PAULINE PERSPECTIVES ON RELIGIOUS CONSECRATION, RELATIONAL RECONCILIATION, AND SPIRITUAL TRANSFORMATION

Benjamin Crisp

Second Corinthians 6:14-18 houses critical data for personal and corporate relational partnerships. This paper services Robbins' (1996) intertextual analysis to evaluate the Apostle Paul's recitation, recontextualization, and reconfiguration of biblical and extra-biblical texts that prohibit certain relational partnerships and demand personal holiness. After a thorough intertextual analysis is completed, 2 Corinthians 6:14-18 and its analysis will engage the four primary categories of transformational leadership: (1) idealized influence, (2) inspirational motivation, (3) intellectual stimulation, and (4) individualized consideration. The Pauline exhortation enhances these four primary categories and recommends areas for further consideration in Pauline literature and transformational leadership.

I. INTRODUCTION

Leadership theoreticians are often drawn toward innovative modalities and trends. Perhaps that is why a simple google search of the term, "leadership," produces over two-billion results. A recent audit of top-tier leadership academic journals revealed transformational leadership as a leading paradigm in scholarly inquiry (Dinh et al., 2014). Transformational leadership theory has developed considerably since its inception. These developments must be considered in order to contextualize the Apostle Paul's unique exegetical, theological, and theoretical contributions.

Transformational leadership, while "first coined by Downton (1973)," was more fully explored by James Burns, a political sociologist, in his seminal work, *Leadership* (1978) (Northouse, 2016, p. 162). Burns (1978) serviced two primary leadership modalities, transformational and transactional, to examine this sociological phenomenon. These two goalposts allowed Burns (1978) to conceptualize an

appropriate framework. He concluded the superiority of the transformational paradigm because of its ability to move beyond mutual exchange to moral and personal development (Mulla & Krishnan, 2011).

Bass (1985) expanded Burns (1978) initial findings by developing a Full Range Leadership Model classifying three leadership styles [transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire] (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2015) and describing four primary components of transformational leadership [idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration] (Bass & Avolio, 2004). These four behavioral components position transformational leaders to transcend personal interests and appeal to followers' "higher needs" (Mulla & Krishnan, 2011, p. 130)

Bass, Avolio, and other colleagues enabled leadership scholars to conduct qualitative and quantitative research that enhanced theoretical propositions with substantial, diverse data (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2015). Time after time the data verified transformational leaders as ones seeking positive change in individuals and collective systems (Kendrick, 2011), valuing process and development over specific skills or behaviors (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2015). Through an interpersonal connection, transformational leaders inspire and intrinsically motivate their followers for everyone's common good (Afsar, Badir, & Bin Saeed, 2014).

The Apostle Paul, whose influence extends far beyond the first century, is introduced within this theoretical framework. His linguistic acuity has shaped ancient and contemporary philosophical, theological, and sociological thought (Kerekes, 2015). In his second letter to the Corinthians, Paul accomplished three primary tasks: (1) He illustrated his delight with the Corinthians' repentant response to his first letter. (2) He urged the Corinthians to participate in the Jerusalem offering fully. (3) He prepared the Corinthians for his pending arrival (Harris, 2008, p. 426). Of particular interest is Paul's instruction regarding relational purity (2 Cor 6:14-18), which is located within the broader discussion of diplomatic and religious requirements of Christ-followers (2 Cor 5:18-20; 6:16). To substantiate his exhortative remarks, Paul strung together several Old Testament recitations and allusions. This paper will service Robbins' (1996) intertextual analysis to discover the textual contours of these instructional intentions further. Subsequently, the pericope and its hermeneutical revelations will engage the four primary categories of transformational leadership to unveil the moral and relational development of the Corinthian correspondents under the Apostle Paul's transformational leadership.

II. EXEGETICAL ANALYSIS OF 2 COR 6:14-18

The pericope under investigation, 2 Corinthians 6:14-18, is located within the immediate literary context of Paul's demand for Corinthian separation from uncleanness (Harris, 2005). To fend off visceral attacks from his Corinthian recipients, Paul employed an intentional and deliberate rhetorical digression (2 Cor 6:14-7:1). However, Paul's exhortative remarks were much more than a rhetorical device to place the Corinthians "on the defensive" (Witherington III, 1995, pp. 335-336). These remarks reveal the relational intimacy Paul desired. His "wide open" heart (2 Cor 6:11) was a model for the relational openness the Corinthians should reciprocate toward Paul and his ministerial associates (2 Cor 7:2). By disengaging from paganism completely, their hearts could be

opened toward Paul, their founding apostle, and Christ, the chief apostle of their faith (Harris, 2005).

"Unequally Yoked"

Paul's initial admonition, "Do not be unequally yoked with unbelievers" (*Μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις*), coordinates the present imperative, *γίνεσθε*, with the strong negative adverbial modifier, *μὴ*, strengthening his demand for the Corinthians to cease this ongoing practice (Martin, 2014). The core of this prohibition is found in the *hapax legomenon*, "unequally yoked" (*ἑτεροζυγοῦντες*):

Literally it means "pull the yoke [ζυγός] in a different [ἕτερος] direction than one's fellow," and figuratively, "make a mismatched covenant," "mismatch" (Spicq 2.80). In this periphrastic construction, then, it means "be yoked in unequal partnership" (LSJ 701 s.v.), with the second element (-ζυγέω) "governing" the first (ἑτερο-) (BDF §119[1]). (Harris, 2005, pp. 498-499).

Paul's language engaged two particular Old Testament texts: (1) The Levitical prohibition which focused on the crossbreeding of animals that resulted in a categorically different species (Lev 19:19; Garland, 1999). (2) The Deuteronomistic prohibition which prohibited the pairing of the ox and donkey for labor (Dt 22:10). The latter better illustrates Paul's intention. In the Deuteronomistic context, two different animal-types yoked together harmed productivity and jeopardized "Israel's distinctiveness from the nations" (Grisanti, 2012, p. 676). Paul serviced this imagery to prohibit communal uncleanliness caused by idolatrous and sinful relational partnerships with "unbelievers" (*ἀπίστοις*). The lexical data steers exegetes away from identifying *ἀπίστοις* as oppositional false apostles (cf. 2 Cor 4:4). It seems more appropriate that this prohibition referred to yoking up with unbelievers in general (Martin, 2014). Semantically, *ἑτεροζυγοῦντες* lends itself to close relational constructs rather than general relationships. Thus, it appears Paul warned the Corinthians "against compromising the integrity of faith" through mixed marriages, which were historically connected with idolatry (cf. Dt 7:1-3; Josh 23:12; Neh 13:25), or any other close relationship or partnership, especially those related to local pagan temples or cults, that hindered fidelity to Christ and His gospel (Martin, 2014, p. 362; Harris, 2005).
Why would Paul present such a strong admonition through codified Old Testament allusion to a church in Corinth—a bastion of opulence and Greco-Roman culture (Garland, 1999)? Perhaps it would be helpful to consider the constituents whom Paul addressed. While significant portions of the Corinthian church were Gentiles "drawn from the pagan world," the church was also comprised of Jews from "the so-called Dispersion" who were converted by "Paul's preaching in the local synagogue" (Martin, 2014, pp 31-32; Acts 18:1-11). Both groups, however, "would be familiar with Jewish teaching" (Martin, 2014, p. 31; cf. Acts 18:4). Their ethnic and theological background contextualizes Paul's prohibition forbidding close relational partnerships between believers and unbelievers and connects the spiritual and relational togetherness Paul envisioned for the Corinthians (2 Cor 6:1).

vv. 14b-16a "for what"

Paul, through the causal, connective conjunction, "for" (*γὰρ*), presented five rhetorical questions (vv. 14b-16a), which presupposed negative answers, to substantiate and explain his initial command (Harris, 2008, p. 488; Abernathy, 2008). The rhetorical questions offer five different categories: (1) righteousness with lawlessness (v. 14b), (2) light with darkness (v. 14c), (3) Christ with Belial (v. 15a), (4) believer with unbeliever (v. 15b), and (5) temple of God with idols (v. 16 a). These categories pedagogically address unequal yoking, encouraging the Corinthians to examine ongoing, and future, practices and partnerships (Witherington III, 1995).

v. 14b "righteousness with lawlessness."

Betz' (1973) claimed the number of *hapax legomenon* in this pericope verify anti-Pauline authorship. Lexical nuance, however, does not discredit Pauline authorship. Instead, the *hapax legomenon*, "partnership" (*μετοχή*), indicated stylistic variation in describing a relational partnership between the righteous and lawless (Louw and Nida, 1996). The contrast could not be more apparent. How absurd is a partnership between the ethically and spiritually upright, which alluded to the Qumranic and Old Testament semantic understanding of "righteousness" (*δικαιοσύνη*), and the lawless (Martin, 2014)? Naturally, no reasonable connection exists.

v. 14c "light with darkness."

Paul considered a second abstract pairing—the partnership between light and darkness. Paul used the parallel term, "fellowship" (*κοινωνία*), to describe an inconceivable relational pairing. Contextually, *κοινωνία* referred to an "active fellowship in pursuing common interests" (Harris, 2005, p. 502). What common interests or goals does light have with darkness? None. Paul's dualistic metaphor, possibly alluding to Qumranic texts which categorize humanity in two basic categories, "sons of light" and "sons of darkness" (Fitzmyer, 1961), further exacerbated the chasm between light and darkness (Harris, 2005). The two are not compatible for partnership and should not be yoked together.

v. 15a "Christ with Belial."

Moving from abstract to concrete, Paul serviced a third parallel rhetorical question displaying the incompatibility between Christ and Belial (Harris, 2008). Debate surrounds the *hapax legomenon*, "Belial" (*Βελιαρ*) (Harris, 2005). Although the term is singularly used in the New Testament, its Hebrew corollary is regularly employed in the Old Testament (cf. Dt 13:13; Judg 19:22; 20:13; 1 Sam 1:16; 2:2; 25:25; Prv 6:12; Na 1:15). With the possible exception of Nahum 1:15, the term conveys general worthlessness, or wickedness, rather than an individual archenemy (Elwell & Beitzel, 1988). The contextual progression from abstract to specific, where Christ is identified as the supreme example of light and righteousness, points to Belial as a single oppositional figure rather than general wickedness.

Late Jewish literature contextualizes the individual usage of Belial. The *War Scroll* frequently referred to Belial "as the arch enemy of God (1QM 13:11 the "angel of enmity; his domain is darkness, his counsel is for evil and wickedness")" (Garland, 1999, p. 335). The question remains, why would Paul abandon his typical identification "for the devil…Σατανᾶς (10 uses; e.g., 2:11; 11:14; 12:7)" (Harris, 2005, pp. 502)? Rather than immediately dismissing Pauline authorship in favor of an interpolated paragraph by an unidentified Qumran Essene, one should consider the intentional shift of Belial's Qumranic counterpart from God to Christ (Fitzmyer, 1961). In Quamranic literature, Belial "is always the adversary of God, never of the Messiah" (Martin, 2014, p. 364). The shift from God to Christ may represent the common interpolative and apocalyptic hermeneutic where Christ is exalted as the king of light and righteousness, while Belial is bound up and trampled by the righteous (cf. *T. Levi* 18; Martin, 2014). Thus, Belial, as the archenemy of God and ruler of darkness, represented "the embodiment of iniquity," while Christ, contrastingly served as the king of light and righteousness (Harris, 2005, pp. 502-503).

v. 15b "believer with unbeliever."

To further solidify the concrete categories of separation, Paul asked, "What portion does a believer have with an unbeliever" (v. 15b)? Paul's line of questioning does not deny basic commonality among people (i.e., food, shelter, water, and clothing) (Garland, 1999). Instead, Paul emphasized the contrast in their "part or portion" (*μερὶς*) (Louw and Nida, 1996, p. 613). The communal portion for believers is a kingdom of light (Col 1:12). Unbelievers do not share "in the community or in the promises" (Eph 2:11-13; Garland, 1999, p. 335). The contrast clearly and concretely displayed their incompatibility—having no share in the righteous community's present and eternal portion.

v. 16a-b "temple of God and idols."

The contrast between the temple of God and idols served as the final climatic question in the five-part series (Harris, 2008). By using the *hapax legomenon*, "agreement" (*συγκατάθεσις*), Paul highlighted a critical reality: agreement or union cannot exist between God's temple and idols (Martin, 2014). Commitment to the worship of God and participation in His community cannot simultaneously occur "with the worship of lifeless images" (Harris, 2005, p. 504). Paul's prohibition is further substantiated by Exodus 23:33 (LXX), where the same verbal form of the *hapax legomenon*, *συγκατάθεσις*, is found (Garland, 1999). The LORD, in the Sinaic revelation to Moses, warned the Israelites of agreements/partnerships with indigenous land dwellers that could lead to idolatry (Ex 23:23-33; Garland, 1999). With this allusion in mind and the immediate contextual thrust, one must consider Paul's intended meaning for the temple of God.

The explanatory force of the term, "for" (*γάρ*) (v. 16b), illuminated Paul's final metaphor. The four previous rhetorical comparisons presented clear and definitive contrasts. The last rhetorical comparison, however, employed a metaphorical meaning for the temple of God in contrast to idols. Contextually, Paul does not describe the

temple edifice located in Jerusalem. Rather, he representatively addressed the corporate Corinthian Christian community, which at this point in salvation history collectively and individually formed "'the temple [or sanctuary] of the living God' (cf. 1 Co 3:16–17; see also 6:19, which individualizes the truth)" (Harris, 2008, p. 488). Like the prohibition given to the Israelites before them (Ex 23:23-33), the Corinthians, as image bearers of God Himself (Gen 1:27) and as the individual and collective temple of God, must abstain from idol images that defile the temple of God and sway one's allegiance from Godly purity to demonic pollution (Harris, 2005).

vv. 16c-18 "God said"

To further substantiate his initial prohibition, "do not be unequally yoked" (v. 14a), Paul provided a Scriptural basis by employing a chain of Old Testament citations. Different from typical Pauline introductory formulas, Paul introduced this Scriptural collage with the unique phrase, "*καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεός ὅτι*, 'as God said'" (2 Cor 6:16; Martin, 2014, p. 368). While unique to the New Testament, this introductory formula "has its Qumran counterpart in CD 6,13; 8,9…but is found neither in the Old Testament nor the Mishnah" (Fitzmeyer, 1961, p. 279). Furthermore, in this reconfigured string of Old Testament recitations, Paul adapted Old Testament (LXX) texts to fit the Corinthian context (Martin, 2014). By mirroring the standard Qumranic *testimonia* and "*pesher* method," his textual reconfiguration engaged "the polemical issues at stake" (Martin, 2014, p. 368; Fitzmeyer, 1961, p. 279).

According to Webb (1993), this introductory formula set up an intentional chiastic pattern which followed a new covenant and second exodus motif (pp. 32-33):

A   Promise of
                         presence (6:16d)

                         relationship—covenant formula (6:16d)

                               B   Imperative of separation (6:17a-b)

                               B' Imperative of separation (6:17c)

                         presence (6:17d)

A' Promise of
                         relationship—covenant formula (6:18)

Betz (1973) echoes this proposal by following a promise (6:16d-f)—ordinance (6:17a-c)—promise (6:17d-18b) paradigm (p. 93). Both of their proposed literary structures frame the subsequent breakdown of each textual allusion within the chain of reconfigured Old Testament texts.

v. 16d "I will."

Within a single verse, Paul presented two primary categories of promise: (1) nearness of divine presence and (2) divine-human relationship (Webb, 1993). The initial

recitation, which promised divine presence, conflated two primary texts (Lev 26:11-12 & Ezek 37:27). Although Paul's initial recitation closely followed Leviticus 26:11-12, "it seems more probable that the third person plurals [found in 2 Cor 6:16d] stem from Ezek 37:27" (Scott, 1994, p. 78). The original context of both texts imports significant theological meaning that warrant further exploration (Garland, 1999).

(1) nearness of divine presence.

Contextually, Leviticus 26 presented God's covenantal plea to Israel—abstain from idol worship and remain faithful to the Sinai covenant. Covenantal faithfulness welcomed divine presence. Similarly, Ezekiel 37 highlighted the divine guarantee of a new heart (Ezek 36:28), described spiritual renewal (Ezek 37:1-14), and promised national and religious restoration (Ezek 37:15-28). Exegetes should not dismiss the covenantal force of these passages. Paul certainly did not, as he linguistically strengthened the language of divine nearness by employing the term, ἐνοικέω/dwell, which is not used in the LXX (Martin, 2014). In doing so, Paul denoted "an idea stronger than 'to tabernacle among them'" (Martin, 2014, p. 369). He demonstrated a profound New Covenant reality: God's dwelling is no longer in the land, or even in the temple edifice. God's dwelling place is within His people in this new age (Martin, 2014). Additionally, this living God walks among his people, ἐμπεριπατήσω, "actively promoting and protecting the welfare of his people" (Harris, 2005, p. 505). This imported theological meaning invited the Corinthians to trust God's relational fidelity and His nearness.

(2) divine-human relationship.

In the New Covenant structure, the promise of divine-human relationship extends far beyond its original Israelite context. Leviticus 26:12, which engaged the Israelite community post-exodus, and Ezekiel 37:27, which prophetically engaged the nation of Israel concerning post-exile renewal/second exodus, were both addressed to the Jewish community (Webb, 1993). Paul skillfully recontextualized these promises for the New Covenant people of God. Christ's death and resurrection provided a new exodus for the Corinthian community and offered Spirit-imbued power to reject idol worship and experience relational intimacy with God (Harris, 2005, p. 506).

v. 17a-c "Therefore go."

The emphatic transitional conjunction, "therefore" (διὸ), connected covenantal relational promises (v. 16d) with "separation from unbelievers" (Harris, 2008, p. 489). In other words, relational nearness to God demanded holiness (Garland, 1999). Holiness, however, should not be understood in a works-righteousness schema. Holiness demonstrates the sanctified lifestyle of God's people (Scott, 1994). Since Corinthian believers formed the temple of God, they were charged to remain holy and ceremonially pure by abstaining from *close* relationships with unbelievers who defile (Murray, 2005).

These recontextualized imperatives, which demand separation, originate primarily from Isaiah 52:11 where the Israelites were compelled to separate from Babylon and its idolatry (Harris, 2008). The central Isaianic imperatives (Depart, go out, and touch not) are slightly reordered in 2 Corinthians 6:17a-c (Go out, be separate, and touch) so that the "last two verbs (ἀφορίσθητε, "be separate"; μὴ ἅπτεσθε, "do not touch") simply reinforce the thrust of 6:17*a*" (Martin, 2014, p. 371). These imperatives

were originally aimed at the priests and Levites who represented the nation of Israel. Paul, by omitting the phrase, "you who bear the vessels of the LORD" (*οἱ φέροντες τὰ σκεύη κυρίου*), directed these three imperatives at the Corinthian Christian community (Isa 52:11; 2 Cor 6:17; Martin, 2014). All of the Corinthian believers, who individually and communally made up the temple of God (v. 16), must conduct themselves in holiness to avoid cultic and ceremonial defilement before the Lord and to experience relational intimacy.

vv. 17d-18b "I will."

After the central chiastic imperatives, Paul returned to the promise of God's presence illustrated by A' of Webb's (1993) proposed structure. Different from the Ezekiel 20:34 allusion where wrath followed deliverance, Paul carefully reconfigured the text to emphasize the relational nearness that holiness precipitated (Harris, 2008). New Covenant exodus from typological Babylon does not result in judgment (cf. Ezek. 20:38) but an intimate relational welcome. God's intimate welcome is described through familial metaphor proving the Corinthian Christians were more than God's temple. They were "individual members of his family" (Harris, 2005, p. 510).

Scholars agree that verse 18 relied heavily upon 2 Samuel 7:14 (Garland, 1999). The Davidic adoption language from 2 Samuel 7 supplemented the covenantal promises available for God's people (Scott, 1994). To linguistically broaden the availability of this relational intimacy, Paul changed "the third person singular 'he,' referring to the son of David, [to] a second person plural 'you,'" which incorporated the entire Corinthian Christian community (Garland, 1999, p. 339). The intentional textual addition, "and daughters," further broadened the scope of God's family (Martin, 2014). More than an egalitarian ploy to gain credibility with Corinthian female congregants (Witherington III, 1995), the Pauline addition heralded ecclesiological and theological truth: women are equal participants as God's temple and equal members in God's family (Magness, 2015). The "Lord Almighty" offered relational intimacy to those in the Corinthian Christian community who abstained from inappropriate relationships with unbelievers and who yoked themselves to Christ and members of His family.

III. TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND 2 COR 6:14-18

The exegetical analysis above exhibits Paul's individual and communal expectations for the Corinthian church, which are rooted in his sincere desire for their progress and development (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2015). Furthermore, Paul's willingness to challenge the Corinthians' moral judgment and character validates his commitment to transcend mental assent to incite holistic personal and relational holiness (Mulla & Krishnan, 2011). By invoking follower transformation through higher order needs, Paul welcomes theoretical investigation through the four primary behavioral categories of transformational leadership: (1) idealized influence, (2) inspirational motivation, (3) intellectual stimulation, and (4) individualized consideration (Bass, 1985). These four categories provide critical insight into the theory and present opportunity for further engagement with the exegetical analysis of 2 Corinthians 6:14-18.

Idealized Influence

Commitment to moral and ethical fidelity is the primary means by which transformational leaders motivate followers and build relationships (Kendrick, 2011). High ethical standards create trust between leaders and followers—the launching pad for healthy organizational culture and robust organizational productivity. Northouse (2016) distinguished transformational leaders as ones who "can be counted on to do the right thing" (p. 167). To the Corinthian community, Paul exemplified utmost character (2 Cor 6:3-13), embodying the reciprocal moral purity he demanded (2 Cor 6:14-18). Paul believed that "no 'minister of reconciliation' should be guilty of inconsistent or dishonest conduct" because his life, and the lives of his recipients, were "the most eloquent advertisement for the gospel" (Harris, 2008, pp. 484-485). In essence, Paul modeled the nuanced indicative-imperative paradigm: Just as God's perfect holiness demanded human holiness (Lev 19:2), Paul's personal and ministerial ethic (2 Cor 6:3-13), validated his demand for Corinthian moral and religious purity (2 Cor 6:14-18). Sanders (2007), in support of this paradigm, eloquently stated, "Paul embodied principles of leadership that he also described in his letters" (p. 39). Paul's model, however, was not a stale paradigm. His moral purity stemmed from God's imparted grace (2 Cor 6:1) and Paul's profound care for the Corinthian community (2 Cor 6:11-13). As evidenced through his idealized influence, relational connectivity and moral purity enhanced visionary direction and united his followers around a shared, specific vision—consecration, reconciliation, and transformation (2 Cor 6:3-18; Bass & Avolio, 1993). For Christian transformational leaders, this moral and religious purity is not merely a show before *unbelievers*, but a lifestyle before their fellow *believers* (Engstrom, 1978). Spiritual, ethical, and relational integrity generates abundant transformation.

Inspirational Motivation

Inspiration and motivation do not rely solely upon positive linguistic nuance. Transformational leaders employ emotional, visual, and aspirational language to inspire followers to reach higher heights and achieve loftier goals (Kendrick, 2011). Inspiration, however, is more than cheerleading. Inspiration is incarnational. Transformational leaders must model the level of organizational enthusiasm and commitment they ask from their followers; thus, authenticating their motivational and forward-looking language (Kouzes & Posner, 2017).

Too often, inspiration is only understood through the lens of future motivation. Transformational leaders, however, understand the integral connection between future forecasting and historical reflection (Kouzes & Posner, 2017). Paul, in his second correspondence with the Corinthians, modeled this vital reality. By identifying Corinthian believers as "the temple of the living God" (2 Cor 6:16), he encouraged reflection on the temple's history as the central dwelling place of God's presence and "the idealized symbol of restoration" (Elwell & Beitzel, 1988, p. 2028). Paul serviced this temple reflection to introduce a theological and ontological shift: The Corinthian believers, individually and corporately, now formed the sacred structure where God's presence resides and emanates. Paul's temple metaphor evoked dynamic images of this magnificent edifice and its rich historical heritage of divine encounter which they were

compelled to embody through personal and communal holiness. Faced with this overwhelming and awe-inspiring metaphor, the Corinthians were encouraged to live in complete holiness and the fear of God (2 Cor 7:1). Paul, through the transformational leadership category of inspirational motivation, stirred the Corinthians to holy living by recontextualizing an ancient theological image to motivate an appropriate present and future response.

Furthermore, Paul's motivational and exhortative command for holiness was predicated upon the very word of God (2 Cor 6:16-18), redefining the ultimate source of inspirational motivation. While Paul exemplified the kind of holiness and relational openness the Corinthians should reciprocate, the standard for transformation originated from God's own desire for Corinthian holiness and relational intimacy (2 Cor 6:17-18). Therefore, Paul's exhortation functions paradigmatically for Christian leaders where the leader's message and model ultimately reflect God's desires.

Intellectual Stimulation

Transformational leaders offer followers a level of autonomy that encourages innovative thinking and provides space for their implementation (Afsar et al., 2014). Such freedom supports innovative work behavior and inspires organizational creativity (Afsar et al., 2014). Kotter (2012) explored the relationship between such organizational innovation and urgency, concluding that the influx of information and future opportunity is essential for transformation. It is imperative, however, not only to consider new information but to also critically evaluate accepted cultural norms and underlying assumptions (Kendrick, 2011). Individuals and organizations are often blinded by presuppositions that hinder personal growth, organizational health, and corporate influence.

Paul, in his plea for personal and communal holiness, immediately critiqued the Corinthians' economic ethos where partnerships between believers and unbelievers were normative (2 Cor 6:14). He demanded they abstain from close partnerships with unbelievers that could lead them toward spiritual infidelity. The Corinthian recipients were, therefore, challenged to evaluate current partnerships and rethink future opportunities. Paul's prohibition potentially limited financial and relational opportunities the Corinthian recipients relied upon. This massive relational and economic shift provided the Corinthians freedom to explore possibilities within their new relational parameters (Afsar et al., 2014). Regardless of the outcome, they could rely on Paul's genuine relational commitment (2 Cor 3:2; 6:11) and God's immeasurable grace (2 Cor 9:8).

It is important to note that relational openness was the context for appropriating Paul's demand. By relationally appealing to the Corinthians (2 Cor 6:11-13), Paul was emboldened to present a new communal rule. His openness and sincere concern for the Corinthians' spiritual well-being eased the reception of this relational expectation, which undoubtedly shifted their economic futures. Paul creatively modeled the way (Acts 18:3; 1 Cor 9:12), proving that innovative approaches work and demonstrating an essential principle of transformational leadership: One must be open to the ideas of others and their subsequent implementation (Kouzes & Posner, 2017). Perhaps this is why Paul modeled his bi-vocational status to the Corinthian community (Acts 18:3)

before insisting on these economic and relational modifications (2 Cor 6:14). Regardless, Paul personified the holy future he envisioned for the Corinthian community (2 Cor 6:3).

Individualized Consideration

Transformational leaders understand the importance of customized and personalized interaction (Northouse, 2016). Broad stroke solutions do not instill a sense of care toward individual followers and certainly do not promote innovation. Afsar et al. (2014) explained, "individualized consideration encourages employees to reciprocate with greater creativity and innovativeness" (p. 1273). How then do leaders offer individualized consideration? Relationships. Relationships stand at the core of transformational leadership. Leadership itself "is a relationship of service to people that continually renews them and reengages them in the life of the organization" (Wright, 2009, p. 209). Relational care undergirds the mentoring and coaching necessary for personal growth (Northouse, 2016). An individual difference does not, however, result in the re-creation of the proverbial wheel for each member. Instead, it promulgates a unity-amongst-diversity approach that calibrates conversation and coaching to the needs of each person, while also maintaining the organizational mission (Afsar et al., 2014).

As the founding apostle of the Corinthian Christian community, Paul was increasingly concerned with relational connections, particularly those that could lead to spiritual infidelity (2 Cor 6:14). Paul serviced idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation to engage an individualized cultural shift. Over time, inappropriate relational constructs chipped away at the Corinthians' fidelity to Paul and ultimately to Christ (1 Cor 1:10-17; 3:1-21; 5:1; 6:1; 8:9; 10:7; 11:18). Paul's second letter to the Corinthians, filled with reconciliatory language (2 Cor 5:11-21), directly engaged this issue. In doing so, Paul took a different approach than his correspondence with the Galatian community (Gal 1:6). Paul personalized his spiritual and relational concerns to the community he addressed, providing individualized consideration to the Corinthian issue at hand. His written correspondence validated a kind of individualization that may occur through linguistic tone and style (1 Cor 4:21). Paul's limited in-person involvement in Corinth (Acts 20:31) further demonstrated transformational change even when he, the primary leader, was off-site (2 Cor 7:8-9). Such off-site individualization is critical for global organizational structures as it brings lasting personal and communal change.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Pauline corpus provides ample opportunity for further exploration. The exegetical analysis above serviced only one of Robbins (1996) five textures and is in no way exhaustive. The analysis does, however, reveal Paul's relational approach toward his followers and his lofty spiritual and relational expectations (2 Cor 6:14). Spiritual and relational purity demarcated the Corinthian community as unique and set them apart from a plethora of pagan, dark spiritual practices (2 Cor 6:16). Their spiritual cleanliness stood as an example to those around and invited others to emulate lives of purity and

holiness. Ultimately, Paul encouraged religious consecration (2 Cor 6:17), relational reconciliation (2 Cor 6:11-13), and spiritual transformation (2 Cor 7:1).

Interestingly enough, Paul's instruction engaged each of the four areas of transformational leadership. While his exchange primarily enhanced the four main transformational leadership categories, they also provided fresh insight into modes of transformation. Second Corinthians 6:14-18 is fertile ground for ideological textual analysis and subsequent engagement with the transformational leadership framework, particularly intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. The Pauline corpus is inexhaustible and contains innumerable theological and sociological revelations that deserve attention and investigation.

About the Author

At the age of ten, God called Benjamin to be a pastor. Since then, he has diligently pursued this calling. He graduated from Emmanuel College (GA) with a Bachelor of Arts in Christian Ministry, earned his Master of Divinity-Biblical Studies from Regent University's School of Divinity, and is currently in the Doctor of Strategic Leadership-Ecclesial Leadership at Regent University's School of Business and Leadership. Benjamin is happily married to Tiffany. He serves as the Programs Manager for Regent University's School of Divinity and as a service facilitator at New Life Church. He plans to plant and pastor a church in Charlotte, NC that plants churches nationally and internationally.

Email: benjcr2@regent.edu.

V. REFERENCES

Abernathy, D. (2008). *An Exegetical Summary of 2 Corinthians*. 2nd ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Afsar, B., Badir, Y.F., & Bin Saeed, B. (2014). Transformational leadership and innovative work behavior. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 114*(8), 1270-1300.

Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly, 17*(1), 112.

_____. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and Sample Set*. 3rd Ed. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Betz, H.D. (1973). 2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An anti-Pauline fragment? *Journal of Biblical Literature, 92*(1), 88-108.

Burns, J.M. (1978) *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Dinh, J.E., Lord, R.G., Gardner, W.L., Meuser, J.D., Liden, R.C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(1), 36-62.

Downton, J.V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in a revolutionary process*. New York: Free Press.

Elwell, W.A., & Beitzel, B.J. (1988). "Belial, Beliar," *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Engstrom, T.W. (1976). *The Making of a Christian Leader: How to Develop Management and Human Relations Skills*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Fitzmyer, J.A. (1961). Qumran and the interpolated paragraph in 2 Cor 6,14-7,1. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 23(3), 271-280.

Garland, D.E. (1999). *2 Corinthians*. Vol. 29. The New American Commentary. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Grisanti, M.A. (2012). "Deuteronomy." *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Numbers–Ruth (Revised Edition)*. Edited by Tremper Longman III and David E. Garland. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Harris, M.J. (2005). *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI; Milton Keynes, UK: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.; Paternoster Press.

_____. (2008). "2 Corinthians." *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Romans–Galatians (Revised Edition)*. Edited by Tremper Longman III & Garland, David E. Vol. 11. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Kendrick, J. (2011). Transformational leadership. *Professional Safety, 56*(11), 14.

Kerekes, E. (2015). The figure of the Apostle Paul in contemporary philosophy (Heideggger, Badiou, Agamben, Zizek). *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies, 14*(42), 27-53.

Kotter, J.P. (2012). *Leading Change*. 1st Rev. Ed. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (2017). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen in Organizations*, 6th Ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Louw, J.P., & Nida, E.A. (1996). *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies.

Magness, L. (2015). The significance of Paul's addition of "and daughters" in 2 Corinthians 6:18. *Pricilla Paper, 29*(2), 3-5.

Martin, R.P. (2014). *2 Corinthians*. 2nd Ed. Vol. 40. Word Biblical Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Mulla, Z.R. & Krishnan, V.R. (2011). Transformational leadership: Do the leader's morals matter and do the follower's morals change? *Journal of Human Values*, *17*(2), 129-143.

Northouse, P.G. (2016). *Leadership Theory and Practice*. 7th Ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Robbins, V.K. (1996). *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Sanders, J.O. (2007). *Spiritual Leadership: Principles of Excellence for Every Believer*. Chicago, IL: Moody Publishers.

Scott, J.M. (1994). The use of Scripture in 2 Corinthians 6.16c-18 and Paul's restoration theology. *JSNT, 56*, 73-99.

Web, W. (1993). *Returning Home: New Covenant and Second Exodus as the Context for 2 Corinthians 6.14-7.1*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.

Witherington III, B. (1995). *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Wright, W.C. (2009). *Relational leadership: A Biblical Model for Influence and Service*. 2nd Ed. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books.

Yahaya, R., & Ebrahim, F. (2016). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: literature review. *Journal of Management Development*, *35*(2), 190-216.