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ABSTRACT

This thesis argues that the Pauline letter opening has an anticipatory function alongside its relational role. This anticipatory function is a development of the epistolary features found in the ancient Greek letter openings. After the introductory chapter, is provided an analysis of form and function of ancient (III BCE to III CE) Greek letter prescripts. Chapters 3 and 4 provide a formal and functional analysis of the Pauline letter prescripts. The conclusion is that the anticipatory function works in two ways in the Pauline letters. First, Paul encapsulates his theology in the expression ‘grace to you and peace’ and uses it in the beginning of his letters, as did Plato and Epicurus who also coined their own greetings to communicate their philosophies. Second, Paul changes elements in the prescripts of all his undisputed letters to anticipate specific themes developed in the letter body.
CHAPTER ONE

GRACE TO YOU AND PEACE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE PAULINE LETTER OPENINGS

I. Introduction

Although the opening is the most formally fixed section of a letter, it has received the least amount of attention in scholarship on the Pauline epistles. There are numerous studies on the formulas of the Pauline letter body\(^1\), many about the epistolary thanksgivings,\(^2\) and at least one comprehensive study on the once neglected Pauline letter endings.\(^3\) On the prescripts, however, there has been no comprehensive academic work, and scholarship is limited to only a few articles.\(^4\) There are short treatments of the Pauline letter openings and various


commentaries on the individual prescripts, but there is no inclusive study of the function of the Pauline letter openings which brings together the otherwise scattered information about them.

The regular use of the term ‘letter opening’ is inclusive, referring to the prescript and thanksgiving sections of the Pauline letters. This thesis, however, uses the term in a narrower sense, leaving the thanksgivings as a distinct epistolary unit. Thus, the typical Pauline letter consists of four sections: letter opening (or prescript), thanksgiving, letter body and letter ending (or postscript).

The prescript, or letter opening, is the initial part of a letter, which, in the case of the ancient Greek letters, is regularly composed of a sender formula (superscriptio), an addressee formula (adscriptio) and a greeting formula (salutatio). Thus, as will be clear in chapters three and four, Paul used the epistolary conventions of his time, but he adapted and expanded them for his own purposes.

The prescript of the Pauline letters has not received much attention, not even by those who work with Pauline epistolary analysis. There are at least three reasons for this situation.

---


7 Epistolary Analysis, also called epistolary criticism, form criticism of letter and letter structure approach, is the study of letter structure and form criticism of letters, and is a discipline that studies the form and function of the constituent parts of letters. This discipline, which saw its precursor in Adolf Deissmann, entered the field of New Testament studies after the discovery of the Egyptian Papyri. The present thesis is written from the perspective of Epistolary Analysis.
First, the assumption by many is that the prescript is of trivial importance, aiming only to start a letter with supposedly meaningless formulaic words. Almost anyone who spends some time reading the Bible can reproduce a generic Pauline prescript: “Paul, apostle of Jesus Christ and Timothy to the church of somewhere, grace to you and peace from God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ”. Thus, the careless Pauline reader thinks that all prescripts are equal and, consequently, without exegetical significance.

A second reason for the fact that the Pauline letter opening has been largely disregarded is the eagerness of scholars to study the more theologically significant sections of the Pauline letters. Jeffrey Weima has pointed out the same in connection with the letter closing: “the lack of attention given to the closing sections may be partially due to a natural tendency to focus on the perceived ‘weightier’ sections of Paul’s letters: the thanksgivings and bodies.” Weima goes on to affirm that the “closing (and opening) sections, however, are not without significance.”

One final reason why the Pauline prescripts do not receive the attention they deserve relates to the very heart of this thesis. Some scholars think that the only function of the letter opening (and closing) is relational. Therefore, it is a natural tendency to seek for what Paul really wanted to say to the addressees in the body, even if the importance of the relationship between the sender and addressee for understanding the letter is accepted. However, as this

---

8 Commenting on this Fred B. Craddock affirms: “Readers inclined to move quickly past this to get to the meat of the matter will miss a world of information plus clues as to the mood and content of the letter.” Philippians (Interpretation; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 3.

9 Weima, Neglected Endings, 21.

10 Idem.

11 See White, The Structural Analysis, 27.
thesis will show, the letter prescript anticipates the main themes of the letter and, therefore, functions as an important hermeneutical clue.

To summarize the above, the letter opening has not received due attention because some scholars downplay its functional relevance for the interpretation of the letter. This thesis intends to demonstrate the hermeneutical relevance of the Pauline letter openings by showing that, even aside from their relational importance, Paul used the prescripts as an introduction to the main themes of his letters.

II. Present Status of the Problem

The problem concerning the function of the Pauline letter prescript is whether it has only a relational function or also a foreshadowing function. Ancient and contemporary epistolary theorists dealing with ancient Greek letters state that the purpose of the letter opening is the maintenance of a relationship between sender and addressee. Some Pauline epistolary scholars hold only to this single purpose when they survey Paul’s letters.

There is, however, an increasing number of scholars who recognize an anticipatory function in the Pauline prescripts. They agree that Paul, even in the opening, predicts the tone and main themes of the letter. There is no agreement, however, as to whether this is a Pauline adaptation with rhetorical, or rather with epistolary roots. Thus, for didactic purposes, I will divide the theorists in three groups: (1) those who recognize only the relational function in the Pauline letter openings; (2) those who explain the anticipatory function as a Pauline adaptation

---

12 See more on that in the next section of this chapter.
that is rhetorically influenced; and (3) those who acknowledge an introductory function in the Pauline letter openings as an epistolary development.

III. Pauline Letter Openings Have Only a Relational Function

Pauline scholars who maintain a strict relational function for the letter opening base themselves on the analysis of the ancient Greek letter prescripts and on ancient works on epistolography. Among these works, two address the letter prescript. Julius Victor was a fourth century rhetorician who wrote an appendix in his manual of Rhetoric (Ars Rhetorica) dedicated to epistles (De Epistolis). It is Victor’s contention that “The openings and conclusions of letters should conform with the degree of friendship (you share with the recipient) or with his rank, and should be written according to customary practice.” The Epistolimaioi Characterers (Epistolary Styles) tends toward the same. This work was written between the fourth and sixth centuries and has been wrongly attributed to Libanius and to Proclus. It is common to refer to the author of this manual as Pseudo Libanius. The opinion of Pseudo Libanius about the opening is as follows:

Nevertheless, it benefits someone who wishes to add an address to the letter type, not to chatter on, indeed, not (even) to use adjectives, lest any flattery and meanness be attached to the letter. It should begin as follows: ‘So-and-so to So-and-so, greeting’. For thus all the ancients who were eminent in wisdom

13 Abraham J. Malherbe collected the ancient works and relevant citations on epistolography in Ancient Epistolary Theorists (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

14 Julius Victor, De Epistolis, 27.10-16
and eloquence appear to have done, and someone who wishes to emulate them must follow their example.  

Therefore, to these ancient epistolary theorists the prescript should be simple, and function only to express the kind of relationship that exists between sender and addressee. Some Pauline scholars likewise maintain only this relational function in connection with the Pauline letter openings. 

John Lee White is a prominent scholar in the field of Greek epistolary analysis. To White the opening and closing of a Greek letter are the embodiment of the more general task of maintaining personal contact. Although he admits that there is probably a correspondence between the way Paul presents himself in Philemon and the content of the letter, White’s basic conception, even years later, is that the letter opening and closing are related to the maintenance or enhancement of the relationship, and that specific information comes to expression only in the body of the letter.  

William Doty is another scholar who explains the variations on the Pauline letter openings in terms of the relationship Paul is establishing with specific churches in order to accomplish different purposes in each letter. 

---

15 Pseudo Libanius, *Epistolimaioi Characterers*, 51.1-10

16 White, *The Structural Analysis*, 27.


Jerome Murphy-O’Connor also sees only the relational function in the prescripts. He presents the Pauline letter openings in parallel, and then explains the differences between them on the basis of the relationship Paul has with each church and on Paul’s need to highlight his own authority (Galatians, 1 Corinthians and Colossians). O’Connor explains the presentation of Paul and Timothy as slaves in the letter to the Philippians as a means to highlight the intrinsic dignity of their mission, due to the fact that those believers had sent offerings to them.

IV. The Anticipatory Function as a Pauline Adaptation of the Rhetorical Exordium

Other scholars acknowledge that the Pauline letter openings have an anticipatory function in addition to the relational function. These scholars can be divided into two categories: those who reach this conclusion using rhetorical analysis and those who affirm that this is a Pauline adaptation of the epistolary opening that is not related to the use of rhetoric. This section will present the first ones in chronological order.

It would be hard to overstate the use of rhetorical analysis in Pauline studies over the last decades. Hans Dieter Betz wrote two works that paved the way for the success of rhetorical analysis in Pauline studies. Because of the clearly epistolary nature of the prescript,

---

20 Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer*, 47.

21 Idem.

22 Weima notes that there are three types of rhetorical criticism that are being applied to the New Testament. The first one applies categories found in the ancient manuals of rhetoric to the biblical text (ancient rhetoric). The second, the ‘new rhetoric’ method, analyses the argumentation of the biblical text based on contemporary rhetoric categories. Finally, the hybrid method tries to combine the first two. Jeffrey A. D. Weima, “The Function of 1 Thessalonians and the use of Rhetorical Criticism: a Response to Otto Merk,” in Karl P. Donfried and Johannes Beutler eds., *The Thessalonian Debate: Methodological Discord or Methodological Synthesis?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000): 124.
both in his article\textsuperscript{23} and even more so in his commentary\textsuperscript{24}, Betz calls Galatians 1:1-5 epistolary prescript, which is followed by \textit{exordium} (1:6-11); \textit{narratio} (1:12-2:14); \textit{propositio} (2:15-21), \textit{probatio} (3:1-4:31), \textit{exhortatio} (5:1-6:10) and epistolary postscript or \textit{conclusio} (6:11-18). Betz asserts that this preface (epistolary prescript) is interrelated to the body of the letter, and points to the introductory function of these first verses of Galatians, affirming that “It is in these points that the theological tendencies and the purpose of the letter can be observed.”\textsuperscript{25} Therefore, according to Betz, Galatians should be understood from a rhetorical point of view, but he maintains that its prescript is eminently epistolary.

After Betz, the majority of Pauline scholars who adopted rhetorical criticism started to advocate the influence or confluence of the concept of \textit{exordium} over/with the letter prescript. According to ancient rhetoric, the \textit{exordium} (or \textit{prooemium}) is the introductory part of a discourse, and has the objective of gaining the disposition of the audience to hear the discourse.\textsuperscript{26} Depending on the kind of discourse, this goal can be accomplished by anticipating the subject.\textsuperscript{27}


\textsuperscript{25} Idem, 37.

\textsuperscript{26} Quintilian affirms that “the reason for a \textit{prooemium} is simply to prepare the hearer to be more favorably inclined towards us for the rest of the proceedings.” (4.1.1.5) Cicero also points to this preparatory function of the exordium, remarking that “An exordium is a passage which brings the mind of the auditor into a proper condition to receive the rest of the speech. This will be accomplished if he becomes well-disposed, attentive, and receptive.” (\textit{De Inventione} 1.20) For a well-informed exposition of the use of the exordium for the interpretation of the Pauline epistles, see Duane F. Watson, “The Contributions and Limitations of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Theory for Constructing the Rhetorical and Historical Situations of a Pauline Epistle,” in Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (eds.), \textit{The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference} (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 139-142.

\textsuperscript{27} Aristotle makes this case affirming that “in [forensic] speeches and epic poems the exordia provide a sample
Shortly thereafter, in 1977, Wilhelm Wuellner wrote an article in which he calls Romans 1:1-15 an *exordium*. Wuellner divides this exordium into two parts, where the first is identical to the letter prescript and the second is commonly referred to as the thanksgiving section.28 Under the influence of Betz, Wuellner points to the foreshadowing function of the letter opening, affirming that the first part of the exordium “provided us with the same clue for Romans as they do in the prescript to the letter to the Galatians”.29

Robert Jewett applied the same notion to the outline of 1 Thessalonians. From an approach that he calls “epistolary rhetoric,” he states that the epistolary prescript (1:1) and the thanking (1:2-5) of 1 Thessalonians are subsections of the *exordium* (1:1-5).30

In 1987, Robert G. Hall challenged the outline and nature of Galatians as proposed by Betz, and suggested that the concept of *prooemium* influenced Paul’s composition of Galatian’s prescript. He writes: “By anticipating two major lines of argument that he will later develop in the letter, Paul has added to his salutation features expected in an exordium.” Yet Hall added the following qualification: “however, the epistolary form still has the upper hand”.31

In the same year that Hall published his article, Robert M. Berchman published an article on Galatians 1:1-5. Berchman’s central thesis is that Galatians 1:1-5 forms the proem of the

---


29 Idem, 132.


letter being “composed under the genres of forensic, deliberative, and epideitic oratory.”\textsuperscript{32} One can affirm that Berchman’s article is the only study of Galatians among those alluded to here which completely ignores the epistolary concept of the prescript, and deals with the letter opening purely rhetorically.

Duane F. Watson shares this same opinion on the influence of the rhetorical exordium over the epistolary prescript in Philippians. He contends that “The epistolary prescript of v. 1-2 also functions much like the \textit{exordium}.”\textsuperscript{33} Watson also shows how this introductory function works in the letter to the Philippians:

> The parties formula helps establish Paul’s ethos and the greeting elicits positive pathos from the audience. Audience attention, receptivity, and goodwill are captured thereby. The important topos of servanthood is introduced here δοῦλος 1:1; 2:7, 27; δουλεύω - 2:22; cf. 1:23-26). The reference to bishops and deacons within the context of Paul designating himself and Timothy as slaves may be an initial attempt to deal with the problem of church leaders falsely claiming to be spiritually mature because they observe Jewish practices.\textsuperscript{34}

In the outline of Philippians presented by L. Gregory Bloomquist the \textit{Preparatio} (1:1-18a) is composed of an Epistolary Prescript (1:1-2), \textit{Exordium} (1:3-11), \textit{Narratio} (1:12-14) and \textit{Partitio} (1:15-18a).\textsuperscript{35} Bloomquist argues that the auto-description of Paul and Timothy as slaves in the letter prescript points to the fact that suffering is the very \textit{stasis} of the letter to the


\textsuperscript{34} Idem, 65.

Margaret M. Michell does not find any rhetorical concept to equate with the letter prescript. Nevertheless, she considers the anticipatory function to affirm that in the prescript Paul “begins to lay the groundwork for his argument.”

Johan S. Vos calls Galatians 1:1-5 an epistolary prescript, and insists that the “special accent on the apostolic authority in the epistolary prescript anticipates the core of the argumentation in the first two chapters.” Like Betz, Vos also acknowledges the anticipatory function of the epistolary prescript of Galatians and considers the rest of the letter a discourse to be understood in terms of rhetoric, but he does not match the letter opening with the exordium. In the same year that saw the publication of Vos’s article, Janeth Fairweather published the third part of her article on Galatians. In contrast to Vos, however, she depended heavily on the classical concept of prooemium in analyzing the letter opening in Paul’s epistle to the Galatians.

Samuel Byrskog is another scholar who appeals to rhetoric to explain the foreshadowing function of the letter opening. He affirms that the letter opening of Romans would have been understood by the first readers through the concept of the exordium. Byrskog also states that just as with an exordium, the letter opening of Romans has a double function: winning the

---


sympathy of the audience, and introducing briefly the most important subjects of the letter.\textsuperscript{40}

Although some of the newer books that analyze the Pauline letters from a rhetorical point of view do not give any further analysis of the letter prescript,\textsuperscript{41} from the brief analysis above it can be concluded that the majority of the scholars who analyze the Pauline letters from a rhetoric-critical perspective affirm the epistolary nature of the letter opening, but also maintain the influence of the concept of the exordium.

\textbf{V. The Anticipatory Function as an Epistolary Pauline Development}

The other position that acknowledges the anticipatory function of the Pauline letter openings does not appeal to rhetorical concepts to explain it. Scholars who promote this position deal with this function as a Pauline development of the epistolary practice.

Stanley K. Stowers states plainly that Paul adapts his salutations “so that they contribute to the particular purposes he hopes to accomplish in writing to a certain church.”\textsuperscript{42} L. Ann Jervis, in her monograph on the purpose of Romans, affirms that “The opening and closing sections of Paul’s letters serve to reaffirm Paul’s relationship with his readers and to direct their attention to the main themes of the letter.”\textsuperscript{43} Jervis also states that it is in the opening and closing


sections that the function of each letter is most evident when compared to other parts of the letter.\footnote{Idem.}


Peter O’Brien states that the Pauline letter openings regularly contain expansions of the basic Greek letter opening, and argues that these developments often point to specific purposes of the letters.\footnote{Peter T. O’Brien, “Letters, Letters Forms,” DPL 550-553.} Similarly, Calvin J. Roetzel illustrates “how Paul molds the salutation to his purposes in the letter as a whole” in Philemon, Romans and Galatians.\footnote{Calvin J. Roetzel, \textit{The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context} (4th ed., Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 55.}

Many commentators have acknowledged this predicting function of the prescript. Fred B. Craddock, commenting on Philippians, affirms that “the signature [the way Paul defines himself in the prescript] reveals a great deal about the mood, purpose and content of a letter, as
well the relationship between writer and reader.” Gordon Fee, in his commentary to 1 Corinthians, affirms that the elaborations made by Paul in his openings reflect many concerns that will be addressed in the letter.\(^{50}\)

Ronald Y. K. Fung contends that one of the ways in which Paul injected new meaning into the greeting was by “occasionally anticipating the contents of the letter in summary fashion by what he says in the salutation.” Richard Longenecker also acknowledges that Paul in the prescript of his letter to the Galatians “highlights” important themes of the letter.\(^ {52}\)

James D. G. Dunn notes that Paul presents himself as a prisoner in the letter to Philemon, in order to introduce a fundamental theme of the letter.\(^ {53}\) And Frank J. Matera comments on the opening of 2 Corinthians by saying that it signals important themes of the body.\(^ {54}\)

\(^{49}\) Fred B. Craddock, Philippians (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1985), 11.

\(^{50}\) Gordon Fee, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 28.

\(^{51}\) Ronald Y K. Fung, The Epistle to the Galatians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 35.

\(^{52}\) Richard N. Longenecker, Galatians (Waco: Word, 1990), 10.

\(^{53}\) James D. G. Dunn, The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1996), 311.

\(^{54}\) Frank Matera, II Corinthians (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 35.
VI. Purpose of the Present Thesis

In short, there are three different approaches concerning the function(s) of the Pauline letter prescript: (1) those who do not see in them an anticipatory function, but only a relational use; (2) those scholars who advocate a foreshadowing function based on the rhetorical influence on Paul; and (3) those who see the predicting function as a Pauline epistolary development. Consequently, since these theories concerning the function of the Pauline letter openings are neither uniform, nor systematized, the purpose of this thesis is (1) to verify whether there is in the Pauline letters an anticipatory function in the letter prescripts, and if so, on what conceptual basis; and (2) to develop a more in-depth evaluation of the seven undisputed Pauline letters in regards to such a function. This thesis intends to show that the seven undisputed Pauline letters do contain an anticipatory function in their opening. It will be argued that the foreshadowing function is not rhetorically influenced, but epistolarily conceived.

In the next chapter, the letter openings of ancient Greek letters are analyzed with attention to the variations in form and especially the functions they have. The main purpose of this analysis will be to show that at least a seminal anticipatory function can be detected in some ancient Greek letters.

55 In this thesis, the terms “anticipatory function,” “foreshadowing role” and “predicting function” are used interchangeably.

56 The undisputed Pauline letters are 1 Thessalonians, Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Romans, Philippians, and Philemon. The preference for the seven undisputed Pauline letters is based on the need to narrow the scope of this thesis and do not reflect the opinion of the author concerning the Pauline authorship of the other letters in the Pauline corpus. For a contemporary study on the discussion about the Pauline authorship see Mark Harding, “Disputed and Undisputed Letters of Paul,” in The Pauline Canon (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Pauline Studies 1; Leiden: Brill, 2004): 129-168.
The third and fourth chapters deal with the Pauline letter prescript. Although a short formal analysis is provided, the main objective of these chapters is to argue for the anticipatory function of the prescript in each of the seven undisputed Pauline letters. These chapters are followed by the conclusion, which offers a brief survey of some of the hermeneutical and theological implications of the Pauline use of the letter prescript.
This chapter analyzes the form and functions of the letter openings of the ancient Greek letters. The letters analyzed here had their origins in the Hellenistic (323 BCE to 30 BCE) and Roman (30 BCE to 299 CE) periods. This chapter is divided into four sections. The first concerns the classification of the ancient Greek letter and clarifies the classification that will be used in the rest of this thesis. The second section of this chapter analyzes the form of the letter opening of the ancient Greek letters. The third analyzes the relational function of the prescript of the ancient Greek letters. The fourth and last part of this chapter shows that the ancient Greek letters present a non-developed anticipatory function, which is manifested differently in the documentary and literary letters.

I. Classification of the Ancient Greek Letter

The ancient Greek letter of the Hellenistic and Roman periods was used for almost as many uses as the skill of writing itself. There are letters to request something, letters to advise, letters to rebuke and letters merely to keep in touch. There are business letters and love letters. There are letters addressed to one person and letters addressed to a whole empire. There are letters from emperors, philosophers and quasi-illiterate people. There are letters written in the most labored literary style and letters numbering three to four lines. There are letter-memorandums and receipts as well as letters which comprise poems and novels. This
impressive vigor of the epistolary genre has caused serious difficulties for classification.

This classification problem was addressed already by some ancient authors. Cicero, writing to his relatives, affirms: “That there are many kinds of letters you are well aware”.¹ Julius Victor claims that there are two kinds of letters, the official and the personal.² Pseudo-Demetrius lists twenty-one different types of letters and provides an example of each. The Pseudo-Demetrian types are friendly, commendatory, blaming, reproachful, consoling, censorious, admonishing, threatening, vituperative, praising, advisory, supplicatory, inquiring, responding, allegorical, accounting, accusing, apologetic, congratulatory, ironic and thankful.³ Pseudo-Libanius expands this list to comprehend no less than forty-one different types of letters.⁴ Thus, there is no consensus among the ancient writers about the classification of letters.

The modern debate about the classification of the ancient Greek letter started with Adolf Deissmann. He proposed, in 1907, a distinction between literary and non-literary letters. To him the literary letters, also called epistles, should be understood as letters composed not for individuals but for the general public, written in an artistic form and preserved intentionally through copies or in quotations or by being engraved on stones. By contrast, the non-literary letters, in Deissman’s classification, are “records of human life” preserved by accident. They aim

¹ Cicero, Letter to his Friends, 2. 4. 1.
² Julius Victor, De Epistulis, 27.1.2.
³ Pseudo Demetrius, Epistolary Types, 22-30.
⁴ Pseudo Libanius, Epistolary Styles, 4.
to enhance the communication between two (or more) individuals in terms of intimacy.\(^5\) Deissmann’s distinction helped to stress the differences between two very different types of letters. And it is, with some adaptations, used even today.\(^6\) Deissmann’s classification of the Pauline letters as one of the non-documentary letters,\(^7\) however, was heavily criticized.\(^8\)

Francis Exler in his 1923 dissertation following the basic distinction of Deissmann,\(^9\) proposed “for the sake of convenience” a classification of the papyri (non-literary) letters in familiar letters (between relatives and friends), business letters (contracts, receipts, and leases), petition letters, and official letters (written or received by official persons).\(^10\)

William Doty, in 1969, criticized Deissmann’s work and suggested a new classification. The first level of classification in Doty’s scheme is between (1) more private letters and (2) less private letters. Under the more private letters Doty suggests a triple classification based on the addressees: writer to individual, to a discrete group or to multiple addressees. The classification of the less private letters is more complex with five types (official, public, non-real, discursive


\(^8\) The quality of the Pauline letters and the fact that they were intended for a broad public cause that they do not fit as non-literary letters in Deissmann’s classification. See a discussion of these critiques in William G. Doty, “The Classification of the Epistolary Literature,” *The Catholic Biblical Quaterly* 31 (1969): 183-99.


\(^10\) Idem, 23.
and other), each one subdivided into other subtypes.\(^\text{11}\)

In 1976 John White and Keith A. Kensinger proposed a classification system for the ancient Greek papyri letters. White affirms in the first part of his presentation, in which he analyzes letters from second and third centuries BCE, that these letters “seem to fall into three functional categories: orders or instructions, letters of request and letters whose primary purpose is to impart information.” The first category, letter of request, White subdivides into letter of recommendation, petition and memoranda. The second category, letter of information, has two subtypes: letters of compliance and epistolary receipts. The last category, order or instructions, has no subcategory. In the second part of the study, Kensinger analyzes letters from the second and third centuries CE. He suggests that the type family or friendly letter should be included among White’s categories.\(^\text{12}\) In 1986 White presented another classification of the documentary letters: letters of introduction and recommendation, letters of petition, family letters and memoranda.\(^\text{13}\)

Also in 1986, Stanley Stowers classified many ancient Greek letters in a way that he judged to be more in line with the ancient epistolary theorists. Stowers presents six main categories: (1) letters of friendship, (2) family letters, (3) letters of praise and blame, (4) letters

---

\(^{11}\) The official type subdivides into administrative non-military; administrative military; administrative Christian (church business); commercial; foreign affairs and legal documents in letter form. The public type subdivides into publicity (propaganda, polemic, opinion-influencing, news and apology) and school exercises (models). Under non-real Doty proposes pseudonymous, imaginary (fictive, to or from a non-existent person), letter from heaven or the gods and epistolary novel. The discursive type of letter can be sub-classified as magical or scientific (religious, literary-critical, historical, knowledge-in-general). Finally, under the other special types Doty suggests that the following kinds of letter can be found: amorous (erotic), poetic, inserted (stylized to fit context), consolation, dedication, introduction and congratulation. Doty, *The Classification*, 183-199.


of exhortation and advice, (5) letters of medication, and (6) accusing, apologetic and accounting letters. The only category which has subtypes is the one of letters of exhortation and advice. Its subtypes are paraenetic letters (exhortation and dissuasion), letters of advice, protreptic letters (exhortation to a way of life), letters of admonition, letters of rebuke, letters of reproach and letters of consolation.\(^\text{14}\)

Still another proposal was made by David E. Aune in 1987. He proposed to expand Stowers’ scheme in the direction of a more inclusive categorization. The main categories of Aune are: (1) private or documentary letters, (2) official letters and (3) literary letters. Under the first category, private letters, Aune includes the following types: letters of request and petition, letters of information, letters of introduction, letters of order or instruction, family letters, and business letters. The second category, official letters, includes such matters as the bestowal of various benefits, the restoration of land, decision and edicts, arbitration and communication of the resolutions of the senate. Finally, the literary letters, the third category, consists of the following subtypes: real letters not for publication, real letters to a broader public, ideal letters for publication, fictional letters with epistolary conventions framing stories or anecdotes, fictional letters for narratives of rhetorical exercises and letter-essays or treatises with an epistolary prescript.\(^\text{15}\)

A more recent classification was proposed by Hans Josef Klauck. In 2006 he proposed a triple main division with (1) nonliterary letters (documentary letters), (2) diplomatic letters


(royal and imperial letters) and (3) literary letters. Under the heading nonliterary letters, Klauck adds private letters, official letters and business letters. The private letters could be familiar, friendly, recommendatory, exhortative, praising or blaming, and consolatory and, as Klauck observes, the list is not comprehensive.\textsuperscript{16}

None of these classification methods has been widely accepted. This thesis will work with the triple division proposed by Aune and Klauck: 1) documentary letters, 2) diplomatic letters and 3) literary letters. This classification is adopted because it is the only one broad enough to comprehend all kinds of ancient Greek letters. Within this categorization, which is adopted in this chapter, for functional reasons the documentary letter is further subdivided into private letters (family and friendly letters), business letters (petitions, receipts, memoranda, etc.) and official letters.

II. Formal Analysis of the Prescript of Ancient Greek Letters

Due to the scope of this thesis, the following formal analysis of the prescript of the ancient Greek letters is not completely inclusive. It is not comprehensive in the sense of including all prescript formulas used in the Hellenistic and Roman periods and pointing out all exceptions. Instead, it provides a description of the main formulas used in the prescript of the Greek letters of those periods. The aim of such an analysis is to provide a basis for the functional analysis of the ancient Greek letters and for the formal and functional analyses of the Pauline prescripts.

The prescript, or letter opening, is the initial part of a letter, which, in the case of the

ancient Greek letters, is regularly composed of a sender formula (*superscriptio*), an addressee formula (*adscriptio*) and a greeting formula (*salutatio*). Thus, the typical letter opening of the ancient Greek letter is well represented by “ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δείνις χαίρειν” [so-and-so to so-and-so, greetings] or “from A (nominative) to B (dative), greetings (infinitive)” (example 1).


‘Ἀρτεμίδωρος Ζένωνι χαίρειν [Artemiodoros to Zenon, greeting.]

1. **Sender Formula (Superscriptio)**

The simplest form of the sender formula offers just the name of the sender in the nominative case, as in example 1. The sender formula can be expanded either by the description or by the multiplicity of sender(s). Both expansions, especially the description of the sender, are more common in official than in private epistles.

The description of the sender can be made by using other names by which the sender is known (example 2) or by using a lineage designation such as “son of A” (example 3) which can be expanded to include also “grandson of B” and/or “mother being C” (example 4). Filiation is expressed by using υἱός [son] followed by the name of the father in the genitive (example 3) or by placing the name of the father in genitive case after the name of the son without υἱός

---


19 The translations provided here are according to the papyri edition quoted; otherwise the source will be indicated.
(example 4). The description of sender can also include current and/or prior vocational information (examples 5-6); official titles (examples 7-8); or geographical information (example 9). These descriptions can appear combined and, when this is the case, as a rule they follow the order presented here (example 9-10).

The multiplicity of senders is expressed by adding the co-senders’ names after a καὶ (example 11), and sometimes the expression ἀμφότεραι αἱ δύο [both] is used (example 12). The description of multiple senders can be made separately (example 13) or at once (example 14).

Example 2 – Transactions of the American Philological Association 90, 139-146 -

Private Letter, 136 CE

Ὁ αὐλέριος Παυλεῖνος ὁ καὶ Ἀμμωνᾶς [Valerios Paulinos also called Ammonas]

Example 3 – P.Oxy. LI 3638 - Private Letter, 220 CE

Μᾶρκος Αὐρήλιος Χαιρήμων υἱὸς Ἐρμίου [Marcus Aurelius Chaeremon, son of Hermias,]

Example 4 P.Oxy. LXIV 4433 - Private Letter, 130 CE

Διδύμος Διδύμου τοῦ Διδύμου μητρὸς Σαραποῦτος

[Didymus son of Didymus grandson of Didymus, mother Sarapous]


Ἀρτεμίδωρος κουρεῖς Ζήνωνι χαίρειν. [Artemiodoros barber to Zenon, greeting,]

Example 6 – P.Oxy. L 3557 – Official Letter, 125-126 CE

Χρύσερμος ιερεὺς καὶ ἀρχιδικαστής [Chrysermus, priest and archidicastes,]

---

20 As is possible to verify in this example, the description using an additional name employs the construction “A ὁ καὶ B” which can be translated “A also called B” (as in the example), or “A alias B”.
Example 7 – P.Oxy. LX 4068 - Official Letter, 200 CE
Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Λουκίου Σεπτίμιος Σεουήρος Εὐσεβής Περτίναξ Ἀραβικὸς Ἀδιαβηνικὸς Παρθικὸς
Μέγιστος καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνίνος Εὐσεβής Σεβαστός
[Imperator Caesar Lucius Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax Arabicus Adiabenicus Parthicus
Maximus and Imperator Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius Augustus,]

Example 8 – P.Oxy. LX 4058 - Official Letter, 158-159 CE
Νεῖλος ὁ καὶ Θέων βασιλικὸς γραμματεύς Ὀξυρυχίτου
[Nilus alias Theon, royal scribe of the Oxyrhynchite,]

Example 9 – P.Oxy. L 3572 - Business Letter, III CE
Αὐρήλιος Θῶν Ἐρείωνος γραμματεύς πρακτορείας σιτικῶν μητροπολιτικῶν
λημμάτων ἀνω τοπαρχίας Μερμέρθων
[Aurelius Thonis, son of Hoion, grammateus of the collection of grain revenues from metropolites in
Mermertha in the Upper Toparchy,]

Example 10 – P.Mich. VI 364 - Official Letter, 179 CE
Ἡρακλείδης Ἀμμωνίου δημοσιών καταλοχισμῶν Άρσινοίτου καὶ ἄλλων νομῶν
[Herakleides, son of Ammonios, farmer of the tax on catoecic registry for the Arsinoite and other nomes,]

Example 11 – P. Oxy. I 49 - Official Letter, 100 BCE
Θέων καὶ Θέων τοῖς ἀγορανόμοις χαίρειν [Theon and Theon to the agoranomus, greeting,]

Οὐαλερεία καὶ Θερμουθᾶς ἀμφότεραι αἱ δύο [Valeria and Thermouthas both]
**Example 13 – P.Oxy. LXIV 4439 - Official Letter, 258-259 CE**

Aurelius Horus son of Paesis, his mother being Techosis, and Aurelius Asclas son of Apollonius, his mother being Taaphychis, both from the village of Senepta,

**Example 14 – P.Oxy. I 45 - Business Letter, II CE**

Phanias, Heraclas and Diogenes also called Hermaeus, officials employed in land distribution,

2. **Addressee Formula (Adscriptio)**

The addressee formula is generally more detailed than the sender formula. Its most common form is the name of the sender in dative case (example 15). Familiar bonds are often expressed on the *adscriptio* of private letters. They fulfill the syntactical function of apposition. Some of the expressions used to communicate familiar relationships are: father, brother, sister, mother, mother of my daughter, lady, lord (examples 16-18). The words “brother” and “sister” can convey the meaning of a literal brotherhood relationship, a husband-wife bond or both, since marriage between a brother and a sister was common in those days. Therefore, it is extremely hard to define in most cases what kind of relationship was being expressed when expressions such as brother or sister were used. The terms “lord/lady” are also dubious, being commonly used to refer to the owner of a slave, a master, as well to parents, brothers and spouses (examples 19-21).

The *adscriptio* is often expanded with expressions of endearment and respect such as

\[^{21}\text{White, Light, 196.}\]
φιλτάτω [dearest] (example 22), τιμιωτάτω [esteemed] (example 23), τωι ἰδίωι [his own] (example 24) and γλυκυτάτω [sweetest] (example 25). In official and business letters the description of the recipient follows the standard presented in the description of sender. It can have one or more of the following: lineage items (example 26), vocational/official titles (example 27), other names by which the addressee is known (example 27) or geographic data (example 28).

The multiplicity of addressees is less common than the multiplicity of senders. In the adscription the plurality of senders is expressed by adding the co-recipients names after καί (example 29), and sometimes the expression ἀμφοτέροις [both] can be used (example 30).

**Example 15 – P.Corn. 50 - Business Letter, 250-299 CE**

Ἡρακλείδης Ἀγχορίμφει χαίρειν. [Herakleides to Anchorimphis greeting.]


Σατορνίλος Ἀφροδοῦτι τῇ μητρὶ πλέιστα χαίρειν. [Saturnilus to Aphrodus, his mother, very many greetings.]


Ὡρίων Ἡλίᾳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ χαίρειν. [Horion to Elias, my brother, greetings.]

**Example 18 – P.Oxy LVI 3853 - Private Letter, III CE**

Ἰσχυρίων Κορνηλίῳ τῷ πατρὶ χαίρειν. [Ischyron to his father Cornelius, greetings.]

**Example 19 – P.Mich. III 209 - Private Letter, Late II or Early III CE**

Σατορνίλος Σεμπρωνίῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ καὶ κυρίῳ πλέιστα χαίρειν.

[Saturnilus to Sempronia, his brother and lord, very many greetings.]
Example 20 – P.Corn. 49 - Private Letter, II CE

Διογείνης θερμούθατι τῇ μητρί καὶ κυρίᾳ χαίρειν.

[Diogenes to the lady Thermouthas his mother, greeting.]

Example 21 – P.Oxy. LV 3810 - Private Letter, II-III CE

Καλλίας Κυρίλλη τῇ κυρίᾳ χαίρειν. [Callias to Cyrilla, his lady, greetings.]


Πτολεμαίος Ἀρβήκη τῷ φιλτάτῳ χαίρειν. [Ptolemaios to his dearest Harbekis, greeting.]


Λογισμὸς Κέλερ Μαξίμῳ τῷ τιμιώτατῳ χαίρειν. [Longinus Celer to his most esteemed Maximus, greeting.]

Example 24 – P.Fay. 110 - Private Letter, 94 CE

Λούκιος Βελλινός Γέμελλος Ἐπαγάθῳ τῷ ἴδιῳ χαίρειν. [Lucio Bellino Gemello to his own Epagato, greetings.]

Example 25 – P.Mich. III 212 - Private Letter, II or Early III CE

Δωρίῳν Σερῆνῳ τῷ γλυκυτάτῳ ὦῳ χαίρειν. [Dorion to Serenus, his sweetest son, greeting.]


Ἀυρήλιος Πρωτάς βουλευτῆς ἐπιμελητῆς θησαυρῶν Λευκογίου Ἀυρήλῳ Πρίςκῳ Εὐδαιμόνος χαίρειν.

[Aurelius Protas, counsellor and epimeletes of the harbor of Leukogion, to Aurelius Priscus, son of Eudaimon, greeting.]

22 Translation mine.
Example 27 – P.Oxy. I 3615 - Official Letter, III CE

Αὐρήλιος Κλαύδιος Λυκαρίων ὁ καὶ Σαραπάμμων ἐπιτηρητής ἡγεμονικῶν ἐπιστολῶν καὶ ἄλλων Αὐρήλιῳ Ἰέρακι τῷ καὶ Σαραπίωνι βασιλικῷ γραμματεῖ Ἐρµουπολίτου τῷ φιλτάτῳ χαίρειν.

[Aurelius Claudius Lycarion alias Sarapammon, overseer of prefectural letters and other matters, to Aurelius Hierax alias Sarapion royal scribe of the Hermopolite nome, his dearest colleague, greeting.]

Example 28 – P.Oxy. LXII 4335 – Official Letter, 128 BCE

Διονύσιος Διογένεως τοῦ Θέωνος Εἱρηνοφυλάκιος ὁ καὶ Ἀλθαεὼς Ἀττίῳ Ἀττίου τῷ καὶ Ἀπολλωνίῳ ἄ Ωξυρύγχων πόλεως χαίρειν.

[Dionysius son of Diogenes, grandson of Theon, of the Eirenophylacian tribe and Althaean deme, to Attius son of Attius also called Apollonius, from the city of the Oxyrhynchi, greetings.]


Σερῆνος Κυρὴλη καὶ Ζῳλὼ τοῖς γλυκυτάτοις χαίρειν.

[Serenus to Kyrilla and Zoilos, his dearest, greeting.]


Ἀντώνις Ἀποληείῳ καὶ Οὐαλερίᾳ ἄμφω τὸν χαίρειν καὶ διὰ παντὸς ὑγιαῖνειν.

[Antonius to Apuleius and Valerias both, greeting and continued good health.]

3. Greeting Formula (Salutatio)

The greeting formula is often composed of just the infinitive verb χαίρειν (example 29).

The reason this verb is in the infinitive, with the sender in the third person, is that the origin of the opening formula is related to ancient oral messenger formula. In the ancient oral message the messenger introduced the message with the expression: “A says B to rejoice,” and then the
message was delivered. Thus, when messages began to be written, instead of oral, the basic form of the oral message was kept. Sometimes an adverb of intensity is placed before χαίρειν, mainly in family and friendly letters. The most common adverbs used to intensify the greetings are πολλά [many] (example 31) and πλείστα [very many] (examples 16, 19).

Sometimes the verb ὑγιαίνειν [be in good health] is combined to χαίρειν (example 30), which is a contracted version of the health wish that will be analyzed below. Another verb that can be combined with χαίρειν is the verb ἐρρώσθαι [be well, fare well] (example 32).

Both in the papyri and in the literary letters, there are only a few that change the greeting verb. The documentary letters that change the customary χαίρειν are: P.Oxy. I 115, PSI XII 1248 and P.Ross.Georg. III 2. Among the literary letters, both Plato and Epicurus created their own greeting formula. These exceptions will be analyzed in the next section of this chapter.

Example 31 – P.Oxy LVI 3855 - Private Letter, 280-281 CE
Θερμοῦθιν Ἰσιδώρῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ πολλά χαίρειν. [Thermuthion to Isidorus her brother, many greetings.]

Example 32 – P.Tebt I 12 - Private Letter, 118 BCE
Μεγχῆς Ἡρώδει τῶι ἀδελφῶι χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρώσθαι. [Menkes to the brothers Herodes, greeting and fare well]

4. Inverted Prescript

The most common variation on the ancient Greek prescript is the inversion between sender and addressee. This alteration occurs mainly in petitions because the author is writing to

---

23 Klauck, Ancient Letters, 18-19

24 Translation mine.
a person of a higher rank (example 33). It is common in these cases that the sender formula has the proposition παρὰ [from] added to clearly express who is the sender (examples 34). White, analyzing the letter opening formula of the petition letters distinguishes four items in these prescripts: (1) the salutation: to B from A; (2) the lineage item, ‘son of C’ with the name of the father in genitive case; (3) the vocation item, which can appear in nominative or genitive case; and (4) the residence item, which is confined to one or more of these three pieces of information: town, district and nome.25

From the sampling of letters analyzed in this thesis, it is possible to conclude that the description of sender and addressee in the inverted prescripts is similar to that of the regular business and official letters. The standard form of the petition prescript entails an addressee formula with name and title of the addressee and a sender formula composed of παρὰ + name of the sender + lineage item + geographic information (example 35). This formula can be expanded with some optional items. Regularly only one or two of these items are added, not all of them together. The elements that can be added to the standard form of the addressee formula are other names by which the addressee is known, lineage information and geographic data. The sender formula can be expanded to include titles or vocational items and a guardian formula. A guardian formula is used when one is not legally responsible, as in the case of women and children of the ancient times that we are analyzing (examples 36-40).

In the letters with an inverted prescript it is possible also to find multiple senders and/or addressees (examples 39-40). The greeting formula is frequently ignored in these kinds of letters with an inverted prescript. When the salutatio is used, it can appear in its regular

---

position at the end of the prescript (example 33), or in the middle, between the *superscriptio* and the *adscriptio* (example 41) and even in the beginning of the prescript (example 42).

**Example 33 – P.Oxy. L 3570 - Private Letter, 285 CE**

κυρίῳ μου ἅδελφῳ Ἀπολλωνίῳ Βησαρίων χαίρειν.

[To my lord brother Apollonius, Besarion, greeting]

**Example 34 – P.Corn 9 - Business Letter, 206 BCE**

Ίσιδώρᾳ κροταλιστρίᾳ παρὰ Ἀρτεμίσις ἀπὸ κώμης Φιλαδέλφειας.

[To Isidora, castanet dancer, from Artemisia of the village of Philadelphia.]

**Example 35 – P.Mich. III 175- Private Letter, 193 CE**

Ἀμμωνίῳ Πατέρνῳ ἑκατοντάρχῃ

παρὰ Μέλανος Ὀρίωνος ἀπὸ κώμης Σοκνοπαιίου Νήσου ιερέως τοῦ ὅντος ἐν τῇ κώμῃ θεοῦ.

[To Ammonios Paternos, centurion

from Melas, son of Horion, of the village of Soknopaïou Nesos, a priest of the god who is in the village.]

**Example 36 – P.Oxy. L 3571 - Official Letter, 286 BCE**

Αὐρηλίῳ [...] νεὶ γενομένῳ ὑπομνηματογράφῳ στρατηγῷ Ἡρακλεοπολίτου παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Παθερμουθίου

Ἀνουβίωνος ἀφ’ Ἡρακλέους πόλεως ξυστάτου ἀμφόδου Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ ἑνεστῶτος 3 (ἕτους) καὶ 2 (ἕτους).

[To Aurelius [...]nes, ex-hypomnematographus, strategus of the Heraceopolite, from Aurelius Pathermuthius son of Anubion, from Heracleopolis, sytates of the distric of Apollonius for the present 3rd and 2nd year.]

**Example 37 – P.Oxy. L 3567 - Official Letter, 252 BCE**

Ἀννίῳ Ἀντωνείνῳ τῷ κρατίστῳ διέποντι τὴν ἄρχιερωσύνην παρὰ Αὐρηλίου

Ὀνυφρίῳ Ὀνυφρίῳ τοῦ Τεώτου μητρὸς Σινθεῦτος ἀπ’ Ὁξυρύγχων πόλεως πυραίθου καὶ παστοφόρου
Ἀθηνᾶς Θεσφίδος θεᾶς μεγίστης ἱερώ τοῦ ὄντος ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει.

[To Annius Antoninus, vir egregius, administratuering the high priesthood, from Aurelius Onnophris son of Onnophris, grandson of Teos, mother Sintheus, from the city of the Oxyrhynchus, pyraethes and pastophorus of the temple of Athena Thoëris, most great goddess, which is in the same city.]

Example 38 – P. Mich. III 179 - Private Letter, 118 BCE
Σαραπίωνι καὶ Θέωνι βιβλιοφύλαξι παρὰ Ταύριος τῆς Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Μεγέχους τῶν ἀπ’ Ὀξυρύγγων πόλεως μετὰ κυρίου Ἡρωείδου τοῦ Κρατέινου.

[To Sarapion and Theon, custodians of the archives, from Tauris, daughter of Apollonios, son of Menches, a resident of the city of Oxyrhynchus, acting with her guardian, Heroides, son of Kratinos.]

Πανεχώτη καὶ Ἰσχυρίωνι ἐγλήμπτοραι γερρίων παρὰ Ἐλένης τῆς Ὡρίωνος μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ ἑαυτῆς ἄνδρος Ἐπινίκου τοῦ Θέωνος.

[To Panechotes and Ischyreon, farmers of the weavers’ tax, from Helen, daughter of Horion, acting with her guardian, her husband, Epinikos, son of Theon.]

Example 40 – P. Oxy. LVII 3905 - Official Letter, 99 CE
Δίως στρατηγῷ παρὰ Νουμενίου τοῦ καὶ Πανεχώτου Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου μητρὸς Διεεύθος ὡς ἔτων 17 ἀσήμου καὶ Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ καὶ Τοτοέως μητρὸς [...]η( ) ὡς ἔτων 73 σοῦλη ἀντικηνημίῳ ἀρίστερῷ καὶ Τοτοέως [...] ἀρίστερῳ τοῦ Πιταίου τοῦ Πιταίου μητρὸς Φιλοῦτος ὡς ἔτων 36 σοῦλη ἀντικηνημίῳ ἀρίστερῷ καὶ Πασαλύμιος Φιλήμονος τοῦ Σκύλακος μητρὸς Ἡλείτος ὡς ἔτων 70 σοῦλη δακτύλῳ [...]ρ( ) χρι( ) καὶ Ὄρου Πεμπύνιος τοῦ Ἀξ [...]μὴ τοῦ Τεθεῦτος ὡς ἔτων 45 σοῦλη γονατί δεξιῷ καὶ Ὅρου Παράιτου τοῦ Παράιτου μητρὸς Σοήρεως ὡς ἔτων 61 σοῦλη μετώπῳ καὶ Νάριδος Λυλάιτος τοῦ Κωλλούθου μητρὸς Δημάτος ὡς ἔτων 40 σοῦλη μετώπῳ καὶ Τανεονεύτος Πετεμίνιος μητρὸς Θερμ( ) μετὰ κυρίου Ἡράτος τοῦ Ἡράτου τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου πάντων τῶν ἀπὸ κώμης Πέλα.

[To Dius, strategus, from Noumenius also called Panechotes sn of Apollonius the son of Apollonius, mother
Dieuēs, about 17 years old, unscarred, and Apollonius son of Apollonius also called Totoes, mother ... About 73 years old, with a scar on his left shin, and Totoes ... mother Senapollonia, about 30 years old, with a scar on his left shin, and Hippolytus son of Pitaeus the son of Pitaeus, mother Philous, about 36 years old, with a scar on his left shin, and Asalymis son of Philemon the son of Scylax, mother Elis, about 70 years old, with a scar on the ... finger on his left hand, and Horus son of Pemsynis the son of Ax..., mother Tetheus, about 45 years old, with a scar on his righ knee, and Horus son of Parais the son of Parais, mother Soeris, about 61 years old, with a scar on his forehead, and Naris son of Lillais the son of Collutus, mother Demas, about 40 years old, with a scar on his forehead, and Tanesneus daughter of Peteminis, mother Therm( ), with Heras the son of Heras the son of Apollonius as Guardian, all of the people of the village of Pela.]


Ἀπολλωνίωι διοικητῇ χαίρειν Ζώιλος ὁ παρὰ [...]οντος τοῦ παρὰ Καλλικράτους λογευτῆς τοῦ τριηραρχήματος.

[To Apollonios, the dioiketes greeting from Zoilos, agent of (...), agent of Kallikrates, collector of the navy tax.]


χαίρε Κοπρῆ παρὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ. [Greetings, Kopres, from Julianus.]

5. Memorandum Formula

There is a special kind of document which has a peculiar prescript. It can be sent by inferiors, equals or superiors. Its prescript formula starts with the word ὑπόμνημα [memorandum] and then adds the addressee formula and the sender formula with the preposition παρά [from] (example 43). Sometimes this order is inverted according to the rank of sender and addressee, the higher in the epistolary situation appearing first (example 44).

---

26 White, Light, 197.

ὑπόμνημα Ζήνωνι παρ’ Ἀρτεμιδώρου τοῦ Θεοδώρου γίοι.

[Memorandum to Zenon from Artemidoros, the son of Theodoros.]


ὑπόμνημα παρὰ Μηνόδωρον Ζήνωνι.

[Memorandum from Menodoros to Zenon.]

6. Incomplete Prescript

The letter opening occasionally can lack one of the three formulas. As already illustrated, it is common for the letter with an inverted prescript to omit the greeting formula. The same phenomenon happens among the regular letters, especially business and official ones (example 45). A rarer phenomenon which also occurs is the absence of the sender (example 46) or the addressee formulas (example 47).

Example 45 – P.Oxy. LXV 4479 - Official Letter, 179 CE

παρὰ Ἀμοῖτος τοῦ καὶ Διονυσίου Διογένους μητρὸς ὸιαροῦτος ἀπ’ ὸξυρύγχων πόλεως.

[From Amois alias Dionysius son of Diogenes, mother Isarous, from the city of the Oxyrhynchi.]

Example 46 – P.Mich. VIII 509 - Private Letter, II-III CE

Πρείσκω Ἀπολινάρι στρατιώτη πλεῖστα χαίρειν. [To Priscus Apolinaris, soldier, very many greetings]

Example 47 – P.Oxy. LXV 4479 - Official Letter, 179 CE

παρὰ Ἀμοῖτος τοῦ καὶ Διονυσίου Διογένους μητρὸς ὸιαροῦτος ἀπ’ ὸξυρύγχων πόλεως.

[From Amois alias Dionysius son of Diogenes, mother Isarous, from the city of the Oxyrhynchi.]
7. Health Wish

In his dissertation, Exler analyzes the health wish as the initial phrase of the letter body. Koskenniemi, on the other hand, asserts correctly that such elements are part of the letter opening. The typical health wish is composed of two parts: the wish of health or welfare for the addressee and a word about the well being of the sender. The health wish is less structured than other formulas used in the ancient Greek letter opening, being more susceptible to change. Aune prefers to call it a topos or a theme instead of a formula. This is not the case in the Latin letters, where the health wish is very stable, being known as formula valetudinis (si vales, bene est, ego valeo [if you are well, it is well, I also am well]). The formula valetudinis appears in Greek also (example 48), but the most common form of the Greek health wish starts with the expression πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὖχομαι σε ὑγιαίνειν [Before all else I desire you fare well and continued good health] (example 49). The health wish can assume the form of a prayer for health instead of a wish (example 50-51).


Ἀντιμένης Ζήτωνι χαίρειν. εἰ ἐρρωσάι, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι: ύγιαίνον δὲ καὶ ἔγώ.

[Antimenes to Zenon greeting. If you are well, it would be excellent. I too am in good health.]

27 Exler, A Study in Greek Epistolography, 101-112.


29 John L. White, Light, 200.


31 See Klauck, Ancient Letters, 21
Example 49 – Chr.Wilck. 480 - Private Letter, II CE

Ἀπίων Ἐπιμάχῳ τῷ πατρί καὶ κυρίῳ πλείστα χαίρειν. πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν καὶ διὰ παντὸς ἔρρωμένον εὐτυχεῖν μετὰ τῆς ἀδελφῆς μου καὶ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ μου.

[Apion to Epimaco his father and lord, very many greetings. Before all else I pray for your welfare and continued good health and prosperity with my sister and her daughter and to my brother.32]


Σατορνίλος Ἀφροδοῦτι τῇ μητρὶ πλείστα χαίρειν. πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν καὶ εὐτυχεῖν.

[Saturnilus to Aphrodus, his mother, very many greetings. Before all things I pray for your health and prosperity.]

8. Obeisance Formula

The obeisance formula is a development of the prayer for health and farewell. Obeisance (προσκυνημά) is an act of worship to one or more gods performed in favor of another person.

According to Koskenniemi, this formula was developed in Egypt in relation to the god Sarapis (example 51), and expanded to other places and then, referring also to other gods (example 52).33 It is common also to find the formula without referring to any specific god (example 53). Regularly the obeisance formula appears after the health wish. White observes that it is unclear whether or not the formula reflects a real act of prayer.34

Example 51 – P.Oxy. XIV 1758 - Private Letter, II CE

Διογενὶς Διδυμ＇ τῷ τιμιωταῖ τιμιωταῖ χαίρειν. πρὸ παντὸς εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν μετὰ τῶν ἄβασκάντων σου

32 Translation mine.

33 Koskenniemi, Studien, 139.

Example 52 – P.Mich. VIII 473 - Private Letter, II CE

Ταβεθεύς Κλαυδίῳ Τιβεριανῷ τῷ ἄδελφῳ πλείστα χαίρειν. πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί τε ὑγιαίνειν καὶ τὸ προσκόνημά σου ποιῶ παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ Σοῦχῳ.

[Tabetheus to Claudius Tiberianus, her brother, very many greetings. Before all else I pray for your health and I make obeisance for you in the presence of the lord Souchos.]

Example 53 – P.Paris 18 - Private Letter, III CE

Ἀμμώνιος Ταχνοῦμι τῇ ἄδελφῇ πολλὰ χαίρειν. πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί τε ὑγιαίνειν καὶ τὸ προσκόνημά σου ποιῶ καθ᾽ ἑκάστην ἡμέραν

[Ammonios to Taconoumy his sister, greeting. Before all else I pray for your health and I make obeisance for you every day]

III. The Relational Function of the Letter Opening in the Ancient Greek Letters

This section intends to show the relational (philophronectic) function of the ancient Greek letter prescript. Although endearment expressions can be used meaninglessly\(^{35}\) and with other purposes than expressing friendship,\(^{36}\) an analysis shows that often the prescript is a reflection of the relationship between the sender and the addressee.


\(^{36}\) Pseudo Demetrius commenting on the friendly type of letter affirms that even people who don’t know one another personally can use the friendly type, “because they think that nobody will refuse them when they write in a friendly manner”. (Pseudo Demetrius, *Epistolary Types*, 1.9)
Originally the prescript functioned as the address of the letter, having as its antecedent the salutation of the ancient oral messages. The next development was that the letter gained an envelope and an outer address, but the prescript was maintained.37

Thus, the prescript began to be used to express the relation between sender and addressee. Julius Victor in the fourth century advised that: "The openings and conclusions of letters should conform to the degree of friendship (you share with the recipient) or with his rank, and should be written according to customary practice."38

Certain general facts point to the relational role of the letter opening: private letters use less personal definition, more endearment expressions and usually contain a health wish; business letters often dismiss the health wish; petitions and other similar letters invert the order of sender-addressee to reflect an order more appropriate to the epistolary situation and frequently disregard the health wish and even the greeting formula; official letters contain a detailed description of the sender and often omit a greeting formula and endearment expressions. When they are sent between officials, however, the official letters contain philophronectic constructions.

Some specific examples will show more clearly how the relational function works on the letter opening. The first example comes from the letters of the Archive of Paniskos (P.Mich. III 214-220).39 Paniskos, because of his work as a soldier was living far from home, in Koptos, in the Upper Egypt. His wife, who probably is also his sister, Ploutogenia, is living in an Egyptian city

---

37 Koskenniemi, Studien, 156.

38 Ars Rhetorica 27 (De Epistolis) 2.8

39 For the complete collection of the Paniskos letters and a brief introduction to them go to: http://www.lib.umich.edu/pap/exhibits/snapshots/paniskos/paniskos.html
called Philadelphia. The couple has a daughter called Heliodora.\(^{40}\)

The first of Paniskos’ letters (P.Mich. III 214; see its prescript in example 54) has the main objective of asking Ploutogenia to come to him. He asks her also to bring wool, olives, honey, his new shield and his helmet. He also tells her to bring her gold ornaments, but not to wear them in the boat. The letter is full of greetings. The letter opening reflects well the good state of the relationship between Paniskos and Ploutogenia. Some elements that support this interpretation are the use of the first person (to my wife), πλείστα χαίρειν in the greeting formula and the prayer for health directed to all gods:

**Example 54 – P.Mich. III 214 - Family Letter, 296 CE**

Πανίσκος τῇ συμβίῳ μου Πλούτογενείᾳ μητρί τῆς θυγατρός μου πλείστα χαίρειν.
πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί σοι τὴν ὀλοκληρίαν καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν παρὰ τοῖς θεοῖς πᾶσι.

[Paniskos, to my wife Ploutogenia, mother of my daughter, very many greetings.
First of all I pray for your good health in the presence of all gods.]

Ploutogenia did not come to meet Paniskos, even after a second letter (probably the poorly preserved P.Mich. III 215) asking her to do so. Thus, Paniskos sent a third letter, not so warm. In this letter Paniskos asks Ploutogenia to say if she will come or not. He presupposes that she will, since he asks her to bring some goods. He also informs her that he sent money through Antoninus. The letter opening reflects this new “not-so-warm” state of affairs between the couple. Paniskos uses the third person instead of first (‘to his wife’), he chooses the less intense greeting πολλὰ χαίρειν instead of the πλείστα χαίρειν, and he changes the content of

---

\(^{40}\) This reconstruction is made based on the letters and on the reconstruction offered by John Garret Winter in *Michigan Papyri* (Vol. III, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1936), 275-98.
his prayer: he does not pray for the health of his wife and daughter, but that he can receive them in good health:


Πανίσκος τῇ συμβίω καὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ πολλὰ χαίρειν.
πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὔχομαι σε ὀλόκληρον {σε} ἀπολαβεῖν μετὰ τῆς θυγατρὸς μου παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ.

[Paniskos to his wife and his daughter, many greetings.
Before all else I pray before the lord god that I may receive you and my daughter in good health.]

The following letter shows that the relationship of Paniskos and Ploutogenia has deteriorated even more. To understand this, it is useful to reproduce here how Paniskos starts the body of the letter: “I enjoined you when I left that you should not go off to your home, and yet you went. If you wish anything you do it, without taking account of me. I know that my mother does these things. See, I have sent you three letters and you have not written me even one.” The last part of the body of the letter is no less revelatory: “The letter carrier said to me when he came to me: ‘When I was on the point of departing I said to your wife and her mother: Give me a letter to take to Paniskos, and they did not give it’.” In harmony with the content of the letter, this prescript is the coldest of all. Notice the third person (his wife), the simplest greeting formula and the complete absence of a health wish or a prayer for health:


Πανίσκος Πλουτογενίᾳ τῇ συμβίω χαίρειν.

[Paniskos to Ploutogenia, his wife, greeting.]
This example of Paniskos’ letters shows how the letter opening reflects the relationship of sender and recipient of a letter. In the second letter we can detect also a glimpse of an anticipatory function, when Paniskos tells Ploutogenia he prays that he can receive his wife and daughter.

A second example of the relational function on the letter opening comes from the archive of Nemesion son of Zoilos, who was a tax collector for the town of Philadelphia. This archive contains both private and official letters, and for this reason it is possible to compare how Nemesion opens his letters in these different situations. In the example 57 Nemesion is addressing his brother Tryphon. He does not describe himself and greets his brother with χαίρειν. In the example 58 Nemesion is probably addressing the emperor, since he calls the recipient “savior of all” in the body of the letter. Nemesion uses filiation, vocational and geographical items to describe himself.


Νεμεσίων Τρύφωνι τῶι ἀδελφῷ χαίρειν.

[Nemesion to Tryphon, his brother, greetings.]


παρά ..[..]..ωνς τοῦ Β?[ μαξ.] τῶι πράκτορος ἁργυρικῶν ἀπὸ Φιλαδελφείας τῆς Ἡρακλείδου μερίδος τοῦ Ἀρσινοίτου νομοῦ. πράκτορος ἁργυρικῶν

[From Nemesion, son of Zoilos, from 'collector of money taxes', from Philadelphia in the division of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, collector of money taxes.]

41 See a description of this collection in [http://www.lib.umich.edu/pap/exhibits/snapshots/Nemesion/nemesion.html](http://www.lib.umich.edu/pap/exhibits/snapshots/Nemesion/nemesion.html).
A third example of the relational function in the ancient Greek letter prescript comes from the archive of Claudius Tiberianus. From this collection the focus will be on some of the letters that Claudius Terentianus sent to his father Tiberianus. The letters show a devoted son always concerned about the welfare of his father. All but one letter of Terentianus to his father include the obeisance formulae. P.Mich. VIII 476-478, 480 are letters about general and familiar matters and include the formula (see P.Mich. VIII 476 and 480 below).


Κλαύδιος Τερεντιανὸς Κλαυδίῳ Τιβερίῳ τῷ πατρὶ πλείστα χαίρειν.

πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν καὶ εὐτυχεῖν μοι, δὲ μοι εὐκταῖον ἐστίν, ὑγιαῖνο δὲ καὶ αὐτός ἐγὼ ποιούμενός σου τὸ προσκύνημα καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ Σεράπιδι καὶ τοῖς συννάσιοις θεοῖς.

[Claudius Terentianus to Claudius Tiberianus, his lord and father, very many greetings. Before all else I pray for your health and success, which are my wish. I myself am in good health and make obeisance for you daily in the presence of our lord Sarapis and the gods who share his temple.]

Example 60 – P.Mich. VIII 480 - Family Letter, early II CE

Κλαύδιος Τερεντιανὸς Κλαυδίῳ Τιβερίῳ τῷ πατρὶ πλείστα χαίρειν.

πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν, ὑγιαῖνο δὲ καὶ αὐτός. τὸ προσκύνημα σου ποιούμαι καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν παρὰ τοῖς ἐνθάδε θεοῖς.

[Claudius Terentianus to Claudius Tiberianus, his father, very many greetings. [Before] all else I pray for your health; I myself am in good health. I make obeisance for you daily in the presence of the local gods.]

42 For more details on this collection go to: http://www.lib.umich.edu/pap/exhibits/snapshots/Claudius/claudius.html
However, in P.Mich. VIII 479 Terentianus is displeased with his father because the latter did not send him a letter concerning his welfare. The beginning of the letter body indicates this: “I marvel that after you sailed upcountry you did not write to me about your well-being, but until today I have been anxious because you were indisposed when you left me.” Even if it is not possible to call the following letter opening a cold one, yet it is impossible to deny that the absence of the obeisance formula in this letter is a mere coincidence:


Κλαύδιος Τερεντιανός Κλαυδίῳ Τιβεριανῷ τῷ πατρί καὶ κυρίῳ πλείστα χαίρειν.
πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαι σε ύγιαίνειν καὶ εὐτυχεῖν, δ ὁμι εὐκταῖον ἔστιν.

Claudius Terentianus to Claudius Tiberianus, his father and lord, very many greetings. Before all else I pray for your health and prosperity, which are my wish.

These examples lead us to conclude that the relational function often does more than reflect the level of friendship between sender and recipient of a letter. This philophronectic function establishes the ethos in which the reader should read the letter and in so doing the letter opening anticipates in a general way, the intention, reason and/or nature of the letter. The following statement of White on this issue summarizes our findings:

The particular form of an individual phrase, or certain combination of epistolary conventions, frequently signals the basic intention or occasion of the letter. For example, when the wish for health is expressed in the letter opening, a degree of intimacy or familiarity is assumed. Or, when the recipient’s name is written prior to the sender’s in the opening address formula, the letter is a petition or some similar type of document in which the sender is the inferior in the epistolary situation. Generally speaking, if the opening and closing are full, the letter is a family letter or a
letter between friends in which the ongoing maintenance of friendship is an important consideration. By contrast, if the opening and closing are minimal, the letter is probably a business letter, a legal transaction in epistolary form, or a piece of administrative correspondence.  

IV. The Anticipatory Function of the Letter Opening in the Ancient Greek Letters

Most ancient Greek letters do not have a specific anticipatory function. Some letters, however, do adapt the letter opening so that it better fits the content of the letter. This section analyzes three private letters of consolation to show that their authors changed the common prescript in order to have it better fit the content of the letters. After that, some literary letters whose authors created their own prescript will be analyzed. The conclusion of this section is that at least a “seminal” anticipatory function can be noted in these letters.

1. Anticipatory Function in the Papyri

P.Oxy. I 115 is a much quoted consolation letter from Irene to Taonnophris and Philo dated from the second century. In her letter Irene has the objective of comforting Taonnophris and Philo because of the death of their son. Instead of using the customary greeting verb χαίρειν, which literally means ‘rejoice,’ ‘be glad,’ Irene chooses the verb εὐψυχεῖν, meaning ‘be

\[43\] John L. White, Light, 19.

of good courage,’ “take heart,”⁴⁵ “with implication of release from anxiety.”⁴⁶ In so doing, Irene is clearly anticipating the content of her letter by changing the greeting formula to another that better fits her purpose. Irene also changes the farewell words from the common ἔρρωσο to the expression εὖ πράττετε, which means “be well,” or “behave well”.

Eirene to Taonnophris and Philo, be of good courage. I was as grieved and wept from the departed one as much as I wept for Didymas. And everything that was fitting I have done, as well as my entire household, Epaphrodeitos and Thermouthion and Philion and Apollonius and Plantas. But, notwithstanding, one is unable to do anything against such things. Therefore, comfort one another. May you fare well. Hathyr.⁴⁷

This same kind of adaptation is detectable in at least two other letters of condolence. The first one is PSI XII 1248, a Letter from Menesthianus to Apollonianus and Spartiates, dating from 235 CE or later. In the first part of this letter, Menesthianus offers his condolences to his lord Apollonianus and Spartiates, father and son, who had lost their son and brother, respectively. Menesthianus changes the common greeting word χαίρειν to εὖθυμεῖν, which means “be of good heart,” “be cheerful,” or “be of good spirits”. Together with εὖθυμεῖν, εὖθυμεῖν is a commonly found in epitaphs, and it is found also as the concluding word of another letter of condolence (P.Ross.Georg. III 2) and in the body of two consolatory letters

⁴⁶ BDAG, 417.
⁴⁷ The translation used here is from John L. White, Light, 184-85.
Thus Menesthianus also used the prescript not only in a relational way, but also to anticipate his condolences expressed in the body of the letter.

Besides having a postscript that expresses condolence, the P.Ross.Georg. III 2 letter has also a special prescript. In P.Ross.Georg. III 2 Serenus writes to his mother, Antonia, to console her on the death of her husband or father. Serenus changed the greeting formula to εὖ πράσσειν, meaning “be well,” or “pass well”. Serenus, as did Menesthianus and Irene, changed the greeting formula in order to use a more suitable expression, connected more closely with the situation that was the occasion for the letter.

2. Anticipatory Function in the Literary Letters

The customary letter prescript of the literary letters retains the same form as that of the documentary epistles. The prescript is the more similar feature between documentary and literary letters. Thus, the regular opening of a literary letter can be exemplified by these prescripts from Isocrates and Demosthenes:

---

48 Chapa, Letters of Condolence, 98.

49 Chapa, Letters of Condolence, 105.

50 Sadly, as most literary letters were preserved in collections, and the collectors did not assign much importance to the prescripts, it is very common that literary letters do not have the original letter prescript. “These opening and closing formulas seem to have been of little interest to the ancients when they reflected on letter writing. Discussing of openings and closings is virtually absent from extant ancient epistolary theory, and in collections of letters, the opening and closing formulas are often abbreviated or omitted” (Stowers, Letters Writing, 20).
Example 62 – Isocrates, Letter 1, 380 BCE

Ἰσοκράτης Διονυσίῳ χαίρειν

[Isocrates to Dionysius, greeting.]

Example 63 – Demosthenes, Letter 1, 323 BCE

Δημοσθένης τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν

[Demosthenes to the Council and the Assembly, greeting.]

Six Demosthenes’ letters have been preserved, of which five are addressed to the Council and Assembly as in example 63, and one to Heracleodorus. The fifth letter begins uniquely. Instead of using χαίρειν, Demosthenes uses εὖ πράττειν. In so doing, Demosthenes is following Plato, who was one of the first writers to change the Greek letter prescript.

In all but one of his thirteen letters Plato begins with εὖ πράττειν instead of χαίρειν. In the only letter in which Plato uses χαίρειν, he does so ironically, and immediately thereafter explains his option for the greeting εὖ πράττειν:

“Plato to Dionysius wishes joy (χαίρειν)!” If I wrote thus, should I be hitting on the best mode of address? Or rather, by writing, according to my custom, ‘Wishes well doing,’ (εὖ πράττειν) this being my usual mode of address, in my letters to my friends? You, indeed, – as was reported by the spectators then present – addressed even the God himself at Delphi in this same flattering phrase, and wrote, as they say, this verse –

I wish thee joy! And may’st thou always keep
The tyrant’s life a life of pleasantness.

But as for me, I would not call upon a man, and much less a god, and bid him enjoy himself – a god, because I would be imposing a task contrary to his nature since the Deity has his abode far beyond pleasure or pain), – not yet a man, because pleasure and pain generate mischief for the most part, since they breed in the soul mental sloth and forgetfulness and witlessness and insolence. Let such, then, be my declaration regarding the mode of address; and you, when you read it, accept it in what sense you please.”

51 Plato, Epistle III A, B and C.
Plato affirms in this letter that his option for εὖ πράττειν is based on the fact that joy and pleasure (as literally desired in the greeting χαίρειν) can lead most men to mischief, since both joy and pain result in mental idleness, failure to remember, foolishness and disrespect.

Therefore, the Platonic option for εὖ πράττειν reflects his philosophy. Specifically, Plato conceived a greeting that communicates his ethical system and, consequently, the presuppositions that governed each one of his epistles. The expression εὖ πράττειν, according to R. G. Bury, is “purposely ambiguous, meaning either ‘act well’ or ‘fare well’ (i.e. ‘prosper’)”.  

What is important about the new greeting formula created by Plato, is that εὖ πράττειν summarizes Plato’s thought on ethics, being an important expression in Plato’s philosophy. It can be equated with the expression εὖ ζοειν, which means to live well. These two expressions are related to the platonic concept of eudemonia (εὐδαιμονία). This term is often translated in English as “happiness,” meaning literally “having a favorable guardian spirit”. More than happiness, though, eudemonia is the desirable state of well being, the real human pleasure that a man reaches by living justly and the “supreme human good”. The term εὖ πράττειν, therefore, is foundational for the ethical and philosophical system of Plato.

Epicurus, according to Diogenes Laertius, followed Plato in using εὖ πράττειν and also

---

52 Plato, LCL 9:394 n. 1


54 See Plato, Republic I.354. In this conclusion of the first book, Socrates conduces Trasymachus to the conclusion that “the just is happy and the unjust miserable” (ὁ μὲν δίκαιος ἄρα εὐδαιμόν, ὁ δὲ ἁδίκος ἁθλιος).
composed his own greeting formula. None of the letters of Epicurus with these formulas has survived. Thus we must rely on the testimony of Diogenes, who says about Epicurus: “And in his correspondence he replaces the usual greeting, ‘I wish you joy,’ by wishes for welfare and right living, ‘May you do well,’ and ‘Live well’ (καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ἀντί τοῦ Χαίρειν εὖ πράττειν καὶ Ἑπουδαίως ζῆν.).”

Both greetings εὖ πράττειν and especially Ἑπουδαίως ζῆν are appropriate to Epicurus’ thought, since in his philosophical system pleasure plays a fundamental role. Stowers makes this same point: “Like the earliest Christians, Epicurus modified the standard opening greetings in order to express his own philosophical perspective: Instead of ‘greetings’ he is said to have used ‘be well,’ ‘prosper,’ or ‘live well.’” In a chapter about the teachings of Epicurus, Howards Jones concludes the following concerning the Epicurean theory about pleasure:

What Epicurean theory calls for, then, is not the random gratification of immediate desires which results in momentary enjoyment, but careful selection of pleasures based upon a calculation of attendant or consequent discomfort and designed to secure the true pleasure which consists in the complete absence of pain. The implications for daily life are clear. Certain activities will be engaged in sparingly, some avoided altogether, others promoted.

As Plato, therefore, Epicurus also communicates his philosophy through changing the traditional greeting formula.

---


3. Is There an Anticipatory Function in the Ancient Greek Letters?

As the next chapter will show, the anticipatory function in the letters of the apostle Paul is very developed and specific. Paul not only states his theology, but in the most part of his letters foreshadows specifically what is the main concern that occasioned the letter.

In a sense, therefore, it is possible to affirm that Paul does not create the anticipatory function from nothing. As we have seen, among the documentary letters there are letters of condolence in which the author adapts the letter opening to fit properly with the content, and in so doing the content of the letter is foreshadowed.

Among the literary letters some authors change the greeting formula in order to communicate their philosophies. In making such a change, Plato and Epicurus do not anticipate specific concerns of the letters they were writing, but rather communicate the philosophical principles on which the letters were based.

It is our contention that Paul developed these two ways of using the letter prescript. On one hand, Paul also developed his own greeting formula that communicates a fundamental part of his theology on which the letters are based. On the other hand, Paul not only fitted the prescript to the content of the letter, but he actually used the prescript to anticipate the main themes of the letter. The main goal of the next two chapters is respectively to prove these two uses of the anticipatory function in Paul.
CHAPTER THREE
FORM AND FUNCTION OF THE PAULINE LETTER OPENING

I. Form of the Pauline Letter Prescript

The analysis of the form of the Pauline letter prescript is a simpler task than the analysis of the classic Greek letter opening. The main reason for this is that instead of using health wish, prayer for health, obeisance formula, greeting formula, or other elements that may constitute the ancient Greek letter opening, Paul expanded some of these opening elements to create a separate section called the thanksgiving.¹ Paul uses the simple tripartite formula “from A to B, greetings” for the prescript and personalizes it, adding the following main features: (1) Paul often includes a co-sender and description of the senders; (2) he often describes the addressees; and (3) instead of using the usual greeting χαίρειν (greetings), Paul always used his own expression: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [grace to you and peace from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ].

It is easy to detect the boundaries of the Pauline letter prescript because of its peculiar characteristics and position in the letter. First, the prescript is the first part of the letter and it always begins with the name of Paul. Second, the prescript, as stated above, is composed of three formulas, superscriptio, adscriptio and salutation. Therefore, once the interpreter detects the formulas, he has detected the whole prescript. Third, the Pauline letter opening is often

---

followed by a thanksgiving section (e.g. 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, Romans, Philemon, Philippians), which starts with the verb εὐχαριστέω, or by a eulogia (starting with εὐλογητός), which is the case of 2 Corinthians. Among the seven undisputed Pauline letters only Galatians does not have a thanksgiving section (or a eulogia), but also starts with a well-known ‘body-beginning’ formula (Θαυμάζω).²

The typical form of the Pauline prescript can be outlined as follows:

1) Sender formula (Superscriptio)
   a. Name of Paul
   b. Description of Paul (most commonly as apostle)
   c. Co-sender(s) name with description (commonly ‘brother’)

2) Addressee formula (Adscriptio)
   a. Name of addressee(s) (regularly a church)
   b. Description of the addressees

3) Greeting Formula (Salutatio)
   a. Greeting: “Grace to you and peace”
   b. Origin: “from God our father and the Lord Jesus Christ”³

It is probably correct to affirm, based on the form of the Pauline letter, that Paul created a new type of letter, which can be called apostolic letter.⁴ The form of the prescript for this new genre of letter, Paul borrowed from the official letters.⁵ This can be proven by the fact that in all seven letters, except 1 Thessalonians, Paul presents himself with a title in connection with Christ; and also that all Pauline letters were sent to a group instead of an individual. Therefore,

³ A slightly different form is presented by Jeffrey Weima, 1 Thessalonians (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, forthcoming).
it is possible to conclude that the Pauline prescript is similar to the official letters prescript.\(^6\)

These are the seven undisputed Pauline letters prescripts presented in a chronological order, as they will be analyzed in the next chapter.

**Brother Sosthenes,**  
the name of our Lord Jesus Christ—**our** and **ours:**  

---  

**2 Corinthians Letter Prescript – 2 Cor 1:1-2**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sender Formula (Superscriptio)</th>
<th>Adderee Formula (Adscriptio)</th>
<th>Greeting Formula (Salutatio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Paul ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ ᾿Ησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς</td>
<td>τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ,</td>
<td><strong>2</strong> χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου ᾿Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1** Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, and Timothy our brother,  
To the church of God in Corinth, together with all the saints throughout Achaia:  
**Grace and peace to you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.**

---  

**Romans Letter Prescript – Rom 1:1-7**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sender Formula (Superscriptio)</th>
<th>Adderee Formula (Adscriptio)</th>
<th>Greeting Formula (Salutatio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Παῦλος δοῦλος Χριστοῦ ᾿Ησοῦ, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ,</td>
<td>ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα,</td>
<td><strong>7</strong> χάρις ὑμῖν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> ὃ προεπηγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, ᾿Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν,</td>
<td>ἔν πάσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις,</td>
<td>χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου ᾿Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> περί τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα,</td>
<td>ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ ᾿Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ,</td>
<td><strong>7</strong> To all in Rome who are loved by God and called to be saints:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, ᾿Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν,</td>
<td>ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ ᾿Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ,</td>
<td>Grace and peace to you from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> δι’ οὗ ἔλαβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ,</td>
<td>ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ ᾿Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ,</td>
<td><strong>7</strong> To all in Rome who are loved by God and called to be saints:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ ᾿Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ,</td>
<td>ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ ᾿Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ,</td>
<td>Grace and peace to you from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου ᾿Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ.</td>
<td><strong>7</strong> To all in Rome who are loved by God and called to be saints:</td>
<td>Grace and peace to you from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---  

**Philippians Letter Prescript – Phil 1:1-2**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sender Formula (Superscriptio)</th>
<th>Adderee Formula (Adscriptio)</th>
<th>Greeting Formula (Salutatio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ ᾿Ησοῦ</td>
<td>πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ ᾿Ησοῦ τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποι καὶ ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις,</td>
<td><strong>2</strong> χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου ᾿Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1** Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus,  
To all the saints in Christ Jesus at Philippi, together with the overseers and deacons:  
**Grace and peace to you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.**
### Philemon Letter Prescript – Phil 1:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sender Formula (Superscriptio)</th>
<th>Addressee Formula (Adscriptio)</th>
<th>Greeting Formula (Salutatio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Παῦλος δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς</td>
<td>Φιλήμονι τῷ ἀγαπητῷ καὶ συνεργῷ ἡμῶν</td>
<td>3 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Paul, a prisoner of Christ Jesus, and Timothy our brother,</td>
<td>To Philemon our dear friend and fellow worker, to Apphia our sister, to Archippus our fellow soldier and to the church that meets in your home:</td>
<td>3 Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form of the Pauline prescript is similar to the form of the official letter prescript. Paul uses the same tripartite prescript found in the ancient Greek letters with sender and description of sender; addressee and description of the addressee; and with a personalized greeting form.

### II. Function of the Common Elements of the Pauline Letter Prescript

Before analyzing each Pauline prescript separately, there are some observations that should be made based on the common features of the Pauline prescripts. The sender formula is composed of the name of Paul, his description and the name and description of the co-senders. From the evidence of Acts, it seems that before his conversion Paul used to use his Jewish name, Saul, but after starting to work as the apostle to the gentiles he began to use his Roman name. Consistent with the evidence on Acts, the apostle presents himself in his letters by using his Roman name, Paul.

Paul commonly qualifies his name with a description in his letters openings, with the

---

7 Before his conversion Paul is called by the Jewish name Saul until his commission to the first missionary journey (Acts 7:58-13:9). After these events the book of Acts consistently refers to Paul by his Roman name.
exception of 1 Thessalonians. His most common description is ‘apostle’ (1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Romans), but he uses also ‘servant’ (Romans and Philippians) and ‘prisoner’ (Philemon). The use of the term apostle is not without an objective. Paul uses it to highlight his authority and right to instruct, commend and rebuke. As the next chapter will show, Paul presents himself as an apostle to churches in which there was some struggle with his apostleship (Corinthians and Galatians) or to churches that do not know him (Romans). In each of these prescripts, Paul always establishes the divine origin of his apostleship. To the Corinthians he affirms that he is an apostle “by the will of God” (1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1). To the Galatians, he clearly states that he is an apostle “sent not from men nor by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father” (Gal 1:1). To the Romans he says that he was “called to be an apostle”, using a divine passive, implying a divine vocation (Rom 1:1). Raymond F. Collins affirms that the title of the sender (intitulatio) defines the capacity or modality in which the writer is making himself present through the letter. Besides the normal relational function therefore, the intitulatio of the apostle in the letters to the Galatians and to the Corinthians anticipates the apology Paul writes concerning his ministry in the body of these letters.

The addition of co-senders, as we have mentioned, is one of the characteristics of the Pauline sender formula. Timothy is cited as co-sender four times (1 Thessalonians, 2 Corinthians, Philemon, Philippians), Silas and Sosthenes once each (1 Thessalonians and 1

---


9 See more on this on Daniel B. Wallace, Greek Grammar beyond the Basics (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 437-38.

Corinthians, respectively) and in the letter to the Galatians Paul includes “all the brothers with me” as co-senders. Only the prescript of the letter to the Romans lacks a co-sender. There is a debate of whether the co-senders play some role in the actual writing of the letter.\(^\text{11}\) With the exception of 1 Thessalonians, this thesis advocates a functional rather than effective use of co-senders. The main reason for having co-senders together with Paul is mainly to clarify to the recipients of the letters that Paul is not alone in what he is saying, i.e., the content he is writing is approved by other persons. The co-senders of the Pauline letters are persons with acknowledged authority over the recipients. Thus, by the addition of co-senders Paul adds authority to his letter.\(^\text{12}\)

Paul always describes the recipients of his letters, except in the letter to the Galatians. Five letters are directed nominally to churches (1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians\(^\text{13}\)). Philippians is directed to “all the saints in Christ Jesus at Philippi together with overseers and deacons.” Romans is addressed to “all in Rome who are loved by God” and the letter to Philemon is addressed to Philemon, Aphia, Archippus and to the church that meets in Philemon’s house. By using the term ἐκκλησία [assembly, gathering, congregation, church], Paul expresses that his addressees should receive his letters as a body of people gathered “in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Thes 1:1), sanctified in Christ Jesus and called to be holy (1 Cor 1:2).

The greeting formula is the most consistent part of the Pauline prescript. Paul always

\(^{11}\) See more on that on Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul the Letter Writer: His World, His Options and His Skills* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995), 16-34.


\(^{13}\) Galatians is addressed to more than one church, to the churches in Galatia.
greets the recipients of his letters with “grace to you and peace.” With the exception of 1 Thessalonians, he adds to the formula the source of the grace and peace he bestows: “from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.” Because the change Paul made in the greeting formula has a special function and he consistently maintains his prescript in all of his letters, the next section of this thesis will more fully analyze the Pauline salutatio.

III - The Place of ‘Grace to You and Peace’ in the Pauline Theology

It is the contention of this chapter that, as Plato and Epicurus did with their ethical systems, \(^{14}\) Paul also encapsulates his theology in the prescript of his letters by using the expression χάρις υμίν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸθεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [grace to you and peace from God our Father and Lord Jesus Christ]. While it is not possible to determine a direct dependence of Paul on Plato and Epicurus for this phenomenon, it is possible to verify Paul’s consistent use of it.

The anticipatory function of the Pauline letter openings, therefore, works on two levels. The first one is by anticipating the theological basis on which the letters are written, which will be analyzed in this section. The second level on which the anticipatory function works is by anticipating the specific content of the Pauline letters. This use will be analyzed in the next chapter of this thesis.

In order to demonstrate that Paul anticipates the fulcrum of his theology by using the

\(^{14}\) Cf. Raymond F. Collins, First Corinthians (SP 7; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 41.
expression χάρις ύμίν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, it is necessary to prove that Paul intended this use for “grace and peace”. The first evidence of this intention of Paul is that he used an epistolary device that was used by other people before him. As chapter two has shown, it was uncommon to change the standard salutation formula (χαίρειν) and those who did, did so with the aim of communicating their philosophy or adjust the opening to fit the content of the letter. Paul created his own salutation formula and consistently used it.

A second evidence of the importance that Paul attributes to the binomial grace and peace is that he does not use them only in the prescripts, but he recalls both concepts in his letter closings. Weima shows that Paul used the grace benediction in all of his undisputed letters and used the grace benediction in five of them (exceptions being 1 Corinthians and Philemon). In the letter closing, however, the order of the concepts is inverted, with the peace benediction appearing first. This use of grace and peace in the letter opening and peace and grace in the letter closing forms an inclusio that encapsulates the letter thanksgiving and body. The following table makes this clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grace and Peace Letter Opening</th>
<th>Peace and Grace Letter Closing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15 Note that in 1 Corinthians, although Paul does not use the peace benediction, he calls the concept of peace in the last chapter in 16:11.

The main evidence for advocating that Paul uses grace and peace in the prescript to communicate his theology in an encapsulated way, however, is the use he makes of both concepts throughout his undisputed letters.

1. Grace in Paul

It is hard to exaggerate the importance of the concept of grace in Paul’s writings. Conzelmann well expresses this when he affirms that “In Paul χάρις is a central concept that most clearly expresses his understanding of the salvation event.”\(^{17}\) While it is possible to assume different approaches to the study of the theme grace in Paul, this thesis will divide the subject in three areas: Paul as an apostle by grace; salvation by grace and the Christian life by grace.

For Paul, grace is not only a theological concept, but it is a real act of God; it is the act of freely give salvation, ministry, spiritual gifts and holiness to the man. Paul himself was a recipient of this grace and he appeals many times to this fact in his epistles.\(^{18}\) He affirms that he was called by grace from his life in Judaism as a persecutor of the church (Gal 1:15). About his ministry and gifts as an apostle, Paul affirms that their origin is God’s grace. He “received grace

---

\(^{17}\) Conzelmann, *TDNT* IX.393-98.

and apostleship to call people from among the Gentiles” (Rom 1:5; See also Rom 15:15-16).

Thus, because of the grace he laid foundation of the Corinthian church” (1 Cor 3:10); by grace he worked harder than other apostles (1 Cor 15:10) and some of them recognized the grace given to Paul (Gal 2:9). It is common for Paul to base the authority of some affirmation in the grace of God that he received; for example, in Rom 12:3 he affirms “For by grace given me I say to every one of you: Do not think of yourself more highly than you ought” (See also Rom 15:15-16). Paul’s own Christian life is also lived by grace. His holy behavior and sincerity (2 Cor 1:12) and his capacity to endure suffering (2 Cor 12:9) are fruits of the grace of God. Therefore, grace is a reality in the life of the apostle, his conversion, his apostleship, his ministry and his conduct in different situations were all made possible by the grace of God.

Another aspect of grace in Paul is the role that it plays in salvation. It is in this sense that Hans-Helmut Esser affirms that “For Paul χάρις is the essence of God’s decisive saving act in Jesus Christ, which took place in his sacrificial death, and also of all its consequences in the present and future (Rom 3:24ff.). Therefore, the use of χάρις in the beginning and end of the Pauline letters is much more than a mere polite cliché.”¹⁹ The gospel Paul preaches is the gospel of grace (Gal 1:6). The attempt of being saved by accomplishing the requirements of the law is condemned by the apostle (Rom 3-6, Gal 2:21; 5:4). Therefore, the only way of being justified in

---

¹⁹ Hans-Helmut Esser, “Grace, Spiritual Gifts” in NIDNTT 2.119. Some other definitions for grace as a mean of salvation are: “χάρις, used here in its widest sense, is the favor of God by which he acquits all sinners, Jews and Gentiles, solely on the principle of faith and grants them freedom from the power of sin and newness of life in Christ or the Spirit.” James Everett Frame, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1912), 71; “To be noted is the fact hat in Paul’s usage it [grace] is not merely a disposition in God, but something dynamic, the generous output of his power to achieve what is best for his creation.” James D. G. Dunn, The Epistle to the Galatians (Peabody: Hendrikson Publishers, 1993), 31; “The sum total of God’s activity toward his human creatures is found in the word ‘grace’; God has given himself to his people bountifully and mercifully in Christ. Nothing is deserved, nothing can be achieved. Gordon D. Fee, Paul’s Letter to the Philippians (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 70.
the sight of God is by freely receiving grace (Rom 3:24; 4:16; 5:15-21). Paul affirms that by grace believers are chosen by God (Rom 11:5) and by grace they receive eternal life (Rom 5:21).

For Paul, the work of grace is not finished in the salvation of the believer, but grace is also what enables Christians to live in a way consistent to their faith; as Paul affirms, in grace the believer stands (Rom 5:2). Grace is not a free license to sin (Rom 6:1); grace enables the Christian to live in holiness (Rom 6, 2 Cor 5:21-6:1). In the Pauline teaching, grace is the source of spiritual gifts (χάρισμα; Rom 12:6; 1 Cor 12-14); thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία; 2 Cor 4:15); offerings (χάριτι; 2 Cor 8) and good deeds (Rom 11:6; 2 Cor 9:8).

Therefore, grace is foundational for Paul. For him, grace is what saved him and made him an apostle and grace is the free gift from God that brings salvation and enables the believer to live a new life. Therefore, it is possible to conclude with the words of Esser: “Arising out of the basic act of pardon and legal acquittal (Rom 8:31 ff.), Paul understands the whole movement of the Christian life from beginning to end as grace (2 Cor 6:1-19, Rom 5:2; cf. Jn 1:16).”

2. Peace in Paul

The importance of εἰρήνη is not as evident as the importance of χάρις in the writings of Paul. Nevertheless, it plays a fundamental role in Paul’s thought. Stanley Porter captures the importance of this concept when he observes the connection of peace with reconciliation. In his entry for peace in the Dictionary of Paul and his Letters, Porter connects peace and reconciliation as follows: “Reconciliation is the Pauline concept in which enmity between God

---


and humanity, or between human groups, is overcome and peaceful relations restored on the basis of the work of Christ. This concept refers to an objective state of peace, not simply a feeling of peacefulness."  

This use of peace in the sense of reconciliation with God is evident in Paul when he relates peace with justification: “Therefore, since we have been justified through faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom 5:1; see also Gal 6:16; cf. Rom 14:17).

In the Pauline concept of peace, there are two fruits of the peace with God that comes as a result of justification and reconciliation. These fruits are peace between persons and groups of persons (Rom 14:19; 1 Cor 16:11; Gal 5:22) and an internal peace filling the heart of the believer (Philippians 4:7; Rom 8:6; 15:13; 1 Cor 7:15).

The Pauline use of ‘peace’ includes also the following stances. In the peace benedictions of the letter endings Paul commonly states that the “God of peace” will be present with the believers (Rom 15:33; 16:20; 2 Cor 13:11; Philippians 4:9). In 1 Thess 5:23 Paul wishes that the “God of peace” sanctify the believers. Peace can be used as opposed to disorder (1 Cor 14:33) and also in an eschatological sense, as one of the blessings the believers will receive in contrast with the sufferings of the unbelievers (Rom 2:9-10; See also Rom 16:20). Even during their lives, the unbelievers live in an unreal peace (1 Thess 5:3; Rom 3:17).

Peace for Paul, therefore, is a comprehensive concept. It is intimately related to

---

22 Stanley E. Porter, “Peace, Reconciliation” in Dictionary of Paul and his Letters (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1993): 695. Another definition in this same sense is “To the Jew peace was the spiritual well-being that came from a right relationship with God. For the Christian it comprehensively expressed reconciliation to God and the consequent blessings given to his people though his gracious action in Jesus.” I. Howard Marshall, 1 and 2 Thessalonians (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 49.
reconciliation with God which is the fruit of the justification and the eschatological shalom with all enemies destroyed and all things restored under Christ. It is because of these multiple meanings of peace, all them dependent on the justification by grace, that Paul uses εἰρήνη to open his letters.

3. The Origin of the Salutatio ‘Grace to You and Peace’

It is very common to read that Paul adapted the standard Greek greeting χαίρειν to use χάρις instead, which is derived from the same root and that he added to this the standard Jewish salutatio shalom. A few writers, however, have challenged this consensus. Judith Lieu, for example, asserts that the Pauline greeting formula is Semitic instead of Greek. Her main argument is that Paul does not use the infinitive form of the verb in his greeting formula, while even ancient Greek writers that changed the prescript kept the infinitive. Other authors dispute the Greek origin and the originality of the Pauline greeting, affirming that it was a

23 “The word reconciliation has to do with restoring friendship and peace.” “The word peace (eirene) is a synonym for reconciliation, and such peace is possible only on the basis of justification: Rom 5:1”. Schreiner, Paul Apostle, 222-223.


greeting current in some Jewish circles. These authors present as evidence 2 Bar 78.2, which uses ‘mercy and peace’ as greeting formula. Stanley Porter questions the legitimacy of affirming that the greeting shalom was adapted from Jewish circles based on the “little substantive evidence from Greek Jewish letters of the time that superscriptions with ‘peace’.”

This thesis defends a Greek-Jewish influence on the Pauline greeting formula and that Paul was its creator. Paul’s use of a simpler form of the greeting ‘grace to you and peace’ in his first letter, 1 Thess 1:1, points to his own authorship and subsequent development. The claim that affirms that Paul used χάρις instead of χαίρειν because of the common root of the words is without evidence. It is more probable, instead, that Paul chose χάρις because of its theological significance than because of the similarity with χαίρειν. Even so, the Pauline salutation should be defined primarily as a Greek one (contra Lieu). The following arguments support the Greek origin of the Pauline letter opening: 1) the Pauline prescript is written in Greek; 2) it is part of a letter which follows many of the ancient Greek letter conventions; 3) it is composed of superscription, adscription and greeting formula; 4) and, as Lieu concedes in a note, the non-infinitive greeting formula has Greek precedents. Exler points to Greek familiar letters which

---


28 Porter, Peace, Reconciliation, 695.


30 Lieu, Grace to You and Peace, 163, note 12.
start with χαίροις and χαϊρε, with examples going from the first to third century. 31 Lieu presents the χαϊρετε in the greeting formula of the epistle of Barnabas as another exception. 32 Among the literary letters, it is possible to present the case of Epicurus as another example of a non-infinitive prescript. According to Diogenes Laertius one of the Greeting formulas used by Epicurus was Σπουδαίως ζήν. 33 Therefore, there is no ground to deny the Greek origin of the Pauline letter prescript.

The Jewish influence on Paul’s prescripts is also assumed in this thesis. The use of the greeting formula in 2 Bar 78.2 as the antecedent of the Pauline formula, however, is denied based on two facts. First, the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch is posterior to the letters of Paul, dating from after 70 CE. 34 Second, the only preserved version of 2 Baruch is written in Syriac and uses an expression better rendered as “mercy and peace” instead of “grace and peace”. Paul indeed used the Jewish traditional greeting, but from the analysis of the term “peace” provided above, it should be understood that the Pauline concept is even broader since it has a strong emphasis in the reconciliation with God and, as a consequence, a harmony of all things under Christ. C. K. Barrett is correct, then, when he affirms that “It is unthinkable, however, that he did not enrich the word [peace] with its specific Christian content.” 35

The greeting formula χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ

31 Exler, A Study in Greek Epistolography, 53-54, 67-68.

32 Lieu, Grace to You and Peace, 163, note 12.


Χριστοῦ, is a creation of the apostle Paul whose form derives from the ancient Greek epistles and the content is composed of an expression that Paul used because of its meaningful theological importance to his teaching/ministry and another that Paul borrowed from the Jewish tradition but gave a slightly different meaning.

4. The Function and Meaning of the Pauline Salutation

Paul, through his prescript, desires that God the Father and Jesus Christ give their grace to the recipients so that they can be at peace with God and with one another. White advocates that this Pauline salutation is a surrogate health wish which instead of health is concerned with the spiritual welfare of the recipients.36 Being an apostle, however, Paul is not only wishing these goods, but he is in fact being an instrument of God to bring these blessings to the addressees.37 Because of the fact that Paul is bestowing grace and peace whose origin is in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, Furnish and Malherbe argue correctly that this is a way in which Paul stresses his authority.38 In bringing blessing to the readers of his letters and reaffirming the Pauline authority as representative of God, the greeting formula is accomplishing its relational function.

The order of the words chosen by Paul is very important because it expresses the

---


primacy of grace.\textsuperscript{39} It is because of the grace of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ that the believers are justified. It is because of this justification before God that the believers are reconciled with God. Therefore grace is the first step to live in peace with God and with other people. As Robert Mounce states: “Grace and peace are intricately related. Real peace comes only as a result of the grace of God. Grace is what we receive; peace is what we experience as a result of the activity of God on our behalf.”\textsuperscript{40}

The gospel that Paul preaches is encapsulated in his greeting formula. The greeting formula of Paul has, therefore, an anticipatory function which foreshadows not specific themes of each letter, but brings out the theological foundation on which Paul bases his letters and his whole ministry. Thus, the contention of this thesis applies for the Pauline letters what Lenski applied for all Theology: “The [Pauline] greeting is brief, but the terms employed are in their combination so weighty that they constitute the basis of the entire Biblical and Christian theology. They were so understood when they were written and sent and when they were received and read.”\textsuperscript{41}


\textsuperscript{40} Robert H. Mounce, \textit{Romans} (NAC 27; Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1995), 64.

\textsuperscript{41} R. C. H. Lenski, \textit{The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians} (Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1946), 811.
CHAPTER FOUR

FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE OPENINGS OF THE SEVEN UNDISPUTED PAULINE LETTERS

This chapter intends to show the anticipatory function of the letter opening in the seven undisputed Pauline letters. Each letter prescript will be analyzed according to its relational and anticipatory functions. The aim of this chapter is not to provide a detailed exegesis of these prescripts, but to prove that they have an anticipatory function alongside the relational function. The prescripts are presented in a chronological order with attention to possible chronological developments in the Pauline prescript.

I. The Prescript of 1 Thessalonians

1 Thessalonians is the oldest Pauline letter which was preserved and the oldest New Testament document written, dating from 50 CE.¹ The special characteristics of the prescript of 1 Thessalonians, when compared to other Pauline letters, are: in the sender formula, the presence of Silas as one of the senders and a lack of any kind of description of the senders; in the addressee formula, the peculiarities are the description of the church as “of the Thessalonians” and the reference to the church as being “in God Father and the Lord Jesus Christ;” and in the greeting formula, the anomaly is the omission of the source of the greeting

“grace to you and peace”, namely “from God our father and the Lord Jesus Christ.” Each one of these particular features of the prescript of Thessalonians will be analyzed below, giving attention specifically to their function.

The sender formula of 1 Thessalonians has two special features when compared to other Pauline superscriptions. 1) It has the name of Silvanus (Silas) together with those of Paul and Timothy and 2) Paul does not describe himself or his co-workers in any way. Firstly, then, why do the names of Silvanus and Timothy appear alongside with Paul’s? Silvanus was not a young trainee in the ministry, as Timothy was. He was a “leader among the brothers” (Acts 15:22) and a prophet (Acts 15:32). He was chosen to be the carrier of the apostolic decree to the church of Antioch (Acts 15:27). Like Paul, Silvanus was a Roman citizen (Acts 16:37). He was chosen by Paul as his co-worker (Acts 15:40) after the disagreement between Paul and Barnabas about Mark. Together with Paul and Timothy, Silas was one of the founders of the church in Thessalonica.2

Timothy also had an important role in the development of that church. Worried about the health of the faith of those brethren, Paul sent Timothy to strengthen and encourage them (εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ύμᾶς καὶ παρακαλέσαι ύπέρ τῆς πίστεως ύμῶν, 1 Thess 3:1-5). Timothy came back to Paul bringing good news about the faith and love of the Thessalonian believers (εὐαγγελισαμένου ἡμῖν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἁγάπην ύμῶν). This joyous news motivated Paul to write his first letter to the Thessalonians (1 Thess 3:6).

Both Silas and Timothy were personally involved, lead by Paul, in the beginning and life of that church. Different from the other Pauline letters, the plurality of senders in 1

---

Thessalonians has the objective not of reaffirming the apostolic authority of the letter, but showing to that inexperienced church that the men of God who started that church, continued to care for them. Moreover, as Timothy had been there recently, the insertion of his name has the effect of showing to the Thessalonians that Paul really knows what was lacking in their faith (cf. 1 Thess 3:10). Another important question that should be answered is whether Silas and Timothy are really co-senders of the letter in the sense that they participate in its composition together with Paul as a team, or, instead, if their names are in the prescript just formally so that only Paul is the real author of the letter. Two facts should be considered in relation to this subject. On one hand, 1 Thessalonians uses the first person plural (pronouns and verbs) more than is normal in other Pauline letters. On the other hand, the form and vocabulary of the letter is Pauline and the first person singular pronoun also appears in this letter and it refers clearly to Paul (2:18; 3:5; 5:27). The best solution to this impasse is something between the letter being written by a committee and the letter being written by Paul alone without any participation of Silvanus and Timothy.

The second special characteristic of the sender formula of 1 Thessalonians is the lack of description of the senders. There are two aspects that should be recognized here. First, the total lack of description suggests that the relationship between Paul and the Thessalonians was a

---

3 Weima, 1 Thessalonians.

4 Bruce, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, 6; Ben Witherington III, 1 and 2 Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 47.


friendly one, in which the authority of Paul was not being questioned. On the contrary, the Thessalonians nurtured the same kind of love for Paul (1 Thess 3:6). As Morris states, “There is no need to protest his position to these good friends.” 7 The other important aspect related to the absence of description is that Paul is presented on the same level of authority as the other senders, a fact paralleled only in Philippians. This fact, together with the profusion of first person plural verbs and pronouns, point to Paul’s intention that the letter be understood as product of the agreement between the senders. Therefore, we must conclude as Shreiner does, that the way “Paul designates himself is significant interpretatively.” 8

In the adscription (addressee formula), the recipients of this letter are described as τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ [to the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and Lord Jesus Christ]. When compared to the other Pauline addressee formulas, this formula detaches itself in the following features: 1) the church is defined as being “of the Thessalonians” (genitive Θεσσαλονικέων). Writing to the Corinthians Paul used the expression ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὖσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ [church of God which is at Corinth] (1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1). To the Galatians he used ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας [the churches of the Galatia]. Therefore, the expression in 1 Thessalonians is different because the Thessalonians are defined as being the “owners” of the church in some sense. 2) Another difference of this adscription is that the church is described as being “in God Father and Lord Jesus Christ” which is unique among the Pauline letters. Notice that Paul inverted what can be called a natural order: “a church of God in Thessaloniki” to “the church of the Thessalonians in

7 Morris, The First, 35.

God and Christ.” 3) One last difference is that while Paul uses ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ [in God Father and the Lord Jesus Christ] in the addressee formula in 1 Thessalonians, in all other instances he uses the same formula in the salutation and with the addition of the pronoun ἡμῶν [our] to qualify God father: ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [form God our father and Lord Jesus Christ] (1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Gal 1:3; Rom 1:7; Philemon 1:3; Philippians 1:2).

The first peculiar characteristic of the addressee formula, therefore, is the definition τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων [the church of the Thessalonians]. The explanation of this difference in relation to other Pauline letters is neither relational nor anticipatory. It is plausible to affirm that Paul used the term ἐκκλησία in a sense more common to his addressees (the Greek-Roman sense assembly, congregation), without the Jewish-Christian theological significance the term has when Paul uses the expression ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ [church of God] (1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1 and even 1 Thess 2:14). Thus, Paul is addressing this letter to the gathering of the Thessalonians who are “in God father and Lord Jesus Christ.”

It is possible to interpret this second peculiarity (ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ) in two ways, the locative and the instrumental. The locative is the way Paul uses the expression “in Christ,” pointing to the situation of the believer living in an organic relationship of

---


10 Beverly Gaventa mentions the possibilities of interpretation of this expression: “Does ‘in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ’ describe the church itself (that is, the church has its location in God and Jesus), or does it describe Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy, who write by means of God and Jesus Christ? The Greek can be translated either way. And what are we to make of the relationship between ‘God the Father’ and ‘the Lord Jesus Christ’? Are the titles ‘Father’ and ‘Lord’ synonymous? Does ‘Father’ here refers to God as the father of Jesus Christ or as the father of all creatures?” Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *First and Second Thessalonians* (Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox Press, 1998), 12.

unity with Christ. The application of this interpretation here results in “the assembly of the Thessalonians which are in God Father and Lord Jesus Christ.” The instrumental interpretation results in the translation proposed by Malherbe: “the assembly of the Thessalonians brought into being by God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.”

The first interpretation should be preferred because it is the more natural reading since it is based on the Pauline recurrent use of the expression “in Christ”. The inclusion of ‘God the Father’ here, according to Morris, is understandable considering that throughout the epistle Paul constantly associates the Father and the Son in the closest way (1 Thess 1:3; 3:11-13; 5:18).

The third peculiarity in the addressee formula is the absence of the personal pronoun ἡμῶν to qualify God. Malherbe explains it affirming that here Paul is pointing to God as the creator of everything. God as the one in whom everyone lives and moves and exists (Acts 17:28). Malherbe points to the significance of this construction saying that: “Paul addresses a church that owes its existence to the Creator of the universe.”

In this addressee formula, therefore, Paul is affirming that what the Thessalonians have in common is the fact that each one of those believers are in an organic relationship with God, the creator of all, and the Lord Jesus Christ, their savior and king. This would be considered a

---

12 This position is held by Frame, Thessalonians, 69 and Morris, The First, 36-36.

13 Malherbe, The Letters, 99. F. F. Bruce, 1 & 2 Thessalonians (WBC 45; Waco: Words Books, 1982), 7;

14 Morris, The First, 36.


16 Malherbe, The Letters, 100.
great encouragement for a persecuted church. Thus, it is possible to see Paul anticipating here one of the important themes of the letter.

Finally, the last difference of the prescript of 1 Thessalonians when compared to other Pauline letters is the omission of ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [from God our Father and Lord Jesus Christ] as the source of the grace and peace of the Pauline greeting. Malherbe interprets this absence as a way Paul waive to stress his authority as the one who bestows grace and peace whose source is God and Christ. Being the first (preserved) Pauline letter, however, it is possible to argue that some of the expressions that gain more significance and formulas that are fully developed in other letters are in an earlier stage of development here. Based on this assumption we argue that the lack of “ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ” is due to the fact that Paul had not yet fully developed his personalized greeting formula.

The 1 Thessalonians' prescript is the first, shortest and least developed of the Pauline prescripts. Therefore, it is difficult to see the anticipatory function well developed. The prescript, however, plays an important relational role, appealing to an ethos of friendship between Paul, Silvanus and Timothy toward the Thessalonians. Besides that, the presentation of the sender on the same level of authority is in full harmony with the consistent use of first person plural throughout the letter. Moreover, the definition of the church as one which is in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ anticipates the encouragement Paul will offer to the Thessalonians in this letter.

17 Some scribes were probably not comfortable with the difference “corrected’ this greeting formula by adding “from God (our) father and the Lord Jesus Christ (see manuscripts A, I, K, among others).”

II. The Prescript of Galatians

The prescript of Galatians underwent changes in its three formulas: *superscriptio*, *adscriptio* and *salutatio*. These changes reflect clearly the status of the relationship between Paul and that church as well some of the specific content of the letter. In the superscription it is possible to verify two alterations, the *correctio* Paul used in his presentation “Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων οὔδὲ δι’ ἰθρώπου ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἑγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν” [Paul apostle neither from men nor through men, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised him from the dead] and the co-senders as being “οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί” [all the brothers with me]. There are two changes in the adscription also: (1) the switch from the singular to the plural ἐκκλησίαις [churches]; and (2) the omission of any description of those churches. The most notable Pauline modification in the prescript is seen in the *salutatio*. Instead of just bestowing “χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ” [grace to you and peace from God our father and Lord Jesus Chirst], Paul goes on and describes Jesus Christ as “τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὧπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν,” [who gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father] followed by a simple doxoloxy: “ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν” [to whom be the glory forever and ever. Amen].

There has been an intense debate about the addressees and the date of letter to the Galatians. Among others, two theories are the most prominent. ¹⁹ The first theory affirms that

the letter was written to the churches located in the North Galatia and has a later date. The other theory insists that the letter was written to South Galatia near the date of the Council of Jerusalem. The general consensus, however is that neither theory has conclusive arguments.

Before assessing how the prescript of Galatians reflects in many ways the content of the letter, it is useful here to present a brief description of the occasion of the letter. Jewish Christians were proclaiming that the gospel did not release believers from keeping the requirement of circumcision (5:2-3; 6:12-13), and other aspects of the Old Testament law such as the Jewish calendar (Gal 4:10). On the contrary, they affirmed that only by being circumcised someone could be saved. Paul strongly combats these leaders by affirming that they were false brothers trying to make the Galatians slaves (Gal 2:4). Paul accuses them of preaching a perverted version of the gospel which is not gospel at all (Gal 1:7).

Frank Matera presents an appropriate summary:

By way of summary, the agitators probably came from Jerusalem with claims of support from some faction of the Jerusalem apostles. Exactly what faction, however, it is impossible to say. Claiming the support of Jerusalem, they criticized Paul and said that his Torah-free gospel was not sufficient. The core of their own

---


message centered upon the person of Abraham and the importance of becoming his descendant. Thus they told the Galatians that they could only enjoy the full benefits of the Jewish Messiah if they accepted circumcision and did the ‘works of the Law.’ The Law, they said, is not opposed to faith in the Messiah. Rather, it brings this faith to completion (3:3). Moreover, the Law provides a way of overcoming the desires of the flesh.\(^{24}\)

A second aspect of this same problem is that Paul was being attacked. The Judaizers were affirming that he was not an apostle in the same sense of the twelve who were called directly by Christ. Therefore, they claimed that Paul do not have the authority to define the gospel. They were attacking Paul as a heretic person, someone who had changed the gospel.\(^{25}\)

The Judaizers and their ideas had a good reception among the believers of Galatia. As Longenecker summarizes:

“The situation at Galatia was serious, not just, of course, because of the presence of Judaizers, but because the Judaizers had persuaded Gentile Christians to turn away from ‘the truth of the gospel’ (2:5, 14) to ‘a different gospel – which is not at all the same gospel’ (1:6-7). Their arguments were persuasive (cf. 3:1; 5:7-8), and those who claimed the name of Christ were beginning to carry out their directives (cf. 4:9-11).”\(^{26}\)

Having summarized up the occasion of the letter to the Galatians, it is possible now to analyze the peculiarities of its prescript in the light of the situation addressed by Paul. The sender formula of the letter to the Galatians is Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι’ ἀνθρώπου ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοὶ [Paul apostle not from men nor through men but from Jesus Christ


and God the Father, who raised him from the dead, and all brothers with me]. Paul often
presented himself as an apostle; the difference here is that he defines his apostleship first in a
double denial (οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὔδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου) and then in a double positive way (ἀλλὰ
dιὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν).

Longenecker defines the statement of Paul regarding his apostleship as apologetic
(defensive response) and polemic (aggressive explication).27 This aggressive explication affirms
that the apostleship of Paul had its origin in “Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised Christ
from the dead.” There are two things in this sentence to notice: (1) the inversion of the common
Pauline order, i.e., in this text Christ appears before God the Father; and (2) Paul’s definition of
God as the one who raised Christ form the dead. The inversion of the common Pauline order is
to clarify that, as the other apostles, Paul was also called directly by Christ.28 Concerning the
definition of God the Father, it serves to add strength to an already strong affirmation,29 adding
also weight to the claim of Paul and appending more authority to his words.

This correction (neither X, not Y, but W) that Paul uses reflects the attacks he was
receiving from his opponents and anticipates the defense he presents in 1:10 to 2:21.30 The
expression “nor from men nor by a man” well reflects the affirmation of Paul that he did not

27 Longenecker, Galatians, 4. Dunn thus comments on this sender formula: “It was unusual enough for a writer
to interrupt the opening greeting of his letter. But the abruptness with which Paul does so here, indicates a degree
of agitation and sense of urgency on his part.” The Epistle to the Galatians (Peabody: Hendrikson Publishers, 1993),
25.

28 Dunn, Galatians, 27.

29 Dunn proposes that Paul added the quotation of God who raised Christ because the resurrection is
foundational to the gospel and that this was a point of unification between him and his readers, but this is not
certain. Dunn, Galatians, 28-29.

30 On the Apologetic nature of chapter 2 see Jeffrey A. D. Weima, “An Apology of the Apologetic Function of 1
receive his gospel from any man, nor was he taught, but he received it directly from Christ (1:11-12). This is in harmony also with Paul’s claim that he did not consult any man nor went to Jerusalem to consult those who were apostles before him (1:16-17). Paul assures the Galatians that only three years after he was already in ministry he went to Jerusalem and met Peter and James, remaining unknown to the church of Jerusalem (1:18-24). Paul also made clear that his ministry was recognized by those reputed to be pillars of the church (2:9) and in different ways insisted that he was not inferior to Peter (2:7-9; 10-14). Therefore, Paul strongly defends the not-human-but-divine origin of his apostleship in the letter body and the sender formula clearly anticipates this subject.

The second part of the sender formula of Galatians is “καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοὶ” [and all brothers with me]. It is common for Paul to add co-senders in his letters (except in Romans), but, different from what happens here, he always nominates one or two co-senders. The reason he does not specify his co-senders here is mainly because Paul wants to show that the gospel he preaches is not a particular invention of his, but it is the gospel accepted by all brothers and the strong letter he wrote has the acceptance of all the brothers who are with Paul. Therefore, Paul adds authority to his letter by adding all brothers with him as co-senders.

From the relational point of view, the superscription of Galatians reveals that there is a strained relationship between Paul and the churches of Galatia, which makes it necessary to start the letter with two negatives about the origin of his apostleship. This grave tone of Paul is still clearer in the addressee formula.


The adscription (addressee formula) of Galatians is the simplest among Paul’s letters being just τας ἐκκλησιας της Γαλατιας [to the churches of Galatia]. Besides the plural ἐκκλησιας that points to the fact that Galatians is a circular letter, the most important difference in this adscription is the lack of any description of the Galatians. Paul usually defines the recipients is his letters in an honoring way. Paul affirmed that the Thessalonians were in God and Christ (1 Thess 1:1); called the Corinthians “those sanctified in Christ Jesus” (1 Cor 1:2); addressed Romans to “those who are loved by God” (Rom 1:7); praised Philemon, Apphia and Archippus (Philemon 1:1-2) and calls the Philippians “saints in Christ Jesus” (Phil 1:1). Compared to the other Pauline addressee formulas, the addressee formula to the Galatians is cold and without any praise. This is another important clue to the bad state of affairs between Paul and the Galatians and of the ethos of seriousness and gravity Paul is setting, in which the letter should be read.

The salutation (greeting formula) of Galatians is the largest of the undisputed Pauline letters. It reads: χαρις υμιν και ειρηνη αποθεου πατρος ημων και κυριου Ιησου Χριστου του δοντος έαυτον υπερ των άμαρτιων ημων, οπως εξεληται ημας εκ του αιωνος του ένεστωτος πονηρου κατα το θελημα του θεου και πατρος ημων, ως δοξα εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, άμην [Grace to you and peace from God our Father and Lord Jesus Christ who gave himself for our sins, to rescue us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father, to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen]. What distinguishes this greeting formula is that

33 Dunn, Galatians, 30-31.

besides bestowing grace and peace from God and Christ, Paul inserts a description of the work of Christ and a doxology. If in the superscription, Paul anticipated his own defense, in the salutation he foreshadows what he says in the letter about the sufficiency of the work of Christ. In other words, Paul summarizes here the gospel he preaches, from which the Galatians were diverting.

About the work of Christ, Paul affirms that 1) Christ gave himself for our sins; 2) he has done this with the purpose of rescuing the believers from the present evil age; and 3) this was according to the will of God. Based on these concepts Paul closes the prescript with a doxology.

Richard Hays presents the following arguments for Paul’s writing, since he is not ‘wasting words’. Paul is stressing, first, that “the gospel is about Jesus Christ’s gracious self-giving.” Second, that this self-giving is “an apocalyptic rescue operation” in the sense that for Paul as a Jew, the world was divided in two eras, the present and evil one, and the future era of God’s justice. Third, the will of the Father is “foreshadowing” an important theme that will be developed later, that “those who are rescued by Jesus are given the Spirit and thereby made God’s children, so that they can cry to God: ‘Abba, Father’ (4:4-7).”

A summary of Paul’s argument in the order that they appear in the body of the letter shows more clearly how the greeting formula anticipates the main argument of Paul. Christ gave himself in the cross for our sins (2:20; 3:1; 3:13) and took upon himself the curse which should be ours because of our disobedience to the law. Therefore, those who believe in him (3:6-10) are made free from the curse of the law (3:10, 13) and from the slavery of the sin (4:1-11; 5:1,

---

13; 6:1-10). He did that by the dwelling of his Spirit in us (3:3, 5; 5:16-26). The fulcrum of the gospel, the sacrifice of Christ, as well the liberty it gives, are the themes Paul is stressing in the addressee formula, which will be developed in the letter body.  

In this prescript Paul expresses the strained situation of the relationship between himself and the Galatians and he sets the ethos in which he wants the letter to be read. Paul writes to the Galatians as someone with authority. As Donald Guthrie affirms, the whole prescript “conveys at once the impression of authority, which underlies the subsequent argument throughout the epistle.” This is evident in the way Paul describes his apostleship, the non-description of the addressees point to a problematic relationship between Paul and the Galatians and the general tone of Paul. The fact that Paul substitutes the customary thanksgiving for a doxology also points in the same direction.

This section about the prescript of Galatians demonstrated that more than relational, however, the letter opening of Galatians has also an anticipatory function. The opening in the letter to the Galatians clearly introduces both main subjects of the letter itself. The sender formula anticipates the personal apology that Paul will develop in chapters one and two.

---


38 F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Gran Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 77.

expanded greeting formula foreshadows the defense of the true gospel that Paul will develop mainly on chapters three to six.

### III. The Prescript of 1 Corinthians

The prescript of 1 Corinthians was not as altered as that of Galatians. But the changes made by Paul are very significant. The form of the superscription and greeting formulas was not altered, being examples of the standard formulas used by Paul. The content of the sender formula is different in the sense that instead of Timothy, the co-sender of Paul in this letter is Sosthenes. The adscription, however, received the addition of a long description of the Corinthians. Paul defined the ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ [church of God which is in Corinth] as ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοίς ἁγίοις, σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν· [those made holy in Christ Jesus, those called holy, with all those everywhere who invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, ours and theirs]. Another important feature of the adscriptio is the play between singular in ἐκκλησίᾳ and the plural words ἡγιασμένοις and ἁγίοις. As Margaret Mitchell notes, this use of both plural and singular to refer to the addressees happens only in 1 Corinthians.⁴⁰

Although Paul presents himself in his customary way as an apostle, this presentation has special weight in 1 Corinthians. There is in the letter an apologetic tone regarding Paul’s

---

apostolicity and ministry (4:3-4; 9:1-23; 15:7-11).\textsuperscript{41} Although the authority of Paul was not being questioned as in the churches of Galatia, there was a need to reaffirm and defend his authority and apostleship to the Corinthians. The relational function of the prescript, therefore, is sensible in the sender formula in a way that also foreshadows some of the elements of the content of the letter.

Paul’s inclusion of Sosthenes as a co-sender can have the same effect of adding authority to the letter. If this Sosthenes is the same synagogue ruler who was beaten (cf. Acts 18:17), he could have been an example and a leader among the Corinthians. Thus, his name as co-sender adds more weight to what Paul has to say to the Corinthians.\textsuperscript{42}

It is on the addressee formula, however, that Paul furthers his intentions. The adscriptio of 1 Corinthians is the largest among the seven undisputed Pauline letters. Its main features are (1) the use of the singular followed by the plural to refer to the recipients; (2) the emphasis on holiness; and (3) the inclusion of those who everywhere invoke the name of Jesus.

The use of singular and plural to refer to the Corinthians reflects one of the main concerns of Paul related to that church. The first part of the letter (1:10-4:21) is addressed to the problem of “the divisions in the community”.\textsuperscript{43} There were factions in that church, each one arguing to follow one spiritual leader (1:11-12; 3:1-4). The root of the divisional problem was the boasting of thinking about him being wiser and more spiritual than others (3:18-19, 4:7, 18; 5:2, 6). The same problem of divisions caused by boasting appears throughout the letter.

Members of that church were leading one another to judgment before unbelievers (6:1-11). The problem of food sacrificed to idols (chapters 8-10) is that some people were eating it based on their ‘superior’ knowledge. They were not concerned whether they were causing a scandal to the brothers with a weak conscience (8:1-13). The divisions were clear also in the holy meal in which some people remained hungry while others got drunk (11:20-21). Also concerning the use of the spiritual gifts Paul needed to emphasize that each spiritual gift is important to the whole body and that, just because of the singularity of each member, the body works properly (12:1-30; 14:1-40). It is because of the divisions that Paul writes 1 Corinthians 13 and recommends the holy kiss in 16:20. The playing with plural and singular in the letter prescript, as well as the expression “with all brothers everywhere…” anticipates a fundamental subject of the letter, the call for unity.44

The other major problem foreshadowed in the addressee formula is related to holiness. The redundant construction of Paul, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις [those made holy in Christ Jesus, those called holy] affirms that the Corinthians were made holy by Christ in the past and the result of this act of Christ was that they are objectively holy in the present.45 God the Father called them a holy people, as he did to Israel. The verb ἁγιάζω, besides appearing in 1:2 comes back in 6:11 and 7:14. The other six undisputed letters combined have two more occurrences (Rom 15:16 and 1 Thess 5:23). In addition to 1:2, the adjective ἅγιος appears again in 3:17; 6:1; 6:2; 6:19; 7:14; 7:34; 12:3; 14:33; 16:1; 16:15; 16:20. The impressive fact, though, is that instead of being separated from the world, the Corinthian church is actually

---

44 See Raymond F. Collins, First Corinthians (SP 7; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 41; Mitchell, Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation, 193.

45 Collins basis this interpretation in the use of the perfect passive ἡγιασμένοις by Paul. First Corinthians, 46.
the ‘less holy’ among the New Testament churches. Besides the lack of holiness showed in the
divisions and boasting, the Corinthian church struggled with sexual immorality: a man having
sex with his father’s wife (5:1-13) and believers going to prostitutes (6:12-20); lawsuits before
unbelievers (6:1-11); believers going to pagan temples to eat cultic meals (8:1-11:1); and
despising the Lord’s Supper (11:12-34). When Paul defines the church as ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ ‘Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, he is not only anticipating one of the major themes of the letter, but he
is also using the prescript pastorally. Craig S. Keener comments on this use of the prescript:
“Being set apart for and dedicated to God meant being set apart from the profane things of the
world. The Corinthians obviously needed to display in practice what they had been called to
be.”46

Finally, another theme foreshadowed by Paul in the prescript is the attempt, in the
words of Richard A. Horsley, “to expand the perspective of the Corinthians – who were focused
on their own divisions – to the broader movement of all the assemblies.”47 There are many
references in the letter to the broader church, of which the Corinthians are a part. Paul regularly
quotes the other churches as a way to show the Corinthians that there is a Christian way of life
that is being practiced by all Christians (4:17; 7:17; 11:16; 14:33 [16:19]). The reference to πᾶσιν
toῖς ἐπικαλομένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν [all those who invoke the name of our and their Lord Jesus Christ, in every place] is especially
important in reference to the collection he is organizing in favor of the church of Jerusalem


47 Richard A. Horsley, 1 Corinthians (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 40. In this matter see also Keener, 1-2 Corinthians, 22.
Paul’s reference to “all those who invoke the name of our and their Lord Jesus Christ, in every place” anticipates the basis of his argument that the Corinthians should conform to a standard of Christian way of life that is practiced by other Christians. It foreshadows also the Paul’s request concerning the collection to the believers of Jerusalem.\(^{48}\)

Therefore, someone could hardly be wronger than Graydon F. Snyder who, commenting on the prescript of 1 Corinthians, affirms that “The opening and the thanksgiving are both formal elements of a letter, so further study may not shed much light on the actual intent of the letter itself.”\(^{49}\) It is exactly the contrary! In Corinthians and other letters Paul clearly chose the prescript (and the thanksgiving even more) to anticipate his main purposes on the letters. In the case of 1 Corinthians, these main purposes were a calling to unity, a calling to holiness and a calling to consider ecumenism.\(^{50}\)

### IV. The Prescript of 2 Corinthians

As it happened in the first letter to the Corinthians, the only part of the prescript with suffered changes was the addressee formula; the changes in the second letter are smaller, however. At this time Paul includes as co-recipients τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ

---

\(^{48}\) Collins affirms that “this outreach [of 1 Cor 1:2] foreshadows Paul’s use of the eclesiatical argument in his exhortation to the community.” *First Corinthians*, 46-47.


\(^{50}\) Hans Conzelmann related 1 Corinthians 1:2 to ecumenism in his commentary. *1 Corinthians*, 23.
Ἀχαΐᾳ, [all the saints who are in the throughout Achaia].

Before the analysis of the prescript of 2 Corinthians⁵¹ and the ways it anticipates the content of the letter, it is profitable to review the historical context of the letter.⁵² Corinthians, whose carrier was Timothy, was a letter with plenty of rebukes. It is possible, although there is no evidence, that the letter was not well received by some of the Corinthian church. Paul then went to Corinth (2 Cor 12:14; 13:1-2), but the problem remained unsolved. Thus, Paul wrote another letter (which is lost), a severe one (2:2-4; 7:8), which was delivered by Titus (7:6-7). The severe letter and the visit of Timothy had good results and the problem in the Corinthian church was solved (7:6-16).

It seems that those that Paul calls “false apostles, deceitful workmen masquerading as apostles of Christ” and servants of Satan (2 Cor 11:12-15) arrived in the church of Corinth after Timothy’s visit and made a campaign of defamation against Paul (2:1-11; 7:2-13; 10-13).⁵³ The church was divided. Some of the Corinthians deserve praise because of the repentance concerning the first problem and others rebuke, because they had been influenced by the false leaders. Amidst all of this, Paul also needed to instruct the Corinthians about the collection for

---

⁵¹ I assume the integrity of 2 Corinthians although acknowledging the authenticity of the debate. For the unity of the letter see David E. Garland, 2 Corinthians (NAC 29; Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1999), 33-44. For a composite letter theory see Victor Paul Furnish, II Corinthians: Translated with Introduction, Notes and Commentary (AB 32A; Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1984), 30-48. See also Murray J. Harris, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 8-51.

⁵² It is possible to be sure concerning the events that happened between 1 and 2 Corinthians, but it is not possible to be sure about the chronological order of those events.

⁵³ As Paul Barnett says: “Earlier doubts about Paul’s apostle ship by some of the Corinthians have apparently now hardened into opposition. This is attributable to the recent arrival of self-professed ‘ministers’ or ‘apostles’ (11:23, 13) who have launched a countermission against Paul (2:17-3:1; 11:4, 12) and who are according to them ‘superior’ in ministry to Paul (11:5, 23; 12:11).” Paul Barnett, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 59. See also Ralph P. Martin, 2 Corinthians (WBC 40; Waco: Word Books, 1986), 4-5.
the church of Jerusalem (ch. 8-9). Therefore, to strengthen his relationship with the Corinthians, rebuke those influenced by the false apostles and organize the collection for the Jerusalem believers, Paul wrote 2 Corinthians.

A quick survey on the structure of 2 Corinthians proposed in some commentaries shows that the letter revolves around two subjects: the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians (1:12-7:16 and 10:1-13:10) and the collection (8:1-9:15). If the main subject of the letter is relational, the relational function of the prescript of 2 Corinthians is also anticipatory.

The sender formula of 2 Corinthians is “Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς [Paul, apostle of Chirst Jesus through the will of God and Timothy, the brother.]” Although Paul’s self presentation as an apostle is the most used in the undisputed letters (1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans), an analysis of the letters proves that when Paul uses this presentation he does so because the situation between him and the church requires a defense of his apostleship. This is the case in 2 Corinthians. The issue Paul’s apostolic authority, highlighted in the sender formula, is the main subject of the letter. Generally speaking, the subject appears in chapters 1-7 and 10-13. Specifically, as Ernest Best argues: “The note of apostolic authority is sounded again at 1:21; 2:17; 4:4; 5:20; 10:8 and 13:10.” The fact that Paul presents himself as an ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ

---

54 Garland, 2 Corinthians, 45; Jan Lambrecht, Second Corinthians (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 10-11; F. F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1971), 174-175. Although not all of these commentators divide the letter exactly in three parts, a look on their titles can show this division of two sections about Paul’s relationship with the Corinthians and one section, in the middle, about the collection. Scott J. Hafemann includes even the collection under the major theme of the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians. 2 Corinthians (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 37-39.

55 “Paul’s opening section focuses attention on an issue that will preoccupy him in the remainder if the letter, if in various ways. It is the question of his apostolic authority in the congregation.” Martin, 2 Corinthians, 4-5.

θελήματος θεοῦ [apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God] contrasts radically to what he says about the false leaders that arrived in Corinth: “ψευδαπόστολοι, ἐργάται δόλιοι, μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ” [false apostles, deceitful workmen, masquerading as apostles of Christ] (2 Cor 11:13) and also servants of Satan (cf. 11:14-15).

Paul’s authority is not based in his own capacities (that are being criticized), but on the fact that it was God who had chosen him. As Lenski points out, even the addition of the name of Timothy presented as “the brother” would serve to stress the authority claim of Paul as, not another brother, but an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God.

Concerning the inclusion of Timothy as co-sender, Ralph Martin thinks that Paul did so to restore Timothy’s authority after his frustrated visit to the Corinthians. Lenski affirms that the objective is to bring a fraternal sound to the letter. Together with Garland, Hafemann and Furnish, however, this thesis contends that the main objective was to add authority to his letter. Timothy was one of the founders and preachers of that church (2 Cor 1:19; Acts 18:5) and had been there recently (1 Cor 16:10-11; Acts 19:22). Therefore, he was more than a brother among the Corinthians, instead, he was a leader who had a ministry among them.

The adscriptio of 2 Corinthians is τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ [to the church of God which is in Corinth with all the

---

57 Cf. Furnish, II Corinthians, 102.


59 Martin, 2 Corinthians, 2.

60 Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians, 807.

61 Furnish, II Corinthians, 104; Garland, 2 Corinthians, 49-50; Hafemann, 2 Corinthians, 46.
saints who are throughout Achaia]. Some commentators interpret this addressee formula as if Corinth was a kind of diocese in some way officially related to the other churches of Achaia.\(^62\)

Based on the fact that Paul addresses not the churches of Achaia but the saints, I think that this interpretation is misguided. Although it should be conceded that because Corinth is the largest and most important city in the region, the church of Corinth had a non-official influence on the saints of the whole Achaia. Thus, the reason for including the σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ ἡ Ἀχαίᾳ [‘with all saints everywhere in the whole Achaia] is to address the letter also to them not as first recipients, but as co-recipients\(^63\) and in doing that Paul achieves the following objectives: (1) minimizes the effects that the crisis in Corinth can have on the saints in the surrounding region;\(^64\) (2) address the collection which will be taken on the whole Achaia to those saints (9:2); (3) address the arrogance and self-sufficiency of the Corinthians by showing that there are other Christians and churches besides them (cf. 11:28), which anticipates the chapter about the collection (ch. 8-9);\(^65\) (4) press the Corinthians toward change, since the letter will be read by other Christians; and (5) remind the Corinthians and recall them to holiness by calling saints the other believers in Achaia.\(^66\)

The greeting formula of 2 Corinthians follows the standard Pauline *salutation*. Thus, was already commented in chapter three. The present analysis has demonstrated that the prescript

---


\(^{63}\) Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, 809-810.

\(^{64}\) Hafemann, *2 Corinthians*, 46-47.

\(^{65}\) Garland, *2 Corinthians*, 50.

\(^{66}\) Hafemann, *2 Corinthians*, 47.
of 2 Corinthians has both functions, relational and anticipatory. These functions overlap since the letter is mainly about the relationship of Paul with that church. The theme of collection is foreshadowed by including the saints of Achaia as co-recipients of the letter since they will also take part on the collection. Besides that, by addressing them Paul reminds the Corinthians (as he does in 1 Corinthians) to expand geographically their conception of church.

V. The Prescript of Romans

The prescript of Romans is not only the largest in the Corpus Paulinus, it is also one of the largest known prescripts among the ancient Greek letters. Moreover, it is “the most theologically complex prescript of all Pauline openings.”67 While the sender formula of Romans was deeply altered and the addressee formula has its peculiarities, the greeting formula of Romans is the Pauline standard. The prescript of Romans, as the other Pauline prescripts, has two functions, relational and anticipatory.68 As the greeting formula used by Paul is the standard, both functions of the salutatio were demonstrated in the preceding chapter. Here, therefore, the goal is to show these two functions in the sender and addressee formulas.

The reason the prescript of Romans is unusual is because its superscription is unusual.69

The total words of all six sender formulas of the undisputed letters without Romans is 69, which

---


68 As introduction to his commentary on Romans 1:1-7, N. T. Wright affirms about the anticipatory function: “As usual, he [Paul] introduces, within the formal structure of a letter opening, the themes that will occupy him in what is to come.” Romans (NIB 10; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), 415.

results in an average of 11.5 words per *superscritio*. The *superscritio* of Romans alone contains 72 words. Formally speaking the sender formula of Romans has two parts: the name of the sender and his description. This is the only Pauline letter that does not add a co-sender. The description of Paul was adapted to include his titles, message and target audience. The *adscriptio* is different from the Pauline standard since the letter is addressed not to one church or more (1 Thess, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Gal and Philemon), but πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμη ἄγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις [to all in Rome who are loved by God and called to be saints] (cf. Philippians “to all the saints in Christ Jesus at Philippi”).

The standard Pauline sender formula is well represented by “Paul + description (apostle or servant or prisoner) + co-sender + description”. Romans’ sender formula, however, is composed of just “Paul + description,” but this description is the most elaborate of all Pauline letters and can be divided into three sections: titles, message, and target public of Paul. While Paul does not describes himself in 1 Thessalonians and uses just one title to describe himself in 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians and Philemon; in Romans he used three expressions in his self-presentation; he is 1) δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ [a slave of Christ Jesus], 2) κλητὸς ἀπόστολος [called apostle], and 3) ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ [set apart to the gospel of God].

Paul’s first designation intends to earn sympathy by humbly stating that Paul is a slave of Christ Jesus; it also guarantees that Paul’s words and acts are according to the will of his master. The second identifying expression points to the authority of Paul: he is a slave called by Christ [implicit] to be an apostle, someone with authority to speak as an authorized

---

representative of Christ.\textsuperscript{71} The third definition Paul uses to introduce himself to the Romans, again, emphasizes God’s initiative instead of his own. Paul affirms that he was set apart for the gospel of God, therefore, his ministry is essentially related to the gospel of God. In doing so, Paul is anticipating the main theme of the letter and introducing the next part of the prescript. The absence of a co-sender, especially considering that Timothy was with Paul in the time he was writing the letter, points to the fact that Paul wants to concentrate all attention of the recipients to himself and his gospel.\textsuperscript{72}

The second part of this sender formula is a large description of Paul’s message:

\textit{(εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ ὃ προεπηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν [(the gospel of God which) he promised beforehand through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures regarding his Son, who as to his human nature was a descendant of David, and who through the Spirit of holiness was declared with power to be the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead: Jesus Christ our Lord.]} L. Ann Jervis is right when she comments that “Paul’s authority is underscored by the fact that his apostleship is on behalf of a gospel that is the fulfillment of God’s purpose.”\textsuperscript{73}

Although the relational function cannot be forgotten (the definition of his message is


part of Paul’s presentation), the anticipatory function of the prescript of Romans is evident in Paul’s description of the gospel. The statements Paul made about the gospel are: 1) it was promised through God’s prophets in the Holy Scriptures; 2) it is a gospel regarding God’s Son, who is descendent of David according to the flesh and through the Spirit of holiness, was declared son of God by the resurrection from the dead. The gospel is the central theme of Romans. It’s the only theme big enough to comprehend what Paul says in Romans and is the subject that frames the letter, being prominent in its prescript (1:1-2), thanksgiving (1:9, 15-17) and conclusion (15:16, 19).

The first statement of Paul, ὃ προεπηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις, is according to the emphasis of Paul throughout the letter, about the gospel being the fulfillment of the promises of the Old Testament. This definition of the gospel especially anticipates parts of chapters four, five and nine where Paul heavily uses the Old Testament. Paul’s second statement about the gospel (1:3-4) is probably a pre-Pauline formulation (a hymn or a creed). It is possible that Paul used this statement as another way to make his letter more acceptable to those believers that did not know him personally, by establishing some common ground. However, it is not possible to affirm with certainty that the statement was known by


75 Cf. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 43-44. Moo argues that the use of the word προεπηγγείλατο is especially relevant since it points the relation promise-fulfillment. Besides that, words started with προ are abundant in the letter (21 occurrences).


77 Cf. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 45; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 230, 234; C. K. Barret, *The Epistle to the Romans*
the believers of Rome. This quotation also introduces the theme of promise and fulfillment presenting Christ as the promised son of David.\(^7^8\)

When Paul defines his target audience as “all the gentiles”, he is not only affirming his connection with his addressees (note 1:7),\(^7^9\) but also preparing them to the subsequent argument about the salvation of the gentiles (11:11-25) and his request that the Romans support him in his ministry to reach other gentiles (15:14-29). Thomas Schreiner comments on the expression “all the gentiles,” suggesting that it anticipates one of the major themes of Romans which is the inclusion of the Gentiles into God’s people (3:22, 31; 4:11-12, 16-17; 10:11-13; 16:26).\(^8^0\) The expression εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως [to the obedience of faith] states what Paul should accomplish amongst the Gentiles. There are two main, possible interpretations of this expression; the first is obedience which is faith; the other is an obedience which is the fruit of faith.\(^8^1\) This phrase, which is repeated in the conclusion of the letter (Rom 16:26), unifies and anticipates two important concepts of the letter, obedience (6:12, 16-17; 10:16; 11:30-31)\(^8^2\) and faith (40 occurrences throughout the letter, especially in ch. 3-4). Jewett affirms that by unifying ‘a favored concept for Jewish theology’ (obedience) and ‘a favorite shibboleth for Gentiles believers in Rome’ Paul is, again, finding common ground by honoring both Jewish and Gentile

\(^7^8\) Cf. Barret, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 21.

\(^7^9\) Cf. Jervis, *The Purpose of Romans*, 77.

\(^8^0\) Schreiner, *Romans*, 35.

\(^8^1\) See Schreiner, *Romans*, 35.

believers.\textsuperscript{83}

The final objective of the ministry of Paul among the gentiles concerns Christ’s name. Before introducing the recipients of the letter, Paul used a few verses to explain by which right he is writing to the Romans. The sender formula answer is that Paul is an apostle to the Gentiles who is writing to the Romans who are people among the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{84} Yet before the addressee formula Paul defines the Romans also as those called to belong to Jesus Christ.

From the relational point of view it is possible to affirm that such a large identification of the sender reveals that Paul was introducing himself to an unknown church.\textsuperscript{85} Thus, this prescript plays a role of self-presentation and self-recommendation.

The \textit{adscriptio} of Romans is πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, [to all in Rome, beloved by God, called saints]. Even before the \textit{adscriptio} Paul had started to define his addressees. He affirmed in v. 6 that the Romans were Gentiles “called property of Jesus Christ.” In the addressee formula (v. 7) Paul adds that the Romans are also beloved by God and called [to be] saints. These epithets were commonly used in the Old Testament to refer to Israel.\textsuperscript{86} Therefore, in the \textit{adscriptio} Paul is working the relational aspect since by those expressions he highly elevates his audience. He is also anticipating an important theme of the letter that he also worked with in the \textit{supercriptio}, namely, the inclusion of the Gentiles in the people of God, Israel.

\textsuperscript{83} Jewett, \textit{Romans}, 110.

\textsuperscript{84} Cf. Brendan Byrne, \textit{Romans} (SP 9; Collegeville:The Liturgical Press, 1996), 41.

\textsuperscript{85} Cf. Moo, \textit{The Epistle to the Romans}, 40; Fitzmyer, \textit{Romans}, 227.

\textsuperscript{86} Moo, \textit{The Epistle to the Romans}, 54-55. See also Dunn, \textit{Romans 1-8}, 25; N. T. Wright, \textit{Romans} (NIB 10; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), 421; Jewett, \textit{Romans}, 113; Byrne, \textit{Romans}, 46.
The greeting formula has special importance in Romans, although the \textit{salutation} used is the Pauline standard. The letter to the Romans deals with the grace of God in providing salvation for Gentiles and Jews, and consequently unifying them as only one people of God. The Pauline salutation anticipates the content of the letter by bestowing to the recipients a related blessing, that God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ provide grace for sinners among Jews and Gentiles so that they are able to live in peace with God and one with other.\footnote{On the anticipatory function of the \textit{salutatio} in Romans see Robert Jewett, \textit{Romans: A Commentary} (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 115-16.}

The prescript of the letter to the Romans points clearly to the fact that Paul was not known to those believers to whom he writes. Besides that, this letter opening also anticipates the major themes of the letter: the gospel, the fulfillment of the Scriptures (Old Testament) in Christ and the inclusion of the Gentiles in the people of God.

\textbf{VI. The Prescript of Philippians}

The letter opening of Philippians was altered mainly in the \textit{superscriptio} and in the \textit{adscriptio}. The \textit{salutatio} is the Pauline standard \greektext{χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ} [grace to you and peace from God our Father and Lord Jesus Christ]. The \textit{superscriptio} differs from the standard Pauline sender formula in the fact that Paul presents himself not as an apostle, but as a slave. The other difference is that Paul does not make a distinction between himself and the co-sender, Timothy.\footnote{Cf. Gordon D. Fee, \textit{Paul’s Letter to the Philippians} (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 62.} Both are presented as slaves of Christ Jesus. The \textit{adscriptio} has two alterations also. The recipients are named as \greektext{πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν...}
Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις [all saints in Christ Jesus who are in Phillipos], not as a church. Moreover this is the only letter which addresses also the ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις [overseers and deacons] specifically.

Acts 16:11-40 narrates the founding of the Philippian church. Paul was accompanied by Timothy, Silas and Luke. The story relates the conversion of Lydia and other women, the exorcism of a python spirit from a young slave girl, the imprisonment of Paul and Silas, an earthquake, the conversion of the jailer, the request of the magistrate to Paul and Silas leave the city and the visit to Lydia’s house to encourage the incipient church.

The Philippian church became a partner in Paul’s ministry, sending repeated offerings to him (2 Cor 11:7-9; Phil 4:15-16, 4:18). During his so called third missionary journey, Paul probably made two visits to Philippi (Acts 20:1-6). After this journey, Paul was imprisoned in Jerusalem, being transferred to Rome after appealing to Caesar (Acts 25:10-11; 28:11-16). And it was from Rome that Paul wrote the letter to the Philippians.  

Three factors should be noticed in the superscription; first, Paul waives presenting himself as an apostle; second, he presents himself as a slave; and third, he presents himself on the same level together with the co-sender Timothy. The presentation as a slave occurs also in Romans, but there Paul adds he is a slave called to be an apostle (Rom 1:1). The presentation as a slave instead of an apostle points to the fact, evident in the rest of the letter, that there is a good relationship between Paul and the believers of Philippi (1:3-11, 25-26; 2:2, 17-18). Paul does not need to emphasize his apostolic authority to those who already recognize it. The

---


expression does claim authority,91 but an authority of someone who is an example in his commitment to Christ and cannot be criticized by his sufferings. The presence of Timothy as a co-sender is relational also and anticipates what Paul will say about him in 2:19-24. Timothy was co-founder of the Philippians church and he visited the church together with Paul (Acts 20:3-4) and on occasions when Paul was unable to go (Acts 19:22).

Besides the relational role, however, this description also has a twofold foreshadowing role.92 It foreshadows, firstly, the biographical account of Paul in 1:12-30. This account of Paul is one of suffering (1:30; 2:17; 27), in chains (1:13, 14), being troubled by others (1:17). It is possible that the Philippians were troubled by Paul’s suffering. The presentation as a slave of Christ Jesus places these sufferings in the right perspective. The distresses of Paul are not because infidelity or lack of blessings from Christ, they have their origins in the fidelity of the apostle to the vocation of God. The result of this comprehension would be a greater disposition of the Philippians to face courageously their own struggles (cf. 1:28, 30).

The presentation of himself as a slave together with Timothy on the same level anticipates, secondly, the subject of humbleness (that leads to unity) dealt in 2:1-18 and 4:2-3.93 This becomes clearer when one notices that the supreme example of humility given by Paul, Christ, uses the same word δοῦλος [slave]: ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών [he emptied himself taking the form of a slave]. Therefore, when Paul presents himself and Timothy


92 Stephen E. Fowl affirms that “This identification of Paul and Timothy as slaves of Christ is taken up in a variety of more or less direct ways in the course of the epistle.” Philippians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 17.

93 Cf. Silva, Philippians, 40-41; Fee, Paul’s Letter to the Philippians, 63-64.
as slaves, he is presenting them as followers of Christ in this matter and implicating that the Philippians should do the same.

The addressee formula also has both relational and anticipatory roles. The relational role is seen both in the honorable way Paul refers to the Philippians: τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [to the saints in Christ Jesus] and in the addition of the ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις [overseers and deacons] as co-recipients of the letter. This last characteristic has no parallel in the Pauline letters and the use of these offices in this addressee formula has caused much debate.94 It is impossible, based on the letter alone, to answer with certainty the reason for including the overseers and deacons as special recipients of the letter.

The anticipatory function of the adscriptio is in the use of the expression ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.95 This expression has a special importance in the letter to the Philippians. Paul uses “in Christ Jesus” ten times in Philippians; only Romans and 1 Corinthians have more occurrences.96 Some commentators stress that by locating the Philippians “in Christ” and “in Philippi”, Paul is stressing their need to live in Christ whereas living under the political realm of Rome, thus anticipating 1:27; 2:5 and 3:20.97

---

94 Reumann, Philippians, 62-64; Fee, Paul’s Letter to the Philippians, 67-69.

95 For comments on the importance of this expression in the letter of Paul to the Philippians see Reumann, Philippians, 58-61 and Fee, Paul’s Letter to the Philippians, 65.


97 Cf. Stephen E. Fowl, Philippians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 19; Fred B. Craddock, Philippians
Thus, the evidence compels us to conclude that the prescript of the letter to the Philippians has an anticipatory function. Paul advances both the subject of humility and the theologically significant expression ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, which will continue to serve as a theme throughout the letter.

VII. The Prescript of Philemon

The letter from Paul to Philemon has one of the clearest examples of how Paul adapts the letter opening in order to anticipate the main theme of the letter. In the sender formula, instead of presenting himself as apostle, Paul describes himself as Παῦλος δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ [Paul, prisoner of Christ Jesus]. The change in the addressee formula is clear also. The letter to Philemon is the only letter addressed to specific persons quoted by name. Paul addresses the letter Φιλήμονι τῷ ἀγαπητῷ καὶ συνεργῷ ἡμῶν καὶ Ἀπφίᾳ τῇ ἀδελφῇ καὶ Ἀρχίππῳ τῷ συστρατιώτῃ ἡμῶν [to Philemon, the beloved and our fellow worker, and Apphia, the sister, and Archippus, our fellow soldier]. But Paul also wants the letter to be read to the whole church and thus he adds καὶ τῇ κατ' οἶκόν σου ἐκκλησία [and to the church of your home]. The greeting formula is the standard one used by Paul.

Before analyzing the anticipatory function of the prescript of the letter to Philemon, it is appropriate here to review briefly the facts that culminated in this letter. Philemon was the host of a church (v. 2). He had been converted by Paul (v. 19) and was a leader in the church (v. 2); his testimony of faith and love (v. 5) was recognized by others. Paul feels a genuine affection for...

(Interpretation; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 12.
Philemon (v. 1, 4, 7, 9, 17, 20). Apphia was probably Philemon’s wife, but this is uncertain. It is hard also to define who Archippus was; Paul calls him a fellow-soldier which indicates that he should be understood in relation to his service to the church (as in Philippians 2:25). Some argue he was Philemon’s son.\(^98\) The letter was also directed to the church, which was hosted in Philemon’s house.

Onesimus, whose name means “useful”, was Philemon’s slave (v. 16).\(^99\) He was probably a problematic slave. By mirror reading it is possible to affirm that he was not a hard worker while he was with Philemon (v. 11) and it is possible that he had stolen something of his master before fleeing (v. 18-19). Onesimus met Paul when he was in jail and was converted by Paul (v. 10). Onesimus started to serve the apostle (v. 11, 13) and his conversion and disposition to serve him made the apostle nurture a genuine affection for Onesimus (v. 10, 12, 16).

The true faith in Christ should lead to complete restoration and reparation. Therefore, Paul could not just keep Onesimus with himself. It was necessary that the slave go back to Philemon as a repentant slave. This letter would go with him and as an appeal of Paul to Philemon in order that Onesimus, now a believer, would be received as brother, no longer as a slave (v. 15-16). This brief overview of the letter allows us to analyze its prescript.

The sender formula has the notable presentation of Paul as a δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Marianne Meye Thompson affirms correctly that it could be supposed that Paul would present himself as an apostle (as in 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians and Romans) to communicate authority or

\(^{98}\) Jac. J. Müller, *The Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and to Philemon* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955), 174;

as a slave (as in Romans and Philippians) to identify himself with Onesimus, but Paul chooses to present himself as a prisoner. Thompson, then, suggests two explanations for the presentation of Paul: (1) to underscore his own vulnerable situation, suggesting solidarity with Onesimus and (2) to communicate to Philemon that he [Philemon] is also a prisoner of Christ’s love and therefore has the obligation of doing what Paul is suggesting. Müller suggests another explanation: he claims that the presentation of Paul as a prisoner intends that Philemon receives the letter as from a friend, not from an apostle. Robert W. Wall offers a more appropriate explication. He contends that in presenting himself as a prisoner of Christ, Paul is showing to Philemon a “new social order” that is based on the “revolutionary content” of the gospel. Paul, the apostle, was appealing to another kind of authority, the authority of someone who lives the consequences of what preaches.

Paul mentions five times throughout the letter his condition of being in bonds (1, 9, 10, 13, 23), which indicates the importance of this fact to his argument in the letter. The first and the last quotations are not in the middle of an argument. The three remaining quotations, however, clarify why Paul starts and ends the letter by presenting himself as a prisoner. In verse 9 Paul uses his condition as prisoner directly connected with his plea on behalf of Onesimus: “Therefore, although in Christ I could be bold and order you to do what you ought to do, yet I appeal to you on the basis of love. I then, as Paul — an old man and now also a prisoner of Christ Jesus.” Paul’s plea is personal. His authority is the authority of a friend, a colleague, an

100 Marianne Meye Thompson, *Colossians and Philemon* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 206-207.


older and more experienced partner; the authority of someone who is suffering for Christ.

Paul appeals again to his condition as a prisoner in v. 10: “I appeal to you for my son Onesimus, who became my son while I was in chains.” In this instance Paul communicates to Philemon the conversion of Onesimus and shows how greatly he considers Onesimus, as a son. The next reference to his chains is in the context of Paul introducing his subtle request to Philemon that he wants Onesimus to serve him. Paul says: “I would have liked to keep him with me so that he could take your place in helping me while I am in chains for the gospel” (v. 13). Again, Paul connects his request directly to his condition of being in chains. He wants to persuade Philemon with a basis in his authority as a prisoner of Christ Jesus and with a basis in his need of a personal assistant while in chains. Therefore, Calvin J. Roetzel is right when he affirms that “the condition central to Paul’s plea for leniency to Onesimus (the condition of bondage) surfaces in the opening line of the letter.”

The addressee formula of the letter to Philemon is unconventional also. Instead of directed to a church, the letter is addressed to three individuals and a church. Each one of the recipients receives a description by Paul. Philemon is described as “our beloved one and fellow worker.” Ben Witherington III notes that in the way Paul describes Philemon “he is establishing rapport with Philemon and making clear how much he cares for him at the very outset of the this document.” Then Witherington concludes: “This perhaps puts some subtle pressure on Philemon to remain in Paul’s favor and good graces.”

---


the friendship more than apostolic authority, this way to refer to Philemon brings forth the relationship of friendship and partnership that exists between him and Paul.

Apphia and Archippus are referred as “the sister” and “our fellow soldier”. As it was noted above, it is hard to specify their identities and consequent roles related to the request of Paul, even though the terms used to describe them are expressions of endearment (Apphia) and partnership (Archippus). Paul also includes the church as a receiver of the letter. Robert W. Wall and David Garland argue that by including the church as co-recipient of the letter, Paul’s goal is that not only the ‘natural’ household of Philemon, but also the ‘spiritual household,’ the church, welcome Onesimus as a brother.  

Although the greeting formula used here is the Pauline standard, it has a special significance because it is specifically applied to the request Paul is doing to Philemon: may God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ give you grace in order that you also show grace and make peace with your slave Onesimus.

Therefore, especially in the case of the auto-presentation of Paul as a prisoner, there is an evident anticipatory function, because he uses this argument throughout the letter to convince Philemon to positively answer his request.

---

In this study I have argued that the prescript of the seven undisputed Pauline letters has an anticipatory function along with a relational role. This anticipatory function has two expressions. First, it can be seen that, as Plato and Epicurus before him, Paul also created and used a greeting formula (*salutatio*) that encapsulates his theology. This is the equivalent to affirming that through the expression “grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ,” Paul is communicating the theology that underlies his letters, as well his life and ministry.

The second way in which the anticipatory function works is through the modification of sender and addressee and greeting formulas in a way that they express important themes of the Pauline letters. I.e., Paul, by modifying the way he describes himself, his co-senders and the church and by adding, expanding or removing elements of the letter opening, foreshadows specific themes that occasioned the letter.

Chapter 2 analyzed the form and function of the ancient Greek letter openings from III BCE to III CE. This section provided the basis for the analysis of the Pauline letter openings of chapters three and four. The analysis of the ancient Greek letter prescripts has shown that a kind of anticipatory function was in use before Paul. Some literary letters, as those of Plato and Epicurus, presented the same phenomenon of communicating in summary form the basic philosophy in which the letters were written. Some documentary letters presented another adaptation developed by Paul. Some authors changed the standard prescript in order to better fit it with the content of the letter. Paul has developed this concept so that the prescript not
only fits the content of the letter, but anticipates some of the main themes developed in the letter body.

Chapters 3 and 4 analyzed the form and functions of the Pauline letter opening. Although the main intent of this thesis is to analyze the anticipatory function of the Pauline letter opening, a short analysis of the relational function was also provided. Chapter three presented the Pauline prescripts (their form and peculiarities) and provided an analysis of the place of the expression “grace to you and peace” in Pauline theology. The conclusion of this last analysis is that the Pauline greeting formula provides a nutshell of Pauline theology. Thus, when Paul opens his letters with this expression, he is anticipating the theological basis that underlies his letters. Chapter four analyzed the differences of the Pauline prescripts and concluded that in these adaptations Paul furthers some of the main subjects of the letter.

This thesis has shown that the anticipatory function of the Pauline prescripts has epistolary roots. Therefore, it is not necessary to appeal to the rhetorical criticism to explain the foreshadowing function of the prescript in Paul’s letters.

The contribution of this study for broad Pauline studies is a better understanding of the Pauline epistolary prescript. For the interpreters of the Pauline letters it should be clear that an awareness of the relational and anticipatory functions of the letter opening and a serious study of this part of the Pauline letter can help the interpreter to better understand the occasion and main theme of the letter.

Charles B. Cousar affirms in his commentary on Galatians that “A study of the beginning of Paul’s letters is a profitable enterprise.”\textsuperscript{106} We hope to have shown the veracity of this

\textsuperscript{106} Charles B. Cousar, \textit{Galatians} (Interpretation; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 15.
statement through this thesis. Further study of the Pauline letter openings continues to be profitable, since there are areas not covered or developed in this thesis that need more attention. Among these areas we suggest a deeper study of the place of “grace to you and peace” in the Pauline theology, a study of the influence of the Hebrew and Roman letter prescripts on Paul and an analysis of the prescript of the so-called deutero-Pauline letters.
Paul was a Jewish Pharisee educated by the most important Rabbi of his time, Gamaliel. Therefore, the place and importance of Jewish practices and thinking cannot be diminished in the study of the apostle and his writings. Many scholars claim that the Pauline greeting, grace to you and peace, is influenced by the Jewish practice of letter writing. This chapter analyzes the form and function of the ancient Hebrew and Aramaic (from now on HA) letter opening (from III BCE to III CE) in order to furnish the necessary background to the analysis of the Pauline letters opening developed in the next two chapters.

The analysis of the Greek and the Semitic letters face opposite problems. On one hand, the analysis of the Greek letters needs to start with classification of them because of the large amount of preserved letters. On other hand, the analysis of the Hebrew and Aramaic (HA) letters has a small sampling. Among the letters from this sampling there are fragments and incomplete letters. Thus, the study of the opening in the HA letters is limited by the availability of them in the chosen period: 300 BCE to 300 CE.

There are two ways in which the HA letters were preserved: in its original form in papyri or incorporated in another kind of literature. Weima calls these groups primary and secondary letters; he correctly attributes more weight to the first group, since the secondary letters, having been incorporated by another writer, might have been edited.¹

This appendix will study the Hebrew letters by, first, presenting the corpus; second, showing the form of the ancient Hebrew letters; and, third, detecting whether is there any anticipatory function present.

I. Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Letter Prescript Corpus

The following corpus is presented here and in the next sections we will draw conclusions about the form and function of these ancient HA letter prescripts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 01 – MasOstr – Massada Letter on an Ostracon, XXX BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[מנח] מ בר Москва שלם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menahem, son of Ma'azi, greetings!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 02 – 5/6HevEp 1 – 5/6 Hever Letter of Bar Cochba 1, XXX BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שמיען בר Kosiba היהיש ישראל ליווהות ולמשבלת שלם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeon, son of Kosiba, the ruler over Israel, to Jonathan and Masabala, peace!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 03 – 5/6HevEp 4 – 5/6 Hever Letter of Bar Cochba 4, XXX BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אגרת שמיען בר Kosiba שלם ליווהות בבעיה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A letter of Simeon, son of Kosiba, peace! To Jonathan, son of Ba'ah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 04 – 5/6HevEp 8 – 5/6 Hever Letter of Bar Cochba 8, XXX BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שמיען בר Kosiba ליווהות בר בועי ולמשבלת בר שמיען</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeon, son of Kosiba, to Jonathan, son of Ba'yan, and Masabala, son of Simeon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 05 – 5/6HevEp 10 – 5/6 Hever Letter of Bar Cochba 10, XXX BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שמעון[ו] ליירוחה ולחמסבָּלה שלם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeon to Jonathan and to Masabbala, peace!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 06 – 5/6HevEp 11 – 5/6 Hever Letter of Bar Cochba 11, XXX BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שמעון בר יוסיב ליירוחה בר ביתו שלם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeon, son of Kosiba, to Jonathan, son of Ba'yan, and to Masabbala.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 07 – 5/6HevEp 14 – 5/6 Hever Letter of Bar Cochba 14, XXX BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שמעון בר יוסיב ליירוחה ולמסבָּלה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeon, son of Kosiba, to Jonathan and to Masabbala.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 08 – 5/6HevEp 15 – 5/6 Hever Letter of Bar Cochba 15, XXX BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שמעון ליירוחה בר מנשה לאירית גרוביה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeon to Judah, son of Manasseh, of Qiryat ‘Arabaya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 09 – Rabbi Joshua b. Hananiah 1, I-II CE (pg 186, HAHL 8.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מֵשִׁמְּכֶנ bn gmly l wmywhn bn zk y lˈhynw šbdrwm hˈlywn whtwn wlʃhlyl wlšb t plky hdrwm šlm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.From Simeon b. Gamaliel and from Yohanan b. Zakkai to our brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the Upper and Lower South, to Shahliil and to the seven southern toparchies: Well-being!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 10 – Rabbi Joshua b. Hananiah 1, I-II CE (pg 186, HAHL 8.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Example 11 – papMur 42, 132-135 CE (pg 123-24, HAHL, 37)

From the village managers of Beth-Mashko, from Yeshua and Eleazar
to Yeshua son of Galgula, camp commander: Greetings.

Example 12 – papMur 43, 132-135 CE (pg 129-30, HAHL, 38)

From Shimon ben Kosiba to Yeshua
ben Galgula and to the men of your company:
Greetings.

Example 13 – papMur 44, 132-135 CE (pg 129-30, HAHL, 132)

From Shimon to Yeshua son of Galgula:
Greetings.
Example 14 – \textit{papMur 45}, 132-135 CE (pg 135-36, HAHL, 40)

\begin{itemize}
    \item mywn\textit{tn} bn [mhnym] lywsh [\textit{bn} ]
    \item šlwm \textsuperscript{*}yn[\textit{y}] sryk l\textsuperscript{c}mrk[ ]
\end{itemize}

From Yonatan son of MHNYM to Yose son of [ ]

Greetings.

---

Example 15 – 5/6 Hev 12, 132-135 CE (pg 142, HAHL, 47)

\begin{itemize}
    \item mšm\textsuperscript{*}wn \textit{br kwsb} \textsuperscript{w}nšy \textsuperscript{*}yn\textit{gdy}
    \item lmsb\textsuperscript{*} [w]\textit{lyhw}[n]tn \textit{b[r]} b\textsuperscript{c}yn šlwm b\textit{twb}
\end{itemize}

From Shimon bar Kosiba to the men of Ein-Gedi

to Masbala and to yehonatan son of Bayan: Greetings.

---

Example 16 – Rabbi Joshua b. Hananiah 1, I-II CE (pg 191, HAHL 8.2)

\begin{itemize}
    \item gm\textsuperscript{c}ly\textsuperscript{*}l wzq\textsuperscript{n}ym šhyw yw\textsuperscript{n}byn c\textit{1 gb m\textsuperscript{c}lw}\textit{t bhr hbyt} wyw\textsuperscript{n}nn swpr hlh lpny\textsuperscript{n}ym \textsuperscript{c}m.
    \item lw k\textit{twb} \textsuperscript{w}hn\textit{b} by\textit{ny glyl} \textsuperscript{c}yl\textit{h} wb\textit{ny glyl} \textit{tht\textsuperscript{w} h šlmkwn ysg} \textsuperscript{m}hw\textsuperscript{d}n\textsuperscript{c}
    \item lk\textit{wn d}y m\textsuperscript{c}zm by\textsuperscript{w}rw \textsuperscript{c}lp\textsuperscript{w}qy m\textsuperscript{c}š\textsuperscript{y}r\textsuperscript{y} mm\textsuperscript{e}w\textit{t}ny zy\textsuperscript{t}yy\textsuperscript{w}ml\textit{h}n\textsuperscript{c} bny drwm\textsuperscript{c}
    \item c\textit{yl\textsuperscript{w} h} wb\textit{ny drwm} \textit{tt\textsuperscript{w} h šlmkwn ysg} \textsuperscript{m}hw\textsuperscript{d}n\textsuperscript{c} lk\textit{wn n\textsuperscript{h}n} dw\textsuperscript{m}zmn by\textsuperscript{w}rw\textsuperscript{c}
    \item l\textsuperscript{p}pw\textsuperscript{q}y m\textsuperscript{c}š\textsuperscript{y}r\textsuperscript{y} m\textsuperscript{c}wm\textsuperscript{r}y sx\textsuperscript{b}ly\textsuperscript{y} ml\textit{h}n\textsuperscript{c} bny gl\textit{wt} db\textit{bl} wb\textit{ny gl\textit{wt}} dy\textsuperscript{m}dy\textsuperscript{w}š\textsuperscript{r kl gl\textit{w}wi} dy\textsuperscript{sr}š\textsuperscript{l} šlmkwn ysg\textsuperscript{m}hw\textsuperscript{d}yn n\textit{h\textsuperscript{h}n} lk\textit{wn kgwz\textsuperscript{y}y} rky\textsuperscript{yn}
\end{itemize}

Gamaliel and the elders who were sitting on the steps on the temple mount, with that scribe Yohanan before them. He told

him, "Write": To our brothers of Upper and Lower Galilee. May you well-being increase! We inform

you that removal time has arrived. Remove the tithes from the olive clusters. And: To our brothers of the

Upper and Lower South. May your well-being increase! We inform you that removal time has arrived.

Remove the tithes from the wheat sheaves. And: To our brothers belonging to the Babylonian diaspora, and belonging to the Median diaspora
and all the other Israelite diasporas. May your well being increase!

Example 17 – Rabbi Joshua b. Hananiah 1, I-II CE (pg 199, HAHL, 8.4)

Our Rabbi told Rabbi Afas, "Write a letter in my name to our Lord King Antoninus"

He proceeded to write: From Judah the Patriarch to our Lord King Antoninus. He (Judah) took it, read it and tore it up.

He told him, "Write: From Judah your slave to our King Antoninus." He replied, "My master! Why do you belittle your dignity? "He answered him, "Am I then better than my ancestor? Said he not thus?

'Thus says your slave Jacob' (Gen. 32:5)

Example 18 – Rabbi Joshua b. Hananiah 1, I-II CE (pg 201-202, HAHL, 8.4)
A. Liebermann 1974:64

1) rbynw hqdwš kšhyh kwtb lʾntwnynws hyh kwtb yhwdh cbdk św��作 l
2) bšlwmk hwh yr操作 t h. bny wmlk

B. Mann 1971 I: 322

1) kḥ操作 mr cbdk yʾqb lmdh twrh drk ṭrš lḥlwq kbwd lmlkwtd
2) r. hyh kwtb lʾntwnynws yhwdh cbdk św操作 bšlwmk
3) lḥlwq kbwd lmlkw t kʾšr cʾšh yʾqb lʾšw

C. Buber 1885:164

1) ṭmr r. pnḥš ʾntwnynws hyh mkbd ṭ rbynw mh ʾšyn swp
2) wkšhyh rbynw mšlhny ṭšl whhyh kwtb lw ʾgrt wkwtb bh
3) ṭbdk yhwdh św操作 bšlwmk whhyh rʾ lʾntwnynws lwmr ʾšhw 操作 qwr操作
4) ʾšmw ṭbd 操作 l. ṭl tktwb ṭwd kdbḥ hzh 操作 l. rbynw kk ṭny kwtb

5) lk ʾšyny twb myʾqb ṭbd kššl ʾšl ʾšw mh ṭmr lw
6) kḥ ṭmr ṭbdk yʾqb
A.
1) When Our Holy Rabbi would write to Antoninus he would write, “Your slave Judah inquires
2) after Your well-being.” This was in keeping with “Fear the Lord my son and the King” (Prv. 24:21).

B.
1) “Thus says Your slave Jacob” (Gen. 32:5). The Torah has taught protocol, to assign honor to royalty.
2) Rabbi used to write to Antoninus “Judah Your slave inquires after Your well-being,”
3) to assign honor to royalty.

C.
1) Rabbi Phineas said, “Antoninus used to honor Our Rabbi boundlessly.
2) And when Our Rabbi would send me to him and write him a letter and in it write,
3) ‘Your slave Judah inquires after Your well-being’ it displeased Antoninus that he called
4) himself ‘slave’. He told him, ‘Write no longer in this fashion.’ Our Rabbi replied to him, ‘Thus I write
5) you for I am no better than Father Jacob. When he sent to Esau what did he say to him?
6) “Thus says Your slave Jacob”’ (Gen. 32:5).”

Example 19 – Rabbi Joshua b. Hananiah 1, I-II CE (pg 203, HAHL, 8.4)

\[\text{šlhw lh lr. yhw. bn btyr}^2 \text{šlm lk r. yhwdh bn btyr}^2 \text{d}^2 \text{t bnšyb}^2 \text{ynm} = wmswtk \text{pr}^2 \text{sh byrws}^2 \text{lm} \]

They dispatched to Rabbi Judah b. Batyra, "well-being to you Rabbi Judah b. Batyra. For you are in Nisibis but your net is spread in Jerusalem."

Example 20 – Rabbi Joshua b. Hananiah 1, I-II CE (pg 205, HAHL, 8.4)

\[\text{yhwdh bn tb}^2 \text{y b}^2 \text{wn mmnytyh n}^2 \text{y b}^2 \text{yrws}^2 \text{lmy w}^2 \text{z}^2 \text{l lyh l}^2 \text{lksndry}^2 \text{h whyw bny yrws}^2 \text{lm kw}^2 \text{tby n myrws}^2 \text{lm hgdwlh l}^2 \text{lksndry}^2 \text{h q̃h}^2 \text{nh c}^2 \text{d mty}^2 \text{rwsy ywš}^2 \text{b}^2 \text{šlm w}^2 \text{ny ywšbt c}^2 \text{gm}^2 \text{h c}^2 \text{lyw} \]
Regarding Judah b. Tabbai, they were about to appoint him patriarch in Jerusalem. He fled and betook himself to Alexandria. So the inhabitants of Jerusalem used to write: From Jerusalem the Great to Alexandria the Small. How long shall my betrothed remain with you while I remain grieving over him?

2. Hebrew and Aramaic Letter Prescript Form

The elements of the Hebrew/Aramaic prescripts, at that time and considering the limitation of letters we have are basic the same of the Greek letters presented in the last chapter. These Semitic prescripts are composed of the following elements: sender formula, addressee formula and greeting formula.\(^2\) Variation occurs related to the order of these elements or due to the suppression of one of them. Other difference between prescripts is due to differences inside the sender, addressee and greeting formulas.

The most common form of the prescript is sender formula, addressee formula and greeting formula (see examples 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15). Some prescripts, though, lack one of the formulas. Thus, it is possible to have a prescript only with sender and addressee formulas (see examples 4, 6, 7, 8, 20); addressee and greeting formulas (see examples 16, 19 [inverted]) and even with sender and greeting formulas (see example 1). Related to the different order of elements, there is only one letter in which the greeting formula appears between the sender and the addressee formulas (see example 3) and this letter is also the unique instance that has the word אגרת in its beginning. Joseph Fitzmyer comments the term אגרת is the most common

Aramaic term for letter and it comes from the Acadian word *egertu*.³

2.1. Sender Formula (*Superscriptio*)

The form of the *superscriptio* is: name of the sender + description (regularly: son of ...) w other senders. The HA superscription presents variations. It is possible to have just the name of the sender (see examples 5, 8) or the name plus a description. This description is usually the name of the father (see examples 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10), but sometimes it is the function of the sender (see examples) or both (see examples 2, ). The name of the father is indicated by the construction: sender + *br* (Aramaic) or *bn* (Hebrew) + name of the father.

Often in the secondary letters, the name of the sender is preceded by the preposition *mn* (see examples 12, 13, 14, 15, 17). When there is more than one sender, the names after the sender appear after the construction *wmn* (see examples 9, 10). Pardee affirms that the use of the preposition *mn* is more common in Hebrew than Aramaic and that the first epigraphic instances of this use dates from the fifth century.⁴

Pardee comments this use in the following terms:

---

⁴ Pardee, Dennis and Sperling, S. David. *Handbook of ancient Hebrew letters: a study edition* / by Dennis Pardee ; with a chapter on Tannaitic letter fragments by S. David Sperling ; with the collaboration of J. David Whitehead and Paul E. Dion  (Chico: Scholars Press, 1982 ), 126.
relationship of correspondents.\textsuperscript{5}

There is one example in which the sender is a group, the village managers of Beth-Mashko, and even this kind of letter may have co-senders (see example 12). There is another example in which the sender is the city of Jerusalem, described as ‘the great’ (which writes to the city of Alexandria) (see example 20).

2.2. Addressee Formula (Adscriptio)

The form of the adscriptio is: name of the addressee + description (regularly: son of ...) w other addressees.\textsuperscript{6} The description of the addressee is often the expression \textit{br} or \textit{bn} plus the name of the father (see examples 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15). The description can be also the function of the addressee (see examples 11, 17, 19) or the place he lives (see examples 8, 9, 10, 15, 16).\textsuperscript{7} This information about the addressee can be combined (see example 8, 11, 19). In some letters with more than one addressee it is possible that both (see examples 2, 5, 7) or one of them (see example 6) appear without a description.

Among the letters extant, there are more letters to multiple recipients (see examples 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16) than letters to just one addressee (see examples 3, 8, 11, 13, 17, 19, 20). And it is possible a letter be sent to a group (see examples 9, 10, 12, 15, 16) or a city (see examples 9, 20) and even to have a person, a group and a place combined (see example 9, 10, 12, 15).

2.3. Greeting Formula (*Salutatio*)

The *salutatio* is the most stable formula of the HA letters. In all instances when the greeting formula is present, the word $šlwm$ appears.\(^8\) In the vast majority, $šlwm$ appears alone (see examples 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15). Dion affirms that the one word salutation is an influence of the Greek usage of the one word salutation $χαίρειν$.\(^9\)

There is one instance, however, that the formula is different. It is in a secondary source letter. This opens the possibility that we are dealing with a modified version of an original letter. In the example sixteen the greeting formula is *tht’ḥ slmkwn ysg’* (may your well-being increase). It is quite possible that this is a development of the common *salutation*, using just the expression $šlwm$.

II. The Relational Function of the Letter Opening in the Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Letters

The analysis of the function of the Hebrew and Aramaic letter prescript is damaged because we do not have the whole Tannaitic letters preserved, and in most cases just the letter opening. Therefore, it is not possible to compare the prescript with the letter content.

Yet, it is possible to verify the relational role of the prescripts in the use of kind words to

---

\(^8\) In the oldest Aramaic and Hebrew letters there is a greatest variation in form and content of the salutation, cf. Lindenberger, James M. *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 7.

\(^9\) Cf. also Pardee, Dennis. & Sperling, S. David. *Handbook of ancient Hebrew letters : a study edition / by Dennis Pardee ; with a chapter on Tannaitic letter fragments by S. David Sperling ; with the collaboration of J. David Whitehead and Paul E. Dion* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1982 ), 120.
describe the recipients.

The parental description is the formal way to describe the recipient and has no special significance (examples 13, 14).

The description ‘brothers’ can be applied in the case of blood relation ('), but also in the case of national/religious relationship. This last is the case of examples 9, 10, 16.

When the sender defined the recipient in terms of vocation is because the addressee is being contacted in an official way and because of its social function. This is the case in examples 11.

In the case of multiple addressees should be noted that the main addressee is referred first and then the co-recipients of the letter. In the case of the example 12 the names of the recipients appears in this way and by the reference of the “the men of you company” the ranking position of the addressee, Yeshua ben Galigula, is affirmed. Pardee affirms that the letters opening is common in the Bar Kokhba letters: “The introductory formulae are regular for the Bar Kokhba correspondence. These are no closing greetings.”

Specifically commenting the Bar Kokhba letters, Pardee affirms that no ranking were expressed through the prescription because no titles were used and because the same formula were used both from superior to inferior and vice-versa.

An interesting relational use of the prescriptio is shown in the examples 17 and 18. In both examples it is said that the Rabbi Joshua b. Hananiah, addressing the king, chose change

---


his own description from “from Judah, the Patriarch” to “from Judah your slave”. Then, when asked why the change, he said that he was not better than Jacob who addressed his brother calling himself ‘your slave’. Therefore, it is possible to see that when reporting to the king, Joshua b. Hananiah chose diminish himself and honoring the king describing him as ‘our Lord King Antonius’.

III – Conclusion

It is not possible to detect any aspect of an anticipatory function in the HA letter openings. Analyzing the small corpus we have it is impossible to notice any aspect that foreshadows the content of the letters, as it happens in the Greek letters of the same period. As the corpus of Hebrew and Aramaic letter prescripts of the period we are analyzing is very small, it is difficult to reach conclusions with security. Thus, the only characteristic of the Aramaic and Hebrew letters that we can see in the Pauline letters is the use of the greeting shalom. But even here we should conclude that Paul filled the term with a new meaning. In the Semitic letters we analyzed in this appendix, the expression has the meaning of a simple greeting, as the translations well-being and greetings show. In Paul, on other hand, the expression gained a new meaning: the reconciliation with God and consequently with one another that is resulted by the receiving of grace.

---

12 Fitzmeyer commenting on the Aramaic letter salutatio said: “In a few cases šlwm was used alone and probably had only the stereotyped meaning of ‘greetings’ functioning like the Greek χαίρειν.” Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Epistolography,” Semeia 22 (1981): 34.
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