

ST. PAUL IN MACEDONIA 3. THE PHILIPPIAN CORRESPONDENCE¹

by F. F. BRUCE, MA, DD, FBA

EMERITUS PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

One of the documents in the Pauline corpus is introduced by the superscription: 'Paul and Timothy, slaves of Christ Jesus, to all the saints in Christ Jesus who are in Philippi, together with "bishops" and "deacons": grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.'

Although Timothy's name is conjoined with Paul's, this need not imply that Timothy was in any effective sense its joint-author. This is indicated by the first person singular, 'I give thanks . . .' (Philippians 1:3), which immediately follows the superscription (we may contrast 1 Thessalonians 1:2, 'we give thanks . . .', following a superscription in the names of Paul, Silvanus and Timothy). It is indicated even more unambiguously in Philippians 2:19-23, where Paul in the first person refers to Timothy in the third person ('I hope . . . to send Timothy to you shortly') and gives him high commendation of a kind that rules out any share by Timothy in the composition. (Even if Timothy acted only as the apostle's amanuensis, he must have blushed as this encomium was dictated to him.)

After the initial salutation and the assurance of his profound thanksgiving and prayer for his friends at Philippi, Paul tells them how his present situation, despite the restrictions of imprisonment, has promoted the spread of the gospel among the officials in whose care he is, and has encouraged many of the local Christians to be more uninhibited in witnessing to their faith. Even if some of them are impelled by motives which are not at all friendly to Paul, the fact remains that Christ is being proclaimed, and this makes Paul rejoice.

¹A lecture delivered in the John Rylands University Library on Wednesday, 10 December 1980.

Paul then makes an appeal for harmony among members of the church in Philippi: he deprecates petty jealousies and antipathies and reminds them of Christ's self-forgetfulness in becoming man and enduring the death of the cross. After further words of encouragement, in which Paul's sense of personal involvement in the spiritual well-being of his converts is made very clear, he tells them that he will shortly send Timothy to see them and bring back news of them. Right now, he says, he is sending back Epaphroditus, one of themselves, who had recently come to discharge a service to him on their behalf and had incurred serious illness in doing so.

Then, with 'finally, my brothers . . .' (3:1), Paul gives the impression that he is concluding the letter, when suddenly he puts them on their guard against subversive intruders who insist on the externalities of religion, and sets before them, with reference to his own experience, the inward essence of Christian faith and life.

Further words of admonition (4:1-9) are followed by thanks for a gift which Epaphroditus has brought to him from Philippi (4:10-20). The letter ends at last with a final doxology, greetings and benediction (4:21-3).

The authenticity of the letter to the Philippians has been generally accepted. F. C. Baur, indeed, cast doubt on it:¹ he quoted W. M. L. de Wette's assertion that the genuineness of the document was 'above all question',² but took leave to suggest several points for consideration which might weigh against this verdict.

One of these points was the alleged employment of certain gnostic ideas and expressions, with which the writer's mind was evidently filled, and which appear especially in the christological passage of Philippians 2:6-11. Another was the repetitious character of the document. It was marked, he thought, 'by a want of any profound and masterly connection of ideas, and by a certain poverty of thought'. 'We find', he added, 'no motive or occasion for it, no distinct indication of any purpose, or of any leading idea.'

¹F. C. Baur, *Paul: his Life and Works*, E.T. (London, 1875), pp. 45-79.

²W. M. L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin, 1842), p. 268.

The polemic outburst of Philippians 3:2–19 was regarded as a ‘weak and lifeless’ imitation of 2 Corinthians 11:13–15. The reference in Philippians 4:15 f. to repeated gifts received from Philippi was felt to be at variance with Paul’s affirmation in 1 Corinthians 9:15–18 and elsewhere that he chose not to be supported by his converts but to earn his living by his own work; it was based, Baur thought, on 2 Corinthians 11:9, where Paul does mention one exception to his regular policy—an occasion in Corinth when his need was supplied by friends from Macedonia.

Finally Baur, who (rightly, I am sure) took Rome to be Paul’s place of imprisonment from which Philippians was supposed to be written, argued that the picture of the progress of the gospel in Rome at that time lacks corroboration. The clue to this picture, and to the mention of ‘saints in Caesar’s household’ (4:22), is provided by the reference to one Clement in Philippians 4:3. This Clement, according to Baur, was intended to be identified with Titus Flavius Clemens, related by marriage to the Emperor Domitian, at whose instance he was put to death in AD 95. He was allegedly introduced into the letter by the post-apostolic author who was acquainted with the growing Clementine legend. In this legend Clement was one of Peter’s converts; by bringing him into contact with Paul the author of Philippians made his contribution to the reconciling of the two historically opposed apostles.

Some of Baur’s arguments were matters of opinion and taste, but the argument about Clement was simply wrong: the Clement of Philippians 4:3 is a Philippian, not a Roman, Christian. None of his arguments has commended itself to later generations of Pauline scholarship. More recently a question-mark has been set against the Pauline authorship on the ground of statistical analysis of the vocabulary,¹ but this argument also has failed to win general acceptance.

II

It is evident that Philippians was written while Paul was in

¹Cf. A. Q. Morton, ‘The Authorship of Greek Prose’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (series A), cxxviii (1965), 169–233, especially pp. 217–24.

prison¹ and awaiting a judgment which would affect his liberty and perhaps his life. Three times in the first chapter he mentions his imprisonment and integrates it into the course of his apostolic ministry: ‘I am posted here’, he says, ‘for the defence of the gospel’ (Philippians 1:16). Through his imprisonment, indeed, the gospel was being promoted in quarters to which it might not otherwise have found access.

But *where* was he imprisoned? He does not say explicitly: his Philippian friends did not need to be told, for they had lately sent Epaphroditus, one of their number, to visit Paul (2:25). The majority answer to the question has always been Rome, but Ephesus² and Caesarea have also been suggested.

Ephesus, however, may be ruled out. That Paul was indeed imprisoned at least once in Ephesus is highly probable, but the imprisonment which he was undergoing when he sent this letter to the Philippians was not an Ephesian imprisonment. ‘It has become known’, he says, ‘throughout the whole *praetorium* and to all the others that my imprisonment is for Christ’ (1:13). His use of the loanword *praetorium* suggests that he gives it its technical sense. The word denotes the headquarters of the *praetor*, in particular the commanding officer’s headquarters in a military camp. In Rome it means the praetorian guard or the barracks in which it was accommodated; farther afield it denotes the headquarters of a provincial governor, but of the governor of an imperial province, the *legatus pro praetore*, who had military units under his command. There is no known instance of its use for the headquarters of a proconsul, the governor of a senatorial province, such as Asia was at this time.³

¹This was contested by T. W. Manson, who suggested that the imprisonment referred to in Phil. 1:7 ff. was Paul’s recent imprisonment in Philippi (Acts 16:23–39) or a brief period in custody in Corinth pending his appearance before Gallio (Acts 18:12–17); he dated Philippians during Paul’s Ephesian ministry (*Studies in the Gospels and Epistles* [Manchester, 1962], pp. 149–67).

²The case for Ephesus was argued (*inter alios*) by G. S. Duncan in *St. Paul’s Ephesian Ministry* (London, 1929). But to the end of his days Principal Duncan was uneasy about interpreting *πρατώριον* as a *proconsul’s* headquarters.

³Epigraphic references to a *praetorianus* in the vicinity of Ephesus have no relevance here. The *praetorianus* mentioned in *CIL*, iii. 6085, 7135, 7136 was a former member of the praetorian guard now discharging police duties as a *stationarius* on a road near Ephesus.

If Ephesus is ruled out as the place where Paul was imprisoned when he wrote to the Philippians, what other places come into consideration? Apart from Rome, Caesarea has had its claims ably defended by a number of scholars, most notably Ernst Lohmeyer.¹ There is this to be said for Caesarea: in Acts 23:35 Paul is expressly said to have been kept under guard in Herod's *praetorium*—one of the buildings erected by Herod on his artificial acropolis, which presumably now served as headquarters for the procurator of Judaea. (Since the procurator had auxiliary cohorts under his command, his headquarters could properly be designated the *praetorium*.)² Paul remained in Caesarea for two years (AD 57–9), waiting for a judicial decision to be promulgated by Felix (Acts 24:26 f.). In fact, Felix never got around to pronouncing judgment on Paul: Luke puts this procrastination down to Felix's hope of receiving a bribe from Paul or his friends. Felix knew that Paul had come to Judaea with a substantial sum for disbursement in Jerusalem (Acts 24:17) and surmised that he might have access to further funds. But Paul had every reason to suppose that Felix's verdict, when it was given, would be favourable and that he would be discharged. This would provide a suitable background for his words: 'I know that through your prayers and the help of the Spirit of Jesus Christ this will turn out for my deliverance. . . . I know that I shall remain and continue with you all, for your progress and joy in the faith' (Philippians 1:19, 25).

But Caesarea was a political backwater. If it was from Caesarea that Paul sent his letter to Philippi, certainly everybody in Herod's *praetorium* would know that he was there and why he was there, but would there be anything very remarkable about that? There were Christians in Caesarea, but were they sufficiently numerous or diversified to take sides for and against Paul, and would they be stimulated by his enforced residence there to preach their varying versions of the gospel? Caesarea offers too restricted a

¹Cf. E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, Kolosser und an Philemon*, KEK (Göttingen, 1953), pp. 3 f., 38 ff. A Caesarean provenance has been defended more recently by J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London, 1976), pp. 60 f., 77–9.

²So Pilate's temporary headquarters in Jerusalem at the time of Jesus' trial are called the *praetorium* in Mark 15:16; John 18:28 ff.

setting to account for the joyful excitement which Paul expresses in telling the Philippian Christians how his imprisonment has worked out for the advance of the gospel.

But Rome would present a very different picture. In favour of Rome, moreover, is the reference to the 'saints of Caesar's household' who, along with other Christians, send their greetings to the Philippian church at the end of the letter (4:22). We know that the imperial civil service was staffed by members of Caesar's household—largely his freedmen—and that these were to be found throughout the provinces, but nowhere was there such a concentration of them as in Rome—a concentration large enough to include a significant proportion of converts to the Christian faith.¹

If Philippians was sent from Rome, then some interesting information can be gathered from it about Roman Christianity.

As for Paul himself, his arrival in the city and his being held under house-arrest pending the hearing of his appeal in Caesar's court would help to make Christianity a talking-point. If, as is probable, the relays of soldiers who were detailed to watch him were drawn from the praetorian guard, then one and another of them can well be imagined as comparing notes about this extraordinary Jew in whose company they had to spend four hours at a time. Paul, who counted himself debtor to Greeks and barbarians, to wise and unwise, would certainly see to it that these praetorian soldiers knew something of the gospel. And, he says, not only the whole praetorian guard but 'all the rest' had learned that it was for the sake of the gospel of Christ that he was held in custody—'all the rest' being probably those who were in any way concerned with the arrangements for the eventual hearing of his case. When the time for the hearing came, he looked forward to the opportunity of making the gospel known before the supreme tribunal.

Nor was it Paul alone who had these opportunities of bearing witness in Rome. Since the gospel had become a talking-point, many Christians in the city found themselves bearing witness to it more openly than they had done before. However the situation

¹Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (London, 1881), pp. 167, 171–8.

was viewed, Paul's imprisonment had worked for the furtherance of the gospel in the capital.

Not that all the Roman Christians consistently bore their witness in a spirit of solidarity with Paul. There does not appear to have been at this time a centrally organized church in Rome: there were several 'house-churches'—some Jewish-Christian, some Gentile-Christian, and some perhaps mixed. Some of these house-churches would wholeheartedly share Paul's outlook; others would have more in common with the judaizing and other groups which caused him such trouble in the provinces. 'Some are preaching Christ in a spirit of envy and strife,' he says; 'others are preaching him in a spirit of good will. The latter do it out of love, recognizing that I am posted here for the defence of the gospel; the former do it in a spirit of personal ambition and not from pure motives: they reckon that their activity will be a further annoyance to me while I am chained as I am. But what of it? The one thing that matters is this: Christ is being preached, and in this I rejoice and will keep on rejoicing' (Philippians 1:15–18).

This is a far cry from the anathema which he invoked several years earlier on those agitators who invaded his Galatian mission-field and taught his converts a counterfeit gospel.¹ True, his ill-wishers in Rome could not be accused of intruding into a sphere which was not their own, and it is not suggested that there was anything defective or subversive in the content of their preaching. Nevertheless, Paul has recognizably mellowed; he shows more of the 'meekness and gentleness of Christ' than he did when he appealed to those qualities in his remonstrance with disaffected members of the Corinthian church.² Perhaps his two years of uncertain waiting in his Caesarean confinement, followed by the hazards of the voyage to Rome and the circumstances of his present house-arrest, had taught him new lessons in patience.

As things were now, he needed daily patience: he had no means of knowing how long he would remain under house-arrest or what would happen when at last he was summoned to appear before Nero. He more than half expected that, when he did appear before him, judgment would be given in his favour. Many

¹Gal. 1:8 f.

²2 Cor. 10:1.

friends in Rome and Philippi and elsewhere were praying for this, and he believed himself that for the welfare of his converts and the progress of the gospel his acquittal and release would be advantageous. If he had his own preference only to consider, he was not so sure: it would be 'far better' for him to set out on his last journey and be at home 'with Christ' (1:23). It would be difficult for him to choose: happily, the choice was not his, and he was content to pray that, whether he lived or died, Christ would be glorified.

III

There was little in the church at Philippi to cause Paul disquiet—no harbouring of a counterfeit gospel, as in the Galatian churches; no public affronts to ethical standards, as at Corinth. The one thing that disturbed him was a failure on the part of some of the members to pull together as harmoniously as could be desired: hence he begs them to reach agreement one with another. If each put the interests of others before his own, if there was a greater willingness to make concessions, all would be well.

To reinforce this plea, Paul quotes some lines which celebrate the humiliation to which Christ voluntarily submitted in becoming man and enduring crucifixion. I say he 'quotes' them, for it has been widely agreed, ever since Ernst Lohmeyer argued for it in 1928,¹ that in Philippians 2:6–11 we have a composition either in poetry or in rhythmical prose which, whether Paul's own work or someone else's, is imported into its present context because of its suitability at this point in the argument. Since then the output of scholarly literature on this passage has been immense. In 1967 our former colleague Ralph Martin produced his monograph *Carmen Christi*, which took account of practically everything of importance that had been published on the passage up to that time,² and much more has appeared since then.

The following rough translation follows the text and line-

¹E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2, 5–11* (Heidelberg, 1928, ²1961).

²R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii. 5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*, SNTSM, iv (Cambridge, 1967).

arrangement of the twenty-sixth Nestle-Aland edition of the Greek New Testament:

He, being already in God's form,
did not think it usurpation
to be on equality with God,
but emptied himself,
taking a slave's form,
being born in likeness of men;
and being found in appearance as a man,
he humbled himself,
becoming obedient as far as death,
even death on a cross.
Therefore indeed God highly exalted him
and granted him the name
which is above every name,
that in the name of Jesus
every knee might bend
in heaven and on earth and under the earth,
and every tongue confess,
'Jesus Christ is Lord!—
to God the Father's glory.

In itself this passage is a recital of the saving work of God in Christ—in his incarnation, passion and exaltation. It has, however, acquired a fresh significance by being placed in its present context. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the attitude shown by Christ is recommended as an example for his followers. The words with which it is introduced in verse 5 (*τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*) mean, according to C. F. D. Moule, 'Adopt towards one another, in your mutual relations, the same attitude which was found in Christ Jesus'¹—that is to say, his attitude is adduced as an example for theirs or they are encouraged to conform their attitude to his. Dr Martin, indeed, rejected this reading of verse 5: he took the missing verb after *ὃ καὶ* to be *φρονεῖτε*,² and approved of the translation: 'Think this way among yourselves, which also you think in Christ Jesus, i.e. as members of His Church.'³ I am bound to agree rather with Professor Moule.

¹C. F. D. Moule, 'Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5–11', in *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (Exeter, 1970), p. 265.

²*Carmen Christi*, p. 71.

³This translation is offered by K. Grayston, *The Epistles to the Galatians and to the Philippians* (London, 1957), p. 91.

I see no ground for taking the composition to be a Hellenistic hymn celebrating the descent and ascent of a saviour-god¹ which was christianized by the judicious addition of a phrase here and there—e.g. 'even death on a cross' at the end of verse 8. Any attempt to establish this theory by the argument that the structure is smoother without the alleged additions is futile: the composition follows no strict poetical pattern, either Greek or Semitic, and arrangements which preserve the alleged additions are just as persuasive as others which omit them. Reference may be made to recent arrangements in Greek by Morna D. Hooker² and Otfried Hofius,³ or to one in English by A. M. Hunter which has been included in a hymnbook.⁴ Some scholars, like P. P. Levertoff and P. Grelot, have turned the passage into Aramaic.⁵ There is no need to postulate an Aramaic origin for it: its Greek is not translation Greek. But there is nothing in it which looks out of place in an Aramaic rendering. Dr Hofius has presented an attractive case for the view that the passage follows the pattern of those Old Testament psalms which rehearse the saving acts of Yahweh by way of confession and thanksgiving.

Some exegetes have argued that the passage draws on the language of well-known Old Testament texts, such as the fourth Isaianic servant song or Daniel's vision of 'one like a son of man'. Thus *ἐάντων ἐκένωσεν . . . μέχρι θανάτου* (verses 7, 8) has been regarded as a variant Greek rendering of *he^erāh nāšō 'al māwet* in Isaiah 53:12 (RSV: 'he poured out his soul to death'),⁶ and *σχήματι ἐνϋρεθείς ὡς ἄνθρωπος* has been understood as reflecting

¹Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, E.T. (London, 1952), pp. 175, 298.

²M. D. Hooker, 'Philippians 2:6–11', in *Jesus und Paulus*, ed. E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer (Göttingen, 1975), p. 158.

³O. Hofius, *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2, 6–11*, WUNT, xvii (Tübingen, 1976), p. 8.

⁴Professor Hunter's rendering appears as Hymn 399 in *The Church Hymnary: Third Edition* (Oxford, 1973).

⁵Dr Levertoff's Aramaic rendering is reproduced in W. K. L. Clarke, *New Testament Problems* (London, 1929), p. 148; Père Grelot's appears in his 'Deux Notes Critiques sur Philippiens 2, 6–11', *Biblica*, liv (1973), 169–86, especially 185 f.

⁶Cf. H. W. Robinson, *The Cross in the Old Testament* (London, 1955), pp. 104 f.

k^ebar^e nāš in Daniel 7:13.¹ If these suggestions could be sustained, the passage might be taken as a witness to the unitive exegesis of the Servant Songs and the book of Daniel which has been discerned by some students in the Qumran literature and in the gospel tradition.

The passage begins by asserting that Christ, existing already in the form (*μορφή*) of God, did not put a false estimation on equality with God. Equality with God, it appears, was involved in his having the form of God. According to the context the *μορφή* could mean the outward appearance as distinct from the inner reality, or it could denote the 'specific character' (to quote J. B. Lightfoot):² as the New English Bible renders it, 'the divine nature was his from the first'. In this context the *μορφή* is more substantial than the *δμοίωμα* or the *σχῆμα* (two of its near-synonyms found at the end of verse 7 and the beginning of verse 8). When our text goes on to say (at the beginning of verse 7), 'but he emptied himself, taking the form (*μορφή*) of a slave', *μορφή* again has the same substantial force: 'made himself nothing, assuming the nature of a slave', says the New English Bible. The outward appearance could be laid aside, but not the essential nature: being from the first in the form of God, he retained the form of God when he emptied himself by taking the form of a slave.³ The implication is not that Christ, by becoming incarnate, exchanged the form of God for the form of a slave, but that he manifested the form of God in the form of a slave.⁴

What now is meant by the statement above that Christ 'did not put a false estimation on equality with God'? What the text says is that he did not reckon being on equality with God as *ἀρπαγμός*. How is *ἀρπαγμός* to be translated? It is derived from

¹Lohmeyer saw a reference both to the Servant figure and to the 'one like a son of man' (*Kyrios Jesus*, p. 36; *Die Briefe an die Philipper* . . . , pp. 94 f.).

²J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, pp. 128 f.

³For the significance of *δόλος* here see C. F. D. Moule, 'Further Reflexions . . .', pp. 268 f.

⁴An illustration of this is found in the Fourth Evangelist's account of how 'Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he had come from God and was going to God, . . . laid aside his garments, and girded himself with a towel' in order to perform a menial service for his disciples (John 13:3-5).

ἀρπάζω, a verb meaning 'snatch' or 'seize', and according to the analogy of such formations in *-μός* it would mean 'the act of snatching, or seizing'. This is the interpretation implied in AV 'thought it not robbery to be equal with God'—a rendering which goes back to Tyndale's version of 1526 and beyond that to the Vulgate *non rapinam arbitratus est* (whence the Wycliffite 'demed not raueyn'). But there is a powerful tradition, going back to the Greek fathers, in favour of treating *ἀρπαγμός* as if it were synonymous with *ἄρπαγμα*—that is (according to the rule governing formations in *-μα*), 'something seized' or 'something to be seized', in a wider sense than the precise one of robbery or plunder. So J. B. Lightfoot paraphrases the opening clauses of the passage—'He, though existing before the worlds in the form of God, did not treat His equality with God as a prize,¹ a treasure to be greedily clutched and ostentatiously displayed: on the contrary He resigned the glories of heaven'—and adds that 'this is the common and indeed almost universal interpretation of the Greek fathers, who would have the most lively sense of the requirements of the language'.² The one objection to this rendering, that it presupposes *ἄρπαγμα* and not *ἀρπαγμός*, he considers to be sufficiently disposed of by the actual usage of the latter form.

In the University of Manchester it is particularly appropriate to recall the comparison which Arnold Ehrhardt drew between this passage and Plutarch's observation that Alexander the Great did not treat his conquest of Asia *ὡσπερ ἄρπαγμα*, as something to be exploited for his personal aggrandisement, but as a means of establishing universal civilization under one law.³

But again I find myself in agreement with Professor Moule, who maintains the active force proper to the form *ἀρπαγμός*.

¹'A prize' is the RV rendering; RSV says 'a thing to be grasped'. NEB gives the one sense in the text ('did not think to snatch at equality with God') and the other sense in the margin ('did not prize his equality with God').

²*Philippians*, pp. 134 f.

³A. A. T. Ehrhardt, 'Jesus Christ and Alexander the Great' (1948), E.T. in *The Framework of the New Testament Stories* (Manchester, 1964), pp. 37-43 (referring to Plutarch, *De Alexandri Fortuna aut Virtute*, 1.8.330d); cf. W. L. Knox, 'The "Divine Hero" Christology in the New Testament', *HTR*, xli (1948), 229-49.

'The point of the passage', he says, '... is that, instead of imagining that equality with God meant *getting*, Jesus, on the contrary, gave—gave until he was "empty" ... he thought of equality with God not as *πλήρωσις* but as *κένωσις*, not as *ἀρπαγμός* but as open-handed spending—even to death'.¹ On the one hand, he did not regard equality with God as the usurpation of something which was not his or as a vantage-point for achieving his personal ambitions: equality with God was already his, by virtue of the fact that he was *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ*. On the other hand, he treated his equality with God as an occasion for renouncing every advantage or privilege which might have accrued to him thereby, as an opportunity not for self-enrichment but for self-improvement and unreserved self-sacrifice.

This is not the only place where Paul invokes Christ's self-denial as an example for his people: in 2 Corinthians 8:9, for example, where he encourages generous giving to the Jerusalem relief fund, he adduces as an incentive 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ who, though he was rich, yet for your sakes became poor, that through his poverty you might become rich'. There, however, he uses his own language, whereas here, in Philippians 2:6–11, he uses a form of words which lay ready to hand.

The Philippian Christians knew Christ as the exalted Lord: how, asks Paul, did he attain his present exaltation? By 'emptying himself'. Having plumbed the depths of humiliation, he has been honoured by God and invested with the name high over all—the designation *κύριος*, 'Lord', in its most sublime sense.² The God who in the Old Testament declares, 'I am the LORD, that is my name; my glory I give to no other' (Isaiah 42:8), swears by himself, 'To me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear' (Isaiah 45:23).³ But now, says Paul, by God's own decree every knee is to bow in Jesus' name and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord—and in so doing enhance, not diminish, the

¹C. F. D. Moule, 'Further Reflexions', p. 272.

²But C. F. D. Moule argues that the name above every name is 'Jesus', not 'Lord' ('Further Reflexions', p. 270). In any case, the name 'Jesus' has henceforth the value of 'Lord'. Cf. J. Barr, 'The Word Became Flesh: The Incarnation in the New Testament', *Interpretation* 10 (1956), 22.

³Cf. Paul's application of this text in Rom. 14:11.

glory of God. But it is not implied that this eventual exaltation was the incentive for his temporary humiliation; otherwise the humiliation would have been no true humiliation: it would have been self-regarding, not self-denying. The lesson for the Philippian Christians is this: as Christ set his own interests aside in the interest of others, so should they.¹

IV

It is more especially in recent times that serious doubt has been cast on the literary unity of the epistle. Polycarp indeed, writing to the Philippians in the earlier part of the second century, reminds them how Paul not only taught them 'the word of truth' when he was present with them 'but also when he was absent wrote letters (*ἐπιστολάς*) to you';² but it would be precarious to conclude that he knew parts of the canonical letter as separate documents: if he is not using the generalizing plural, he may have in mind other letters than the one which has survived.

¹See also on the problems of Phil. 2:5–11, W. Foerster, 'ὄχι ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο bei den griechischen Kirchenvätern', *ZNW*, xxix (1930), 115–28; E. Käsemann, 'A Critical Analysis of Philippians 2:5–11' (1950), E.T. in *Journal for Theology and Church*, v (1968), 45–88; J. Jeremias, 'Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen', in *Studia Paulina in honorem J. de Zwaan*, ed. J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik (Haarlem, 1953), pp. 152–5; G. Bornkamm, 'On Understanding the Christ-Hymn, Phil. 2, 5–11' (1959), E.T. in *Early Christian Experience* (London, 1969), pp. 112–22; E. Schweizer, *Lordship and Discipleship*, E.T. (London, 1960), pp. 61–4; E. Larsson, *Christus als Vorbild* (Uppsala, 1962), pp. 230–75; G. Strecker, 'Redaktion und Tradition im Christushymnus Phil 2, 6–11', *ZNW*, lv (1964), pp. 63–78; D. Georgi, 'Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil. 2, 6–11' in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an R. Bultmann*, ed. E. Dinkler (Tübingen, 1964), pp. 263–93; I. H. Marshall, 'The Christ-Hymn in Philippians 2:5–11', *Tyndale Bulletin*, xix (1968), 104–27; R. W. Hoover, 'The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution', *HTR*, 64 (1971), 95–119; J. Carmignac, 'L'importance de la place d'une négation', *NTS*, xviii (1971–2), 131–66; T. F. Glasson, 'Two Notes on the Philippians Hymn (ll. 6–11)', *NTS*, xxi (1974–5), 133–39; J. Murphy-O'Connor, 'Christological Anthropology in Phil. 2. 6–11', *Revue Biblique*, lxxxiii (1974), 25–50; J. D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London, 1980), pp. 114–21.

²Polycarp, *To the Philippians* 3:2. But in 11:3 (for which the Greek is not extant) he speaks of the Philippians among whom Paul laboured as being 'in the beginning of his epistle' (*in principio epistolae eius*)—unless indeed the words mean 'his epistles in the beginning' (cf. 2 Cor. 3:2).

It has been frequently observed that Paul says 'finally' or words to the same effect surprisingly early in the letter (3:1; 4:8) and uses formulae of farewell repeatedly (4:7, 9, 23)—but this sort of thing is not unknown in informal letters (not to speak of sermons).

When once the question of literary unity was raised, attention was directed to two sections of the letter: (a) the expression of thanks for a gift in 4:10–20 and (b) the warning against dangerous characters which begins in 3:2 ('Beware of dogs . . .') and continues into the earlier part of the fourth chapter.

(a) *Thanks for a gift.* Paul's expression of thanks for a gift, towards the end of the letter, is linked with the earlier part of the letter by its mention of Epaphroditus (4:18). Already, in 2:25–30, Paul has made a very appreciative reference to Epaphroditus. We gather from this reference that Epaphroditus had recently visited Paul as the Philippian church's messenger (*ἀπόστολος*), ministering to his need (2:25). It is natural to find another reference to this same visit in 4:18, where Paul says he has received from Epaphroditus the gift they sent (*τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν*), which he characterizes as 'a fragrant offering, a sacrifice acceptable and pleasing to God'.

Between his setting out from Philippi and Paul's dictating this letter, Epaphroditus fell seriously ill. When news of his illness reached the church in Philippi, its members were greatly concerned about him. Now, however, he has recovered, and Paul is sending him back to Philippi to reassure his friends there. Presumably he carried Paul's letter to them.

There is a problem, however. In thanking the Philippians for the gift brought by Epaphroditus, Paul says, 'I rejoice greatly . . . that now at length (*ἤδη ποτέ*) you have revived in your care for me' (4:10). This curious way of expressing gratitude has often (and probably rightly) been taken to reflect the embarrassment experienced by Paul's independent spirit even in sending a note of thanks for a spontaneous gift of money from friends. Moreover, if there had been a substantial lapse of time between their last gift and this one, the modern reader finds it difficult not to discern a nuance of 'And high time too!' behind Paul's 'now at length'. This has led some commentators to date the whole letter during

Paul's Ephesian ministry; it has led others, who locate the imprisonment of 1:7 ff. in Caesarea or Rome, to the view that in 4:10–20 we have a separate letter of thanks (or part of one), written earlier than the main body of the letter.¹ In that case, the mission of Epaphroditus mentioned in 2:25–30 would be later than that of 4:18.

But even if Paul's wording implies that the Philippians' gift has been long in coming, he makes it plain that no negligence is attributed to them: 'you were thoughtful for me', he says, 'but you had no opportunity' (*ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ ἐφρονεῖτε, ἡκαιρεῖσθε δέ*). And perhaps the reason they had no opportunity was that Paul himself had deprived them of any. More than once, immediately after his leaving them, they had sent a gift to him in Thessalonica (4:15 f.).² But in Thessalonica and again in Corinth Paul learned that if he accepted material aid for himself from his converts, this was misrepresented by his detractors (outside the church, in Thessalonica; inside the church, in Corinth), who charged him with sponging on them.³ Hence, perhaps, he had to request his churches not to send him money for his personal use—a request which was reinforced when he got down in earnest to organizing the Jerusalem relief fund.⁴ He was anxious that all available gifts from his churches should be channelled into that fund, and he knew that even so there were some who would seize on any pretext to suggest that money intended for it was being diverted to his own pocket.

But now, the relief fund has been completed and taken to Jerusalem. Paul, having spent two years in custody in Caesarea, is now living under house-arrest in Rome. His situation has changed: his friends in Philippi may well have judged that now at length (*ἤδη ποτέ*) they had an opportunity to send him a gift, and they sent one. They entrusted it to Epaphroditus, one of their own number. But its delivery was delayed.

¹Cf. F. W. Beare, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (London, 1959), pp. 4, 149–57; B. D. Rahtjen, 'The Three Letters of Paul to the Philippians', *NTS*, vi (1959–60), 167–73.

²Cf. 2 Cor. 11:8 f.; Acts 18:5.

³Hence the emphasis of 1 Thess. 2:9; 2 Thess. 3:7–10 (why is no reference made there to gifts from Philippi?); 1 Cor. 9:3–18; 2 Cor. 12:13–18.

⁴Cf. C. H. Dodd, *New Testament Studies* (Manchester, 1953), p. 98.

Why? Because Epaphroditus fell seriously ill, not (as has generally been supposed) after his arrival in Rome, but on his way there. This dating of his illness has been maintained by only a few scholars,¹ but it is consistent with Paul's language. 'He hazarded his life', says Paul, 'to supply what your ministry (*λειτουργία*) to me lacked to complete it' (2:30). As Bishop Lightfoot saw, the *λειτουργία* here is their gift to Paul, for which he thanks them in 4:10–20;² Epaphroditus is appropriately called the minister or 'supplier' (*λειτουργός*) of Paul's need in 2:25. It was his service in bringing the Philippians' contribution to Paul in his place of custody that caused his illness, not his further service to Paul after he reached his destination.

If (as we think) Paul was in Rome, Epaphroditus would travel westwards from Philippi along the Egnatian Way. Somewhere along this road (perhaps not very far along it) he fell ill; and his friends in Philippi got to hear of it. Perhaps (and we can only say 'perhaps', because of our lack of information) he was able to send a message back to them by someone travelling in the opposite direction, warning them that he might not be able to complete the journey (at least, within reasonable time) and asking them to send someone else to the place where he was, to collect the gift from him and take it on to Paul. The Philippians were naturally concerned, but had difficulty in sending a replacement; they hoped that Epaphroditus might recover in time to complete the journey without excessive delay. They probably did not know how serious his illness was: when Paul tells them that he had been at death's door, this was news to them.³

Epaphroditus might have been willing to stay on in Rome for a time and serve Paul further, but Paul said 'No. Our friends in Philippi have been very anxious about you and will be relieved to see you safe and well again; besides, I am giving you a letter

¹E.g. W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (London, 1877), p. 722; B. S. Mackay, 'Further Thoughts on Philippians', *NTS*, vii (1960–1), 169; and especially C. O. Buchanan, 'Epaphroditus' Sickness and the Letter to the Philippians', *Evangelical Quarterly*, xxxvi (1964), 157–66.

²J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 123.

³This account of the matter gets rid of the necessity of postulating a journey from (say) Rome to Philippi to let the church there know of Epaphroditus' illness.

for them to tell them how things are with me here and to thank them for the gift you have brought.' So he sent Epaphroditus back with the letter, and included in the letter a warm encomium on him.

(b) *Warning against trouble-makers.* Two things that may strike the reader of the section beginning with 3:2 are its difference in tone from the rest of the letter and its resemblance to the last four chapters of 2 Corinthians, where Paul lets himself go in his denunciation of the 'false apostles' who have invaded the church of Corinth, bringing 'another Jesus' than the one whom Paul and his associates proclaimed. But whereas in 2 Corinthians 10–13 these people have already been at work in Corinth, it is not implied in Philippians 3:2 ff. that they have come to Philippi, still less that the Philippian Christians give them any countenance (as some of the Corinthian Christians evidently did). Paul, however, having encountered their mischief-making elsewhere, is concerned lest they try to launch the same kind of subversive programme in Philippi, so he puts his Philippian friends on their guard against them. As he does so, he describes them in no flattering terms: 'Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers,¹ beware of the mutilation party' (3:2). The term 'circumcision' (*περιτομή*) is a sacral term, which Paul takes over and uses in a spiritual sense of Christian consecration. As for the purely external and religiously worthless cutting of which the judaizing party makes so much, Paul gives it the non-sacral designation 'mutilation' (*κατατομή*).

In Corinth the intruders claimed better credentials and higher achievements than Paul, and he felt obliged, 'speaking as a fool', to argue that, if the kind of credentials and achievements which they put forward were really necessary and important, then he could produce a more impressive record than any of them.² He takes a similar line here, remarking that if it were fitting to have confidence 'in the flesh'—in natural endowments and accomplishments—he would have plenty of ground for such confidence: 'circumcised on the eighth day, of the people of Israel, of the

¹*κακοὶ ἐργάται*, cf. the *ἐργάται δόλιοι* of 2 Cor. 11:13 (perhaps both expressions hark back to the 'workers of iniquity' denounced in the Psalter).

²2 Cor. 11:16 ff.

tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew born of Hebrews; as to the law a Pharisee, as to zeal a persecutor of the church, as to righteousness under the law blameless' (3:4–6). But those things which he had formerly reckoned to his credit he now dismissed as loss—and then he launches out into an eloquent statement of the things which he really values: the personal knowledge of Christ, the sharing of his sufferings, the hope of resurrection with him, and the ambition to apprehend the high purpose for which he was once apprehended by Christ (3:7–14).

In his study of 'The Mind of Paul', C. H. Dodd assumed the unity of Philippians and dated it in the later phase of Paul's career, after the 'second conversion' which he allegedly experienced before the writing of 2 Corinthians 1–9. He dated 2 Corinthians 10–13, 'a letter full of caustic sarcasm and indignant self-vindication', to the period immediately before the 'second conversion'. Indeed, he treated the contrast between the invective of 2 Corinthians 10–13 and the 'quiet self-abandonment' of 2 Corinthians 1–9 as a good illustration of the 'change of temper' wrought in Paul by his 'second conversion'. But, he said, 'it is in the epistle to the Philippians (possibly the last of his letters which we possess in an uninterpolated form) that we see most clearly what experience had made of this naturally proud, self-assertive and impatient man'—and he quotes Philippians 3:13–16:

I do not consider that I have apprehended the high purpose yet, but one thing I do: forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead, I press on toward the goal for the prize of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus. Let those of us who are mature be thus minded; and if in anything you are otherwise minded, God will reveal that also to you. Only let us hold true to what we have attained.¹

But what, we must ask, can be said of the description of his opponents as 'dogs' and 'evil workers' earlier in the same chapter, or of his reference in verses 18 and 19 to those 'enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is perdition, whose god is their belly, whose glory is in their shame, who mind the things of earth'? True, he says he writes with tears, whereas in 2 Corinthians 10–13 he may have written more in anger than in sorrow, but

¹C. H. Dodd, *New Testament Studies*, pp. 80–2.

there is not much to choose between his language here and his language there.¹

If Professor Dodd's dating of Philippians as a unity is right, the conclusion must be that Paul could engage in as fierce denunciation in later years as he did in earlier years, and this conclusion may be quite valid. But, if I could overcome a disinclination to concede such a violation of 'bibliographical probability'² as the division of Philippians into two originally separate letters, I should be disposed, while dating the epistle as a whole to Paul's Roman imprisonment, to date the section beginning in 3:2 rather earlier—to the same general period as 2 Corinthians 10–13. The tone in which the opponents are excoriated in this section is quite different from that which Paul uses in Philippians 1:15–18 with regard to those who preach Christ from unworthy motives, hoping to annoy the apostle in his present restricting circumstances. I could find it easy to believe that a period of mellowing has intervened, and that Paul has learned to see cause for thanksgiving in a situation which at one time would have made him explode with indignation.

But this is not all. It has been argued that Paul's perspective on the life to come underwent a shift between his earlier and later epistles. Whereas earlier he usually included himself among those who would still be alive at the parousia, later he speaks as if he thought it more likely that he would die before that momentous event and be among those who would be raised from the dead. To be sure, this 'delay of the parousia' in Paul's thinking did not modify his theology but it did affect his personal expectation.

In Philippians 3:20, 21, he seems still to group himself with those who from earth will witness the parousia and experience the 'change' of which he speaks in 1 Corinthians 15:52: 'the dead

¹Cf. T. W. Manson: 'I am unable to persuade myself that in Philippians there is any really serious change in Paul's general outlook and temper, such as is required by the theory of a second conversion. Indeed Chapter iii is more easily understood before the second conversion than after it' (*Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, pp. 163 ff.). Professor Manson accepted the unity of the epistle but dated it during Paul's Ephesian ministry.

²A term of mild but scholarly reproach with which F. G. Kenyon was wont to put down some literary-critical hypotheses (cf. his *The Bible and Modern Scholarship* [London, 1948], p. 37).

will be raised and we [the living] shall be changed.' So here he says, 'From heaven we expect a Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ, who will transform our body of humiliation and conform it to his body of glory.'¹ But in Philippians 1:23 his language is more like that of 2 Corinthians 5:1–10, where for the first time he considers what his state of existence will be if he dies before the parousia, and concludes that absence from the body will mean being immediately 'at home with the Lord'. So he tells his Philippian friends that, in his present uncertainty regarding the outcome of his trial, his personal preference would be 'to depart and be with Christ'. He does not envisage the possibility that the parousia might take place before his case comes up for hearing. Here, then, a shift in outlook might be detected which could be used to support an earlier date for Philippians 3:2 ff. than for the earlier part of the letter; but in itself it would be too weak to provide an argument against the unity of the letter.

If we suppose that another letter, or part of another letter, begins at 3:2, how far does it go? Certainly as far as 4:1, with its plea to the Philippians to 'stand fast in the Lord', but perhaps as far as 4:3,² and possibly even 4:9. If it goes on to 4:9, we should have a satisfactory ending to a letter, the last paragraph beginning 'Finally, my brothers' (τὸ λοιπὸν, ἀδελφοί, 4:8) and ending with a benediction: 'the God of peace will be with you.'

If verses 2 and 3 of chapter 4, with their personal references, do belong to an earlier date than the Roman imprisonment, then we have a simple answer to the identity of the 'true yokefellow' (γνήσιε σύνζυγε) whom Paul addresses in verse 3 without giving him or her a name. 'I entreat Euodia', says Paul, 'and I entreat

¹A pre-Pauline formulation has been discerned in these two verses, e.g. by E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper . . .*, pp. 156–63; E. Güttgemanns, *Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr*, FRLANT, xc (Göttingen, 1966), 246 f.; J. Becker, 'Erwägungen zu Phil. 3, 20–21', *Theologische Zeitschrift*, xxvii (1971), 16–29. Their arguments are refuted by R. H. Gundry ('Soma' in *Biblical Theology*, SNTSM, xxix [Cambridge, 1976], pp. 177–83), including the argument from the affinity in vocabulary between these verses and Phil. 2:6–11—an affinity which is invoked to quite different effect by M. D. Hooker, 'Philippians 2:6–11', p. 155.

²C. Bornkamm, 'Der Philipperbrief als paulinische Briefsammlung', in *Neotestamentica et Patristica*, ed. W. C. van Unnik—*NovT Suppl.* vi (Leiden, 1962), pp. 192–202, prefers to carry this separate composition on to 4:3 (p. 195).

Syntyche, to agree together in the Lord. Yes, and I ask you too, my true yokefellow, to help those women, for they shared the gospel contest with me (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ συνήθλησάν μοι), together with Clement and my other fellow-workers, whose names are in the book of life.' If these words were written any time before Paul's last journey to Jerusalem, I should have no difficulty in identifying the 'true yokefellow' with Luke. The author of the 'we' narrative is left behind when Paul and his other companions leave Philippi at the end of Acts 16, and he reappears in Philippi when Paul comes there in Acts 20:5 f., on the eve of his embarkation for Judaea. It is a fair inference that he spent the intervening period in Philippi, and if Paul singled Luke out in this way in his letter, everybody would understand. If, on the other hand, this section of the letter was sent, with the rest of it, from Rome, it would be difficult to identify the yokefellow with Luke and indeed impossible to identify him or her at all.¹ But, of course, the identification one way or the other of the yokefellow cannot be made the basis for a literary-critical argument.²

If, then, we recognize (as I am disposed to do) Philippians 3:2–4:9 as belonging to a separate and earlier letter,³ the main letter will end with Paul's 'Finally, my brothers, rejoice in the Lord . . .' (τὸ λοιπὸν, ἀδελφοί μου, χαίrete ἐν κυρίῳ . . .) in 3:1, followed by his expression of thanks for the Philippians' gift (4:10–20) and the final greetings and benediction (4:21–3).⁴

¹The author of the 'we' narrative accompanied Paul to Rome (Acts 27:1–28:16), and if Colossians and Philemon have a Roman provenance (as I believe), Luke was in Rome with Paul when these letters were written (Col. 4:14; Philem. 24).

²One may mention, as a romantic curiosity, the idea that Paul married Lydia and that she was the 'true yokefellow' (S. Baring-Gould, *A Study of St. Paul* [London, 1897], pp. 213 f.).

³B. D. Rahtjen, 'The Three Letters . . .', pp. 171 f., sees 3:2–4:9 as belonging to a separate but later letter, which 'follows the classical pattern of the Testament of a dying father to his children'.

⁴In addition to others mentioned above, the composite nature of Philippians is maintained by J. Müller-Bardorff, 'Zur Frage der literarischen Einheit des Philipperbriefes', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Friedrich von Schiller-Universität Jena*, vii (1957–8), 591–604; W. Schmithals, *Paul and the Gnostics*, E.T. (Nashville, 1972), pp. 65–122. The unity of the epistle is defended by B. S. Mackay, 'Further Thoughts on Philippians', *NTS*, vii (1960–1), 161–70; V. P. Furnish, 'The Plan and Purpose of Philippians', *NTS*, x (1963–4), 80–88; T. E.

V

When Paul characterizes the men against whom he warns the Philippians as those 'who mind the things of earth' (3:19), he adds immediately, by way of contrast, 'But our *πολίτευμα* is in heaven' (3:20). By *πολίτευμα* is meant 'citizenship' or 'constitution'. James Moffatt translated the clause, 'But we are a colony of heaven.' He was probably moved to render it thus by the consideration that Philippi was a colony of Rome, as though Paul meant: 'What Rome, the mother-city (*μητρόπολις*), is to Philippi, heaven is to you.'¹ It is doubtful if Paul had this consideration in mind; nevertheless, Moffatt's rendering is an apt paraphrase of his words.

It is not easy for us in the western world to imagine what it felt like to be a Gentile Christian in one of the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire in the first century AD. Gentile Christians found themselves suddenly transplanted into membership of a new society, which in some important aspects involved a breach with the society to which they had previously belonged. Their new society was normally a small one, organized on two or more levels: in the first instance they would find themselves members of a house-church, which met regularly in the home of one of their number, but in most cities there would be a number of house-churches, all of which would be incorporated in the wider city-church. The consciousness of membership in the city-church might be stronger in some house-churches than in others, just as consciousness of membership in a worldwide fellowship would be stronger in some city-churches than in others.

In Philippi the sense of membership in a city-wide church was

Pollard, 'The Integrity of Philippians', *ibid.* xiii (1966-7), 57-66; R. Jewett, 'The Epistolary Thanksgiving and the Integrity of Philippians', *NovT*, xii (1970), 40-53; cf. W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, E.T. (London, 1966), p. 237: 'There is . . . no sufficient reason to doubt the original unity of the transmitted Philippians.'

¹ Lydia, one member of the church so addressed, might have reflected that, while she was resident as a *μέτοικος* (or *πάροικος*) in Philippi, her *πολίτευμα* on one level was in Thyatira (Acts 16:14) and on another level in heaven.

probably quite strong: this is suggested by the terms in which the letter is addressed: 'to all the saints in Christ Jesus who are in Philippi, with "bishops" and "deacons".' In none of the other Pauline letters (apart from the Pastorals) do we find such special reference made to a definite body of people in the church exercising supervisory and administrative functions (*ἐπίσκοποι* and *διάκονοι*).¹ The Corinthian Christians would probably have been impatient of any such exercise of authority over them; the church of Rome at this time was probably too decentralized to have one city-wide college of leaders. Paul might conceivably have nominated the 'bishops' and 'deacons' at Philippi, but the Philippian church was doubtless quite capable of electing them itself.

One feature that strikes us about the Philippian church, both in Acts and in Paul's letter, is the active part played in it by women. In the Acts narrative Lydia, the purple-seller from Thyatira, and her companions, with the members of her household, were the foundation-members of the Philippian church. In the letter Paul makes special mention of Euodia and Syntyche as women who contended by his side in the gospel ministry: the verb he uses, *συναθλέω* (as in 1:27), is drawn from the athletic realm and implies no merely auxiliary role. This is not only consistent with what has been said already about the independence and initiative of Macedonian women:² it is in line with Paul's affirmation in Galatians 3:28 that in Christ 'there is no "male and female".'³—an affirmation which does not deny the distinction between the two sexes but abolishes any inequality between them in respect of religious roles.

We know the principal features which distinguished the Jewish community in a Gentile city from its neighbours, but many of these (circumcision, sabbath-keeping, food-restrictions) did not obtain in a Pauline church. If Paul had been asked what marked off one of his churches from its environment, he might have pointed to the cross of Christ as fencing off believers from the

¹The role of the *προϊστάμενοι* of 1 Thess. 5:12 and Rom. 12:8 was less precisely defined. See B. Holmberg, *Paul and Power* (Lund, 1978), pp. 100-3.

²See *Bulletin*, lxi (1978-9), 349 f.

³The construction of the clause suggests an allusion to Gen. 1:27.

world.¹ But the cross of Christ exercised a positive rather than a negative influence on their lives. The society in the midst of which the Philippian Christians lived might be described as 'crooked and perverse', but they were commended for shining 'as lights in the world' and 'holding out to them the word of life' (Phil. 2:15 f.).

Each local church might be compared to a garden planted in a wilderness, but the church's first concern was not to prevent the wilderness from encroaching on the garden, but rather to see to it that the garden took over more and more of the wilderness. The garden was not to be 'walled around'; its boundaries were to be flexible and expandable. To change the figure, each colony of heaven was to extend its territory and incorporate more and more of its neighbourhood. Every church was to be a missionary church, and the history of the expansion of early Christianity suggests that many churches realized and fulfilled this mission. Among those that did so the church of Philippi, like the other Macedonian churches, holds an honoured place.

¹When Paul says that by the cross of Christ 'the world has been crucified (*ἔσταύρωται*) to me and I to the world' (Gal. 6:14), there may be a hint of the other meaning of *σταυρόω*, 'fence round' or 'fence off'.