant that they would not have endorsed, aided or abetted the wicked opposition of Old Testament Israel to God's emissaries. The word "partakers" here is the translation of koinoonous. The contemporaries of Jesus claimed they would not have been

partners with their murderous forefathers.

The question comes, How might they have become partners, by contributing to or partaking of (receiving) the attitude of the fathers? On the one hand one may argue that the forefathers were there first; if the descendants were to become partners, it could only be as later agents who accepted the viewpoint and practice of those already on the scene. From this view koinoonos would be a partner who became such by receiving what existed prior to and outside of himself. On the other hand one may contend that the later Jews could become partners only by contributing to the hatred and opposition already possessed by the fathers. In this way they would become partners by giving. Their added, contributed opposition would make them partners. Such reasoning, however, is pure speculation and tendential; there is no textual evidence to support either view. About all one can attribute to koinoonos here is the idea of agreement, joint possession of an opinion or attitude. Not even the Dative of reference, en too haimati, throws any light on the subject. The opponents disclaimed partnership with their ancestors in respect to the blood of the prophets, either as those who might receive that blood as evidence of guilt or as those whose actions would cause more blood to flow.

Luke 5:10. The same specious arguments advanced above could be used here. James and John are called "partners" of Simon (and presumably his brother, Andrew). In verse 7 the synonym metochoi is likewise translated "Partners". How did

How did the Boanerges enter into partnership (form a company) with Simon and Andrew? If one asserts that they received a share in the business already established together with use of equipment and access to the outlet of an established market, then another may with as much right assert that James and John also put something into the business, i.e. their labor at least, if not additional capital in the form of equipment, potential customers and previous experience or "know-how". Koinoonous here can designate only a partnership or rather, the parties of a joint business.

Rom. 11:17. The metaphor employed in this passage compares a Gentile convert to Christianity with a wild olive branch grafted into a cultivated tree. Just as a grafted branch draws life and nourishment from the roots of the engrafted tree, so the Gentiles received blessings when they were joined to the Judaeo-Christian Church. In this instance the Gentiles, who became the sugkoinoonous, the grafted branches, became partners not by adding anything to the tree but by receiving something from it. Sugkoinoonous here definitely implies a receptive partnership.

I Cor. 9:23, 10:18.20. If the Bible anywhere teaches that the hearers of God's word should support their teachers with material goods - "communicating to them" -, it is in this section of First Corinthians (8:1 to 11:1). In his reply to the question, "Is it permissible for Christians to eat meat sacrifices to an idol?" the Apostle takes great care to ex-

plain the principle, viz. that a Christian should be ready to forego the enjoyment of his liberty and his rights. The Apostle takes himself as an example. He certainly had the right to marry and to draw material support from his hearers, (9:1-14) but in Christian, brotherly consideration of the ignorant, he refrains from enjoying this right (9:15-23). In support of this right Paul cites the example of the Old Testament priests (9:13). Although the translators render this last verb in the same way that they translate koinooneoo and its cognates, the Greek is summerizantai. The meaning is akin to that in verses 7-11. Those who contribute toward a result have a right to enjoy the fruits of their contribution. As the shepherd, the hired hand on farm or in vineyard, the soldier, the threshing ox each has a part in the fruits of their efforts, so the priests were entitled to receive and eat part of the sacrifices which they handled in the temple service. Their "sharing" with the altar was that of men who received.

This example would clearly make of koinoonos a receiving partner, if this were the word used in 9:13, but koinoonos is not the word employed, or if summerizoo were accepted as a synonym of koinooneoo, but to make synonyms of the two words at this point is a begging of the question. There is a temptation to say, "This word is a synonym to the first. Therefore the first word has this meaning." That is reversing the process. One can pair up synonyms only after one has settled upon the meaning of each word independently of the other. A

similar situation exists in regard to metechomen in 10:17.¹

The words that we must deal with do not yield to such fortunate ease of treatment. In 10:18 the talk is of the Israelites who eat of the sacrifices made on the temple altar. In 10:20 it is of Christians who eat of the sacrifices made to devils, i.e. heathen idols. In each case these eaters are koinoonoi. There is a difference between them and the priests whose sharing was clearly a matter of receiving material reward for their work (10:13). It is possible to consider the laity as receiving partners with the altar of God or that of devils. As they ate of the sacrifices they received a part of what was offered to God or to devils. It seems, though, according to the narrower context concerning idolatry (10:14-21), that Paul is speaking here not of the benefits of any communion but of the confessional character of the Lord's Supper, of the temple sacrifices and of heathen rituals. To eat of any one is to associate oneself with all that the ceremony stands for. The Israelite who ate of the temple offerings - other than the priests who ate to live - identified himself as a worshipper of Jehovah, the Christian communicant as a follower of Jesus and the heathen devotee as a worshipper of idols. Koinoonos in these two passages must have the primary meaning of one who shares an opinion, holds a joint belief with others, with no suggestion of contributing to or receiv-

¹For this reason a study of synonyms or antonyms is not included in this thesis.

ing from the others. The abstract partnership is the topic.

I Cor. 9:23 presents some difficulty. Paul declined to accept monetary remuneration for preaching the Gospel. The reason for this lay in the compelling nature of the Gospel itself; there was, at least subjectively for Paul, something in it which forced the Apostle to proclaim it for its own sake and regardless of material rewards. He preached the Gospel that he might be a fellow-partner in it. The greek does not have "you", although this pronoun may be implied in the prepositional prefix sun-. Paul's aim in preaching the Gospel without cost to the hearers was to be included personally in the Gospel. To be a partaker of the Gospel is to receive and enjoy the blessings it offers: forgiveness of sins, salvation, etc. The only question about the meaning of sugkoinoonos is whether it refers only and in general to the partnership relation or whether it expresses Paul's hope of receiving the Gospel blessings. Granting that it emphasized the relationship with other believers, it is still a receiving partnership. Paul hopes to enter it as others enter it, by receiving what the Gospel offers.

II Cor. 1:7. The adjectival noun is employed only once but its repetition is implied: "as you are partakers of our sufferings, so shall ye also be (partakers) of the consolation." In the first instance koinoonoi are partners who have taken on themselves what they did not previously have. The Corinthians shared in Paul's sufferings by sympathetically

taking them as their own. In the second instance where koinoonoi is to be supplied the partnership is again one in which the partners receive something, namely, the comfort that Paul also has, or will have. Inasmuch as this comfort comes from God it cannot be a contributing comfort that the Corinthians provide for the Apostle. While the receptive side of partnership seems to be stressed, the primary idea of sympathetic union is not ruled out.

II Cor. 8:23. Paul calls Titus "my partner, koinoonos emos. The text and context say nothing as to how Titus became Paul's partner. Was Paul in the work first? Did Titus join him as a contributor or recipient? The questions are beside the point. The word means nothing more than that the two men worked together, each contributing and each accepting whatever the labor required or provided.

Philem. 17. The word is used here as simply as in the preceding passage. The condition of reality makes Paul and Philemon partners. They hold certain matters in common. There is no tendency toward one-sidedness.

Heb. 10:13. The author of Hebrews encourages his readers to patient continuance in faith under the stress of persecutions by wicked men. They had endured a great contest of suffering. These sufferings were in two parts: 1. They were made a spectacle by reproaches and afflictions; 2. They were partners with others who were so treated. It made no difference whether the Christians of the diaspora were direct-

ly the victims of persecution or only allied as sympathizers with the direct victims; in either case they endured the great trial of faith. The relationship of united feelings, aims, hopes, fears, is all that can be found in the word koinoonoi.

I Pet. 5:1. The fact that the glory which Peter hopes to share is still to be revealed obviates any thought that it is a possession which the Apostle will share to others as a distributor. This glory is the future glory of heaven, the blissful, holy splendor of being face to face with God. Peter will not be a partner in it as the previous proprietor who divides what he has with others, but as one who himself presently lacks it. He will be a partner only as he receives a share. Here koinoonos leans toward the side of receiving.

II Pet. 1:4. Fully in keeping with his epistolary theme of hope Peter looks to the glories and joys of heaven which shall be the inheritance of those who survive the lust and corruption of this world. One of these joys is partnership in the divine nature. The Concordia New Testament with Notes explains this as being "made like God in His moral nature". Obviously the divine nature is not now the possession of any human, since all men are sinners. If we are to be partners of this nature, we will be only as God bestows that nature on us. The koinoonos here becomes such as a recipient.

In summary of the foregoing exegesis we note that in seven of the twelve passages koinoonos has no other connotation than

that of a person who jointly shares something with another. This corresponds to what we have designated as the first meaning of the verbs and the abstract nouns. In two instances (I Cor. 9:23 and II Cor. 1:7) there is a slight leaning to the receptive side. The three remaining cases at least allow, if they do not require, what corresponds to the second designated meaning of koinooneo and koinoonia, that is, the idea of a partnership in which the receiving action is in the fore.

The adjective koinoonikos is used only once in the New Testament. It occurs in the instructions to Timothy (I Tim. 6:18) to admonish the rich "that they do good, that they be rich in good works, eumetadotous einai, koinoonikous". The Greek phrases are rendered by the Authorized Version "ready to distribute, willing to communicate"; but the Revised Standard Version "liberal and generous"; but Luther "gerne geben, behilfflich seyn", and by the French "de donner l'aumone de bon coeur ; de faire part de leurs biens". All of these understand the adjective as denoting a spirit of generosity, a spirit which is manifested in liberal sharing of one's goods with or to the less affluent. As was noted in Chapter III the lexicographers employ the word "liberal", Thayer giving this meaning first place.

Many commentators construe the two phrases as synonymous, but to do so is to imply redundancy on the part of the inspired penman. (Note: The heaping up of synonyms for the sake of effectiveness in speaking is good usage. A.) Everything

that can be said about generous, liberal giving is contained in eumetadotous. The dividing with others is expressed in the prepositional prefix meta. The concept of generosity or liberality is held in the adverbial prefix eu. Nothing more need be said about how the rich should help the poor. The phrase eumetadotous einai is itself a detailed elaboration of the two preceding phrases. Whatever follows must be an advance in thought. The "sharing well" of the rich should not be a cold, aloof action that accentuates the difference between the donor and the beneficiary. The rich members of the congregation should not only give generously; in addition they should be of a sociable nature. They should be aware of the many communities of interest they have with the poor members. They should not, because of their wealth or other reason, refrain from associating with the poor. They should not let their money go to church for them nor exempt them from personal association and cooperation with the other members. This is what koinoonikos means, a mind and spirit that are alert to common interest binding all Christians. This social or community spirit will show itself in donations of money, in a readiness to give, but also a willingness to receive from others, to join them in common efforts. There are many intangible and even some tangible benefits that a rich Christian can receive from the poor brethren. A rich Christian is koinoonikos when he is as ready to receive these benefits as he is to give of his wealth.

The one use of koinoonikos does not justify letting it influence the meaning of the more frequently employed cognates. Rather, it should be accorded a passive place. As to its meaning in this one instance, aside from disputable exegesis, the accumulation of evidence in regard to the cognate words must certainly be admitted as a deciding factor. According to this evidence the verbs and nouns are used most frequently in our first meaning. As far as there is any tendency toward one-sidedness, the advantage is on the side of receiving. The verbs overwhelmingly lean toward this side. Negatively, there is little - and that doubtful - evidence for the implication of giving in any of the forms.

The translations "contribution", "collection", "communicate" and other expressions of giving have arisen perhaps by the confusion of the general sense of various passages in their context with the literal meaning of the koino- words. Evidence for this hypothetical explanation is found in the fact that these translations occur in the references to the collection of funds among the European Christians for the relief of the southern or Levantine brethren (Rom. 15:26, II Cor. 8:4, 9:13, Heb. 13:16), or in connection with the giving of material things to the Apostle Paul or other needy clergy or laity (Phil. 4:14.15, I Tim. 6:18) and our questioned passage Gal. 6:6. Giving is certainly involved in all these cases but the idea of giving is found in the context; it is not contained in the koino- words themselves. The point of

contact and of confusion is this, that the donors are united in their giving to one another or to their beneficiaries. That is to say, koinooneoo, koinoonia, etc. express the unity of the givers, not the gift itself. Our English "contribute" would be acceptable if it were clearly understood that the prepositional prefix represents the oneness of the many individual donors. Properly understood one person or one church cannot contribute. A contribution is possible only when two or more offer "tribute" in unison or for the same purpose. The union is expressed in the "con", not in the "tribute".

CHAPTER VIII

EXEGESIS OF GALATIANS 6:6

On a numerical basis it would be an easy thing to say, "koinooneoo has reference to receiving in seven out of ten instances and in the other three instances the reference to giving is very doubtful" and then interpret the eleventh passage accordingly. It is true, this numerical preponderance in favor of the receptive side of koinooneoo is a weighty factor in interpreting the eleventh passage. Nevertheless, there is a theoretical possibility that in the eleventh passage the prevailing usage does not apply. A closer study of the text and context will be necessary to determine whether the rule or the exception holds good.

Further, our study of the nouns and adjective cognates of koinooneoo indicates that the intrinsic, root meaning of the words stresses the fact of partnership rather than the manner in which the partnership is brought about. This truth, then, requires us to admit the possibility that the verb also in this instance may express no more than the fact of partnership. The most one can say at this point is that the idea of giving, so frequently subject to modifications and doubts in other passages, quite likely does not fit in the disputed passage. In any case, even if the meaning of koinooneoo is limited to our first and second definitions, the close examination of text and context is still necessary.

Dividing the context into clear-cut sections is not easy. The Epistle is coming to its close. The writer has covered the main points which he wanted to cover. There remain only some minor thoughts to be added - greetings to mutual friends, a special word of comfort or admonition to a particular person, some previous matter to round off, a bit of biographical information, a belated thought that has a bearing on the chief message and other items. The last chapter of many of Paul's letters show this diversity of thoughts. Not every statement is bound or related to the preceding or following. Each is a separate idea, only very loosely joined with the others. To take the whole chapter and divide it into a clear outline of related thoughts is, under these conditions, forcing the writer into a mental process that was not his when he wrote. Correctly and practically our Bibles usually head these chapters and pages with some such notation as "Sundry exhortations and notices". Only in a wide, general manner can the closing words be outlined into divisions and subdivisions of main thought, co-ordinate and subordinate thought. We believe that this is the case with Galatians 6.

The section including Gal. 6:6 begins with the last verse of the preceding chapter. It ends with v. 10. If there is any single key-word giving the tone for the whole section it is just the word under question, koinooneitoo. In the last part of Chapter V Paul had described hoi pneumatikoi, "the spiritual" persons. In Chapter VI he enjoins spiritual

fellowship. Opposed to spiritual fellowship is selfish vain-glory (5:25). Spiritual fellowship is expressed by loving consideration and sympathy for the brother overtaken in a fault, vv. 1-2. To those who are tempted to depart from fellowship by selfishness and proud boasting there is the warning that the time will come when each will have the opportunity to speak about himself. That will be the final judgment. In the meantime they will do well to examine and judge themselves in preparation for the time when they must answer to God, vv. 3-5. Each person will be individually responsible for himself. But even in this respect he is to be entirely independent, but should avail himself of whatever help is offered by the spiritual community of fellowship in which he has a part, that is, he should join whole-heartedly with his spiritual advisors (teacher, pastor, etc.) in the work they are doing - a work which will enable him to give a good account of himself to God. This fellowship will be chiefly receptive but also - as a normal outcome - donative, v. 6.

Vv. 7-9 are separate from the preceding, there being no connective word. They are an interjected warning reminding the readers of the consequences that follow any given way of life. It urges them to live in a way they will not regret. V. 10 is joined to the foregoing by ara oun but only to v. 9. It rounds off the general idea of this section by urging the spirit of fellowship.

According to the above analysis of the section there is

no suggestion of giving material things. Not even v. 10 forces the reader to think exclusively of alms-giving. Doing "the good thing" to all takes many more forms than doling out money or material goods. Certainly there is no indication in the context that Paul is speaking of material support of the clergy by the laity. Rather the entire atmosphere is that of spiritual fellowship. So Meyer says,

In contrast to the referring of every one to himself (vv. 4,5) there is now, by the koinoneitoo de, which is therefore placed emphatically at the beginning, presented a "fellowship" of special importance to a man's own perfection. "Fellowship," on the other hand, let him who is being instructed in the doctrine have with the instructor in all good (v. 10), that is, let the disciple make common cause (endeavor and action) with his teacher in everything that is good... The disciple is not to leave the sphere of moral good to the teacher alone. ...he is to strive and work in common with his teacher in the same sphere.¹

This spiritual fellowship is seen also by Wuest. He reverts to the underlying trouble in Galatia, a situation precipitated by the false teachers "in which those who followed their teaching broke fellowship with the true teachers of the Word". Wuest continues

Paul is exhorting these to resume their fellowship with their former teachers and share with them in the blessing of grace which their teachers were enjoying. The exhortation is that the disciple should make common cause with the teacher in everything

¹H.A.W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Galatians, translated by G. H. Venables (Fifth edition; New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884), s.v. Gal. 6:6.

that is morally good and which promotes salvation.²

Moffatt also refuses to limit the horizon of Paul's view to a narrow fellowship. He says it is much wider than the idea of material support of the teacher by the pupil. He continues

Continuing the thought of a spiritual fellowship referred to in verse 1 (Paul) insists that the spiritual relationship between the man who is taught the Word and the man who teaches it.... ought to express itself in the most complete partnership ... He who is being taught the Word is not to be merely a passive recipient; he has something to give back to his teacher, e.g. from the fruit of his experience; and by his interest and sympathy and helpfulness he must do all he can to further, and nothing to impede (hence "In all good things") the good work which was going on around him.³

Still another advocate of this wider view is G. G. Findlay. He shows the connection of the context in this way: Chapter V of Galatians shows the conduct of the so-called "spiritual" toward the erring brother, whom they were tempted to despise; Chapter VI shows the conduct of the "spiritual" toward their teachers, whom they tended to neglect. In Chapter V it was the harsh, cold contempt of the "spiritual" with the weak brethren; in Chapter VI it is the rude insubordination to their betters, the jealous independence in regard

²Kenneth S. Wuest, Galatians in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1944), p. 170.

³James Moffatt, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934), s.v. Gal. 6:6.

to their teachers.⁴

Findlay grants that the full fellowship will be reciprocal, but only incidentally as one detail in the larger relationship. His comment follows.

But it is spiritual fellowship that the Apostle chiefly desiderates... Christian teaching is designed to awaken their sympathetic response. And it will take expression in the rendering of whatever kind of help the gifts and the means of the hearer and the needs of the occasion call for. Paul requires every member of the Body of Christ to make her wants and toils his own. We have no right to leave the burdens of the church's work to her leaders, to expect her battles to be fought and won by the officers alone... But when, on the contrary, an active, sympathetic union is maintained between "him that is taught" and "him that teacheth", that other matter of the temporal support of the Christian ministry, to which this text is so often exclusively referred, comes in as a necessary detail...⁵ Everything depends on the fellowship of spirit.

Proceeding on the grounds that the Apostle is here invoking a spirit of fellowship we may look at some individual words in vs. 6. The Imperative koinooneiteo occupies an emphatic position as the first word in the sentence. Whatever it means it is important. The force of its position would be rendered in English "Sharing let him be who is taught...." The connection of the verse with the preceding is made with de, which our versions leave untranslated. Alvah Hovey asserts that the

⁴G. G. Findlay, "The Epistle to the Galatians," The Expositor's Bible (New York: A.C. Armstrong and Son, 1895), s.v. Gal. 6:6.

⁵Ibid.

particle has "a slightly adversative sense" and translates as follows: "While each bears his own burden, still let him....."⁶

That there is a contrast between v. 5 and v. 6 the particle makes plain, but how that contrast is to be understood is not plainly indicated. We have taken the position that the contrast lies between a spirit of proud independence (each bearing his own burden entirely alone and without help) and a spirit of united dependence on others for the help they can offer. Those who refer the passage exclusively to the matter of tangible support of the ministry see a different contrast. They contrast the individual responsibility for oneself (v. 5) with the duty of responsibility for others. While a person must give an account for his own actions, these say, he is not exempt from responsibility for others, such as his teachers. The Critical Commentary is among these with its comment

de... expresses, I said, Each shall bear his own burden, but I do not intend that he should not think of others, especially of the wants of his ministers.⁷

Lenski recognizes the force of *de* but only as a small one. He would agree with Hovey's "slightly adversative", mentioned

⁶Alvah Hovey, "Galatians," An American Commentary on the New Testament, edited by Alvah Hovey (Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, 1887), V, s.v. Gal. 6:6.

⁷Robert Jamieson, A.R. Fausset and David Brown, Critical Commentary (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott and Company, n.d.), VI, s.v. Gal. 6:6.

above. Lenski concedes that

de does turn to a different subject, yet to one that is allied. Verses 4, 5 emphasize, as does the participial clause in v. 1, that each must look well to himself even as each must carry his own load. The allied subject is fellowship, but certainly not merely in money and in earthly goods.⁸

The next four words offer no difficulty. Ho kateechoumenos is "the catechumen", the person being instructed. He is the layman, the pupil, the disciple, the parishioner who listens to the sermon and other public and private exposition or application of God's word. Ton logon is an Accusative of respect. "The Word" is the Gospel, the Word of God. The catechumen is being instructed in respect to the Gospel, i.e. he is instructed in the doctrine of the Bible.

The next two words likewise entail no hardship of interpretation. Too kateechounti is the instructor, either a specially appointed catechist or teacher, or a pastor or missionary - someone exercising the teaching office of the ministry. If this be a part-time, occasional teacher - such as Sunday School, Bible Class or Vacation Bible School teacher - there would be little need for a donative fellowship. Those who cite Gal. 6:6 as evidence of the early rise of full-time, paid instructors in the Church without adducing historical proof are guilty of begging the question. The Dative is governed

⁸R.C.H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, to the Ephesians and to the Philippians (Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1946), p. 302.

by the verb, the usual construction with κοινοῦντες.⁹ It is not the indirect object such as would follow verbs of giving. The Dative denotes only the person with whom one has fellowship regardless of whether he imparts or accepts a share. In some way or other the catechumen should have fellowship with the catechist.

On the meaning of the last three words hangs the meaning of the verb and the entire sentence. The sharing should be ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς "in respect of all good things". In eight out of ten instances¹⁰ the thing shared is expressed by the simple Dative. This is so when the person with whom a thing is shared is not mentioned or is expressed by the Genitive of possession following the noun of the thing shared. But here both the thing shared and the person with whom shared are named. To put them both in the simple Dative might be confusing. That is the only reason, but a sufficient one, by which one accounts for the preposition ἐν.

Not the syntax but the meaning of "all good things" constitutes the exegetical problem. Does the phrase refer to temporal goods such as food, clothing, shelter, transportation books, etc.? Or does it refer to spiritual good things such as the benefits of the Gospel, the gifts of the Holy Spirit and all else that is conveyed in the teaching of God's word?

⁹For remarks on the syntax of κοινοῦντες see Chapter IV, p. 28, f.n. 2.

¹⁰Ibid.

The third possibility is that it includes both. On the answer to these questions hangs the interpretation of the passage.¹¹ If material goods are meant, the koinoneitoo calls for donations from the pupil to the teacher. If spiritual goods are meant, then the verb stresses the receptive side of sharing. If both are meant, the action is reciprocal and mutual and the basic idea of fellowship is all that we can get out of the verb.

The commentators who consider pasin agathois as material goods do not lack Scriptural warrant for this use of to agathon and ta agatha. Thayer says agathos, "The Neuter used substantively denotes: 1. a good thing... in particular a) in the plur., external goods, riches" and cites Luke 1:53, 12:18 and 16:25 as examples of this usage.¹² Accepting this definition Henry Alford calls pasin agathois "the things of this life",¹³ material things with which ministers can be supported. Otto Schmoller¹⁴ does the same when he defines the phrase as denoting not the morally good but temporal pos-

¹¹For the statement of the problem see Chapter I, p. 3.

¹²Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Corrected edition; Chicago: Harper and Brothers, American Book Company, 1889), s.v. agathos.

¹³Henry Alford, The Greek Testament (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1865), III, s.v. Gal. 6:6.

¹⁴Otto Schmoller, "Galatians," Lange-Schaff Commentary, translated by C. C. Starbuck (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1870), s.v. Gal. 6:6.

sessions of every kind. So do Carl Swensson¹⁵ and L. F. Rueckert, the latter paraphrasing pasin agathois with "alles was zum Leben erfordert wird".¹⁶

The substantivized adjective, however, is not limited to this one meaning. Thayer offers another definition: "the benefits of the Messianic kingdom" and further on, "what is upright, honorable and acceptable to God."¹⁷ Examples of this meaning are found in Rom. 2:10, 9:4, 10:15, 12:2.9; Eph. 4:28; I Thess. 5:15; Heb. 9:11, 10:1; III John 11. Hence, there is Scriptural warrant for this meaning also. Ta agatha may designate moral or material good.

The objection to acceptance of pasin agathois as material good is based on the total lack of any reference to material good in the context. In general, those who see a division of material wealth called for here do not support their view; their exegesis is rather arbitrary, didactic and summarily given without corroborating reasons. Argument and supporting evidence, both negative and affirmative, are generally offered by those only who insist that "all good things" must be taken in a wide sense - if not limited to the morally good - and

¹⁵Carl A. Swensson, The Lutheran Commentary, edited by Henry Eyster Jacobs (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1897), VIII, s.v. Gal. 6:6.

¹⁶L. F. Rueckert, Commentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Galater (Leipzig: K.F. Koehler, 1833), s.v. Gal. 6:6.

¹⁷Thayer, op. cit., s.v. agathos.

certainly cannot be limited to material wealth. Meyer¹⁸ claims that any reference to material goods is too general and indefinite to a congregation in which the people had already misunderstood Paul's words and in which false teachers were only too ready to misconstrue his words in a derogatory manner. Meyer accordingly rules out the material goods entirely and insists that moral good alone is the subject. In vv. 1-5 moral faultiness is the point and in v. 10 to agathon is the morally good. Findlay¹⁹ asserts that "all good things" cannot surely be limited to the "carnal things" of I Cor. 9: 11.

Not a spirit of compromise but the words of the text call for a concession to both of the preceding, opposing views. The phrase "in all good things" and the general to agathon of v. 10, unmodified and undefined by anything in text or context, forbid limiting the terms; they must be taken in a wide, general sense as including all kind of good. Further, the basic idea of fellowship in koinooneitoo must be recognized. Inasmuch as this word can refer to the creation of a partnership by giving only with great doubt but is clearly used for a receptive fellowship, the limitation to giving cannot stand. If the Galatians were to give their teachers anything, that action would be only incidental to their receptive fellowship.

¹⁸Meyer, op. cit.

¹⁹Findlay, op. cit.

A few commentators therefore make this concession to material good when they interpret the phrase as including both moral and material good. One of these is Burton, who after stating the problem, answers it in these words, "Since it is apparently an inclusive term ... referring to both spiritual and material good, koinoneitoo is best taken as in Phil. 4: 15 as referring to a mutual, reciprocal sharing, wherein he that was taught received instruction and gave of his property."²⁰

Stressing the "most complete partnership" in which the man who is taught is not to be merely a passive recipient but is to give back to his teacher when he can, Moffatt concedes the matter of paying the preacher is touched on only indirectly and very delicately, if at all. He writes

It is therefore not impossible that in the present passage (Paul) may wish to remind the Galatians indirectly of the duty they have to support these teachers in material ways. But even if this be so, we must still note that the matter must be approached delicately and from a highly spiritual standpoint, and that the lesson which is endorsed is capable of a much wider application.²¹

To sum up at this point let us paraphrase the section beginning at 5:26. Instead of being selfishly vainglorious, the Galatians should consider one another in a spirit of fellow-

²⁰Ernest De Witt Burton, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians," The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), s.v. Gal. 6:6.10.

²¹Moffatt, op. cit.

ship. As to the praise or condemnation that each one deserves, that is a personal, individual matter. Each one is individually responsible for himself as well as for his brother. However, he should not be absolutely independent, for this would vitiate the spiritual fellowship, but should avail himself of any benefits offered by fellowship. These benefits will come mostly through the teachers and preachers of God's word, the men who are leaders in fulfilling the mission of the Church. Each individual should ally himself as closely as possible with this work and its benefits. Much of this association will be as recipients or hearers, but as a consequence there will also be a response to the opportunity to maintain and manifest this fellowship by doing and giving something for the teacher. Financial support of the clergy is merely one detailed method of fellowship. The hearer can give other "good things", such as moral support, encouragement, assistance to his spiritual leaders. The warning about reaping what one sows is interjected and then comes the concluding admonition to spiritual fellowship in holy living with all men but particularly in association with fellow-believers.

This view does no violence to the context. It does not limit the meaning of any word or foist a doubtful sense upon any. In further support of this natural interpretation there are the arguments against the traditional view, the arguments advanced by Lenski and Wuest and which originally revealed

the problem contained in the passage. Bound by succinctness of the Expositor's Greek Testament, Frederic Rendall also, but briefly, makes the following objections:

1. There is no warrant in Greek usage of koinoneo for the sense of "communicate" as a donative action.
2. It is impossible to restrict (agathois) to mere worldly goods, except where the language of the context suggests or warrants such a restriction.²²

Aside from the words of the text the context affords material for rebuttal of the traditional view. Negatively, there is the absence of any reference to or suggestion of financial remuneration to the public ministers. Affirmatively, the context deals with spiritual matters, forgiveness of the fallen brother, moral responsibility of oneself and neighbors, spiritual sowing and reaping and sanctified fellowship. In addition, there is not only no support for the idea of paying the preacher, but the context of the entire letter and the background situation in Galatia are utterly opposed to the introduction of such a thought. The mention of money with the teachers as the beneficiaries would, under the local circumstances, be extremely tactless, foolish and dangerous.

Paul wrote the Epistle as a defense of the doctrine of justification by grace through faith without obedience to the Law and in defense of Christian liberty. False teachers were

²² Frederic Rendall, "The Epistle to the Galatians," The Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d.), IV, 189.

jeopardizing this liberty and nullifying the doctrine of justification. In order to attach these two institutions the opponents would seize any opportunity to criticize and impugn the motives and personal character of the protagonists. Hence Paul took care to defend his own apostleship. It was from God, direct and immediate. He was responsible to God, not to man. Nor was he in the work for material gain. His interest was the spiritual welfare and freedom of the Galatians. Suppose, then, that he had told them to pay their preachers. One can easily imagine the eagerness with which the opponents would pounce on this one word and use it to decry the Apostle and his legitimate successors. It would be grist for their mill, fuel for the fire of opposition. "After all," they would more than suggest to the believers, "you see what Paul's real motives are. He's not interested in the truth. All he wants is money, an easy living for himself and his colleagues." Paul was keenly aware of the insidious force contained in the charge that he was commercializing his ministry, so much so, that he leaned over backward in his attempt to keep clear of the accusation. The situation in Galatia was loaded with enough danger without introducing the ever delicate and sensitive subject of money and salary. To introduce it, especially without an elaborate preparation and explanation of principle as in I Cor. 9, in an abrupt, summary brevity, would brand Paul as lacking even in an elemental diplomacy and prudence.²³

²³Wuest, op. cit., pp. 169-171.

Because koinooneeo seldom, if ever, connotes only a giving partnership, but always expresses a partnership relation and frequently such a relation characterized by receiving; because there is nothing in the text to limit the meaning of koinooneeo or pasin agathois; because the context speaks of spiritual fellowship and because the thought of money is alien to and utterly out of place in the context, we reject any interpretation which makes Gal. 6:6 a command to impart material goods to the ministers. The passage does bespeak a fellowship between hearer and teacher of the Gospel. This partnership may be a reciprocal thing, but the receptive side - from the viewpoint of the subject of the verb - far, far outweighs the contributing side.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

The foregoing study is not a mere abstract, academic search for the truth, but has practical value. In the Lutheran Church the final proof for any discussion of doctrine or practice is the Bible. When a clear Bible verse is adduced, that ends all controversy, for then the judgment is God's. The authoritative "Thus saith the Lord," "It is written" puts an end to human argumentation. Accordingly, any Lutheran catechumen knows that when his pastor or teacher asks him to prove a statement of religious belief or practice, the interrogator wants him to recite or read a Bible passage. Such a passage is a "proof passage." Obviously, a proof passage must say what it is adduced to prove. If it does not say so, or even is unclear, it does not serve the purpose for which it is used. More seriously, knowingly to adduce a Scripture statement which does not apply is a perversion and twisting of Sacred Writ, a sin condemned by God in severe terms (Rev. 22: 18.19). Such practice is condemned also by pedagogical principles. A "proof" which does not prove is no proof.

Gal. 6:6, standing where it does in the Catechism, is confusing at least; at the most it is out of place. The passage may be used to teach the relation of hearer to pastor, but this would require much explanation of evidence which should be conclusive and explanatory in itself. In this use

the passage is related more to that which precedes it (Heb. 13:17) than to that which follows (I Cor. 9:11). The instructor or pastor should then stress the spiritual benefits which accrue to the hearer when he forms and maintains a close fellowship with the teacher. The faithful teacher of God's word has much spiritual wealth which he dispenses. The hearer will honor him by listening attentively and receiving, or learning, all he can for his (the hearer's) own good. This is the way to "communicate" with the teacher. But since the duty of hearing and learning God's word is commanded in Part B on the answer,¹ Gal. 6:6 should be included in that place rather than where it is. Incidentally, but only incidentally, the teacher may add that complete fellowship will include also a conveying of benefits, both material and spiritual, to the teacher, and then refer to Part C. of the answer.

We recommend that Heb. 13:17 be retained under Part C and that I Cor. 9:11 be printed out in full together with v. 14. Of course, the teacher may direct his pupils to the Table of Duties, "What the Hearers Owe to Their Pastors"² but this method has two weaknesses. It leaves the main topic for a reference and it entails turning pages, which may not be desirable practice. A third possibility is to include I Cor. 9:7-14

¹A Short Exposition of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1943), p. 62.

²Ibid., pp. 25f.

in the "Bible Narratives" and then have the pupil read this section in the Bible.

For sermonizing or other method of indoctrination or exhortation the pastor should avoid using Gal. 6:6 when he wants to encourage financial support of the ministry. To employ a weak instrument or one not made for the job is to work under a handicap and risk failure of achieving the desired result. Nor is there any reason for forcing Gal. 6:6 to say something else than what it does say; there are other, better, more direct and clear passages which can and should be used for this purpose. I Cor. 9 is such a passage. Here the Apostle's intent is clear and in his typical fashion he handles the subject thoroughly. He prepares and leads up to the subject with examples from human experience. He bolsters and supports his contention with the underlying principle, cites an Old Testament example and then clinches with a clear command of God.

Proving - rather, attempting to prove - a point with a Bible verse that is not relevant is poor pedagogy, poor sermonizing, poor symbolics and poor polemics. Such attempts succeed only in beclouding the issue, confusing the pupil and making the protagonist appear ridiculous and incompetent. Gal. 6:6 is no exception to the rule that a quotation is to be used properly.

INDEX OF BIBLE PASSAGES

	Page		Page
Mt. 23:30	55	Eph. 2:1-3	54
Lk. 1:53	76	2:8.9	54
5:7.10	18, 56	3:9	37
12:18	76	5:11	32
Acts 2:42	39	Phil. 1:3-5	47
Rom. 1:16	53	2:1	49
8:7	54	3:10	50
11:17	24, 57	4:14.15	32, 37, 65, 79
12:13	29, 31, 37	II Thess. 2:14	54
15:25	54	I Tim. 5:22	15, 34, 39
26.27. 20, 31, 37, 40, 65		6:18	17, 63, 65
I Cor. 1:9	41	II Tim. 1:9	54
2:14	54	Tit. 3:5	54
9:11-	31	Philem. 6	51
9:23ff	57, 63	17	24, 61
10:16	42	Heb. 2:14	28, 35, 37
18	19	42	36
18-20	57	10:13	61
12:3	54	13:16	20, 24, 52, 65
II Cor. 1:7	19, 60, 63	I Pet. 4:13	36, 37
6:14	42	5:1	19, 61
8:4	20, 43, 65	II Pet. 1:4	19, 62
8:23	61	I Jn. 1:3	53
9:13	65	6.7	54
13:14	46	II Jn. 11.	36, 37
Gal. 2:9	24, 47	Rev. 18:4	15, 37
5:26-6:10	68	22:18.19	84
6:6	12, 14, 16, 35, 67		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Dictionaries, Lexicons and Word Studies

- Abbott-Smith, G. A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1929.
- Berry, George Richer. A New Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament. Chicago: Wilcox and Follett Co., 1944.
- Ebeling, Heinrich. Griechisch-deutsches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testamente. n.p., 1913.
- Kittel, Gerhard. Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. III. Stuttgart, Germany: n.p., 1938.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. Revised edition. n.p., 1940.
- Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmann's Publishing Co., 1949.
- Preuschen, Erwin. Griechisch-deutsches Woerterbuch zu dem Schriften des Neuen Testaments. 2nd revised edition by Walter Bauer. Giessen, Germany: Alfred Toepelmann, 1928.
- Robertson, Archibald Thomas. Word Pictures in the New Testament. IV. Nashville, Tenn.: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1931.
- Robinson, E. Lexicon of the New Testament. N.p., 1850.
- Souter, Alexander. A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament. London and New York: Oxford University Press, n.d.
- Stephanus, H. Thesaurus Graecae Linguae. IV. N.p., n.d.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Corrected edition. Chicago: Harper and Brothers, American Book Company, 1889.
- Vine, W. E. Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words. II. London: Oliphants, 1944.
- Vincent, Marvin R. Word Studies in the New Testament. II. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1905.

B. Commentaries

- Alford, Henry. The Greek Testament. III. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1865.
- Barnes, Albert. Notes on the New Testament. VI. London: Blackie and Son, n. d.
- Burton, Ernest De Witt. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians." The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1920.
- Findlay, G. C. "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians," The Expositor's Greek Testament. II. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.
- "The Epistle to the Galatians," The Expositor's Greek Testament. III. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.
- Fuerbringer, Ludvig. "Exegetical Notes on Galatians." Unpublished Notes on Classroom Lectures, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., 1931-32.
- Gaebelein, A.C. The Annotated Bible. II. New York: n.p., 456 Fourth Ave., 1916.
- Hovey, Alvah. American Commentary on the New Testament. V. Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, 1887.
- Hustable, E. and T. Groskery. "Galatians," The Pulpit Commentary. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., n.d.
- Jamieson, Robert, A. R. Fausset and David Brown. Critical Commentary. VI. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., n.d.
- Kennedy, H.A.A. "The Epistle to the Philippians," The Expositor's Greek Testament. III. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.
- Lenski, R.C.H. The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1946.

- Lenski, R.C.H. The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, to the Ephesians and to the Philippians. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1946.
- The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Epistle of James. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1946.
- Luther, Martin. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A New Abridged Translation by Theodor Graebner, third edition. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, ca.1949.
- MacLaren, Alexander. Exposition of the Holy Scriptures. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1938.
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Galatians. Translated from the German fifth edition by G. H. Venables. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884.
- Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar ueber das Neue Testament. VII. 7. Auflage, neugearbeitet von Friedrich Sieffert. Goettingen, Germany: Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag, 1886.
- Moffatt, James. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934.
- Rendall, Frederic. "The Epistle to the Galatians," The Expositor's Greek Testament. IV. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d.
- Rueckert, L. F. Commentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Galater. Leipzig, Germany: K. F. Koehler, 1833.
- Sanday, W. and A. C. Headlam. "Romans," The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, n.d.
- Schmoller, Otto. "Galatians," Lange-Schaff Commentary. Translated from the German by G. C. Starbuck. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1870.
- Swensson, Carl A. The Lutheran Commentary. VIII. Edited by Henry Eyster Jacobs. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1897.

Wuest, Kenneth S. Galatians in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1944.

C. Bible Versions

Authorized Version of 1611.

Die Heilige Schrift. Translation by Martin Luther.

New Testament, Standard Revised Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1946.

Nouveau Testament. Traduit sur la Vulgate par le Maistre de Sacy. Paris: 58, Rue de Clichy, 1903.

Novum Testamentum Graece. Everhard Nestle, 18th edition. Revised by Erwin Nestle. Stuttgart, Germany: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1948.