

# **Finances in the Pauline Churches**

**A Social-Exegetical Study of the Funding of Paul's Mission and  
the Financial Administration of His Congregations.**

---

**Dachollom C. Datiri**

---

*Submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy*  
**The Department of Biblical Studies  
University of Sheffield  
UK**

**April, 1996.**

## Summary.

### **FINANCES IN THE PAULINE CHURCHES:**

**A Social-Exegetical Study of the Funding of Paul's Mission and the Financial Administration of His Congregations.**

----- Dachollom C. Datiri.

Paul, like other apostles who adopted the so-called 'charismatic poverty,' could have relied on his churches for the funding of his mission. He rejected such support and opted to work on a trade, a choice which ultimately rested on his conception of the gospel and the influence it had on his life. He gives three reasons for his actions: love for his converts, not to hinder the gospel, and his independence/freedom. This shows also an awareness of his social milieu. This thesis utilises 'models from the environment' to demonstrate that Paul extensively adopted, reshaped or modified the social conventions of his day, as need be. He conceived the gospel as received and interpreted within his social context, appreciating the good aspects of that social context. He accepted hospitality and benefaction only when it did not 'hinder the gospel' as he put it.

Similarly, Paul expected the churches of his mission to run their local finances on these same principles, with the social conventions of hospitality, and benefaction featuring prominently. Such hospitality and benefaction were however understood in the light of the gospel message described as the 'law of Christ' (ἐννομος Χριστοῦ). His admonitions on work indicate that he expected his converts to follow his practice. Although he anticipated that out of love his converts would help one another, especially the poor, he did not by that expect that the poor would be lazy. For trans-local finances, he expected that his reshaped, and modified form of patronage and benefaction would be adopted, taken in conjunction with the theological conception of giving as the grace of God bestowed for generosity.

**To Naomi, Dorcas and Blessing**

**My wife and two daughters who endured my obsession with this project.**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page Numbers
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.</b>	viii
<b>ABBREVIATIONS.</b>	ix
<b>INTRODUCTION.</b>	1
<b>A. Reasons for the Choice of Subject for this Research.</b>	1
1. Why Finances?	1
2. Why the Pauline Churches?	2
3. Agenda.	2
<b>B. Methodology.</b>	4
1. Social Scientific Interpretation of Biblical Texts.	4
2. Models.	8
3. Methodological Assumptions.	10
4. Scope.	11
<b>SECTION ONE: SOCIAL MODELS.</b>	12
<b>CHAPTER 1: THE FAMILY.</b>	13
<b>1.1. Family Finances of the Romans.</b>	13
<b>1.2. Family Finances of the Greeks.</b>	18
<b>1.3. Hospitality.</b>	19
<b>1.4. Patronage.</b>	26
<b>1.5. Conclusion.</b>	31
<b>CHAPTER 2: THE SYNAGOGUE.</b>	32
<b>2.1. Preliminary Remarks.</b>	32
2.1.1. Background to the Institution of the Synagogue.	33
2.1.2. Nature of the Sources.	35
<b>2.2. OT Models of Community.</b>	36
2.2.1. Priests and Levites.	36
2.2.2. Tithes, Offerings and Taxes.	39
2.2.3. Charity.	41
<b>2.3. Intertestamental Judaism.</b>	42
2.2.1. Priests and Levites.	43
2.2.2. Sacrifices, Tithes, Offerings and Taxes.	44
2.2.3. Charity.	47
<b>2.4. Synagogue Practice.</b>	48
2.4.1. Means of Financial Support	48
2.4.2. Temple Tax.	58
2.4.3. Paid Officials?	59
<b>2.5. Conclusion.</b>	61



<b>CHAPTER 3: CLUBS OR VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS.</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>3.1. Introduction.</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>3.2. Legal Existence.</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>3.3. Organisational Structure.</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>3.4. Financial Organisation.</b>	<b>76</b>
3.4.1. <i>Arca Communis</i>	76
3.4.2. Sources of Income.	77
3.4.3. Expenditure.	84
<b>3.5. Conclusion.</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4: HELLENISTIC SCHOOLS.</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>4.1. Introduction.</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>4.2. Philosophical Schools.</b>	<b>92</b>
4.2.1. The Pythagoreans.	92
4.2.2. The “Socratic” School.	94
4.2.3. Plato and the Academy.	95
4.2.4. Aristotle and the Peripatetic School.	98
4.2.5. The Epicurean School.	100
4.2.6. Stoicism.	102
4.2.7. Cynicism.	104
<b>4.3. Other Hellenistic Schools.</b>	<b>108</b>
4.3.1. Rhetorical Schools.	108
4.3.2. Medical Schools.	113
4.3.3. Schools of Mathematics and the Technical Subjects.	115
<b>4.4. Means of Financial Support.</b>	<b>116</b>
4.4.1. Patronage and Hospitality.	116
4.4.2. Other Means of Financial Support.	121
4.4.3. The Debate on the Question of Teachers’ Pay.	126
<b>4.5. Conclusion.</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>SECTION TWO: EXEGESIS.</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5: PAUL AND SUPPORT FROM THE CHURCHES.</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>5.1. Introduction.</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>5.2. The Rights of Apostleship. I Cor 9: 1-27.</b>	<b>131</b>
5.2.1. Review of Scholarship on the Context of the Passage.	131
5.2.2. Apostleship and Apostolic Rights (vv. 3-18).	134
5.2.3. Apostolic Freedom (vv. 19-27).	140
<b>5.3. Paul and Support From Corinth.</b>	<b>142</b>
5.3.1. Support Which Paul did Accept.	142
5.3.1.1. Rom 16: 1-5a.	142
5.3.1.2. Rom 16: 23a.	146
5.3.1.3. I Cor 16: 5-11.	147
5.3.1.4. II Cor 1: 15-17.	148
5.3.2. Support Which Paul Refused and Why.	150
5.3.2.1. Background: Relationship With Corinth.	150

5.3.2.2. Concerns for the Gospel (I Cor 9: 12b, 15ff).	155
5.3.2.3. Misuse of Support for Missionaries (II Cor 10: 1-12: 18).	158
<b>5.4. Support From Philippi: Partnership in the Gospel.</b>	<b>165</b>
5.4.1. A Review of Some Explanations.	165
5.4.2. The Gift in the Salutation and the Epistolary Thanksgiving.	166
5.4.2.1. The Salutation (1: 1-2).	166
5.4.2.2. The Thanksgiving Report (1: 3-6).	167
5.4.2.3. Paul's Affection for his Friends (1: 7-8).	169
5.4.3. Epaphroditus, The Emissary of the Philippians (2: 25-30).	171
5.4.4. Paul's Thanks for the Philippians' Gifts (4: 10-20).	175
5.4.4.1. The Christian Secret (vv. 10-13).	176
5.4.4.2. Partnership in Giving and Receiving (vv. 14-16).	180
5.4.4.3. Investing for Compound Interest (vv. 17-20).	183
<b>5.5. Conclusion.</b>	<b>187</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6: PAUL AND HIS WORK.</b>	<b>188</b>
<b>6.1. Introduction.</b>	<b>188</b>
<b>6.2. Paul's Trade in Thessalonica (I Thess 2: 1-12).</b>	<b>188</b>
<b>6.3. Paul's Paraenesis on Work (I Thess 4: 9-12).</b>	<b>193</b>
<b>6.4. Paul the Artisan Missionary (I Cor 4: 11-12a; 9: 6).</b>	<b>199</b>
<b>6.5. Paul's Attitude to Work (I Cor 9: 19-23; II Cor 11: 7).</b>	<b>202</b>
<b>6.6. The Personal Cost of Working.</b>	<b>205</b>
<b>6.7. Conclusion.</b>	<b>210</b>
<b>CHAPTER 7: PAUL'S COLLECTION PROJECT.</b>	<b>211</b>
<b>7.1. Paul's Eagerness to Remember the Poor (Gal 2: 1-10).</b>	<b>211</b>
<b>7.2. A Practical Admonition on the Collection (I Cor 16: 1-4).</b>	<b>215</b>
<b>7.3 Organisational Details (II Cor 8 &amp; 9).</b>	<b>219</b>
7.3.1. The Collection as χάρις (8: 1-7).	220
7.3.2. The Ultimate χάρις (8: 8-9).	221
7.3.3. The Collection as a Voluntary Gift (8: 10-12).	222
7.3.4. A Means of Achieving Equality (8: 13-15).	224
7.3.5. Commendation of Delegates (8: 16-24).	225
7.3.6. The Delegates' Task (9: 1-5).	226
7.3.7. A Theological Motivation for the Collection (9: 6-15).	228
<b>7.4. The Collection as an Obligation (Rom 15: 25-33).</b>	<b>231</b>
<b>7.5. Conclusion.</b>	<b>237</b>
<b>CHAPTER 8: FINANCES OF THE HOUSE CHURCHES.</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>8.1. Introduction.</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>8.2. Responsibility Especially to Instructors (Gal 6: 1-10).</b>	<b>240</b>
<b>8.3. Social Status and Finances (I Cor 1: 26-31).</b>	<b>246</b>
<b>8.4. Men Deserving Honour (I Cor 16: 15-18).</b>	<b>251</b>
<b>8.5. Influential Members (Rom 16: 1-15, 23; Philem 2).</b>	<b>255</b>

<b>8.6. Conclusion.</b>	262
<b>CONCLUSION.</b>	263
<b>SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.</b>	267

## **Acknowledgement.**

I welcome the opportunity the completion of this thesis offers me to express my sincere appreciation to those who contributed in extremely significant ways to making it a success. First, special thanks go to Professor John Rogerson who stimulated as well as encouraged me to go ahead with the project. Without his contribution, it would not have taken off at all, and through his influence a grant from the JW Laing Trust was secured. I am personally thankful to the JW Laing Trust for this grant without which I would not have undertaken the research. My home church will always remain indebted to this Trust for their tremendous contribution. I also owe much thanks to St Thomas' Church Crookes whose bursary provided for living expenses for myself and my family, and whose continued support has been remarkable. Special thanks also go to John Paramore whose rent free accommodation for two years meant that we had no worries about a place to live during the first half of the course. Also deserving special mention is the Free Baptist Church Great Shelford who paid the air fares for my family to come over from Nigeria to join me here.

Most special thanks go to Dr L.A Alexander my supervisor, whose inspiration, incentive and encouragement were constant during the entire period of this project. Her insights, wealth of experience and stimulating suggestions guided the direction I took for this project. I will always remain indebted to her for this significant contribution. The flaws that remain in this thesis are however my responsibility. I am also grateful to the entire staff of the Department whose friendship, encouragement and support I greatly appreciate. Finally, I cannot name, but must acknowledge the support many individuals rendered in various ways during the period of this research.

D. C. Datiri  
*Sheffield University*  
April, 1996.

## Abbreviations.

Standard abbreviations as found in LSJ and Hawthorne, G.F. *et al* eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Inter-varsity Press: Leicester, 1993) are used for classical authors and works both Latin and Greek. Rabbinic citations are abbreviated as in Hawthorne, *et al* 1993, and Bowker, J. *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1969): xvii-xxi.

### General Abbreviations

BCE	Before Christian Era.
CE	Christian Era.
cf.	<i>confer</i> , compare.
cols.	columns
ed/eds.	editor(s), edited by ...
e.g.	<i>exempli gratia</i> , for example.
esp.	especially
ET.	English Translation.
<i>et al</i>	<i>et alii</i> , and others.
etc.	<i>et cetera</i> , and the rest; and similar things or people; and so on.
f., ff.	following (verse or verses, page or pages, etc.).
<i>ibid.</i>	<i>ibidem</i> , in the same place.
i.e.	<i>id est</i> , that is.
Inc.	Incorporated.
infin.	infinitive.
JB	The Jerusalem Bible.
KJV	King James Version of the Bible.
κτλ	Greek, and so on.
LB	The Living Bible.
Ltd.	Limited.
LXX	Septuagint.
MSS	manuscripts.
n.	note.
NIV	New International Version of the Bible.
no.	number
NT	New Testament.
OT	Old Testament.
p., pp.	page, pages.
repr.	reprinted.
RSV	Revised Standard Version of the Bible.
s.v.	<i>sub verbo</i> , under the word.

TEV	Today's English Version.
Tr.	Translated.
vol.	volume.
v, vv.	verse, verses.

### **Commonly Used Periodicals, Reference Works, and Serials.**

ABB	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary.</i>
ABQ	<i>American Baptist Quarterly.</i>
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang de römischen Welt.</i>
ATR	<i>American Theological Review</i>
BAGD	eds. Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of New Testament and Early Christian Literature.</i>
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of The John Ryland Library.</i>
BT	<i>The Bible Translator.</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin.</i>
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift.</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly.</i>
CII	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum.</i>
CIJ	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum</i>
CIL	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly.</i>
CNT	<i>Commentaire du Nouveau Testament</i>
CPh	<i>Classical Philology.</i>
CRINT	<i>Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum</i> , ed. Safrai, S. et al. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1974).
EvQ	<i>The Evangelical Quarterly.</i>
ExpTim	<i>The Expository Times.</i>
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies.</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review.</i>
IDB	<i>Interpreters' Dictionary of the Bible.</i>
ICC	<i>International Critical Commentary.</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature.</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenistic Studies.</i>
JRH	<i>Journal of Religious History.</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies.</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament.</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament.</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies.</i>

LCL	Loeb Classical Library.
LTQ	<i>Lexington Theological Quarterly.</i>
LSJ	Liddle-Scott-Jones, <i>Greek-English Lexicon.</i>
MNTC	The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.
NAB	New American Bible.
NCB	New Century Bible.
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary.
NEB	New English Bible.
NIGTC	The New International Greek Testament Commentary.
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament.
NTC	New Testament Commentary.
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies.</i>
NovT	<i>Novum Testamentum.</i>
NovTSupl.	<i>Supplement to Novum Testamentum.</i>
OCD	<i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i>
ODCC	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of the Christians Church.</i>
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum.</i>
RevExp	<i>Review and Expositor.</i>
RSR	<i>Religious Studies Review.</i>
RTR	<i>The Reformed Theological Review</i>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series.
SEv.	<i>Studia Evangelica</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series.
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association.</i>
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries.
TynB	<i>Tyndale Bulletin.</i>
U.M.I.	University Microfilms International: A Bell & Howell Information Company. 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary.
WEC	Wycliffe Exegetical Commentary.
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.</i>
ZWT	<i>Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie.</i>

# **INTRODUCTION.**

## ***A. Reasons for the Choice of Subject for this Research.***

### **1. Why Finances?**

Every research project seeks to satisfy specific needs. A wide variety of reasons account for the choice of topic each scholar makes. These can range from sheer curiosity to a desire to answer specific questions the scholar faces in his/her circumstances or questions facing the community s/he lives. As a pastor from a very fast growing church in Nigeria, my choice of topic for this research project is influenced by specific circumstances which have raised specific questions I have had to struggle with as an individual, and which the church as a whole is having to confront. In a word, they are questions to do with the best, and safest way to raise support to meet the financial needs of the growing church. In the first place, how should the church respond to individuals who want to use their financial giving as an instrument to gain social control or to manipulate the church? In other words, how should the church respond to one who makes his money in a corrupt way but donates heavily, and with that expects to be accepted or even honoured and given prominence as a good church member? Should the church continue to accept those individuals because of the size of what they put into the collection plates each Sunday, as well as their generous donations to meet specific needs of the church? Is 'corrupt' money acceptable to the church? Is giving for honour biblical? What should be the right motive for the giving of church members?

A y

Very closely related to the above are questions to do with personal support given to church leaders, especially to missionaries in a new environment where a church is being planted. Again, how best should one respond to those whose giving is a kind of a 'bribe' to buy the conscience of the leader? What is the proper attitude the church should have towards bribery? How should a pastor or missionary or any church leader in a desperate financial situation have his needs met? Is it legitimate for him to engage in some form of business to supplement the little and obviously insufficient income he receives from the supporting church, or can he rely on the support he gets from these rich benefactors he knows to be corrupt? If the better choice is to engage in business, which business is acceptable for someone in his position? On what grounds can this decision be made?

These questions are as relevant for individual church members as they are for leaders. In an economy where wealth is poorly distributed and inflation is growing at an



alarming rate, the majority of the population is unable to support itself on a decent mode of livelihood. The wealthy in turn, tend to exploit such situations. How should the Christian giver treat his/her fellow Christian receiver, and how should the receiver feel towards the giver? How should the poor Christian regard the rich? How best can s/he respond to her/his situation? How should s/he respond to bribery? On a trans - local level, how should the supporting church regard the receiving church? How should a church feel about asking for support from another church? Is there genuine theological motivation for such support, and what does the supporting church benefit? How can the supporting church avoid feeling proud? These questions clearly justify the choice of subject for this study.

## **2. Why the Pauline Churches?**

The Pauline churches seem an obvious place to seek for answers to these questions. There was comparably less missionary activity going on in the Jerusalem church. More importantly, much less is known about this branch of the early church than the Pauline churches. In addition, the availability of data for the Pauline churches supplied by the letters of Paul surpass by far what we know about the Jerusalem church or any other branch of the church in those early days. In my opinion, the Nigerian church with which I am concerned (The Church of Christ in Nigeria), compares well with the Pauline churches, not only because it is a missionary church, but also because of its rapid growth. This church was founded in 1904 by the Sudan United Mission (SUM). In just 92 years or less, it has grown to include thousands of congregations, and hundreds of thousands of members spreading extensively over the country and still growing every day. This rapid growth was intensified in the early seventies and has been sustained since then.

On an economic level, at least some of the Pauline churches, like the Nigerian church, were poor (II Cor. 8: 2). The information from these early churches as recorded in the Pauline epistles should therefore prove very helpful in answering at least some of the questions the church in Nigeria is faced with.

## **3. Agenda.**

My agenda therefore explores the Pauline epistles to seek to answer at least some of these questions. I shall focus on four specific areas: support Paul received from the churches, his personal means of support, interpersonal support between members of a local congregation, and trans-local support between congregations. These will form four of the chapters of this thesis, treated in the second section. In the first section, I

shall explore four 'models from the environment', that is, the Mediterranean world of Paul's time, to seek to explain what Paul says in his letters about the subject in question.

These four models: the household, the synagogue, clubs or voluntary associations, and hellenistic schools, were proposed in Wayne Meeks' groundbreaking study.<sup>1</sup> In this study, Meeks argues that the use of these models "has the advantage of approximating the way in which a curious contemporary observer might have tried to identify and understand the Christians."<sup>2</sup> The basic argument has two parts: (1) that each of these four models has something to offer for the understanding of the Pauline churches, and (2) that there are differences between each of these institutions and the Pauline churches. Meeks conclusion therefore, is that these models have to be taken together as none, by itself, is able to fully compare with the Pauline churches:

The fact is that none of the four models we have surveyed captures the whole of the Pauline *ekklesia*, although all offer significant analogies. At the least, the household remains the basic context within which most if not all the local Pauline groups established themselves, and the manifold life of voluntary associations, the special adaptation of the synagogue to urban life, and the organisation of instruction and exhortation in philosophical schools all provide examples of groups solving certain problems that the Christians, too, had to face.<sup>3</sup>

Meeks' work has received some criticisms. Notable are those by Malina and Elliott. In his review of this work, Malina refers to Meeks' conceptualisations as "implicit, arbitrary and unsystematic," and charges it with being "less aware of ethnocentrism," suffering from "lack of conceptual specificity," and using "generalisations based on implicit theory ... while avoiding scrutiny of the theoretical presuppositions upon which the generalisations rest."<sup>4</sup> His valuation of the chapter that concerns us (ch. 3) however, is that it is "particularly good."<sup>5</sup> Elliott expresses similar sentiments about Meeks approach:

Meeks' entire enterprise would have gained considerably in methodological clarity and perhaps also cogency if he had identified his theories and their sources, explicated his conceptual models, and clarified his sociological as well as historical and theological premises and thus provided a more precise basis for the verification and critique of conclusions reached.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Meeks, W.A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 1983), ch. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 74.

<sup>3</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 84.

<sup>4</sup> Malina, B.J. "Review: *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, by Wayne A. Meeks" in *JBL* 104/4 (1985): 346-349.

<sup>5</sup> Malina, 1985, p. 348.

<sup>6</sup> Elliott, John H. "Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: Review Essay*." *RSR* II No. 4 (1985): 329-335, here, p. 332.

Also, like Malina, he calls chapter 3 of Meeks' work "a gem."<sup>7</sup> His conclusion is that Meeks' work as a whole "constitutes a milestone, if not a turning point" in Pauline studies, and illustrates the potential of the social-scientific study of the Bible as well as the problems it is yet to address.

In spite of these criticisms, which really do not apply as far as this chapter of Meeks' work is concerned, I propose to adopt these four models as a working hypothesis to provide a way of structuring data from the social context, as well as to enable us ask structural questions about the Pauline churches as social groupings. It will also be part of the task of this thesis to test the models by asking concrete questions about finance - a matter which must be important in the day to day life of any social group in a complex society like that of the first century Mediterranean world. lect

## **B. Methodology.**

### **1. Social Scientific Interpretation of Biblical Texts.**

The use of models is a key element in the social scientific interpretation of the Bible. It is therefore appropriate to describe briefly this inter-disciplinary approach to interpreting biblical texts - the marriage between the social sciences and biblical interpretation.

The last two decades or so have witnessed a renewed interest in the social world of early Christianity. The social sciences have been employed by a considerable number of scholars to locate and describe the social realities of the first Christians.<sup>8</sup> The

---

<sup>7</sup> Elliott, 1985, p. 331.

<sup>8</sup> An illustrative, and by no means comprehensive list which includes works on social-historical studies, would include Gager, John G. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*. (Prentice-Hall, Inc.: New Jersey, 1975); Malherbe, A.J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. (Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge and London, 1977); Holmberg, B. *Paul and Power*. (Part 1) *Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament*, 11 (Gleerup: Lund, 1978); Theissen, G. *The First Followers of Jesus*. (SCM Press: London, 1978), see also his *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity*. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1982); Kee, Howard C. *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective*. (SCM Press Ltd.: London, 1980); Malina, B.J. *The New Testament World: Insights From Cultural Anthropology*. (John Knox Press: Atlanta, 1981); Elliott, John H. *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1982); Meeks, 1983. Cf. *Semeia* 35 (1986) which is devoted in its entirety to *Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament and its Social World*. Others include Tidball, D.J. *An Introduction to the Sociology of the NT* (Paternoster Press: Exeter, 1983); Neusner, J., and Frerichs, E.S. eds. *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*. (Scholars Press: Chico, California, 1985); Jewett, R. *The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety*. Foundations and facets. New Testament. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1986); Kyrntatas, D.J. *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities* (Verso: New York, and Methuen & Co.: London, 1987); Moxnes, H. "Honour, Shame, and the Outside

branches of the social sciences most commonly adopted include anthropology, sociology, and social psychology.<sup>9</sup> Richter prefers to distinguish between proto-sociological and sociological approaches, and between the term 'social' and 'sociological' - the former showing an absence of 'explanatory theories and hypothesis' and a lack of interest in explaining and describing relevant social data.<sup>10</sup> The thing that is common between these two categories is the concern with social matters. Recently, Elliott has classified this interest in the social world of the New Testament into five groupings: (1) those which are concerned with the *social realia* and seek to provide a social description; (2) those interested in constructing a social history; (3) those whose approach includes a deliberate use of social theory and models; (4) those who concentrate on the social and cultural scripts of the social interaction; and (5) those who enlist the research, theory and models of the social sciences in the analysis of biblical texts.<sup>11</sup> In this categorisation, Meeks' work falls under category 3, which places him midway between the social historian and the social scientist.

This raises the question of characteristics of an adequate social science approach to biblical texts. Malina identifies four: (1) it 'must be historical'; (2) it 'must be cross-cultural'; (3) it must focus on the geographical and social world 'depicted in the texts and inhibited by the text's original audience'; and (4) it 'should allow for validation and testing.'<sup>12</sup> If by cross-cultural Malina excludes the Mediterranean culture of Paul's day, then this position must be contested. I think that there is a place for cross-cultural models from among the various cultures of the contemporary period with the NT, like those suggested by Meeks and adopted here. This approach can therefore be termed social-scientific in the sense that it deliberately employs social theories and models

---

World in Paul's Letter to the Romans." In (ed.) Jacob Neusner et al. *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1988). Kee, H. C. *Knowing the Truth: A Sociological Approach to NT Interpretation* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1989); Holmberg, B. *Sociology of the NT: An Appraisal*. (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1990); More recent such studies include Atkins Jr., Robert R. *Egalitarian Community: Ethnography and Exegesis*. (The University of Alabama Press: Tuscaloosa and London, 1991); Esler, Philip F. *The First Christians in their Social Worlds: Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. (Routledge: London and New York, 1994); and Esler, Philip F. (Ed.) *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*. (Routledge: London and New York, 1995). A detailed and up-to-date bibliography of social-historical and social-scientific interpretation of the NT can be found in Elliott, J. *Social Scientific Criticism of the NT* (SPCK: London, 1995), pp. 138-162.

<sup>9</sup> See for instance the essays collected in Esler, 1995. Atkins, 1991 refers to sociology and cultural anthropology.

<sup>10</sup> Richter, Philip J. "Recent Sociological Approaches to the Study of the New Testament" in *Religion* 14 (1984): 77-90, here 78ff. Gager, J.G. "Shall We Marry Our Enemies?" *Interpretation* 36 (1982): 256-265, (here p. 258), makes this distinction.

<sup>11</sup> See Elliott, 1995, pp. 18-20 whose account includes as well the respective scholars that fit each category.

<sup>12</sup> Malina, Bruce J. "Why Interpret the Bible with the Social Sciences?" *ABQ* 2 1983, pp. 129-130.

(and also historical in that it privileges models from the contemporary world of the NT).

The interest in the social sciences is justified by the insights that have been gained from this inter-disciplinary approach to biblical texts. In an article which reviews seven different works on the use of sociology as an interpretative tool on biblical scholarship, Edwards has no doubts about the usefulness of this approach.<sup>13</sup> Because of its fruitfulness, Esler contends that “traditional disciplinary boundaries” are in fact “unnecessary and unfortunate limitations” which should not be allowed to hinder our leap into this fertile field.<sup>14</sup> This approach does not, however, replace the traditional literary and historical criticisms, but is seen “as a necessary adjunct to” these “established forms of criticisms.”<sup>15</sup> Historical criticism and literary criticism have been recognised as falling short of their well intended goals. Historical-critical method is seen to be not critical enough. Likewise, literary criticism is seen to be using language symptomatically rather than therapeutically.<sup>16</sup> The limitation of these traditional approaches is caused not by “the absence of good intentions but the lack of a sociological method adequate for the task” - a limitation because it does not have “a genuinely sociological perspective and a sociological technique.”<sup>17</sup> Traditional approaches fail to acknowledge that “all ideas, concepts and knowledge are socially determined” and that the biblical literature are “products and reflections of a dynamic social process, of socio-religious movements.”<sup>18</sup> On the other hand, the social sciences have provided “some of the important tools for both the linguistic and the historical dimensions of biblical scholarship.”<sup>19</sup> They “offer adequate sophistication in determining and articulating the social systems behind the texts under investigation.”<sup>20</sup> Sociological exegesis for instance goes a step further to ask not just what the texts meant to the original audience, but also to enquire as to how and why those texts were designed to function, and how well they succeeded.<sup>21</sup>

The emphasis on the social context of the first Christians is based on the assumption that biblical texts were written and read within specific social and cultural contexts, and that to understand what they meant to the original audience we need to uncover

---

<sup>13</sup> Edwards, O.C. “Sociology as a Tool for Interpreting the New Testament” *ATR* 65 (1983): 431-448, especially pp. 444-5.

<sup>14</sup> Esler, 1995, p. 3.

<sup>15</sup> Esler, 1994, p. 2.

<sup>16</sup> So Malina, 1983: 119-133.

<sup>17</sup> Elliott, 1982, p. 2.

<sup>18</sup> Elliott, 1982, pp. 4-5, 7.

<sup>19</sup> Malina, Bruce J. “The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation” *Interpretation*. 36. No. 3 (1982): 229-242, here, p. 229.

<sup>20</sup> Malina, 1982, p. 240.

what these contexts are. This raises the question of the relationship between context and *kerygma*, history and theology. This question has been addressed by a number of scholars advocating the use of the social sciences, who recognise that the *kerygma* was meant to be understood within specific cultural and social contexts. To correctly appreciate and appropriate that *kerygma*, the argument goes, we need to understand what that *kerygma* meant to the original audience.<sup>22</sup> Put differently, the gospel message is God speaking to humans within a social context, and that message is best understood today if its meaning is situated within its first-century context.<sup>23</sup> Malina contends that adopting this approach, which seeks to learn and share the social system of the biblical author, is simply being considerate as a modern Bible reader:

If the Bible is the word of God in the words of men, it ought to be obvious that it is only through the words of men that we can get to hear the word of God in the Bible. Since these words encode meanings from a social system, it would not be too much to say that it is those meanings which the biblical writers intend to communicate and that Christian tradition has canonised as God's word.<sup>24</sup>

Elliott, one of the great exponents of the social scientific approach to interpreting biblical texts, discusses eight presuppositions with which this approach operates. These are worth summarising.<sup>25</sup> First, it assumes that biblical documents and traditions are “products and vehicles of ongoing social interactions.” Second, it assumes that these texts point either implicitly or explicitly to interpersonal or social transactions and relationships. Third, it assumes that the perspectives they represent are not just historically and religiously conditioned, but also socially conditioned. Fourth, it assumes that the implicit factors that condition these texts require analytical and comparative methods and inferences to be drawn out. Fifth, it assumes that biblical texts are not only designed to communicate ideas but are also strategies with a specific social effect intended. Sixth, it assumes that the strategies of the texts reflect “the social interests, class positions, organisational structures, geographical locations, and modes of authority of diverse groups within a given socio-religious movement.”

---

<sup>21</sup> Elliott, 1982, p. 8.

<sup>22</sup> Scroggs, R. “The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament: The Present State of Research” *NTS* 26 (1980): 164-179, writes: “Interest in the sociology of early Christianity is no attempt to limit reductionistically the reality of Christianity to social dynamic; rather it should be seen as an effort to guard against a reductionism from the other extreme, a limitation of the reality of Christianity to an inner-spiritual, or objective-cognitive system. In short, sociology of early Christianity wants to put body and soul together again” (pp. 165-166). Harris, O.G. “The Social World of Early Christianity” *LtQ* 19,3 (1984): 102-114 also addresses this issue. Cf. Elliott, (1985): 329-335, who makes the same point (here p. 331).

<sup>23</sup> Esler, 1994, p. 2 writes: “My position is that the New Testament writings manifest a complex interpenetration of society and Gospel, of context and *kerygma* (‘the proclamation of faith’), and that we cannot hope to understand either without an appropriate methodology for dealing with the social side.”

<sup>24</sup> Malina, 1983, pp. 122-123.

Seventh, it assumes that such interests have resulted in the creation of collective or contrasting ideologies. Lastly, it assumes that the exegete her/himself "is conditioned by his or her own social and psychological experience." These well considered, the need for a concerted effort in employing the social sciences in interpreting the biblical texts can hardly be overemphasised.

## 2. Models.

Models represent the main tools with which the social scientist goes about his task. Models are hard to define. A simplified definition can be given at the expense of their dynamism: an "abstract, simplified representation of some real world object, event or interaction, constructed for the purpose of understanding, control or prediction."<sup>26</sup> Models are used as heuristic tools which serve the purpose of providing grounds for comparison with texts, and of allowing new questions to be asked on these texts.<sup>27</sup> Carney's work on this subject provides a discussion of models that can easily be called a masterpiece.<sup>28</sup> As to what models do, Carney contends that they enable a selective perception, serve as cognitive filters, bring unconscious levels of thought into awareness, enable us to handle data well, and provide new perceptions.<sup>29</sup> Carney describes a model as "an outline framework, in general terms, of the characteristics of a class of things or phenomena" and as "something less than a theory and something more than an analogy."<sup>30</sup> A model, he continues, links theories and observations, is a stepping stone 'upon which theories are built', is a conceptual map that arranges 'the stimuli which has come through the cognitive filter', is a kind of a check list, is an approximation to reality because it is selective, and 'cannot be true or false, as a replica' but 'useful, stimulating and/or appropriate - or the reverse.' Its main characteristic is that it is a speculative instrument which provides a frame of reference. With special reference to biblical interpretation, Malina identifies six characteristic features of a good social model: (1) it is 'cross-cultural' to account, in a comparative perspective, for those being interpreted as well as the interpreter; (2) it is sufficiently abstract, allowing for comparison facilitating similarities to come to the foreground; (3) it fits "a larger socio-linguistic frame for interpreting texts;" (4) the experiences it derives match closely those of the biblical world; (5) it generates meanings irrelevant but understandable to our present-day society; and (6) its application "should be

---

<sup>25</sup> For a detailed discussion of these and the task of the exegete in handling them, see Elliott, 1982, pp. 9-13.

<sup>26</sup> Malina, 1982, p. 231, quoted by Esler, 1995, p. 4.

<sup>27</sup> See Esler, 1994, pp. 12F. Cf. Malina, 1982, pp. 236ff .

<sup>28</sup> Carney, T.F. *The Shape of the Past: Models and Antiquity*. (Coronado Press: Lawrence, Kansas, 1975).

<sup>29</sup> Carney, 1975, pp. 1-7.

acceptable to social scientists (even if they disagree with the validity of the enterprise)."<sup>31</sup> With this understanding, "a model is not a set of pigeon-holes into which data is slotted," but a tool whose purpose "is essentially comparative."<sup>32</sup>

The use of social science models in biblical scholarship has not gone unchallenged. Malina has noted and discussed the fact that the criticism has, generally speaking, been on three counts: that it is 'reductionistic', and therefore 'eminently useless'; that it may be useful, but simply 'impossible, given the paucity of data in our body of texts'; and that it is 'simply too deterministic to explain adequately anything as distinctive and personal as change in human history.'<sup>33</sup> The first charge, Malina contends, rests on the misappropriation of the term reductionism. Reductionism, he argues, "refers to the procedure of subsuming one model into another when both of the models are at the same level of abstraction." This, he continues, cannot be said of the use of models in biblical interpretation where the models provide data for comparison. Rather, he says, equating biblical interpretation with theology is what is reductionistic. Similarly, Malina feels that the second charge does not hold because "the use of the social sciences in biblical interpretation is essentially one of retrodiction and not prediction," and thus the paucity of data does not constitute a problem to the approach. Rather the approach is seen as a way of handling the problem of paucity of data. The third charge, the charge of determinism, is correct to some extent. But Malina's point must be taken:

We can indeed seek out the distinctiveness of the God of Israel and of his Messiah Jesus, but that distinctiveness cannot be adequately discerned until the commonalities of the time and place have been duly accounted for. I think it would be a fault in method to claim distinctiveness before commonalities have been duly discerned and accounted for.<sup>34</sup>

The use of social science models is the best procedure in duly discerning and accounting for the commonalities, which in turn leads to a correct distinctiveness assigned to the God of Israel and of his Messiah Jesus. Thus, the use of social science models is not deterministic.

The importance of the study of contemporaneous social models for any student of Paul cannot be overemphasised. This is especially true for an exegesis of his finances. This is because, as emphasised above, Paul's interpretation of the gospel message was done in the context of his social culture. It can be asserted that in his interpretation of, and definition of the gospel message to his converts, Paul assimilated some of the cultural practices of his society, adapted and modified some, and possibly reworked

---

<sup>30</sup> Carney, 1975, pp. 7-9

<sup>31</sup> Malina, 1982, p. 241.

<sup>32</sup> Esler, 1994, pp. 12-13.

<sup>33</sup> Malina, 1982, pp. 237-239.



or transformed others. In other words, can it be asserted with all confidence that the gospel came to Paul devoid of his culture? If not, then the study of the social models is not only useful, but almost a necessary prerequisite for a proper understanding of Pauline thought and teaching.<sup>35</sup> Each of the models engenders a distinct pattern of expectation concerning financial matters, particularly the exchange of goods and services. This study of models looks specifically at the question of finances.

In employing models from the environment, I have taken seriously Judge's caution that the painstaking field work has to be undertaken to make the use of models valid. Otherwise, he says, the whole adventure would become a 'sociological fallacy.'<sup>36</sup> Thus the first four chapters of my work are devoted to this field work study. I have surveyed these models drawing out especially the issues that relate to finances with a view of providing data for comparison with the Pauline texts.

### 3. Methodological Assumptions.

I undertake this study with a number of assumptions which are based on the perception outlined above: that biblical authors and texts operated within specific cultural and social contexts, which determined what was written and how it was interpreted. These assumptions form a working hypothesis to be tested. First, it is assumed that patronage and benefaction and the related subject of friendship played a key role in Paul's acceptance and rejection of support from the churches. It is also assumed that the ongoing debate on the issue of teachers' pay influenced Paul's perception and attitude. In that case, it is hoped, the models will engender a good perception of what happened and why Paul acted the way he did in each case.

Secondly, it is assumed that Paul's decision to work for a living as an option to accepting support from the churches, as well as his choice of the trade he adopted has a social grounding: that it reflects the contemporary perception as well as the

---

<sup>34</sup> Malina, 1982, p. 238. This point has already been made above expressed in another way (see p. 2).

<sup>35</sup> There has been discussion of this theme in both sociological and socio-historical studies of early Christianity summarised in Enberg-Pedersen, T. (edited) *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*, (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1994): Introduction, especially pp. xv-xxi. It is here argued strongly that "Paul was part and parcel of Hellenistic culture, a participant in it as opposed to an outside spectator to it" (p. xvi). By this it is meant that "Paul was neither *specifically* Jewish nor *specifically* Hellenistic. Any one- or two-word categorisation of him should be avoided" (p. xix). See also in earlier discussions Theissen, 1982: Introduction; Malherbe, 1983; and Meeks, 1983: Introduction.

<sup>36</sup> Judge, E.A. "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History" *JRH* II (1980): 201-217. He writes, "Until the painstaking field work is better done, the importation of social models that have been defined in terms of other cultures is methodologically no improvement on the 'idealistic fallacy'" (p. 210).

arguments for and against whatever choice is made. Thus, it is hoped that rabbinic attitudes to work, or the arguments of philosophers, or both perceptions, will enlighten an understanding of Paul's position. Thirdly, it is assumed that the convention on exchange of gifts lay behind the discussion of trans-local finances of the churches, especially the collection project. Next, it is assumed that the local finances of the churches reflect the practice in at least one of the institutions discussed in the models, if not all of them. Lastly, it is assumed that Paul's theological perception, as well as his ability to assimilate aspects of his social milieu into the gospel message, must have played a key role in what he wrote in these texts.

#### **4. Scope.**

The study is limited to the undisputed Pauline letters: Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, I Thessalonians, and Philemon. References from elsewhere in the New Testament are brought in only when they illuminate the discussion of the texts in these writings, and not as a major part of the argument. This is true for references from the Old Testament which do not come under the discussion of the model of the synagogue.

## **SECTION ONE: SOCIAL MODELS.**

This section explores four social models from the environment with specific reference to finances. Chapter one considers the family finances of the Romans and the Greeks, and looks at the questions of hospitality and patronage. Chapter two takes a look at institution of the Synagogue. It looks at OT models of community, intertestamental Judaism and synagogue practice especially its means of financial support. Chapter three discusses the organisational structure and the financial organisation of clubs or voluntary associations. Chapter four focuses on hellenistic schools, both philosophical and non-philosophical. The structure and practices in these schools, as well as their means of financial support, are considered.

It is hoped that these will provide parallels for what Paul writes about the churches of his mission in his epistles, discussed in section two.

## Chapter 1. THE FAMILY

The family is a significant social institution for any study of the Greco-Roman world, and especially for the study of finances. Family finances of the Greco-Roman world are therefore significant in the study of the finances of the Pauline churches. The emphasis in this chapter will be on the finances of the families of the Romans and the Greeks, hospitality, and patronage. The first two of these topics can be termed the simple level of family finances, while the third, patronage or *patronus*, is obviously the developed level of it.

### *1.1. Family Finances of the Romans.*

Two aspects of this are of particular interest for this study: the law regarding *patria potestas*, and that regarding dotal property. The former concerns the rights of control the *paterfamilias* (family head) has over everyone and everything in his household. The latter concerns particularly the rights of the husband over his wife's *dos*. Strictly speaking, "rights over property in Roman law" are "*dominium* and not *potestas*", but the way the family operates, particularly its role in society, affects this law considerably.<sup>1</sup> As a result, the head of the family has power over his household in three distinct categories: sacral head-ship, 'gubernatorial' head-ship, and property head-ship.<sup>2</sup> Sacral head-ship means that the *paterfamilias* is the sole leader of all ritual rites and household worship in the domestic cult. David G. Orr has provided sufficient evidence for the existence of numerous domestic cults in the Roman empire, which were under the power of the family head.<sup>3</sup> This has some significant relevance for the study of Paul, and in particular, in understanding his comments on the house churches. The essential question here has to do with the way these domestic cults were funded. It is probably too early to comment on how its rituals were provided for before discussing the 'gubernatorial' and property head-ship of the family head, but the fact that the *paterfamilias* is the sole leader, implies that he was also leader in their financial responsibility.

---

<sup>1</sup> Crook, J.A. "*Patria Potestas*" *CQ* 17 (1967) 113-122, here, p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> Crook, 1967, p. 113. He shows that these differ in intensity and extent in different societies.

<sup>3</sup> Orr, D.G. "The Roman Domestic Religion: The Evidence of the Household Shrines" in *ANRW* II, 16.2 (Walter de Gruyter: Berlin, 1978): 1557-1591.

The 'gubernatorial' head-ship of the Roman *paterfamilias*, was unique in the sense that "it was extensive and also that it ended only with the death of the *paterfamilias*."<sup>4</sup>

Gaius, the Roman jurist of the second century CE, provides evidence for this:

Also in our *potestas* are the children whom we beget in civil marriage. This right is peculiar to Roman citizens; for scarcely any other men have over their sons a power such as we have. The late emperor Hadrian declared as much in the edict he issued concerning those who petitioned him for citizenship for themselves and their children. I am not forgetting that the Galatians regard children as being in the *potestas* of their parents.<sup>5</sup>

Even the Greek writer, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing at about 7 BCE highly praised this aspect of Roman *patria potestas*.<sup>6</sup> This has some relevance for understanding Paul, particularly on the relationship between parents and children. Paul certainly calls his converts his children. But nowhere does he give any explicit indication that he had any 'gubernatorial' power over them, though this might be implied in the use of the term 'children'. In any case, Paul does seem to recognise their freedom in Christ, even though he shows that he had the power to instruct them on spiritual matters. Put differently, Paul seems to see himself as their father spiritually and in spiritual things, rather than socially and in social conduct. Indeed their spirituality ought to affect their social conduct, but that is different from assuming social power over their conduct as the Roman *paterfamilias* would do. The relevance of this for the finances of the Pauline churches is that it provides at least a partial explanation for Paul's emphases on personal decision regarding the collection for the poor among the saints in Jerusalem.

Even more relevant is the property head-ship of the Roman *paterfamilias*. This is not included in Dionysius' comments quoted above. This is surprising, but it does not mean that it was absent in *patria potestas*. Whatever his reason for the omission, its

<sup>4</sup> Watson, A. *Society and Legal Change* (Scottish Academic Press: Edinburgh, 1977), p. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Gaius, *Inst.* 1.55. The translation is Watson's (1977), p. 23. See also Crook, 1967, p. 113.

<sup>6</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiq. Rom.* 2.26. He writes, "These then are the excellent laws which Romulus enacted concerning women, by which he rendered them more observant of propriety in relation to their husbands. But those he established with respect to reverence and dutifulness of children toward their parents, both in their words and actions were still more august and of greater dignity and vastly superior to our (i.e. Greek) laws. ... Mild punishments are not sufficient to restrain the folly of youth and its stubborn ways or to give self-control to those who have been heedless of all that is honourable; and accordingly among the Greeks many unseemly deeds are committed by children against their parents. But the lawgiver of the Romans gave virtually full power to the father over the son, even during his whole life, whether he thought proper to imprison him, to scourge him, to put him in chains and keep him at work in the fields, or to put him to death, and this even though the son were already engaged in public affairs, though he were numbered among the highest magistrates, and though he were celebrated for his zeal for the commonwealth." The translation is Watson's (1977), pp. 23-24. Later, Watson, p.26, calls the last part of this comment dealing with the power of life and death as an exaggeration by Dionysius and scholars after him including modern scholars.

existence is not in doubt. Property head-ship in Rome “includes full legal ownership of everything the family has, full power of alienation, and full power to dispose of the whole by will.”<sup>7</sup> The power is therefore very extensive, and is recognised by scholars as “the stereotype of the Roman family.”<sup>8</sup> That the Roman son lacked any right of ownership was stressed by Daube in the following words:

Suppose the head of the family was ninety, his two sons seventy-five and seventy, their sons between sixty and fifty-five, the sons of these in their forties and thirties, and the great-great-grandsons in their twenties, none of them except the ninety-year-old Head owned a penny. If the seventy-five-year-old senator, or the forty-year-old General, or the twenty-year-old student wanted to buy a bar of chocolate, he had to ask the *senex* for the money.<sup>9</sup>

Saller has rightly argued on the grounds of the realities of family life, its structure, low life expectancy and late age at marriage, that “Daube’s image of four generations of men standing in line to get permission from their *paterfamilias* to buy chocolate is a caricature of the system, offered to make a point about a legal principle.”<sup>10</sup> This is not however, dismissing property head-ship in *patria potestas*, but correcting the impression it gives that ancient history can be interpreted in the light of life today. Property head-ship by the head of the family is further supported by the evidence of two devices aimed at modifying the power *patria potestas* gave heads of families for the control of property. *Emancipatio* frees the son from paternal power and gives him independence.<sup>11</sup> *Peculium*, the second device, is a fund parents gave to their sons, a kind of an allowance they could use as their own in any way they wished.<sup>12</sup> In this last device, the wealthier and more aristocratic members of the Roman society evaded the effects of *patria potestas* in their relations with their sons.<sup>13</sup>

The specific aspect of property head-ship most relevant is the power the family head had to dispose of the whole of the family property by will which Paul alludes to in II Cor. 12: 14-15:

Now I am ready to visit you for the third time, and I will not be a burden to you, because what I want is not your possessions but you. After all, children

<sup>7</sup> Crook, 1967, p. 113.

<sup>8</sup> See e.g. Saller, R.P. “*Patria Potestas* and the Stereotype of the Roman Family” in *Continuity and Change 1* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1986) 7-22.

<sup>9</sup> Daube, D. *Roman Law: Linguistic, Social and Philosophical Aspects* (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 1969), p. 79.

<sup>10</sup> Saller, 1986, pp. 7-22, esp. p. 11.

<sup>11</sup> Gaius *Inst.* 1.132. See also Watson, 1977, pp. 24-25. He notes that this was “a deliberate misinterpretation of the provision of the XII Tables that if a father sold his son three times the son was free from his father.”

<sup>12</sup> Watson, 1977, p. 25. Watson notes that this too was a latter development of the provision of the XII Tables which allowed *peculia* to slaves only, and not to sons.

<sup>13</sup> Watson, 1977, p. 26.

should not have to save up for their parents but parents for their children. So I will very gladly spend for you everything I have and expend myself as well. If I love you more, will you love me less? (NIV).

It seems obvious that Paul was here appealing to the social convention on inheritance of family property. Several ancient texts can be cited on the law on inheritance and wills.<sup>14</sup> The convention on this was well established that parents left their property to be inherited by their children. It was well developed to the extent that wills were made for children who were still young so they can take on their inheritance when they become of age. The provision even allowed someone else to inherit the father in the event that the child does not reach maturity.<sup>15</sup> Paul was therefore writing within the confines of the existing social convention. But what exactly did he intend to leave behind for his children? Was it physical, material inheritance, or was he referring to spiritual inheritance? Surely what he was refusing from the Corinthians was material, but what he would leave behind for them, what he was going to expend on them, is not certain. I shall have to come back to this issue in more detail when discussing the Pauline texts (see below, under 5.3.2.3).

A more positive perspective of *patria potestas* is that which emphasises the moral duty of parents to provide for all the material needs of their children. Cicero states:

Now, if a contrast and comparison were to be made to find out where most of our moral obligation is due, country would come first, and parents; for their services have laid us under the heaviest obligation; next come children and the whole family, who look to us alone for support and can have no other protection; finally, our kinsmen, with whom we live on good terms and with whom, for the most part, our lot is one. All needful material assistance is, therefore, due first of all to those whom I have named.<sup>16</sup>

Cicero is here talking about a moral obligation for Roman citizens. He distinguishes between the duty to the state and to parents on the one hand, and the duty to children on the other. As a third category, he identifies the duty to kinsmen. It is interesting

---

<sup>14</sup> See e.g. *Digest* 36, 1.83; 28, 6.2; Gaius, *Inst.* 2, 179-181; Cicero, *Orat.* 1, 180. See Gardner, J.F. and Wiedemann, T. *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook* (Routledge: London, 1991) pp. 118-122, where their translations are given.

<sup>15</sup> Gaius, *Inst.* 2, 179-80. "To our children who are below puberty and in our *potestas* we cannot only institute heirs in the way already stated, that is, that if they are not forthcoming as our heirs, someone else is to be heir; but we can go further, and appoint someone to be heir to them, even if they should qualify as our heirs, and should then die while still below puberty. For instance, we can write: 'You my son Titius are to be my heir. If my son shall not be my heir, or shall be my heir and shall die before becoming legally independent, then let Seius be my heir.' In this case, if indeed the son is not forthcoming as heir, the substitute becomes heir to the father. If however the son does become heir but dies before puberty, the substitute actually becomes heir to the son. So there are in a way two wills, one that of the father, the other of the son, just as if a son had himself instituted an heir for himself; or at any rate there is one will covering two inheritances." The verse in this reference goes on to make provisions for a situation in which this law is exploited for selfish ends so that the will actually goes to the right person.

that he adds a special clause to the duty to children and the whole family, “who look to us alone for support and can have no other protection.” This clearly separates it from the other duties as Cicero here explicates in what he goes on to say:

...the first bond of union is that between husband and wife; the next, that between parents and children; then we find one home, with everything in common.<sup>17</sup>

With this it will be seen that the duty to the country is of a different category from that to children and the whole family. In addition, Cicero implies that there is no substitute to the duty to children and the whole family. It is very unlikely that Paul read Latin. It seems reasonable to assume that the principle was widespread, or at least that Paul was aware of it since he refers to it in II Cor. 12: 14-15. In fact, Cicero appeals to it as a widely recognised moral principle, not a specifically Roman one.

The second aspect of family finances of the Romans, dotal property, demands only a brief summary. In general, though it strictly speaking belongs to the husband's area of jurisdiction, the wife's parents had a claim to it on the event of a dissolution of a marriage with no children.<sup>18</sup> Dixon has critically analysed this aspect of Roman law from the evidence of the letters of Cicero from exile.<sup>19</sup> She concludes that “the correspondence of the period of exile points up the *de facto* assumption of the wife's eventual right to the return of the dowry.”<sup>20</sup> She adds also that both Cicero and his wife Terentia did not consider the wife accountable to the husband for “her private holdings.” The letters show also that Terentia was prepared to exert herself for her matrimonial family, and that Cicero did not disapprove. This is interesting because it provides ground, and throws light, into a better understanding of women like Prisca and Phoebe in the churches of the Pauline mission. Two points are very useful here: the fact that a man had to handle his wife's *dos* with care, and the fact that women had the right to exert themselves undeterred in their matrimonial homes. That women in the Roman world could be very wealthy is well acknowledged in scholarship.<sup>21</sup> The wealth of these elite women almost certainly has to do with the fact that they had the right to manage their *dos* as well as exert themselves undeterred. Several

---

<sup>16</sup> Cicero, *De Off.* 1. xvii. 58. LCL translation.

<sup>17</sup> Cicero, *De Off.* 1. xvii. 54. LCL translation.

<sup>18</sup> Dixon, S. “Family Finances: Terentia and Tullia” in Rawson, B. (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome*. (Croom Helm Ltd.: London, 1986). 93-120, esp. p. 94.

<sup>19</sup> The following are among the passages Suzanne considered: *Fam.* 14.1.5; 14.2; 14.2.2; 14.2.2.3; 14.2.3; 14.3.2; 14.4.3.4; 14.4.4.

<sup>20</sup> Dixon, S. 1986, p. 102.

<sup>21</sup> See for instance Brooten, B.J. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue* (Scholars Press: Chico, California, 1982); and Gill, D.W.J. “Acts and the Urban Elites” in Winter, B.W. (series ed.) *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting* vol. 2. (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, and The Paternoster Press: Carlisle, 1994): 105-118, esp. 114-118.



examples of these wealthy women are discussed as women donors by Brooten.<sup>22</sup> Gill discusses a number of examples, one of which dates from 43 CE, whose generosity and hospitality very closely parallels that of Phoebe and Lydia.<sup>23</sup>

### 1.2. Family Finances of the Greeks.

The above section, particularly the praise of the Roman *patria potestas* by the Greek writer Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and the comment of the Roman jurist of the second century CE, shows that things were not the same among the Greeks. The Athenian head of the household is κύριος of his wife, and children up to adulthood. Crook has particularly demonstrated that in the category of property head-ship, “the head of the Athenian family is not legal owner of all; his wife, to some extent, and certainly his children may have property of their own, of which indeed he has control but no more. And his power of ultimate disposal is narrowly limited.”<sup>24</sup> Even in the case of family property, he can not like the Romans dispose of it by will away from his sons, or daughters by the ἐπίκληρος system, if he has no sons.<sup>25</sup> So among the Greeks, the head of the household is “no more than administrator of the common goods.”<sup>26</sup> This does not mean that the family head did not make wills. In fact, there is evidence that even when Pasion had an adult son, he made a will because one of his sons was still a minor.<sup>27</sup> As in the case of Roman family heads, Athenian counterparts had to lead their family members in the family cult worship, only in this case it was mainly the ancestral worship. This was so enshrined in the law of the land that it became one of the requirements of the δοκίμασια, a process during which those aspiring to be magistrates were scrutinised.<sup>28</sup> The law on dotal property was the

<sup>22</sup> See under Synagogues where several examples are cited from Brooten, 1982.

<sup>23</sup> Gill, 1994, p. 116 quoting Kent, J.H. *Epigraphica* 2 (Brill: Leiden, 1969) no. 8; refers to “... a woman of highest esteem ... who with full measure and generosity aided many of our citizens from her own means, and welcomed them in her home, and in particular never ceased benefiting our citizens regarding any favour asked, the majority of the citizens have met in assembly to give testimonial on her behalf. In gratitude our people [sc. of Patara] agreed to vote to commend Junia and to give testimonial of her generosity to our native city and her good will, and declares that it urges her to increase her generosity to our city, knowing that our people too will not cease in their good will and gratitude to her, and will do everything for the excellence and glory she deserves. For this reason - may good fortune attend - it was decreed to commend her for all that she has done.”

<sup>24</sup> Crook, 1967, p. 113.

<sup>25</sup> See a very detailed discussion of property and the family in Athens in Lacey, W.K. *The Family in Classical Greece*. (Thames and Hudson, London, 1968), pp. 125-150. See also, Crook, 1967, p. 113.

<sup>26</sup> Crook, 1967, p. 114.

<sup>27</sup> Dem. xxxvi.22. See also Lacey, 1968, p. 132.

<sup>28</sup> Ath. Pol. iv, 3; cf. Xen. Mem. ii. 2.13, where one fails his δοκίμασια if he is discovered to have not cared for the tombs of his dead parents. See also Lacey, 1968, p. 138.

same in the Athenian family system as among the Romans. In the case of the woman having children, the children inherit their mother's property.<sup>29</sup>

### 1.3. Hospitality.

It is generally accepted that hospitality was already a well established convention when the early church came into being.<sup>30</sup> It was a virtue among the Greeks and Romans to be hospitable. However, it should be pointed out that Matthews' view that the practice experienced a decline and lost its reputation as a virtue in the pagan world of the first century BCE,<sup>31</sup> needs to be modified. In the light of what Dio Chrysostom experienced among the poor peasants of Euboea,<sup>32</sup> one needs to be a little more cautious in running into such a conclusion. It might have declined in some sectors of the society but most probably not a general phenomenon.

So what do we know about the social convention of ξενία among the Greeks and Romans of the period in question? The bibliography on this is extensive.<sup>33</sup> A less quoted work on the subject, a 'suggestive' monograph by Bolchazy, gives another perspective.<sup>34</sup> It is divided into two sections. Section one establishes through comparative studies and inference from Roman mythology and extant literature the development of hospitality in ancient societies including the Greeks and Romans. Its central thesis is that the Romans:

characterised in their prehistory by xenophobic attitudes and responses toward strangers, gradually developed altruistic motives for humane treatment of strangers, and that the latent concepts of the brotherhood of man found in certain categories of the *ius hospitii* prepared the Greco-Roman world for the reception of the concepts of the brotherhood of man and the golden rule preached by late Stoicism and Christianity.<sup>35</sup>

Bolchazy describes this development in seven stages or categories of hospitality.<sup>36</sup> In the second section of the book, Bolchazy attempts an explanation of "Livy's deviation

<sup>29</sup> Lacey, 1968, p. 139.

<sup>30</sup> This was the central thesis of J. B. Mathews' extensive work on the subject: *Hospitality and the New Testament Church: An Historical and Exegetical Study* (Unpublished ThD Dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1965). Cf. G. Stählin, s.v. ξένος, *TDNT*, 5. 1-36.

<sup>31</sup> Mathews, 1965, pp. 180ff.

<sup>32</sup> Dio Chrysostom. *Or.* 7. See Malherbe, A.J. "The Inhospitability of Diotrophes," in *God's Christ and His People: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl*. Eds. Jacob Jervell and Wayne A. Meeks (Oslo, Bergen, and Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget, 1977b): 222-232.

<sup>33</sup> There is no point repeating the bibliography given by Stählin in *TDNT*, s.v. ξένος.

<sup>34</sup> Bolchazy, L.J. *Hospitality in Early Rome: Livy's Concept of its Humanising Force*. (Ares Publishing Inc. Chicago, 1977).

<sup>35</sup> Bolchazy, 1977, p. III.

<sup>36</sup> Bolchazy, 1977, pp. 1-34. gives these categories as 1. Avoidance or mistreatment of strangers. 2. Apotropaic hospitality which refers to the use of 'counteracting rites and incantations' in order to

from the ascertainable reasons for Aeneas' survival" as well as a demonstration of "Livy's appreciation of the *ius hospitii*.." He continues:

Its civilising role was superior to the virtues mentioned in the moral and political platform suggested by Augustus by Livy's contemporaries and listed on the *clupeus virtutis*: *virtus, clementia, iustitia, pietas*.<sup>37</sup>

The contention in this second section of the book is that Livy appreciated the humanising force of hospitality in favour of the other reasons suggested by his contemporaries. It was also, says Bolchazy, that Livy saw in hospitality a force that would be a "greater factor in contributing to world peace than the virtues referred to on the *clupeus virtutis* of Augustus." He then goes on to demonstrate how these prepared the ground for Stoic and Christian hospitality.

While the possibility must be allowed that Livy saw hospitality as a powerful force in contributing to world peace and a good forerunner to the Christian practice, it must be recognised that the Homeric usage already attested to the importance hospitality had, and its prominence as a virtue. Homer saw hospitality as 'co-extensive' with fear of God and civilisation, demonstrated in 'fine gifts and guest-friendship'.<sup>38</sup> This ideal was shown to be at work also in what happened to Odysseus at Ithaca during his wandering there.<sup>39</sup> It then became an ideal that was often appealed to as the clearly idealised description of the Hunters of Euboea by Dio Chrysostom illustrates.<sup>40</sup> Jones describes this location as "the so-called 'Hollows' of Euboea, the inhospitable south-eastern coast of the island," but the hospitality Dio receives is described as remarkable and generous.<sup>41</sup> Livy's appreciation then, is not a new development, but one which acknowledged and valued what was already enshrined in the culture.

---

'disarm strangers of their alleged magico-religious powers prior to any contact with them.' 3. Medea category which carries on the xenophobia of the previous category but uses it to the advantage by benefiting from the stranger's alleged magico-religious powers by first giving them hospitality. This is seen as the beginning of hospitality proper. 4. Theoxenic Hospitality. This is based on the belief which ascribes to the stranger the power to curse and bless because they represent some deity. This gives hospitality a religious motive. 5. The "*Ius Hospitii, Ius Dei*" category of hospitality which says that the gods wish that strangers be treated hospitably. 6. Contractual hospitality entered into with a stranger or acquaintance to ensure food and shelter, protection, as well as representation are secured in the land of the guest-friend or foreign land when travelling as a stranger. 7. Altruistic hospitality which is administered because it is the human thing to do. Bolchazy endeavours to demonstrate that these categories were true for the Romans for the Greeks and other ancient cultures. Several motives are seen for these categories of hospitality summarised as "xenophobia, religious considerations, enlightened self-interest, and altruism."

<sup>37</sup> Bolchazy, 1977, p. IV.

<sup>38</sup> Homer *Od.* 6. 119ff; 9.175f. cf. Stählin in TDNT s.v. ζένοϋ who shows further that the Greeks were no different in this as they appealed to Hercules their national hero.

<sup>39</sup> Homer *Od.* 19. 272ff. Cf. the discussion in Finley, M.I. *The World of Odysseus*. Second Edition (Chatto & Windus: London, 1977), pp. 121ff.

<sup>40</sup> Dio Chrysostom *Or.* 7, discussed in Jones, C.P. *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 1978). pp. 56ff.

<sup>41</sup> Jones, 1978, p. 56.

It has been observed that there is nothing “wholly distinctive and thus uniquely Christian” in the early church’s practice of hospitality, and that the differences between the Christian practice and private practice in antiquity appear only in degree and emphasis.<sup>42</sup> The point has already been made above that it was a virtue to be hospitable in Roman and Greek antiquity. It should perhaps be added that in Greek antiquity, Ζεὺς Ξένιος was regarded as protector of the rights of hospitality.<sup>43</sup> Mathews argued that in ancient Christian hospitality, the Divine Host element is strategically central in understanding the practice. He contends that the church understood its mission as host, “who by his act of love incorporates the stranger, even the strange enemy, within the peace of the community of life, thereby ministering to his need of reconciliation and delivering him from the plight of alien existence.”<sup>44</sup> He provides no evidence for this assertion, but goes on to say that this becomes the edge that Christian hospitality had over the practice of antiquity. Christian hospitality, according to him, derived its valuation from the understanding that God identified with the sinner in the work and person of Jesus as the parable in Matt. 25: 31-46 reveals. This, he says, is what made it unique, and different from the practice either in Greek and Roman antiquity or in Judaism. He thus asserts that “the unique significance assigned by ancient Christianity to the act of hospitality, and the important place which its practice assumed in the life of the early church, was due to Christ and to Him alone.”<sup>45</sup> This is tendentious as the ancient evidence shows. It is better to contend that Christianity adopted and perfected this ideal.

The ideal stage for the practice of hospitality, at all times, has been and will continue to be the home. In early Christianity, hospitable homes were very important for the growth of the church. The services they rendered can be divided into two broad sections. First, there is the material support for travellers, particularly itinerant preachers and teachers. Malherbe has noted that “a virtually technical vocabulary developed to describe the hospitable reception (compounds of λαμβάνω and δέχομαι) and sending on (προπέμπω) of those individuals who were spreading the faith.”<sup>46</sup> Paraenesis of the early churches almost always included exhortations to excel in this practice.<sup>47</sup> The kind of support that this practice provided included the

---

<sup>42</sup> Mathews, 1965, p. 354.

<sup>43</sup> See e.g. Od. 9.270; 8.546; 6.208; 9.271.

<sup>44</sup> Mathews, 1965, p. 353.

<sup>45</sup> Mathews, 1965, p. 363.

<sup>46</sup> Malherbe, 1977b, p. 223. See also Mathews, 1965, pp. 166-174.

<sup>47</sup> See e.g. Rom. 12: 13; 16: 1-2; I Cor. 16: 11; etc.

provision of a guest room and food to the guests, and provision for the journey when sending them away. It is also likely that Jewish practice provided a model here.<sup>48</sup> Secondly, there was the phenomenon of the house church. The absence of buildings designed especially for religious services demanded that well-off members of the church who had accommodation of fairly ample space provide the hospitality of their homes for the meetings of the church.<sup>49</sup>

During the early days, this second aspect of hospitality in the early church - the use of private homes for the meetings of the church - at least as far as I know, did not seem to have run into serious problems. The problem between the 'strong' and the 'weak' at the Lord's meal (I Cor. 11: 17-34), which obviously took place in the hospitable homes of wealthy members reflects the social status of the hosts and the social convention on dinners, and not directly a problem on hospitality.<sup>50</sup> This relates more to the question of patronage than hospitality. The situation in Corinth encouraged the perception and maintenance of social status differentials. Here it is worth spelling out the differences between patronage and hospitality. Patronage is an unequal relationship. The one party is, at least in some way, superior to the other. Hospitality on the other hand is an equal relationship. Because of reciprocity implicit in ξένος, the parties are seen to be equal. This could be important for understanding Paul's intimate relationship with certain individuals in the churches. For instance, when Paul described Gaius as 'host' (Rom. 16: 23), he most likely did not see it as a relationship which implied inferior status in the 'guest'.

did

As the church grew in size, there was need to expand the place of meeting to accommodate all its members, and this resulted in the renovation of residential homes by knocking down some walls to join two or more rooms together to give more space. These facts have come to us thanks to archaeological findings.<sup>51</sup> The gradual change from house to church, we are made to understand came in three stages: (1) 50-150 CE, the church meeting in houses of members; (2) 150-250 CE, the renovation of these private houses to accommodate the teeming numbers of church

<sup>48</sup> See under 2.2.3 where it is noted that hospitable treatment of strangers is encouraged along with caring for the poor and destitute.

<sup>49</sup> See an excellent discussion of this in Malherbe, 1977b, pp. 223ff.

<sup>50</sup> For a detailed discussion of this issue, see Theissen, 1982, pp. 121-174. Malherbe, 1977, pp. 60-91 discusses these issues too, though he thinks that "social status most probably exacerbated those problems" - the theological problems that this implies.

<sup>51</sup> A detailed discussion of this is available in White, L.M. *Domus Ecclesiae: Domus Dei*. (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1982); and Blue, B. "Acts and the House Church" in Winter, 1994): 119-222.

members; and (3) 250-313 CE, “the introduction of larger buildings and halls (both private and public) before the introduction of basilical architecture by Constantine.”<sup>52</sup>

For the hospitable reception of travelling visitors and itinerant preachers, however, there appear to have been serious problems. How early these problems became manifest in the life of the church is hard to say. Paul refers to letters of recommendation in II Cor. 3: 1-2 which indicates that this measure was adopted by the church to tackle the problem of false apostles and teachers. II and III John indicate that this was not a problem for Corinth alone.<sup>53</sup> The Didache picks up this issue showing that the practice of hospitality in the early church had to contend with this problem of persons who took advantage of it to enrich themselves.<sup>54</sup> This document provides precautionary measures against the kind of travelling Christian who is branded *χριστέμπορος*. Travelling Christians are generally to be received and entertained for three days at the most, and assisted to settle if they so wish. The travelling Christian is disqualified if s/he is unwilling to conform: “But if he will not do so, he is making traffic of Christ; beware of such.”<sup>55</sup> In fact chapters 11, 12, and 13 show that the practice was regarded as fraud by those who were “making traffic of Christ.” The Greek word *χριστέμπορος*, is a very rare word that gives the sense of people who are after their own selfish ends, more specifically financial gain, i.e. using Christ as a ‘commodity’ for trade. There is evidence that this was already becoming manifest during the fifties and sixties of the first century CE. The language is clearly similar to that of Paul in II Cor. 2: 17; and 11: 13-15. The Didache then, provides measures to guard against such malpractice of Christian hospitality. The specific forms of *χριστέμπορος* are clearly spelt out as using hospitality for more

<sup>52</sup> Blue, 1994, pp. 124-130.

<sup>53</sup> On this see Lieu, J. *The Second and Third Epistles of John: History and Background* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1986): esp. pp. 41, 49, 119, and 130.

<sup>54</sup> Kirsopp Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* In two volumes, here vol. I. (William Heinemann: London, and G.P. Putnam’s Sons: New York, 1919), pp. 305-307 tells us that this document was unknown until 1875 when it was discovered in the Patriarchal library of Jerusalem at Constantinople by Bryennios. This manuscript, which contains also I and II Clement is usually labelled as C; but other discoveries have been made: the Latin version, the ‘Church Ordinances’ (KO), and the ‘Apostolic Constitutions,’ bk. vii. The document comprises of “The Two Ways” and the “Teaching,” with the latter seen to have had a second recension. The “Two Ways” which is seen to be “a Jewish pre-Christian document used for catechetical purposes” is dated in the early first century or earlier; while the original “Teaching” is dated in the early second century or earlier and the second recension of the “Teaching” is seen to be not later than the second century or earlier (see vol. I. p. 307). See further Cross, F. L. and Livingstone, E. A. (editors) *ODCC* second Edition (Oxford University Press: London, 1974). p. 401; and more recently Freedman, D. N. (editor) *ABD* vol., 2 D-G (Doubleday: New York; London; Toronto; Sydney; Auckland; 1992): p. 197. Modern scholars are prepared to argue for a date in the early years of the second half of the first century CE. Patterson, S.J. “*Didache* 11-13: The Legacy of Radical Itinerancy in Early Christianity” in Clayton N. Jefford edited, *The Didache in Context*. NovTSup., volume 77 (E.J. Brill: Leiden, New York, and Köln, 1995): 313-329, here p. 315, for instance argues for a date as early as 50-70 CE.

than 3 days.<sup>56</sup> One wonders why the specification is for one or two days or at most three. It does seem it was designed to protect against those who would not mind over-burdening the church by their extended stay. That this must be right is confirmed by the distinction made between this injunction and the injunction on those who would want to settle among the community in question.<sup>57</sup> The basic principle does seem to be that apostles should not be a burden to those they preach to. If so, then Paul's teaching and basic principle is here being applied. Paul very consciously and deliberately avoided being a burden to those he preached to.<sup>58</sup>

Another specification of what 'making traffic of Christ' meant comes up in the discussion of what happens when the Apostle leaves the particular church to proceed with his journey:

ἐξερχόμενος δὲ ὁ ἀπόστολος μηδὲν λαμβανέτω εἰ μὴ ἄρτον, ἕως οὗ αὐλοσθῆ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀργύριον αἰτῆ, ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστί.

And when an Apostle goes forth let him accept nothing but bread till he reach his night's lodging; but if he ask for money, he is a false prophet.<sup>59</sup>

Again the principle is the same as above. The Apostle should not be one who is greedy for money. It is interesting that what is forbidden here is in agreement with Paul's characterisation of his opponents in II Corinthians. This business of asking for money or things and receiving them is further expounded:

καὶ πᾶς προφήτης ὀρίζων τράπεζαν ἐν πνεύματι οὐ φάγεται ἀπ' αὐτῆς, εἰ δὲ μήγε ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστί.

And no prophet who orders a meal in a spirit shall eat of it: otherwise he is a false prophet.<sup>60</sup>

Χριστέμπορος, then, is a specific form of being a false prophet. It refers to those who falsely and for the simple reason of enriching themselves claim to be Apostles. They take advantage of the church and use that for their base gain. This has implications for the finances of the Pauline churches. Paul's practice of not accepting support from the church he is ministering to seems to be based on the same principles.<sup>61</sup> This was a very vulnerable area that was readily open to accusation for any minister of the gospel who was not careful in the way they received support, and Paul ensured that he did not fall prey to it.

<sup>56</sup> *Did.* xii. 1-5.

<sup>56</sup> *Did.* xi. 4-5. See also xii. 2.

<sup>57</sup> *Did.* xii. 3-4.

<sup>58</sup> This picture is clearly given in I Cor. 9: 12, 15-18; II Cor. 11: 7-11; 12: 13-18; I Thess. 2: 7-11.

<sup>59</sup> *Did.* xi. 6.

<sup>60</sup> *Did.* xi. 9. See also xi. 12.

<sup>61</sup> This issue is taken up in greater details in the second section.

It is fascinating that despite this vulnerability, the Apostolic fathers could still teach that prophets be honoured in the provision of their upkeep. A true prophet, and one who is tested, is “worthy of his food.”<sup>62</sup> So also is the true teacher. Even more fascinating is the identification of the prophets and teachers with the OT priests, to whom the “firstfruit of the produce” are due.<sup>63</sup> The teaching of the OT is that as these are given to the priests, they are given to God. It is clear that the Apostolic fathers assumed this understanding here. The church is taught to be a giving church, whether there is a prophet/teacher there or not. In their absence, the firstfruit are to be given to the poor.<sup>64</sup> This applies the OT model of support for priests which is not foreign to the Pauline texts.<sup>65</sup> Even more fascinating is the reaction of pagan writers to the practice of this form of hospitality. Lucian’s *Peregrinus* provides an excellent example of this. His treatment of the reaction of the Christians to the imprisonment of Proteus shows that the latter received unusual attention to the extent that large numbers of Christians spent many nights outside the prison while the officials bribed their way into the prison where they slept with their leader.<sup>66</sup> Lucian’s surprise is voiced out even louder in the following:

Indeed, people came even from cities in Asia, sent by the Christians at their common expense, to succour and defend and encourage the hero. They show incredible speed whenever any such public action is taken; for in no time they lavish their all. So it was then in the case of *Peregrinus*; much money came to him from them by reason of his imprisonment, and he procured not a little revenue from it.<sup>67</sup>

There is suggestion of a common purse for the Christians here. In a few lines down in the same place, Lucian confirms the point made above, showing that any cheat could pounce on this to his advantage:

So if any charlatan and trickster, able to profit by such occasions, comes among them, he quickly acquires sudden wealth by imposing upon simple folk.

*Peregrinus* himself is shown to have made so much money from the Christians:

He left home, then, for the second time, to roam about, possessing an ample source of funds in the Christians, through whose ministrations he lived in unalloyed prosperity.<sup>68</sup>

Paul clearly seems to have tried to avoid allegations of this nature.

---

<sup>62</sup> *Did.* xiii. 1. cf. xii. 1.

<sup>63</sup> *Did.* xiii, 3, 5-7.

<sup>64</sup> *Did.* xiii. 4.

<sup>65</sup> See the discussion of this issue under OT models, support for priests in 2.2.1.

<sup>66</sup> Lucian, *Peregr.* 12.

<sup>67</sup> Lucian, *Peregr.* 13. Loeb’s translation.

<sup>68</sup> Lucian, *Peregr.* 16. Loeb’s translation.



#### 1.4. Patronage.

With patronage, the Greco-Roman family is seen to be far different from the family today. It includes distant relations of what we call the extended family. Also included are clients and dependants. There is even a likelihood that it included members of the same trade, association, and interests.<sup>69</sup> Patronage therefore, can be seen as an extension of the ties of family obligations. The ancient (Roman) concept of patronage seems to have had its derivation from the Latin word *pater* (father). This possibly indicates one or both of two things. First, the patron initially may have played the role of the father to the client. Second, and more likely so, the patron was called *pater* because of the protection he gave the client. Block presents what I think is one of the best modern definitions of this term:

Patronage is a model or analytical construct which the social scientist applies in order to understand and explain a range of apparent different social relationships: father-son, God-man, saint-devotee, godfather-godchild, lord-vassal, landlord-tenant, politician-voter, professor-assistant, and so forth. All these different sets of social relationships can thus be considered from one particular point of view which may render them comprehensible.<sup>70</sup>

Saller's identification of "three vital elements which distinguish a patronage relationship": "the reciprocal exchange of goods and services", the fact that it is personal and of some duration distinguishing it from a commercial transaction in the market place, and the fact that it has to be "asymmetrical" with the two parties involved being of unequal status;<sup>71</sup> describes further this analytical construct. The last point about the unequal status of the parties involved, however, needs to be qualified. In some cases, though only very few, the persons involved in such a relationship "were formally equals", but the relationship may now be termed patronage because one of the parties involved is in a position to "provide access to goods or services which one of the parties did not in fact possess."<sup>72</sup> Such relationships are properly called *amicitiae*, which must not be entered lightly, and are

---

<sup>69</sup> The Roman *paterfamilias* knew that he had obligations to these relations, distant and immediate; as well as to the clients, members of his association, trade and interests. Some of these ties are not necessarily those he entered into freely, but inherited. See Gardner, J.F. and Wiedemann, 1991, p. 166.

<sup>70</sup> Block, A. "Variations in Patronage," in *Sociologische Gids* 16 (1968) 365-378. See also Moxnes, H. "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts" in Jerome H. Neyrey, ed., *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (Hendrickson Publishers Inc., Peabody, Massachusetts, 1991), p. 242, who stresses the reciprocal element of this social relationship.

<sup>71</sup> Saller, R.P. *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire*, (Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 1. See also Gellner, E. "Patrons and Clients" in Gellner, E. and Waterbury, J. eds., *Patrons and Clients*, (Duckworth: London, 1977), pp. 1, 4, who adds that patronage is a form of "power."

<sup>72</sup> Gardner, and Wiedemann, 1991, p. 166.

“based upon the exchange of very real *beneficia*, goods and services required by the parties involved: ‘I give so that you may give’, *do ut des*.”<sup>73</sup> The one who gives the *beneficia* naturally considers the advantage he gets, but even so, this institutionalised friendship obliges such a person to give regardless of what advantage that might bring.<sup>74</sup> The reciprocal exchange of goods and services is clearly the most important and sustaining element of patronage. Not only was one obliged to give, but there was also the obligation to receive<sup>75</sup> which in turn was followed by the obligation to reciprocate. Peterman’s work on this subject sets out clearly this aspect of patronage.<sup>76</sup> He shows that reception of a benefit places the receiver under obligation.<sup>77</sup> But the obligation is not one-sided because it makes equal demands on the persons involved.<sup>78</sup> Reception of a benefit implies the establishment of friendship<sup>79</sup> which is in essence an exchange of obligations.<sup>80</sup> Thus, receiving such a benefit equals receiving a debt.<sup>81</sup>

The personal element of this relationship is equally significant. As already noted, the two parties involved become *amici*, a friendship that lasts. Such a friendship, or the obligation to render services, is one that is often inherited.<sup>82</sup> Seneca shows that his kind of friendship with the obligation to repay gratitude for whatever benefit is received and “to start again from fresh” by offering another benefit makes it a lasting relationship, and therefore one that should be entered into with one who is a worthy friend.<sup>83</sup> He distinguishes it from a loan of money from a rich fellow who is not an *amicus*. Aulus Gellius shows that such friends or clients as the case may be, by obligation of the convention of patronage deserve what our immediate family members deserve, and in fact even more:

---

<sup>73</sup> See Seneca, *De Ben.* 2, 18. 5; Suetonius, *Augustus* 66. See also Gardner, and Wiedemann, 1991, pp. 168-169, who comment that “it was important not to enter into such a relationship without being sure that one’s partner was a worthy one.”

<sup>74</sup> A good example of this can be seen in Seneca, *De Ben.* 4, 15.3. See also 3, 3.2. Cf. Gardner, and Wiedemann, 1991, p. 170.

<sup>75</sup> Seneca, *De Ben.* 4.20.

<sup>76</sup> Peterman, G.W. *Giving and Receiving in Paul’s Epistles: Greco-Roman Social Conventions in Philippians 4 and in Selected Pauline Texts.* (PhD Dissertation submitted to the University of London, Sept. 1992) p. 65.

<sup>77</sup> Seneca, *De Ben.* 5, 11.5.

<sup>78</sup> Seneca, *De Ben.* 2, 18. 1.

<sup>79</sup> Seneca, *De Ben.* 2, 2.11; 2, 18.3; Pliny, *Ep.* 19. 11-12.

<sup>80</sup> Seneca, *De Ben.* 2, 18.2.

<sup>81</sup> Seneca, *De Ben.* 2, 23.2.

<sup>82</sup> See Seneca *De Ben.* 3, 3.2 where Seneca shows that such a relationship ideally lasted one’s lifetime and might even be inherited by their children.

<sup>83</sup> Seneca, *De Ben.* 2, 18.5. The translation used here is by Gardner, and Wiedemann, 1991, p. 168.

I am unable to evade this duty, Marcus Juncus, both because of my guest-friendship with King Nicomedes, and because of my relationship (of patronage) with those whose case is being tried. For the memory of a man should not be expunged by death in such a way as to be forgotten by those who were near him; nor, without incurring extreme disgrace, can we desert our clients, to whom we have undertaken to bring assistance even against our relatives.<sup>84</sup>

This reference reveals that the obligation imposed on the patron by this convention is such that the client is even defended against close relations. This is one of two reasons here given why a client cannot be deserted by his/her patron to die. The other reason equally falls within the confines of friendship and patronage: that the guest-friendship with King Nicomedes is a relationship that lasts several generations. The guest-friendship (*ξενία*), is distinct from patronage. The former, an 'equal' relationship, describes the ties with the king and the latter, an 'inferior' relationship describes the ties with the accused. This personal element of patronage was certainly an important issue for Dionysius of Halicarnassus who gives the impression that such a relation could not continue when one of the parties has sided with the enemy:

For both patron and clients alike it was impious and unlawful to accuse each other in law-suits or to bear witness or to give their votes against each other or to be found in the number of each other's enemies; and whoever was convicted of doing any of these things was guilty of treason by virtue of law sanctioned by Romulus, and might lawfully be put to death by any man who so wished as a victim devoted to the Jupiter of the infernal regions...<sup>85</sup>

I have already cited above the reference from Cicero about the obligation due to children as well as to relations.<sup>86</sup> Cicero leaves no doubt the fact that distant relations whom he calls kinsmen are included among those to whom most of the moral obligation of household heads is due. There is a qualification: that they must be those "with whom we live on good terms".

There is evidence also that the Greco-Roman family extended as far as to include members of associations. One evidence from the third century (224 CE) shows how a woman was venerated in the erection of her statue by members of an association of engineers.<sup>87</sup> Clearly members of this association felt a nearly as strong, or even stronger, a tie to this woman as her family relations. We have no way of knowing what this woman's immediate family did in memory of her, but whatever the case, it could not have been anything better than what members of this association did. As far

<sup>84</sup> Aulus Gellius 5, 13. 6 as translated by Gardner, and Wiedemann, 1991, p. 168.

<sup>85</sup> *Ant. Rom.* 2. 10. 3. Dionysius goes on in 2. 10. 4 to show that such a relationship is often handed over from parents to children. Cf. Brunt, P.A. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1988), p. 405.

<sup>86</sup> See above p. 5, which is a discussion of Cicero, *De Officiis* 1. xvii. 58. LCL translation.

<sup>87</sup> CIL XI, 2702 (Volsinii). See the translation in Gardner, and Wiedemann, 1991, p. 179.

as they were concerned, she was an ideal patroness. There is evidence that this social convention had existed from a period much earlier than Paul's time. One example is seen in a relationship between the city of Fundi and their patron, which is dated in the second-century BCE:

With the agreement of Titus Fa[...], the senators and entire magistracy of Fundi enter into guest-friendship with Tiberius Claudius. We give ourselves into his trust and assent to select him as our patron. In the consulship of Marcus Claudius, son of Marcus...<sup>88</sup>

Pliny provides several examples of the outworking of this aspect of patronage relationships.<sup>89</sup> This personal nature of patronage can sometimes be marred by what David Braund calls a "dysfunction of patronage."<sup>90</sup> Paul Millet describes it as the misuse of power, which lies in the hands of the superior partner of the relationship, and which sometimes overrules the other elements of the relationship and leads to a situation where reciprocity, and the asymmetrical elements of this personal relationship are absent and result in exploitation.<sup>91</sup>

Very much part of the patronage relationship is what the social scientist colourfully describes as 'brokerage.' Jeremy Boissevain's work on the subject provides a very good and detailed discussion of this aspect of patronage.<sup>92</sup> Boissevain shows that the patron uses "first order resources" while the broker uses "second order resources" even though they are all entrepreneurs. The broker thus, directly or indirectly, bridges the "gaps in communication" and in a professional way "brings about communication for profit." A study of the Roman world shows that the function of the broker was significant, not only in personal relationships but also in the running of the empire. The literature of the period is littered with requests and recommendations made by brokers on behalf of their clients.<sup>93</sup> This model was most likely less widespread outside Roman society, not only because the Romans instituted it, but also because power lay with Rome, and the one with the power is the benefactor.

<sup>88</sup> CIL I, 532 and 611 (Fundi), (cf. CIL VI, 1492 [Rome] and *Spanish War* 42 in Gardner, and Wiedemann, 1991, pp. 179-181.

<sup>89</sup> Pliny, *Ep.* 4, 13; 1, 8; 7, 18; 10, 8; 9, 39. See Gardner and Wiedemann, 1991, pp. 181-182.

<sup>90</sup> Braund, D. "Function and Dysfunction: Personal Patronage in Roman Imperialism" in ed. Wallace-Hadrill, A. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. (Routledge: London, 1989), pp. 143-151. See also Astin, A.E. "Literary Patronage," *OCD* Second Edition (1970), pp. 790-791.

<sup>91</sup> Millet, P. "Patronage and Its Avoidance in Classical Athens" in ed. Wallace-Hadrill, A., 1989, p. 16.

<sup>92</sup> Boissevain, J. *Friends of Friends: Networks, Manipulators and Coalitions* (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1974), esp. pp. 147-158.

<sup>93</sup> See, e.g. Cicero, *Ad Fam.* 8.9.4; 13.9; 13.53; 13.56. Cf. Scott, J. "Patronage or Exploitation" in Gellner, E. *et al* (1977), p. 23. See also Millar, F. *The Emperor in the Roman World* (Duckworth, London, 1977), pp. 466-467.

This raises a number of questions concerning Paul's church finances. Did Paul use the language of patronage in his letters, and if so did his readers understand him? Did Paul understand his role as that of a patron/broker or as a client? If as a client who was (were) his patron(s)? If as a patron or broker what sort of protection or promotion did he supply to his clients, and what sort of goods and services did he expect from them? But these are questions that are best answered in the exegesis of the passages in Paul's letters that are relevant. Here it is only necessary to note the application of the patronage model to the early church. Paul, it seems to me, was careful in the use of the patronage model. He seems to deliberately avoid the language of patronage in his correspondence to the Corinthians. To be sure, he calls them his children (II Cor. 12: 14), which can be used for the personal element of the patronage model. But not every parent-children relationship comes under this model. He nowhere in this correspondence applies the reciprocal element of the model, and the same can be said about the asymmetrical element. The reason for this, it seems to me, is that the Corinthians did want to understand their relationship with their apostle in terms of patron-client, which Paul did not like. This may account for the fact that the apostle entered a partnership with the Philippians, and received support from them on a number of occasions, but refused support from Corinth.

Interestingly, in his letter to the Christians in Rome, Paul uses the language of patronage. About Achaia and Macedonia as the participants of the collection, he says:

They were pleased to do it, and indeed they owe it to them. For if the Gentiles have shared in the Jews' spiritual blessings, they owe it to the Jews to share with them their material blessings. (Rom. 15: 27).

Similarly, Paul was free in referring to Phoebe as *προστάτις* in Rom. 16: 2. Almost certainly, this word comes under the language of patronage. A discussion of its connotations is reserved for the second part of this work. Also, Paul uses the language of debt and obligation in a number of places in Romans and Philemon (Rom. 1: 14; 13: 8; Philem. 19). The first two of these do not necessarily have the connotation of patronage. Paul's obligation to preach to the Gentiles in the first passage was not because of a favour from them that he was obliged to repay, but an obligation of a different nature. In the same way, the obligation to love in the second passage did not depend on an earlier favour that had to be returned. In Philem 19 however, the implication is that Philemon owes Paul an earlier favour, and that Paul counts on that as he makes his request (or, demand). This appeals to the reciprocal element of patronage, but most unlikely to the asymmetrical element. In fact, Paul seems to have avoided completely the asymmetrical element of patronage. This is

possibly because of his conception of the gospel and the equality of all before God (Gal 3: 28-29). Further discussion of these issues will be taken up in the exegesis.

### **1.5. Conclusion.**

This chapter confirms then, that the family provided a social model for the finances of the Pauline churches. Paul's epistles portray an awareness of the social practices in the families of the Greco-Roman world. Hospitality and patronage, which are central elements in the families of antiquity, were equally central in Paul's valuation, and consequently in the way he applied them.

## Chapter 2. THE SYNAGOGUE.

### 2.1. Preliminary Remarks

It is usually assumed that the synagogue is a natural social model from the Greco-Roman world that should inform our knowledge of the early church. Meeks is explicit about this when he argues that the study of the synagogue as a social model is relevant for early Christianity. He contends among other things, that Christianity being “an offshoot of Judaism, the urban Christian groups obviously had the Diaspora synagogue as the nearest and most natural model.”<sup>1</sup> Meeks goes on to discuss “a number of similarities between Jewish communities in the Greco-Roman cities and the Pauline groups that grew up alongside them.” These include, among others, “the practice of meeting in private houses” which, he says, is “an expedient” for both the Jews and the Pauline groups. As evidence for this, he refers to “the remains of synagogue buildings at Dura-Europos, Stobi, Delos, and elsewhere that were adapted from private dwellings.”<sup>2</sup> Very closely related to this is the significance of “persons who function as patrons.” Noting the particular difference between patrons in the synagogues and those in the Pauline churches, Meeks writes:

But again, as in the case of collegia, the terminology of functions and honours is different. We do not meet an *archisynagogos* or any *archontes* - except mythical and Roman imperial ones - in Paul's letters, nor is the term *synagoge* used for the assembly. Accordingly, although there are persons who function as patrons, they received no honorifics like *pater* or *mater synagoge*.<sup>3</sup>

This has tremendous significance for this study. There is clear evidence that people like Gaius (Rom. 15: 23), Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus (I Cor. 16: 17), just to mention a few, performed qualitative acts of patronage of the same level as these under discussion in the ancient synagogue, and deserving honour, but received none. Despite this difference, Meeks still insists that the synagogue provides a model for the early church.

---

<sup>1</sup> Meeks, 1983, pp. 80-81.

<sup>2</sup> See Meeks, 1983, p. 80. Cf. Hengel, M. “Die Synagogeninschrift von Stobi,” *ZNW* 1966: 145-183, especially pp. 160-164. On the archaeology of these synagogues in general and how they relate to the early church buildings, see among others Gutmann, J. *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture*, (Ktav Publishing House, Inc.: New York, 1975); esp. the section on Archaeology. A very recent compilation of essays edited by Urman, D. and Flesher, P.V.M. entitled *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery* (Brill: Leiden, 1995), pays particular attention to archaeological questions.

<sup>3</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 81.

The concern here is to test this hypothesis against the evidence. If found to be correct, this should shed some light on the finances of the Pauline churches. This is not a study of the subject of the synagogue as a whole. The interest is on how the Pauline churches compare with its means of financial support, the role of benefaction, the issue of paid officials, relationship with the OT models of community, and the use of OT laws with reference to support of priests and the poor.

### 2.1.1. Background to the Institution of the Synagogue.

The name Synagogue refers both to the “meeting place and prayer hall of the Jewish people since antiquity,” which later, during the period of the Second Temple, referred to “a group of people and/or a building or institution.”<sup>4</sup> The origin of this institution has been debated for decades, and is still being debated. Different periods have been suggested: pre-exilic, exilic, and post exilic; with a variety of circumstances suggested for its birth.<sup>5</sup> *Synagoge* (house of assembly) and *proseuche* (house of prayer) appear in both literary and archaeological sources for this institution.<sup>6</sup> There has been some dispute as to when these terms came into use and which one came first. The conventional position, which makes sense, is that *proseuche* is the earliest, replaced by *synagoge* in the second century CE.<sup>7</sup> Hengel gives *proseuche* a Diaspora connotation, and *synagoge* a ‘Palestinian’ nuance used in the NT, by Josephus, and rabbinic sources.<sup>8</sup> Meyers notes that the difference in these terms clearly affirms the fact that the institution had different functions depending also on the location they are found, Palestine or Diaspora; a point confirmed by Aramaic terms of post-70 CE, which include in addition ‘house of study’.<sup>9</sup> Horbury and Noy have supplied about seven inscriptions which use the word *proseuche* for the building and conclude that when used in this sense, they betray their Jewishness.<sup>10</sup> These inscriptions are all dedications, or honorific dedications of *proseuches*. The first (no. 9) is a Plaque which comes from Hadra in Alexandria, and dated from about the second century BCE. The second (no. 22) is also a Plaque from Scheidia, dated 246-221 BCE. The third and fourth (nos. 24 and 25) are both Steles from

<sup>4</sup> Meyers, E.M. “Synagogue” in *ABD*. Vol. 6 (1992) pp. 261-260.

<sup>5</sup> These are summarised by Meyers in his article in the *ABD*, p. 252. See also Sonne, I. “Synagogue” in the *IDB* in 4 vols., here, vol. 4: (Abingdon Press: New York, 1962), pp. 476-491. Gutmann, 1975 remains the standard work on this.

<sup>6</sup> McKay, H.A. *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism*. (E.J. Brill, Leiden. New York. Köln, 1994).

<sup>7</sup> See the discussion of this in the *ABD* pp. 252f.

<sup>8</sup> Hengel, M. “Proseuche und Synagoge” in Gutmann, 1975, pp. 27-54, esp. 41-54.

<sup>9</sup> *ABD* p. 253.

<sup>10</sup> Horbury, W. and Noy, D. *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt: With an index of the Jewish inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrenaica*. (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1992), no. 9 (*CIJ* ii no. 1433); no. 22 (*CIJ* ii no. 1440); no. 24 (*CIJ* ii no. 1441); no. 25 (*CIJ* ii no. 1442); no.



Xenephyris and Nitriai respectively and dated 140-116 BCE. The fifth is a Plaque from Athribis (Benha) dated second or first century BCE. The sixth is a Stele from Arsinoe-Crocodilopolis (Medinet el Fayum) dated 246-221 BCE. The last is also a Stele bought at Cairo but whose origin is uncertain, and is dated first or early second century CE.

What follows is based on the understanding that the synagogue was a well established institution by the end of the first half of the first century CE. This point has since been established in New Testament scholarship.<sup>11</sup> No better evidence can be found for this than the well known and earliest-known synagogue inscriptions of the Ptolemaic period:

ὑπὲρ βασιλέως/ Πτολεμαίου/ του Πτολεμαίου/ και βασιλίσσης  
5 Βερενίκης τῆς/ γυναικὸς καὶ ἀδελφῆς/ καὶ τῶν τέκνων/ οἱ ἐν  
Κροκ(ο)/ δέλων πόλει Ἰουδαῖ  
10 οἱ τὴν προσε(υχήν)

In honour of King Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy, and of Queen Berenike, his wife and sister and their children, the Jews in Krokodilopolis (dedicated) the *proseuche*....<sup>12</sup>

It has been noted that this text is incomplete, a point supported by the photograph of the inscription.<sup>13</sup> By convention the verb 'to dedicate' is supplied. It is not clear why the *proseuche* is dedicated to these persons. It might have been to honour them for some good thing they did for the Jews. Most likely, it is because they donated heavily towards building this house of prayer. In any case it confirms that the synagogue as an institution was established well before Paul's time.

### 2.1.2. Nature of the Sources.

The study of the finances of the synagogue, more than any aspect of this institution,

27 (CIJ ii no. 1443); no. 117 (CPJ iii. no. 1532a); and no. 126.

<sup>11</sup> Several references can be cited here. See for instance, Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern in co-operation with D. Flusser and W.C. van Unnik. *CRINT*. in 2 Volumes (Van Gorcum & Comp. B.V.: Assen, 1974). Meyers, E.M. "Synagogue" in *ABD* Vol. 6 (1972) pp. 251ff; Gutmann, 1975, pp. 3ff; Smallwood, E.M. *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations*. (Brill: Leiden, 1981) reprint; Shürer, E.M. *History of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ (175 BC - 135 CE)*. Revised Edition, Vermes, G.; Goodman, M.; Millar, F. 3 vols. (T & T Clark: Edinburgh, 1987). See also even more recently: Sanders, E.P. *Judaism, Practice and Belief: 63 BCE - 66 CE*. (SCM Press: London, 1992); and Grabbe, L.L. *Judaism From Cyrus to Hadrian* 2 vols. (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1992). In fact the question with these scholars is whether the origin of the Synagogue was during or before or after the exile, not whether it predates the New Testament.

<sup>12</sup> CPJ 1532a; see also CIJ iii. no. 1440. Horbury and Noy, 1992 cite and discuss these inscriptions dating them to the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes I, to the period between their marriage in 246 and 221 BCE; see pp. 201ff and 35f respectively.

<sup>13</sup> Horbury and Noy, 1992, p. 201.

is made very difficult by the fact that the sources are very late. The main sources include Rabbinic sources, epigraphic material, and archaeological findings. Although some of the teaching of the Rabbinic sources (the Talmud and Midrash) probably existed from very early times, at least in their crude form as traditional lore before collection and compilation (the intertestamental period), the documents as they have come down to us were not published until much later than the beginning of the early church. On the date of the Palestinian Talmud, Strack and Stebenger write:

It seems plausible to connect the final redaction of PT with the end of patriarchate before 429 ... i.e. to see it as a reaction to serious intervention in the organisation of Palestinian Judaism.<sup>14</sup>

The Babylonian Talmud is seen to be even later.<sup>15</sup> Similarly, the compilation of the various commentaries called 'Midrash' as an exposition of the Torah which started soon after the Babylonian exile, is seen to have found its completion only in the thirteenth century.<sup>16</sup> Again, the collections are late but the material may be earlier.<sup>17</sup>

The epigraphic material consists mainly of inscriptions, supplied chiefly by archaeological findings. Some of the inscriptions like those discovered in Egypt provide evidence for synagogues from the previous era. There are however, many others from a much later period. The gospels and Acts provide another source of information about the synagogues. These are not as late as the Rabbinic sources or some of the epigraphical and archaeological evidence. The problem with using this evidence however, has to do with whether the writers of the gospels and Acts are accurate in making statements of the kind they make about synagogues in Palestine in the time of Jesus. McKay, for instance, discusses this question in terms of the 'Narrative World versus Social World of the Author', indicating that they were representing Palestine in the light of what was true of the Diaspora practice of the localities from where they wrote.<sup>18</sup> But this favours my argument which is actually concerned with synagogues of the Diaspora.

The problem of using the Rabbinic sources as well as some of the archaeological evidence is that it is difficult to avoid the danger of anachronism. However, in view of the fact that evidence about the organisation of synagogue and community life of the first century CE is spasmodic and hard to interpret, one can not but somehow find

---

<sup>14</sup> Strack, H.L. and Stebenger, G. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1992), p. 189.

<sup>15</sup> Strack and Stebenger, 1992, pp. 213-225.

<sup>16</sup> Strack and Stebenger, 1992, pp. 383-393.

<sup>17</sup> See Safrai, S. in *CRINT*, pp. 958ff; and Alexander, P.S. "Midrash" in Coggins, R.J. and Houlden, J.L. (edited) *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (SCM Press: London, 1990), pp. 452-459, whose discussion of the date of the midrash is very instructive (see pp. 455-456).

<sup>18</sup> McKay, 1994, pp. 154-156.

a way of using these late sources. In what follows therefore, I shall start by looking at these late sources (where there is no evidence from the first century CE) and then work backwards to the period in question.<sup>19</sup> Kraabel argues against this procedure, disputing its validity.<sup>20</sup> But his concern is with the architecture, material and shape of the Synagogue building in light of the archaeological and epigraphic evidence, rather than on the practical outworking of the institution.

## 2.2. OT Models of Community.

### 2.2.1. Priests and Levites.

I should make clear here that I am discussing OT texts that deal with the issues in question, rather than reviewing OT history on the subject. The institution of the priesthood by Moses at God's command which occurred as he was leading Israel through the wilderness on their way to the promised land is documented in specific OT texts. In Exodus 28: 1 God says to Moses:

Have Aaron your brother brought to you from among the Israelites, along with his sons Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, so they may serve me as priests.

The specification here is that Aaron and his descendants would make the priestly clan. The rest of the chapter describes specific preparations for, leading on to the consecration proper:

After you put these clothes on your brother Aaron and his sons, anoint and ordain them. Consecrate them so they may serve me as priests (v. 41).

This is followed by a seven-day solemn ceremony described in detail in chapter 29 including special sacrifices. In verse 9 it is decreed that "the priesthood is theirs by a lasting ordinance." Chapter 30 begins with a specification of some of their duties: the burning of incense every morning on the altar as well as the offering of the atonement sacrifice on a yearly basis (see esp. vv. 7-10). The priests were thus set apart for the religious service of leading the Israelites spiritually, offering sacrifices and performing all the sacred duties of the cult. The parallel account in Lev. 8 is followed by an account of the priests beginning their ministry (chapter 9).

---

<sup>19</sup> Arie Kindler, "Donations and Taxes in the Society of the Jewish Villages in Eretz Israel During the Third to Sixth Centuries CE" in *Ancient Synagogue in Israel, the Third - Seventh Centuries CE: Proceedings of Symposium, University of Haifa, May 1987*. Ed. Rachel Hachlili, (B.A.R.: Oxford, 1989), is a work that concentrates on the period containing sufficient evidence and does not even care to work backwards to the first century. Safrai, S. "The Synagogue" in Safrai and Stern eds., *CRINT*. vol. 2., argues back from this material to the first century CE and further. Cf. also in the same work, S. Appelbaum, "The Social and Economic Status of the Jews in the Diaspora."

<sup>20</sup> Kraabel, A.T. "The Diaspora Synagogue: Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence since Sukenik," in *ANRW*. II.19.1 (1979): 477-510.

The Levites were equally set apart in a solemn ceremony. The occasion is described in detail in Num. 8: 5-26. Their specific duties were to "work at the Tent of Meeting under the supervision of Aaron and his sons" (v. 22).<sup>21</sup> The qualifying age is set at 25, and the retiring age at 50, thus they were to work for 25 years (vv. 23-26). The distinction between their duties and that of the priests is pointed out in Num. 18: 1-7. The priests were responsible for the "care of the sanctuary and the altar, so that wrath will not fall on the Israelites" (v. 5). For the Levites, they were responsible to the priests and took care of all the work of the Tent of Meeting (v. 4). The duties of the priests were reserved for them alone, and so were those of the Levites. The punishment of death was decreed for anyone who intruded (vv. 6-7). This special calling of the priests and Levites, also meant that they were exempt from sharing in the allocation of the land in the Promised Land. Numbers 18: 20 makes this clear:

The Lord said to Aaron, "You will have no inheritance in their land, nor will you have any share among them; I am your share and your inheritance among the Israelites.

Deut. 18: 1-2 makes clear that the whole tribe of Levi is included in this exemption:

The priests, who are Levites - indeed the whole tribe of Levi - are to have no allotment or inheritance with Israel. They shall live on the offerings made to the Lord by fire, for that is their inheritance. They shall have no inheritance among their brothers; the Lord is their inheritance, as he promised them.

There is however a problem with this text. It gives the implication that the Levites shared with the priests in the sacrifices of animals, grain and oil brought to the Lord. But this contradicts Lev. 2: 3 which shows that such offerings belong to Aaron and his sons only.<sup>22</sup> In fact, Lev. 7: 28-34, a command to be observed for all generations (v. 36), indicates that the 'waved' offering from the fellowship offering (i.e. the breast, as well as the thigh), belong to Aaron and his sons. What then was the share of the Levites? Numbers 18: 21 answers that question:

I give to the Levites all the tithes in Israel as their inheritance in return for the work they do while serving at the Tent of Meeting.

Here the tithes are seen as payment to the Levites for their service unto the Lord, a kind of salary they received. It was however not a fixed salary because its size and frequency depended on the amount of tithes that came in and ultimately on the prosperity of the Israelites. The Levites were in turn to give a tithe of all the tithes they receive to Aaron the priest (Num. 18: 25-29). These arrangements which ensured a guaranteed means of livelihood for the Levites included provisions for those who have to migrate. Deut. 18: 6-8 stipulate that a Levite who resettles should

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Num 1: 47-54 where their duty is specified as to include the care of the all the "tabernacle of the Testimony - over all its furnishings and everything belonging to it. They are to carry the tabernacle and all its furnishings; they are to take care of it and encamp around it" (v. 49).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Lev. 6: 16-17 which call the grain offering like the sin offering and the guilt offering 'most holy to the Lord.'

be allowed to share in these benefits with the Levites living in that locality as well as in their services. This was a duty the Israelites were commanded not to neglect:

And do not neglect the Levites living in your towns for they have no allotment or inheritance of their own (Deut. 14: 27).<sup>23</sup>

The next two verses make it clear that the reference here is to tithes the Israelites are required to give of all the blessings they receive. Clearly this was necessary because they did not have land (i.e. means of support) in their own right and therefore had to be dependent on others. In this way, the priests and Levites were freed from the concerns of possessions to be devoted to their duty and be free of all. When the priesthood came into being, it needed specific provisions and guidelines for its sustenance and existence, and Moses, at God's instruction here, provided that.

I Chron. 23: 3-5 and chapter 24 indicate that there was little change in the way the priesthood was organised during the period of the monarchy.<sup>24</sup> Virtually the same conclusion might be made regarding the post-exilic period. Neh. 7: 39-45 lists priests and Levites among those who came back from the exile. Later, in 13: 10 a negative effect of the failure to obey the command to give tithes to the Levites is recorded:

I also learned that the portions assigned to the Levites have not been given to them, and that all the Levites and singers responsible for the service had gone back to their own fields.

The next two verses register the steps taken by Nehemiah to correct this as well as make it clear that the reference is to tithes. It seems however that by this time, the Levites could own some land in addition. In any case, I am not concerned with the historical accuracy of this picture, but with its use as a model (understood to be historical and divinely sanctioned) within first century Judaism.

The Pauline churches would appear to be closer to the synagogues than to the temple. There is no obvious reference to priests in the sense of OT priesthood in the Pauline letters. There seems to be no indication that Paul thought of himself or any of the leaders of the churches he founded as priests in the OT sense of the word. However, in his defence of his apostolic rights, the rights to be supported by the churches and be accompanied by a wife, which he declined, Paul appeals to the OT model of the support of priests in I Cor. 9: 13. It is unquestionable that Paul is appealing here to the practice I have been describing. He is referring to the priests and Levites who get their means of livelihood from the temple where they work. Theissen has discussed this verse and the next in terms of 'legitimation and subsistence' and especially with

---

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Deut. 12: 19.

<sup>24</sup> The only noticeable change the text does seem to allow is in the qualifying of age of the Levite - from 25 in law and 30 in I Chron. 23: 3.

reference to the conflict between Paul and his opponents.<sup>25</sup> He understands it in terms of a conflict between 'itinerant charismatics and community organisers' (see further below in 5.2.2.). Moreover, Paul's liturgical language seems to indicate that the OT model had at least some influence on his thinking although he did not adapt its practices. The language of sacrifice comes to mind here. His understanding of Jesus as the Passover lamb who has been sacrificed is very influential in his non-acceptance of its practice now (I Cor. 5: 7). He however speaks of the offering of our bodies as a living sacrifice (Rom. 12: 1). Even more directly relevant to the subject in question is the liturgical language used in his appreciation of the gift of the Philippians:

... I am amply supplied, now that I have received from Epaphroditus the gifts you sent. They are a fragrant offering, an acceptable sacrifice, pleasing to God (Phil. 4: 18).

The last sentence translates the Greek: ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, θυσίαν δεκτὴν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ. The cultic religious connotation here is unmistakable (see further in 5.4.4.3).

### 2.2.2. Tithes, offerings and taxes.

I have already referred to tithes while discussing priests and Levites. Here I need to specify what the content of these were. For the Levites, their tithes would have been whatever they had received from the people (Num. 18: 21-32). Deut. 12: 17 lists grain, wine and oil; as well as herds and flocks, among the tithes. Deut. 14: 22 specifies them as 'a tenth of all that your fields produce each year'. Verses 23-29 go on to describe how they were to be disposed of. They were to be eaten before the Lord. Here, the tithes that went to the Levites were those of every third year (vv. 28-29; cf. 26: 12f). These were given to the Levites. During the time of the monarchy, when Hezekiah was king, storerooms were built where tithes, along with contributions and dedicated gifts were collected with a Levite in charge of the collection and storage (II Chron. 31: 11f.). This indicates an organised development from the early practice which gave directly to the Levites. After the exile, Nehemiah reports that tithes were collected by Levites accompanied by a priest, and that they were brought 'to the storerooms of the treasury' in the house of God (Neh. 10: 37-39). Again, they consist of grain, new wine and oil.

There were other forms of giving that supported the priesthood. Firstfruits were given of almost all that was produced, including humans. In the case of the first male offspring, of animals and humans, they had to be redeemed because they belonged to the Lord (Exod. 13). There were specific ways of redeeming the consecrated first

---

<sup>25</sup>Theissen, 1982, pp. 27-67.

male offerings (see e.g. Exod. 34: 20). The firstfruits of crops were however used for the celebration of feasts (Exod. 23: 16; cf. 34; 22). The firstfruits were to be accompanied by sacrifices, and they were 'waved' to the Lord, and given to the priests (Lev. 23: 10-17). Deut. 15: 19f talks about eating these firstfruits before the Lord. There were also **freewill offerings**, contributions and dedicated gifts whose designation seems to be the same as that of the firstfruits, or for unspecified designations. Deut. 12: 17 talks about freewill offerings and special gifts. II Chron. 31: 11f mentions contributions and dedicated gifts that go with the tithes into the storerooms.

The **Temple tax** is designated for the 'service of the Tent of Meeting', and given by each male counted in Israel (Exod. 30: 13-16). Everyone gave the same amount, 'half a shekel according to the sanctuary shekel' (about a fifth of an ounce, which is about 6 grams). It was called the atonement money, collected annually. During the time of the monarchy, and precisely during the reign of Joash, there was a reluctance in collecting this money (II Chron. 24: 5). This last passage indicates that the practice had not changed. The later history of this is discussed below.

There is no reference to tithes and taxes in the Pauline correspondence. This silence really makes one wonder, particularly with reference to tithes. Should it be interpreted as indicating that Paul understood it as part of the old order that is passed? Or could it be that Paul took it for granted? Interestingly, the Didache, though later than Paul does appeal to this question of tithes and sees the prophets as priests who are entitled to the tithes of their congregations. After referring to the prophet who wishes to settle or the 'true teacher' as a 'workman' who is 'worthy of his food', this document goes on to employ OT models as follows:

Therefore thou shalt take the firstfruits of the produce of the winepress and of the threshing-floor and of oxen and sheep, and shalt give them as firstfruits to the prophets, for they are your high priests.<sup>26</sup>

In the lines that follow, the Christians were encouraged to give their firstfruits of bread, wine or oil, money, clothes, and all their possessions as tithes. In the absence of a prophet, they were asked to give their tithes "to the poor."<sup>27</sup> We do not know why Paul is silent about this issue. It is possible that with the passage of time, the sharp break with OT Jewish practices was felt to be unnecessary, or that the Didache might have represented a different branch of the church. Similarly, Paul says nothing about the **temple tax**, and this silence permits only a guess as to the reason why. The possibility that he did not think this was needed in the churches can not be ruled out.

---

<sup>26</sup> *Did.* 13. 3. Loeb's translation.

<sup>27</sup> *Did.* 13. 4-7.

But it is possible also that the silence was because the issue did not arise. The collection for the saints in Jerusalem appears to fit naturally to the category of freewill offerings and donations.<sup>28</sup> The discussion in the Pauline texts at least give this indication. Paul seems to be emphasising individual decision and willingness in the administration of this project.

### 2.2.3. Charity.

The concern here is for the poor, the destitute and the disadvantaged in society. The statement that keeps occurring is 'leave what remains for the alien, the fatherless and the widow'. Deut. 14: 28-29 mentions this in relation to tithes:

At the end of every three years, bring all the tithes of that year's produce and store it in your towns, so that the Levites (who have no allotment or inheritance of their own) and the aliens, the fatherless and the widows who live in your towns may come and eat and be satisfied, and so that the Lord your God may bless you in all the work of your hands.

It is interesting that these groups of people listed here share with the priests in the tithes that were collected by every Jew. This is followed by a statement promising material advantage for accomplishing the moral obligation. With specific reference to harvesting, Deut. 24: 19-22 encourages the adherence to this moral obligation of caring for the alien, fatherless and widows. The idea is that these disadvantaged groups would glean the fields for the sheaves or whatever remains of the grain, or glean the fruit from the branches that are harvested, or gather the grapes from the vineyards that were missed by the harvesters (cf. Lev. 19: 9-10). Lev. 23: 22 adds another element: that the reaping should not go the edges:

When you reap the harvest of your land, do not reap the very edges of your field or gather the gleanings of your harvest. Leave them for the poor and alien. I am the Lord your God.

On a broader level of relationship between the rich and poor, Deut. 15: 7-11 encourages the Israelites to be open-handed and give freely, not 'hard-hearted' or 'tight-fisted.'<sup>29</sup> Again, here the moral obligation to give to the poor is strengthened by the promise of material blessings for the one who gives. With this it seems reasonable to conclude that this emphasis on physical material reward must have played a significant role in the charity of ancient Judaism.

---

<sup>28</sup> See the discussion of the Pauline texts where the suggestion that the collection project was a form of the temple tax is examined (see 7.2. above).

<sup>29</sup> "Be careful not to harbour this wicked thought: 'The seventh year, the year of cancelling debts, is near,' so that you do not show ill will towards your needy brother and give him nothing. He may appeal to the Lord against you, and you will be found guilty of sin. Give generously to him and do so without a grudging heart; then because of this the Lord your God will bless you in all your work and in everything you put your hand to" (vv. 9-10).



This provides a good analogy for what Paul says to the Corinthians about the collection, as well as what he says to the Galatians in his general exhortations to them about doing good to all where a similar sort of moral obligation was applied in both cases. In II Cor. 9: 6 Paul says:

Remember this: Whoever sows sparingly will also reap sparingly, and whoever sows generously will also reap generously.

In fact, the whole passage (chapters 8 and 9) applies this principle of encouraging the giver to give in order to prepare ground for receiving the material and spiritual benefits that follow their giving. The giver is made to understand that by giving, she/he is given more by divine providence so that they will have more to give (II Cor. 9: 8; cf. Gal. 6.7). Therefore, Paul's correspondence to the churches of his mission, our only source of knowledge for the life of these churches, gives indication that concern for the needs of 'the poor' was central, at least in Paul's consideration. This is also evidenced by what Paul says in Galatians 2: 10 as well as the organisation of the collection project as a whole. There is however, no reference to gleanings by the poor in the 'fields' of the wealthy in the Pauline letters. The urban setting of the Pauline churches makes this unlikely. The theme reappears in James though (James 1: 27), which is probably the way at least some of the early churches understood their application of these principles - or at least the author did.

### 2.3. *Intertestamental Judaism.*

The evidence that has come down to us does seem to indicate that there is very little difference between the practice in the intertestamental period and that at the beginning. Safrai and Stern tell us that in the first century CE, the priests worked in divisions (twenty-four in all), each headed by head of the father's house or head of the division.<sup>30</sup> Also, there is evidence that the priests, including those who would not take part in the Temple service because of their blemish, had "the right to partake of the 'holy things' from the individual and communal offerings, and they took part in their distribution," and possibly were not "entirely barred from Temple service, and several of the rites which were not directly connected with the sacrifices, such as the sounding of the trumpets in certain instances, the bestowal of the priestly benediction, and the preparation of the sacrificial wood."<sup>31</sup> In the divine service of the synagogues, however, "the whole institution was based on public participation," a "communal

---

<sup>30</sup> Safrai and Stern, 1974, Vol. 2, p. 870. The following references are provided as evidence: *T. Taan.* 2: 2; *T. Hor.* 2: 10; *M. Mid.* 1: 8; *Josephus Ap.* II, 108.

<sup>31</sup> Safrai and Stern, 1974, Vol. 2, p. 871. The following references are provided as evidence: *M. Sukk.* 4:3; *Sifre Num.* 75 (p. 70); *T. Sotah* 7: 8; *M. Mid.* 2: 5.

character which gave it its special status.<sup>32</sup> In other words, the congregation rather than the priests was central in the running of synagogue worship. The priest was however given recognition, and he took his place if he happened to be present. The emphasis in this section is not on synagogue Judaism but on Temple Judaism to which the priesthood was central. Philo and Josephus provide a fortunate source of information for this section. The former was born at around 20 BC. and lived on to around the mid first century CE when his work was written.<sup>33</sup> The latter was born at around 37 CE, and his works were written between 93 and 100 CE.<sup>34</sup> There is also some information in Tobit, Jubilees, and Judith. I now discuss this evidence under the headings priests and Levites, tithes, and charity.

### 2.3.1. Priests and Levites.

Philo, writing a philosophical exposition of the OT texts on the subject, has an extended discussion on the priesthood,<sup>35</sup> which leads on, as one would expect, to a discussion of tithes, sacrifices and other similar topics. The priests, he says, were from a tribe elected from the twelve tribes of Israel on merit and as 'a reward granted to them for their gallantry and godly zeal'. This is essentially the same as the OT account, though Philo goes on to philosophise on the occasion of this 'gallantry and godly zeal'. Also, as in the OT texts discussed above, he makes a distinction between the priests and what he calls 'subordinate priests.'<sup>36</sup> On inheritance of the priests, Philo writes:

The priests were not allocated a section of territory by law so that like the others they might reap the proceeds of the land and have abundance of their requisites therefrom. Instead, when referring to the consecrated offerings, it paid them the transcendent honour of saying that God was their inheritance. He is their inheritance for two reasons. One is the supreme honour conferred by sharing with God in the thank-offering rendered to Him. The other is the obligation to concern themselves only with the sacred rites, thus becoming in a sense trustees of inheritances.<sup>37</sup>

The reasons Philo gives here are either the general conception current in his day or his own ingenious formulation. This adds a new element, or a modification of the OT model. Similarly, lamenting the punishment that had come unto the city of Jerusalem, Josephus ascribes the blame to the Levites who through their 'transgression', he says, occasioned it:

Those of the Levites - this is one of our tribes - who were singers of hymns

---

<sup>32</sup> Safrai and Stern, 1974, Vol. 2, p. 915.

<sup>33</sup> Philo, *LCL*. Vol. 1; pp. ix f.

<sup>34</sup> See Rajak, T. *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*. (Duckworth: London, 1983), pp. 11 f. and 237 f.

<sup>35</sup> Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1. 79-167; cf. *Vit. Mos.* 2.133.

<sup>36</sup> *Spec. Leg.* 1.108.

<sup>37</sup> *Spec. Leg.* 1. 131. Loeb translation.

urged the king to convene the Sanhedrin and get them permission to wear linen robes on equal terms with priests, maintaining that it was fitting that he should introduce, to mark his reign, some innovation by which he would be remembered. Nor did they fail to obtain their request; for the king, with the consent of those who attended the Sanhedrin, allowed the singers of hymns to discard their former robes and to wear linen ones such as they wished. A part of the tribe that served in the temple were also permitted to learn the hymns by heart, as they had requested. All this was contrary to the ancestral laws, and such transgression was bound to make us liable to punishment.<sup>38</sup>

This shows that innovations to the OT models was possible, but that such innovations were likely to be met with criticism. In this case, such criticism was serious, a consequence that was considered as beyond repair. Josephus blames the fall of Jerusalem to other causes, though.<sup>39</sup> Rajak has discussed a number of references in Josephus' own works in which Josephus insists on his priestly background, tracing his ancestry to the OT priestly family.<sup>40</sup> This confirms that the OT model of priesthood was still practised. Generally speaking, the priests were the rulers and judges of the Jewish nation during the first century CE.<sup>41</sup> Goodman is unwilling to accept Josephus' claim that the priests "as a class in his time," were responsible "for the interpretation of scripture."<sup>42</sup>

### 2.3.2. Sacrifices, tithes, offerings and taxes.

Philo's philosophical exposition of the OT texts includes a section on sacrifices which he refers to as 'special incomings' for the priests:

... but the priests have also other special incomings drawn very appropriately from the sacrifices offered. It is ordained that with every victim two gifts should be presented to the priests from two of its parts, the arm or shoulder from the right side and all the fat from the breast, the former as a symbol of strength and manliness and of all lawful operations in giving and receiving and general activity. ....<sup>43</sup>

He also speculates the significance of the second gift, and discuss other specifications of the sacrifices. Apart from these speculations, his accounts are the same as those in the OT texts. He also provides an extended discussion of first-fruits given to the priests as inheritance:

First a maintenance ready to hand and entailing no labour or trouble. ... As the nation is very populous, the first-fruits are necessarily also on a lavish scale, so that even the poorest of the priests has so super-abundant a

<sup>38</sup> *AJ.* xx. 216-218; Loeb translation.

<sup>39</sup> See for instance, *AJ.* xx. 165; 15. 402; *BJ.* 2. 224; 2. 254-57; 2. 413; 5. 526; and 6. 390.

<sup>40</sup> Rajak, 1983, p. 18. See for instance *Ap.* 1. 54; *Vit.* 198.

<sup>41</sup> See Josephus, *Ap.* 2. 165; 2. 184-87; 2. 194; *AJ.* 14. 41. These references are discussed in Sanders, 1992, p. 171.

<sup>42</sup> Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judea* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1987, p. 118. He however admits the fact that the priests were influential as a ruling class (pp. 109-133).

<sup>43</sup> *Spec. Leg.* 1. 145ff. The quotation here uses the Loeb translation.

maintenance that he seems exceedingly well-to-do.<sup>44</sup>

Philo goes on to describe the elaborate nature of this form of giving, and concludes with a statement on how the Jewish people administer these 'gladly and cheerfully':

οἱ δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους [τὰ ἱερατικά] γεγηθότες, χαίροντες, τοὺς αἰτούντας φθάνοντες, τὰς προσθεσμίας ἐπιτέμνοντες, λαμβάνειν ἄλλ' οὐ διδόναι νομίζοντες, μετ' εὐφημίας καὶ εὐχαριστίας καθ' ἑκάστην τῶν ἐτησίων ἡρῶν ποιοῦνται τὰς εἰσφοράς, ἄνδρες ὁμοῦ καὶ γυναῖκες, αὐτοκελεύστῳ προθυμίᾳ καὶ ἐτοιμότητι καὶ σπουδῇ παντὸς λόγου κρεῖττονι.

But our people pay gladly and cheerfully. They anticipate the demand, abridge the time limits and think that they are not giving but receiving. And so at each of the yearly seasons they make their contributions with benediction and thankfulness, men and women alike, and with a zeal and readiness which needs no promptings and an ardour which no words can describe.<sup>45</sup>

Philo talks about tithes as a source of revenue bestowed on the Levites as 'their wages' for their services in the temple:

All these have the tithes appointed as their wages, this being the portion settled on them as temple attendants. It should be noted that the law does not allow them to avail themselves of these tithes until they have rendered other tithes from them treated as their own property as first-fruits to the priests of the superior class. Only when this condition has been fulfilled are they allowed to enjoy their income.<sup>46</sup>

Again this follows the OT stipulations. So also is his discussion of the temple tax which he describes as the 'ransom money', a kind of firstfruit which is paid by each adult Jew beginning at age 20. Also as in the case of the other gifts, he says that his people give "cheerfully and gladly, expecting in return, release from slavery, healing of diseases, enjoyment of liberty fully secured and complete preservation from danger."<sup>47</sup> Interestingly, Philo provides a discussion of the attitude of the donors of these gifts and offerings towards the recipients of these privileges, the priests as:

But that none of the donors should taunt the recipients, it ordered the first-fruits to be first brought into the temple and then taken thence by the priest. It was the proper course that the first-fruits should be brought as a thank-offering to God by those whose life in all its aspects is blessed by His beneficence, and then by Him, since He needs nothing at all, freely bestowed with all dignity and honour on those who serve and minister in the temple. For if the gift is felt to come not from men but from the Benefactor of all, its acceptance carries with it no sense of shame.<sup>48</sup>

This distinguishes Jewish giving from the practice in the Greco-Roman world where donors acted as patrons and benefactors to their recipients.

<sup>44</sup> *Spec. Leg.* I. 132-144. The quoted section adopts the Loeb translation.

<sup>45</sup> *Spec. Leg.* I. 144; Loeb translation.

<sup>46</sup> *Spec. Leg.* I. 156-157; Loeb translation.

<sup>47</sup> *Spec. Leg.* I. 77. Loeb translation.

<sup>48</sup> *Spec. Leg.* I. 152. Loeb translation.

Josephus, writing political history could not have been able to devote so much space to the discussion of these subjects. But he does make some reference to them, particularly to tithes, as they relate to his concern. He refers to tithes as a due to the priests, a due he himself forfeited once during the war,<sup>49</sup> presumably because he did not want to add to the hardship of the donors caused by the war. He notes, like Philo how these brought a substantial revenue to the priests.<sup>50</sup> He also speaks of second tithe which was meant for the feasts.<sup>51</sup> This was collected and eaten at a set place by all at a given time, and was separate from that given to the priests. Josephus also reports that during the war, the priests abused this right by their atrocious behaviour of seizing the tithes from the Levites to the extent that some of them starved to death:

And there was not even one person to rebuke them. No, it was as if there was no one in charge of the city, so that they acted as they did with full licence. Such was the shamelessness and effrontery which possessed the high priests that they actually were so brazen as to send slaves to the threshing floors to receive the tithes that were due to the priests, with the result that the poorer priests starved to death. Thus did the violence of the contending factions suppress all justice.<sup>52</sup>

Speculatively, the high priests probably did this because they no longer could enjoy the luxuries of all the sacrifices, tithes and offerings. The strains of the war which brought severe famine, probably reduced the flow of these sources of income which they were used to, and coupled with greed, they could not restrain themselves. This happened during the high priesthood of one Ishmael ben Phiabi, and during the priesthood of Ananias.<sup>53</sup> These two incidents reveal the utter dependence of the priests and Levites on the tithes for their survival. This fits well with the OT model of priesthood as seen above. However, Josephus gives indication that during his day it was possible for priests to own land, unless if his claim to the priesthood is seen as unfounded. He himself owned land.<sup>54</sup> Rajak discussed this issue citing an example from before 70 CE of one “extraordinarily rich, and at the same time studious Eleazar ben Harshum, whose father left him one thousand hamlets, or perhaps farmsteads, in ‘the king’s mountain’, and the same number of ships - though all was ultimately

---

<sup>49</sup> Jos. *Vit.* 80.

<sup>50</sup> Jos. *Vit.* 63, writes, “My colleagues, having amassed a large sum of money from the tithes which they accepted as their priestly due, decided to return home; but, on my request, consented to stay until we had brought things to order.”

<sup>51</sup> *AJ.* iv. 205f.

<sup>52</sup> *AJ.* xx. 180-81. Loeb translation. Rajak, *Josephus*, 125 discusses this.

<sup>53</sup> *AJ.* xx. 205-207 writes: “Now the high priest Ananias daily advanced greatly in reputation and was splendidly rewarded by the goodwill and esteem of the citizens; for he was able to supply them with money: At any rate he daily paid court with gifts to Albinus and the high priest. But Ananias had servants who were utter rascals and who, combining operations with the most reckless men, would go to the threshing floors and take by force the tithes of the priests; nor did they refrain from beating those who refused to give. The high priests were guilty of the same practices as his slaves, and no one could stop them. So it happened at that time that those of the priests who in olden days were maintained by the tithes now starved to death” (Loeb translation).

<sup>54</sup> Josephus, *Vit.* 422.

destroyed.”<sup>55</sup> This represents a clear shift from the OT model.

The book of Tobit written any time between 350 BCE and 170 BCE,<sup>56</sup> and Jubilees written between 161 - 140 BCE<sup>57</sup> both speak about tithes in almost exactly the same way. Tobit writes:

The first tenth part of all increase I give to the sons of Aaron, who ministered at Jerusalem: another tenth part I sold away, and went, and spent it every year at Jerusalem: and the third I gave unto them to whom it was meet, as Deborah my father's mother had commanded me, because I was left an orphan by my father (1. 7f).

Presumably, ‘the third’ was given to the Levites and the destitute. The Jubilees (32: 10-15) similarly refer to tithes as an ordinance and a decree to be observed. It refers to a ‘law to tithe the tithe in order to eat it before the Lord from year to year’ as well as the ‘whole tithe of oxen and sheep’ being ‘holy to the Lord and it will belong to the priests who will eat it before him year after year’. This is essentially the same as in the OT texts.

### 2.3.3. Charity.

Again, it seems evident that the OT model is followed here. Philo conceives God as concerned about the disadvantaged in society providing for their needs:

Yet vast as his excellencies and powers, he takes pity and compassion on those most helpless and in need, and does not disdain to give judgement to strangers or orphans and widows. He holds their low estate worthy of His providential care, while of kings and despots and great potentates he takes no account....<sup>58</sup>

Philo goes on to discuss the reasons why these need God’s attention. The underlying purpose seems to be to encourage his readers to care for the disadvantaged because by doing so they will be sharing in God’s concerns, and as a result enjoy His benefaction. Also writing on the broader issue of love and charity, he addressed a different concern of acting in love which is remotely the underlying motif for charity - caring for others by putting yourself in their positions:

What man would hate to suffer he must not do himself to others. ... He must not grudge to give fire to one who needs it or close off running water. If the poor or the cripple beg food of him he must give it as an offering of religion to God. ... He must not by fettering or any other means worsen the plight of him who is in hard straits; ... No unjust scales, no false measurements, no

---

<sup>55</sup> Rajak, *Josephus*, pp. 24-25.

<sup>56</sup> Charles, R.H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1965), vol. 1. p. 185.

<sup>57</sup> Charlesworth, J.H. ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 2. (Darton, Longman and Todd: London, 1985), p. 44

<sup>58</sup> *Spec. Leg.* I. 308-310. Loeb translation.

fraudulent coinage must be substituted. . . .<sup>59</sup>

Josephus refers to a triennial tithes which was meant for the widows and orphans:

In addition to the two tithes which I have already directed you to pay each year, the one for the Levites and the other for the banquets, ye should devote a third every third year to the distribution of such things as are lacking to widowed women and orphan children.<sup>60</sup>

So, what parallel is there between intertestamental Judaism and the Pauline Christianity? Because there is little difference between intertestamental Judaism and the OT models discussed above, the points made about the latter apply here. It needs however be pointed out that the language used by Philo to describe the motives for giving by the Jews in the intertestamental period finds a good parallel in what Paul says in II Cor. 8 and 9 about the Macedonians. The key words are σπουδή, προθύμια and έτοιμότης. The first two of these feature prominently in Paul's description of the Macedonians attitude to the collection. σπουδή is used twice in II Cor. 8: 7-8, and προθύμια occurs in 9: 2. This suggests one or more of three influences. Either Paul knew Philo's writing which was most likely in circulation when Paul wrote II Corinthians, or the Judaism of the day generally taught these concepts, or they were generally known in the society of the day. It can not be ruled out that Paul's Jewish heritage was playing a key role here.

## 2.4. Synagogue Practice

### 2.4.1. Means of Financial Support.

What means of financial support was available for the synagogue? Who provided for this means of support? Do titles such as *archisynagogos*, *archontes*, *pater* and *mater synagoges* have anything to do with this? How do these compare with the means of financial support in the Pauline churches? These are the sort of questions that this section seeks to answer. One means of financial support that stands out conspicuously is the numerous donations that came from individuals or from groups to finance the various needs of the institution of the synagogue. Such needs range from the building of the synagogues, to the funding of charitable projects. Tessa Rajak and David Noy bring this out most clearly in their discussion of the office, title and social status of the *archisynagogos* in the Greco-Jewish synagogue.<sup>61</sup> In this article, they show that the traditional consensus which sees this as a functional title of the most important leader of the synagogue is methodologically wrong and therefore

---

<sup>59</sup> *Hypothetica*, 7. 6-8.

<sup>60</sup> *AJ.* iv. 240. Loeb translation.

<sup>61</sup> Tessa Rajak and David Noy, "*Archisynagogoi* : Office, Title and Social Status in the Greco-Jewish

misleading.<sup>62</sup> The traditional approach which appeals to “external perceptions, as reflected in literature” (the ‘distinctive Jewish flavour’ in the title, ‘fixed from the Gospels on,’ as well as it being ‘almost exclusively’ a ‘Jewish term’), they argue, is not only “a powerful emotive component” but also one based on “reflections, direct or indirect, of Christian anti-Judaism, and should not be read literally as straight evidence on synagogue arrangements.”<sup>63</sup> This approach, they contend, fails to account for the handful of epigraphic, pagan *archisynagogois* that are known, and moreover these pagan title holders were principal sponsors, or sometimes even founders of religious or craft associations. The vehemence of these scholars is evident in the following statement:

What is perhaps more disturbing is the widespread modern assumption of precise knowledge. Scholars have thought it a straightforward proposition to define the functions of the *archisynagogos*, by a process of joining together dubious evidence, which they read wholly literally, extrapolating from the combination, and filling in the gaps with anachronisms.<sup>64</sup>

With this, Schürer’s reasoning is rejected on the ground that it “assumes that titles consistently defined specialised roles within a developed administrative system.” They also raise eyebrows on Brooten’s study of women synagogue leaders, particularly on the question of functions - whether or not they combined liturgical functions with practical duties.<sup>65</sup> The climax of their rejection of the traditional viewpoint finds expression in the following paragraph:

*Archisynagogos*, a more imposing word, can be understood as compounded of *archi-* and *synagogos* rather than as derived from *synagoge*. This undermines Brooten’s premise. Second, a different line of formation, from ἀρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς is conceivable, given the use of that term at Luke 8: 41 to describe Jairus, who has been presented in the same narrative also as an *archisynagogos* (and in Matt. 9: 18 and 23 as an archon). Third, as we have seen, the designation has a solid and respectable pagan existence in one geographical region: not such as to lead us to conclusions about direct influence either way, but such at least as to demonstrate the word as quite at home in a Greek context.<sup>66</sup>

---

Synagogue” in *JRS* (1993): 75-93.

<sup>62</sup> Rajak and Noy (1993), p. 77 write, “On the problem which concerns us, the nature of the Greco-Roman synagogue hierarchy, there exists a consensus which has gone wholly unchallenged; this gives primacy to the literary evidence, while drawing sporadically on impressions gleaned from inscriptions. Our approach, by contrast, is to re-read the literary texts with a proper recognition of their character as texts; and, at the same time, adequately to exploit the epigraphic evidence with the help of a hypothesis derived from Greek parallels. Much of the epigraphy consists of names of individuals, figuring in epitaphs or as donors, and those names often go with titles, not only that of *archisynagogos*, but also *archon*, *gerousiarch*, *presbyter*, father or mother of the synagogue, *grammateus*, *phrontistes*, and occasionally others. These evidently represent a spectrum of positions within the community. The titles give us some leverage on the communities which generated them.”

<sup>63</sup> Rajak and Noy (1993), p. 78. This is discussed at length in Lieu, J. “History and Theology in Christian views of Judaism,” in Lieu, J., North, J. and Rajak, T. (eds.) *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*. (Routledge: London and New York, 1992): 79-96.

<sup>64</sup> Rajak and Noy, 1993, p. 81.

<sup>65</sup> Rajak and Noy, 1993, pp. 82-83.

<sup>66</sup> Rajak and Noy, 1993, p. 84.



With this understanding, the alternative is presented which sees the *archisynagogos* as a title that is best understood in the context of Greek honorific titles, a title of benefactors and patrons. A total of 38 inscriptions are supplied (six non-Jewish) to substantiate the claim. Sixteen of these are simply epitaphs of *archisynagogoi* which may or may not have been made with reference to patronage and benefaction. More interesting is the fact that at least nine of these designate the *archisynagogoi* as donors.<sup>67</sup> One of these, cited also by Brooten, is quoted below. Another, found in Jerusalem (definitely before 70 CE) clearly refers to the role of patronage, and it indicates that it is representative of the practice:

Theodotos son of Vettenus, priest and *archisynagogos*, son and grandson of *archisynagogoi*, built the synagogue for reading the law and teaching the commandments, and the guest-house and the rooms and the water provisions, as accommodation for those who need it from abroad. His fathers and the presbyters and Simonides founded the synagogue.<sup>68</sup>

Safrai is convinced that appeals were usually made for such donations, and that the *hazzan* of the synagogue “announced the total collected” after such an appeal.<sup>69</sup> Further evidence can be found in the Talmud where reference is made to “a synagogue that has a dwelling-house for the *hazzan*..”<sup>70</sup> Brooten’s appendix of inscriptions of women donors in the ancient synagogue includes at least three such inscriptions from the contemporary period. The first two are from the 1st century BCE, and the other from the 1st century CE. There is also a fourth inscription that is probably from the 1st century CE.<sup>71</sup> The latter is perhaps the most important inscription, and is here quoted in full:

Τὸν κατασκευασθέντα οἶκον ὑπὸ/ Ἰουλιᾶς Σεουηρας· Π(οπιλιος)  
 Τυρρώνιος Κλαύδος, ὁ διὰ βίου ἀρχισυναγωγος καὶ  
 4 Λουκιος Λουκιου ἀρχισυναγωγος/ καὶ Ποπιλιος Ζωτικὸς ἀρχων  
 ἔπεσ-/ κέυασαν ἔκ τε τῶν ιδίων καὶ τῶν συν-/ καταθεμένων καὶ  
 ἔγραψαν τοὺς τοί-  
 8 χους καὶ τὴν ὀροφήν καὶ ἐποίησαν/ τὴν τῶν θυρίδων ἀσφάλειαν  
 καὶ τὸν/ λυτὸν πάντα κόσμον, οὕστινας καὶ/ ἡ συναγωγή  
 ἐτείμησεν ὀπλῶ ἐπιχρῦ-

<sup>67</sup>Rajak and Noy, 1993, pp. 87-93.

<sup>68</sup>Rajak and Noy, No. 25, *CIJ* 1401; Lifshitz, no. 79. Θεόδωτος Ουεττήνου, ἱερεὺς καὶ ἀρχισυναγωγὸς, υἱὸς ἀρχισυναγωγὸς, ὑποδόμησε τὴν συναγωγὴν εἰς ἀνάγνωσιν νόμου καὶ εἰς διδασχὴν ἐντολῶν, καὶ τὸν ξενῶνα, καὶ τὰ δώματα καὶ τὰ χρῆσθηρὰ τῶν ὑδάτων εἰς κατάλυμα τοῖς χρήζουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ξένης ἢ ἐθεμελίωσαν οἱ πατέρες αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ Σιμωνίδης.

<sup>69</sup>“The Synagogue” in *CRINT*. VOL. 2, p. 936. Safrai backs this claim up with references from the *Midrash Rabba*, *Lev. Rab.* 16, and *Eccles. Rab.* 5.

<sup>70</sup>See *T. B. Erub.* 55b and *T. B. Yoma* 11b among many others. All references to the Babylonian Talmud are from the translation by Epstein, I. unless otherwise stated.

<sup>71</sup>Brooten, 1982, pp. 157ff. The references by Brooten here are drawn from Lifshitz, B. *Donateurs et Fondateurs dans les Synagogues Juives: Répertoire des dédicaces grecques relatives à la construction et à la réfection des synagogues*. (J. Gabalda et cie: Paris, 1967).

12 σφ διὰ τὴν ἐνάρετον αὐτῶν δι(ι)άθ(ε)σις καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὴν συναγωγὴν εὐνοϊάν/τε καὶ σπουδὴν.

The building was erected by Julia Severa; P(ublius) Tyrronios Klados, the head-for-life of the synagogue, and Lucius, son of Lucius, head of the synagogue, and Publius Aotikos, archon, restored it with their own funds and with the money which had been deposited, and they reinforced the windows and made all the rest of the ornamentation, and the synagogue honoured them with a gilded shield on account of their virtuous behaviour, solicitude and zeal for the synagogue.<sup>72</sup>

A number of points should be underlined from this quotation. First, it is certainly significant to note that this synagogue was built by a woman. This speaks for her wealth, the rights of women in the synagogues of antiquity, and the place played by donations in the life of those institutions. Second, the restoration of the synagogue by a collective donation indicates that there was more than one way in which it could be done. Donations came from individuals as well as from groups. Third, such donors were rewarded with honorifics by the congregations of the synagogues for their acts which were certainly considered heroic. These points are supported by a number of similar inscriptions from the period before the time of Paul. An inscription from the second or first century BCE does illustrate this well:

ὑπὲρ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου/ καὶ βασίλισσης Κλεοπάτρας/  
Πτολεμαῖος Ἐπικύδου  
ὁ ἐπιστάτης τῶν φυλακῶν  
5 καὶ οἱ ἐν Ἀθρίβει Ἰουδαῖοι/ τὴν προσευχὴν/ θεῷ ὑψίστῳ.

In honour of King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra, Ptolemaios son of Epikydes chief of police and the Jews in Athribis (dedicated) the *proseuche* to the Supreme God.<sup>73</sup>

This inscription points to a donation by this king, queen, another person and community as a whole. The fact that this king and queen as well as the chief of police are mentioned in person does indicate, at least to some extent that their donations were most significant. This shows also that donations for the building of synagogues did not come only from the Jews. Non-Jews contributed greatly in this respect, as is very clear in this and the previous inscriptions quoted. Safrai and Stern are convinced about this point and provide Luke 7: 1-5 as further support for this.<sup>74</sup> This is an interesting passage, and verses 4 and 5 are worth quoting here:

4 οἱ δὲ παραγενόμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν παρεκάλουν  
αὐτὸν σπουδαίως λέγοντες ὅτι Ἄξιός ἐστιν ᾧ παρέξη τοῦτο·

<sup>72</sup> Brooten, 1982, p. 158, here quoting Lifshitz, *Donateurs*, no. 33; *CII* 766. The translation is however Brooten's.

<sup>73</sup> *CIJ* 1443; cf. *CIJ* 1444. See also *P.T. Peah* vii, 21b; *T. Baba Metzja* 11:23; *CIJ* 1404 and 694.

<sup>74</sup> Safrai and Stern, 1974, p. 937. The other references Safrai and Stern give are *CII* no. 766 and *P.T. Meg.* III, 74a.

5 ἀγαπᾷ γὰρ τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτοῖς  
 ὠκοδόμησεν ὑμῖν.

When they came to Jesus, they begged him earnestly, and said that he (the centurion) is worthy enough for you to give him this thing; for he is fond of our nation and has built our synagogue.

The centurion, obviously a Gentile is here said to have built a synagogue for the Jews in this town. It is interesting that the Jews here are keenly making the request on behalf of this centurion. It marks their gratitude for this man they describe as fond of their nation. It would not be surprising if such an attitude leads to erecting an inscription for this man. This raises several questions, not least the question why this man built the synagogue for the Jews, which is not directly relevant to our subject.<sup>75</sup> If the Evangelist is here portraying a situation of the Diaspora synagogue, then we have here good evidence for its means of financial support.

In addition to appeals and donations, Safrai and Stern point to a further means of financial support. They refer to “various collections, especially for charitable purposes,” which “were made in the synagogue, for which there is evidence from the era of the Temple and throughout the whole of antiquity.”<sup>76</sup> A number of references are given in evidence of this claim, one of which is from the first century CE: Matt. 6: 1-4.<sup>77</sup> The key words are δικαιοσύνη and ἐλεημοσύνη.<sup>78</sup> Verse 1 talks about being careful not to practise one’s good deeds to be seen by men (Προσέχετε [δὲ] τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὑμῶν ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἴσῃτε ὡς οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) without clarifying what these good deeds are. But verses 2-4 make it undoubtedly clear that the good deeds refer to giving for charity (ὅταν οὖν ποιῆς ἐλεημοσύνην lit., ‘therefore when you do alms’). The passage is later than Paul, but

μὴ

<sup>75</sup> On these see for example Creed, J.M. *The Gospel According to St. Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. (MacMillan: London, 1950), pp. 100-101; Marshall, I.H. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (The Paternoster Press: Exeter, 1978), pp. 276-280; and Fitzmyer, J.A. *The Anchor Bible. The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Doubleday & Company, Inc. Garden City, New York, 1981, pp. 646-652.

<sup>76</sup> Safrai and Stern, 1974, p. 942.

<sup>77</sup> The other references Safrai and Stern quote are *P.T. Dem.* III. 48a; *Eccles. Rab.* 5; *T. Sabb.* 16: 12.

<sup>78</sup> On the semantic development of these terms, see the very careful and detailed discussion in David R. Register’s thesis, *Concerning Giving and Receiving* (MPhil Thesis submitted to the University of Sheffield, Feb. 1990) pp. 80-85. The text of these verses is well discussed by commentators. See for example Beare, F.W. *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary*. (Basil Blackwell: Oxford 1981), pp. 163-166; Gundry, R.H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. (William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1982), pp. 100-103; Daniel J. and Harrington, S.J. (Editors) *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra Pagina Series, (The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, Minnesota 1991) pp. 93-97; and Hagner, D.A. *Matthew 1-3* Word Biblical Commentary, (Word Books Publisher: Dallas, Texas, 1993) pp. 136-141.

definitely in the first century. There is plenty of evidence for charitable practice earlier as exemplified in Tobit.<sup>79</sup>

The Gospels and Acts make reference to the Synagogue, though a lot of the evidence has little to do with the finances of the institution. In fact very little detail is given about any practical outworking of this institution; the references mainly affirm the existence of the institution during the first century CE. Heather McKay discusses this on a wider scale in relation to the question of the Sabbath in the Synagogues.<sup>80</sup> She comes to the same conclusion about practical details, and notes the difficulty that any scholar of these materials has to contend with: reconciling the “narrative world” with the “social world” of these writers.<sup>81</sup> McKay however notes the agreement between the picture the Gospels and Acts paint and that of Josephus and Philo, particularly on the synagogue as a meeting place for the Jews to “deal with *all* matters that were of concern to them as a community.”<sup>82</sup>

In a paper that deals with the third to the sixth century CE, and concerned with donations and taxes of the Jewish village in the land of Israel, Arie Kindler of Tel Aviv University<sup>83</sup> gives an excellent presentation of financial issues of the kind that I am concerned with here. His objective was “to examine the ways the building of a synagogue was financed”, and he begins by noting that the synagogue, being the only public building of the village, fund-raising for its building was a responsibility that was “an honour to some villages and a burden to others.”<sup>84</sup> He discusses the various methods of fund-raising which included donations by single persons like the donation of Theodotus who built a synagogue in Jerusalem (cited above), and those by Rabbis like “Rabbi Issi who donated the whole mosaic floor and the plaster for the synagogue of Sussia.” Also included here are donations according to ability in cash or kind (days of work and skills), donations from outside the village or city as the case may be, as well as donations from visitors.<sup>85</sup> The donations from individuals

---

<sup>79</sup> See above under 2.3.

<sup>80</sup> McKay, 1994, pp. 132-175.

<sup>81</sup> McKay, 1994, p. 166. On Luke, she writes, “Luke is writing about synagogues as he knew them, and painting the same picture whenever he describes a synagogue no matter what date or location he is purporting to describe. Luke’s narrative depicts a later, or perhaps Diaspora, perspective on synagogues. Therefore it seems to me likely that the depiction can be faithful neither to ‘synagogues’ that Jesus visited, nor to the ‘synagogues’ at the time of Paul that Luke purports to portray in Acts in his accounts of Paul’s missions.”

<sup>82</sup> McKay, 1994; p. 173.

<sup>83</sup> Kindler, 1989, pp. 55-59.

<sup>84</sup> Kindler, 1989, p. 55.

<sup>85</sup> Kindler, 1989, p. 55-56. The evidence for these is mainly from Rabbinic sources: for the donations of Rabbis see *P. T.* viii, 21, p. 2. For donations from visitors or donations from outside, see *T. Meg.* iii, 4: 15 and *B. T.* xxvi, p. 1. Naveh, J., *On Stone and Mosaic, The Aramaic and*

were the substantial ones because they came from the wealthy members of society who acted as patrons. The rest were relatively very small, and mainly of days of work and skills. The donations in kind which also came from the poorer members of the community (of wheat or some other things) were sold and the product of the sale used for whatever purpose.<sup>86</sup>

Kindler discusses another method of raising funds: taxes.<sup>87</sup> Sometimes, he says, it was necessary to impose a 'special tax,' often a 'voluntary tax'. This is attested by a number of synagogue inscriptions. Sometimes the taxes were levied for the treasury of the community, and Kindler suggests that this was done "most probably on the basis of a graduated system taking into account the economic status of the inhabitants; a kind of progressive tax with the rich paying more than the poor," but notes that this is not discussed in the Rabbinic sources. "The tax", he says, "was similar to the half-sheqel tax levied for the Temple in Jerusalem prior to its destruction in 70 CE and in accordance with Exodus 30: 11-16." Other methods of fund-raising according to Kindler include proceeds from the hostel for visitors which was usually annexed to the synagogue.

Kindler also discusses the various designations of the donations and levies.<sup>88</sup> For charity, only the donations were used, "handled by the synagogue treasury" and directed to the "care of the poor, the sick, the widows and the orphans." Other donations, levies, and dues, were used for a variety of purposes: for ritual services that included "the maintenance of the synagogue, the maintenance of the service proper therein, the payment for the synagogue beadle (where there was no arrangement for a voluntary beadle by rotation), the copying of a Torah-scroll, and finally, the purchase of the Books of the Prophets," or for "various municipal services."<sup>89</sup>

The presentation of Kindler is very impressive. However, a number of considerations have to be made before any rash assimilation of the points presented. First, there is the time difference of about two centuries at the least. Second, there is the fact that Kindler's paper is concerned only with villages in Palestine, rather than the Diaspora synagogues of Asia and Greece. Nevertheless, as can be seen from the discussion

---

*Hebrew Inscriptions from Ancient Synagogues*, (Hebrew), pp. 19-23. Jerusalem 197 is cited as evidence for donations in kind.

<sup>86</sup> *T. Shebū.* vii, 9; *T. Peah*, iv; *P. T. Dem.* iii, 23, p. 2.

<sup>87</sup> Kindler, 1989, p. 56.

<sup>88</sup> Kindler, 1989, p. 57.

<sup>89</sup> It should be noted that in Israel, there would not have been much distinction between ritual services and municipal services.

above, most of these points were already evident in the Diaspora synagogues of the first century. This is particularly true for donations. The earliest-known synagogue inscription which comes from the Ptolemaic period referred to above, as well as the Julia Severa inscription and other earlier inscriptions from the Diaspora Jews support this point. This is probably true for levies too, although I have not been able to lay hands to any evidence. On the second consideration, it might be asked if there is any genuine reason to suppose that there were vast differences in practices in the Judaism of the Palestinian synagogues and that of the Diaspora. I would like to suggest that what Kindler discusses here is a development and an improvement on what began much earlier in Diaspora Judaism. What we cannot determine at the moment is how much of it had developed and improved. It goes without saying then that benefaction was the backbone that held this institution together. The synagogues depended on the benefactions of its members, particularly the wealthy who naturally contributed the greatest. Similarly, the poor in this institution depended on the generosity of these wealthy members for their existence.

Moral obligation to give for Jewish benefactors and in addition the desire for prestige for Greek benefactors are the basic incentives - a very strong driving force that stimulated all giving in antiquity. Jewish discussion did not make use of prestige as a motive for giving, at least as the sources indicate. This was probably because of the teaching of their faith, at least in theory - but the *archisynagogos* inscriptions indicate that there was a prestige element (cf. also the Aphrodisias inscription). Perhaps it was because they believed that God was the 'true benefactor', and that we are all beneficiaries of his great benefaction.<sup>90</sup> Consequently, they considered it wrong to gain prestige from it and felt morally obligated to give, and in doing so seek the equality of all. This is a continuity of the principles of OT Judaism as seen above. For the Greeks, civic life depended on the benefaction of leaders and wealthy members. One reason for this was their concern for general welfare. Two other motives were very important: the desire for prestige and honour; as well as fear of dislike, or loss of honour.<sup>91</sup> Moreover, the society came to encourage benefactors in this by electing leaders on the basis of their service (*λειτουργία*) to the community. It was therefore a mark of honour to be able to rise up to the highest level on the scale of leadership in the society.

---

<sup>90</sup> I have quoted above Philo *Spec. Leg.* 1.152 referring to God as the 'Benefactor of all' and 1.308-310 which talks about God's 'Providential care'. Also, Rabbinic texts attest to giving "in confidence of divine providence" (*Git. 7a, Ta'an. 24a, Qoh R. 2.18*) quoted and discussed in Register, 1990, pp. 61 and 88.

<sup>91</sup> Jones, 1978, pp. 20; 22; 28.

The above discussion compares nicely with the means of financial support in the Pauline churches, at least as it appears on the surface. Paul's discussion of the collection corresponds roughly to two means of financial support discussed here: appeals and collection for charity. It is not clear however, whether or not, apart from the collection project, there were other appeals for funds or collections for charity in these churches. Paul exhorts the Galatians to 'carry each other's burden,' and 'in this way you will fulfil the law of Christ' (Gal. 6: 2). Could this be taken as a statement about support for the poor? Was Paul here voicing his/the church's concern about charity and the care of the disadvantaged? Can it be said that this was the obvious financial need of the church? I think these are possibilities that must be allowed even though we cannot be sure since the Pauline letters are silent about them. On donations, either by individuals or by the communities corporately the Pauline letters are not explicit. What is clear is that meeting places were donated by members of the communities who were fairly well-off and acted as patrons. These also provided hospitality for the visiting missionaries. But whether or not they donated in cash as well is not known. In any case, benefaction played a significant role as a means of financial support here. Also, there is indication that the moral obligation to give, both for the running of the churches and for charity, was a strong driving force. The situation is however less clear in the Pauline correspondence regarding giving for the reason of seeking prestige.

Moxnes' treatment of "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community," describes clearly the institution of patronage in the NT period, with special reference to Luke.<sup>92</sup> After defining the institution as one which emphasises "inequality and difference in power" whose structure was "an exchange of different and very unequal resources,"<sup>93</sup> he goes on to describe the nature and outworking of the institution as exemplified in Dio Chrysostom.<sup>94</sup> Then he compares it with Luke's perception and description, concluding that "Luke is arguing for a transformation of the patron-client relations." The "urge to give to the poor who cannot repay in kind," and "not expect any return" for such gifts, "not even in terms of gratitude or glorification,"<sup>95</sup> he says, confirms this. When Paul speaks to the Corinthians about the collection for Jerusalem as well as about other issues, he employs the language of patronage and benefaction, particularly when he talks about generosity, and enthusiasm. It seems very likely that Paul had already advocated the transformation of the institution manifested in Luke.

---

<sup>92</sup> Moxnes, H. "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community" in Neyrey, 1991, 241-268.

<sup>93</sup> Moxnes, 1991, p. 242.

<sup>94</sup> Dio Chrysostom *Or.* 3: 86-122; 3:131-32; 44; 46: 7-8; 31:44.

<sup>95</sup> Moxnes, 1991, pp. 264-265.

One obvious difference between the Pauline churches and the synagogues should be mentioned. There is no indication, whatsoever, of levies in the writings of Paul. The discussion about the collection emphasises the willingness of the giver and the freedom s/he had in deciding the amount. But should we bring a “Hermeneutic of Suspicion” into play here? An inscription cited by Trombley in his discussion of sacrifices in the Greek city does illustrate this.<sup>96</sup> The inscription which dates from around 196 BCE begins by describing the purchase of the bull for the sacrifice, followed by a description of some of the proceedings of the sacrifice itself making special mention of the officers of the occasion. Part of the conclusion reads as follows:

When the stewards have exhibited the bull, they are to farm him out that he may be nourished by a contractor. The contractor is to lead the bull to the agora; he is to collect from the grain merchants and other merchants what is fitting for its nourishment. It is better for those who give.

The stewards are responsible for the purchase of the bull. However it is expected that a sufficient number of merchants will contribute enough grain for its fattening. The last statement of this quotation creates suspicion on the whole ethos of λειτουργία and φιλοτιμία in Greek cities. The statement implies that merchants who contributed grain for feeding the bull for the sacrifice had the goodwill of the society and therefore possibly the blessing of the gods for success and prosperity in their business. This certainly seems to be an implicit element of Greek benefaction. The question is whether this kind of moral pressure was implicit in the Pauline exhortations about the collection and bearing one another’s burden. Another difference which seems very clear is that the early church as a whole, did not have any property to rent out from which it derived some form of income. In fact the church could not own property until the third and fourth centuries CE.

#### 2.4.2. Temple Tax.

Several instructive references to the subject are made by Mary Smallwood in her work.<sup>97</sup> Adult male Jews of the Diaspora aged between twenty and fifty, as well as freed slaves and proselytes, were obliged to pay the half shekel (the Roman two dinarii or Greek two drachmae) from as early as the late Hellenistic period.<sup>98</sup> It was this that constantly reminded Jews everywhere of their subordination to Jerusalem

---

<sup>96</sup> Trombley, F.R. *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529*. Vol. 1. (E.J. Brill: Leiden; New York; Koln; 1993); pp. 4-5. The inscription is from *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, ed. Otto Kern (Berlin 1900), 98.

<sup>97</sup> Smallwood, 1976

<sup>98</sup> Several references can be cited in support of this. See for instance Josephus *AJ.* iii, 194-196; xviii, 312; *BJ.* vii, 218; Philo, *Heres* 186; *Spec.* I, 77-78; Matt. xvii, 24. Cf. Smallwood, 1976, 82; 124f. Smallwood notes here that the earliest apparent reference to the Temple tax is in 88 BCE,



and to the Temple cult. In fact, it was a major function of the synagogues to collect the Temple tax as much as it was to provide for Sabbath service, educational purposes, and serve as the local meeting point.<sup>99</sup> This situation continued right through until the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, when it was replaced by the Jewish tax.<sup>100</sup> This practice by Jews of the Diaspora of sending the Temple tax to Jerusalem was met with resistance of their neighbours, not least the leaders of the provinces in which they lived. Caesar had promulgated a legislation which favoured the Jews, giving them this privilege, a legislation which made the Temple tax 'sacrosanct by law.'<sup>101</sup> Nevertheless, there are examples of instances when the Temple tax was stolen, or confiscated. Josephus reports the Jews in several cities of Ionia complaining on how their religious rights and liberty were infringed when their Temple tax was stolen.<sup>102</sup> Similarly, when the Temple tax was seized in the provinces of Asia and Cyrenaica, Josephus reports that the Jews sent a delegation to Augustus himself, and that the emperor affirmed the rights of the Jews.<sup>103</sup> Josephus gives other edicts affirming this right of the Jews in different instances of conflict with their neighbours on the question of the Temple tax.<sup>104</sup>

#### 2.4.3. Paid officials?

A Talmudic reference mentions a synagogue providing a dwelling-house for the *hazzan*.<sup>105</sup> It is late but important because it implies that such an office holder was an employee of the synagogue, and if so, one who was paid. The relationship between this office and that of the *archisynagogos* and especially whether the latter was also a paid official of the synagogue, is not certain. Rather more clear is the fact that the terms of office of the *hazzan* included a wide range of activities: the 'beadle', court crier, the janitor at academic debates, the supervisor of children's education, one who prompted the reading of portions of the scripture during the synagogue worship, one who blew the *shofar* at the top of his roof to signify the beginning or end of the Sabbath day, the synagogue attendant, deputy of the congregation, and other such duties.<sup>106</sup> There is evidence that the *hazzan* was second in rank to the synagogue

---

and it refers to it being seized when Mithridates raided Cos.

<sup>99</sup> Smallwood, 1976, p. 133.

<sup>100</sup> A full discussion of the Jewish tax is given in Smallwood, 1976, pp. 371-378; cf. 380; 384-5; 396; 401; 405; 480; 515-516, etc.

<sup>101</sup> Smallwood, 1976, pp. 162; cf. 135-36.

<sup>102</sup> Josephus, *AJ* xvi, 27-57. Smallwood, 1976, p. 140 dates this at 14 BCE.

<sup>103</sup> Josephus, *AJ* xvi, 160-61.

<sup>104</sup> Josephus, *AJ* xvi, 162-73.

<sup>105</sup> See *T. B. Erub.* 55b and *T. B. Yoma* 11b among many others.

<sup>106</sup> *T. B. Shabb.* 11a, 12b, 35b; *T. B. Erub.* 55b; *T. B. Pesah.* 17b n. 1; *T. B. Ta'an.* 16b; *T. B. Sotah* 41a; *T. B. Mak.* 22b.

head.<sup>107</sup> The *hazzan* was a paid employee of the community while the *archisynagogos* offered his services free of charge.<sup>108</sup> In supporting this, Kindler argues that the paying of the 'beadle' was a responsibility of the Jewish community in the city or village.<sup>109</sup> This was one of the designations of the various donations and levies collected in such communities. Again, this is from a later period, but the possibility that it was practised in the first century CE or earlier, can not be ruled out. The lack of evidence does not allow us to make any fast conclusions, one way or the other. Although the Babylonian Talmud was completed at the very end of the 5th century CE, we have to use this late evidence as it is all that is available.<sup>110</sup> Another Talmudic passage refers to some *hazzanim* who "sat in their own town, in order to increase the fees of their beadles and scribes."<sup>111</sup> This willingness to pay the *hazzan* (who among other things was responsible for teaching the children) contrasts Rabbinic attitudes to teaching the Torah for pay. Presumably a distinction was made between this and the teaching of the Torah.

The Mishna provides a clear picture of the Rabbinic attitude to teachers' pay. The Rabbinic saying, "And whoso serves himself with the crown passes away," is understood as meaning "the teacher of Torah must not be paid for teaching."<sup>112</sup>

Elsewhere, a longer version of this saying is recorded:

R. Zadok said: (Separate not thyself from the congregation, and be not as they who prepare the judges). Make not them a crown wherewith to magnify thyself, nor a dish to eat from. And thus Hillel used to say: He who serves himself with the crown passes away. Behold, (thou hast learned,) 'Every one that makes a profit from words of Torah removes himself from the world.'<sup>113</sup>

Charles explains that to make a living, they either had to work or depend on private means.<sup>114</sup> A combination of study of the Torah with a 'secular' work is recommended:

Rabban Gamaliel the son of Rabbi Judah the Prince said: Comely is study of Torah with worldly occupation, for toil in both makes sin forgotten. And all Torah without work ends in failure and brings *with it* sin.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>107</sup> *T. B. Yoma* 68b.

<sup>108</sup> Safrai and Stern, 1974, p. 935.

<sup>109</sup> Kindler, 1989, p. 57.

<sup>110</sup> See above under sources.

<sup>111</sup> *T. B. Shabb.* 56a.

<sup>112</sup> *Pirqe Abot* 1. 13 in Charles, R.H. et al. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English: with introduction and critical and explanatory notes to the several books*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979, p. 693. Cf. Danby, H. *The Mishna: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. Oxford University Press, 1964, p. 447.

<sup>113</sup> *Pirqe Abot* 4. 7. (Charles, 1979, p. 704).

<sup>114</sup> Charles, 1979, p. 693.

<sup>115</sup> *Pirqe Abot* 2. 2. (Charles, 1979, p. 695).

Paul in Acts 18: 3 is reported as working on a trade of tentmaking. Most commentators see a connection between this and the fact that he had a Rabbinic background.<sup>116</sup> Also, in Paul's discussion of Apostolic rights in I Cor. 9, the question of support for teachers features prominently. Surprisingly, however, commentators generally do not see a connection between the question of support and Paul's Rabbinic background.<sup>117</sup> Could it not be suggested that his background as a Rabbi made it difficult for Paul to come to terms with accepting support for preaching the gospel? Preaching the gospel is not exactly the same as teaching Torah, but it seems to me that the distinction would not have been so marked in his mind. This, to me seems implicit in the text. The Pauline correspondence attests to the support of travelling missionaries. Paul comes into this category, and his discussion on the question of accepting support from the churches is very informative (see 5.2.2 and 5.3.2.2 below). The question to be asked here is where this fits into this model. The Corinthian correspondence shows that Paul did not want to be dependent on the church for his upkeep. It would seem that he did not want to appear to be the employee of the church. He was happy to enjoy the hospitality of his churches, but that is a different category of support. Also the Philippian correspondence shows Paul accepting support from this church, but again, this kind of support falls under a different category - 'partnership in the gospel', as he himself calls it. Patronage and benefaction were clearly practised in the Pauline churches. I have referred above to the significance of benefaction in the running of the finances of the Pauline churches, just as it was the backbone that held the institution of the synagogue together.<sup>118</sup> There is however no indication, it seems, of paid officers in the churches.

## 2.5. Conclusion.

This chapter confirms then that the synagogue was conceived as a natural model of the early church. The role of benefaction was as significant in the early church as in the synagogue. There is indication that the synagogue had paid officers. The Pauline

---

<sup>116</sup> See for instance Bruce, F.F. *The Book of the Acts* Revised Edition. (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1989), p. 346; Marshall, H. *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (Inter-Varsity Press: Leicester, 1980), p. 293. For a contrary viewpoint, see Haenchen, E. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1982), p. 534 who deny that Paul was a Rabbi.

<sup>117</sup> See Héring, J. *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (Epworth Publishing Company: London, 1962), pp. 78-80; Conzelmann, H.A. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1975), pp. 156-157; Barrett, C.K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Harper and Row: New York and A & C Black: London, 1968), pp. 206-208; and Fee, G.D. *The New International Commentary on the New Testament: The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1987), pp. 411-414, only discuss it in connection with the priestly practice and the command of the Lord. Even Theissen, 1982, pp. 40-46, does not see any connection between this and the Rabbinic practice.

epistles show that officers were expected to be supported, but not paid. Also, there is indication that OT models of support of priests and of charity were being observed. These issues will be confirmed in the Pauline texts.

---

<sup>118</sup> See 2.2.1. above.

## Chapter 3. CLUBS OR VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS.

### 3.1. Introduction.

This subject is relatively neglected, particularly in English scholarship.<sup>1</sup> Continental scholars do seem to have acquired the motivation to delve a little deeper into this area of research than their English counterparts.<sup>2</sup> And even there, it is long overdue for reconsideration. Because the subject is vast and extensive, the concern here is by no means a review of the whole of it. Rather, it is simply to explore the financial organisation of these ancient establishments for comparisons or contrasts with the Pauline churches. I shall begin by commenting briefly on the legal right and status of these establishments, and only as much as it sheds light on my concern. I shall then look at the organisational structure of the associations, including the question of entry qualifications, offices, as well as their activities. These should set the scene for a discussion of their financial organisation, especially their incomes and expenditures.

### 3.2 Legal Existence.

The existence of clubs or associations in the sense of communities of people grouping together because of common interest and purpose is attested for very ancient times, as far back as the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. Writing over a century ago and drawing his authority from Mommsen and Foucart, Heinrici asserts that the legal mention of such communities, which have from very early times been, on occasions, a cause of concern for the government, can be traced among the Greeks, to the time

---

<sup>1</sup> A few scholars have written short sections or chapters on the subject, for instance Wilken, R.L. in his *The Christians as the Romans saw them*. (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 1984) discusses the early church as an association and as a burial club in the first two chapters. See also Judge, E.A. *The Social Patterns of Christian Groups in the First Century*. (Tyndale Press: London, 1960a), 40-48; and Malherbe, A.J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. Second Edition (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1983), 87-91. George La Piana had written earlier on private associations and clubs in ancient Rome as well as on professional associations of foreigners and funerary associations in his "Foreign Groups in Rome During the First Centuries of the Empire" in *HTR* Vol. XX, No. 4 (1927) 225-281.

<sup>2</sup> The first major work in this subject which was by a French scholar, Waltzing, J. *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains*. 4 vols. (Peeters: Louvain, 1895-1900), goes back to about a hundred years; this was followed shortly by another in German by Poland, F. *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Preisschriften ... der fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft, 38. (Teubner: Leipzig, 1909), which deals only with Greek associations. More recently is the work by an Italian, de Robertis, F. M. *Storia delle corporazioni e del regime associativo nel mondo romano*. 2 vols. (Adriatica editrice: Bari, 1973).

of Solon; and among the Romans, to the law of the Twelve Tablets.<sup>3</sup> Herrman<sup>4</sup> provides evidence that such communities were limited in early times up until the fourth century BCE, but sprang up to their full splendour thereafter. Reasons for this include: the diminishing importance of the polis structure, opening of human activity to that which is non-political, spread and scattering of Greek culture in the Hellenistic kingdom, internationalisation of urban life because of trade and a mixture of people, and a change in religious life and in the state of social consciousness. Meeks asserts that "the early Roman Empire witnessed a luxuriant growth of clubs, guilds, and associations of all sorts."<sup>5</sup> This is however misleading in the light of new evidence recently made available that similar groups flourished within the classical polis.<sup>6</sup>

Groups tended to congregate together for purposes that were varied. On the whole, they provided the common citizens the privilege of having their social and religious needs met, which otherwise were out of reach to the lower classes. Broadly speaking, they fall into three main groups: professional associations some of which were fostered by the state, funerary societies which functioned mainly to provide decent burials for their members, and religious societies made up of worshippers of a particular deity.<sup>7</sup> The religious character was evident in most, if not all groups or associations, and they were usually attached to a certain deity.<sup>8</sup> Some of these tended to be mystical in nature, for instance the cult of Dionysus.<sup>9</sup> The social character of these communities manifested itself in mutual support, for example in the payment for a decent funeral of a member, insurance against fire damage, charitable giving,

<sup>3</sup> Heinrici, C.F.G. "Die Christengemeinde Korinths und die religiösen Genossenschaften der Griechen." *ZWT*. 19 (1876) 481-2. See Robertis, 1973, p. 37 who traces the origin of associations in Rome to the time when Rome was ruled by the tyrannical dynasty of Tarquin in the sixth century.

<sup>4</sup> Herrmann, P. and others, "Genossenschaft" in *RAC* 4 (1959) col. 94.

<sup>5</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 77.

<sup>6</sup> Murray, O. and Price, S. eds. *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1990), esp. chs. 1, 8, 11, and pp. 311-320.

<sup>7</sup> See Meeks 1983, p. 36 where this is discussed. See also Lewis, N. and Reinhold, M. eds. *Roman Civilisation Sourcebook II: The Empire*. (Harper and Row: New York, 1966), p. 270. See also La Piana, 1927, pp. 225-281.

<sup>8</sup> Hatch, E, *The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches: Eight Lectures Delivered before the University of Oxford, in the Year 1880*. (Rivingtons: London, 1881), pp. 27-28 writes: "The most important among them were the religious associations. Almost all associations seem to have had a religious element: they were under the protection of a tutelary divinity, in the same way as at the present day similar associations on the continent of Europe invoke the name of a patron saint." He cites Ovid, *Fast.* ii, 819-832; *CIL* vol. v. No. 6970, vol. iii No. 1424, vol. v. No. 7595 etc. Heinrici (1876) 482 describes a group of this kind as an *ἐρασιον* and asserts that it was customary to call a community of purely religious character by this name.

<sup>9</sup> Herrmann, and others, (1959), col. 95.

entertainment, theatres, and so on.<sup>10</sup> Heinrici argues, and rightly so, that the provision of these services, as well as the interest in the mysteries of foreign cults and the general restlessness of the then known world provides the bases for the growth of associations, particularly during the first two centuries CE.<sup>11</sup>

The place to find information about the legal rights of *collegia* is the juridical literature. Unfortunately, they are rarely mentioned in such literature, or any other literature. This is because in Roman law, *collegia* belonged to the public right and not the private right, which made Roman lawyers uninterested in them.<sup>12</sup> A main reference is *Dig.* 47, 22, which directs provincial governors not to permit political associations, but to allow religious assemblies that conform to the mandate of the senate.<sup>13</sup> A few other things are known about such groups: First, not less than three persons can constitute a group, and admission was authorised by the assembly or some functionaries of the group. Second, one could belong to only one group and members paid a certain fee called 'stips' into the *arca communis* (community money box). Third, the law sees an *arca communis* not as the possession of the corporation but of the members not yet shared out.<sup>14</sup>

At first, the communities which were then religious, did seem to have existed unnoticed by the Roman government. When they came to be noticed, the government seemed to have encouraged their existence.<sup>15</sup> As time went on, they were by and large tolerated, at least. But the influx of foreign cults, particularly those of a mystic nature, which were fostered by general interest in such cults, began to attract the attention of the state, especially during the period of the empire.<sup>16</sup> Reference should be made to successive legislation to that effect: the abolition of associations except a few, by the senate in 64 BCE; followed shortly afterwards in 58 BCE by the *lex Clodia de collegiis*, which re-established them; and the *lex Licinia de sodaliciis* in 55 BCE

---

<sup>10</sup> See Heinrici, 1876, 482. Wilken, R.L. "Collegia, Philosophical Schools, and Theology" in *The Catacombs and the Colosseum*, ed. Stephen Benko and John J. O'Rourke, (Judson: Valley Forge, 1971), p. 280 discusses this including recreation in the social dimension of the purposes of associations.

<sup>11</sup> See Heinrici (1876) 486-8.

<sup>12</sup> Herrmann, and others, (1959), col. 113.

<sup>13</sup> Justinian *Digest* xlvii. xxii. 1-3. The full text can be found in Lewis and Reinhold, 1966, p. 270.

<sup>14</sup> Herrmann, and others, (1959), col. 113.

<sup>15</sup> The government installed the Sodalitates. The Collegia which were private associations came into existence at about the same time, and the two replaced the religious communities which were the first known groups. See Herrman and others (1959), col. 102.

<sup>16</sup> See La Piana, 1927, pp. 225-248 who discusses the subject from the standpoint of private associations in ancient Rome.

which forbade political clubs.<sup>17</sup> Towards the end of the Republic, Augustus' Julian promulgated a law that is well known as the Julian Law,<sup>18</sup> the date for which is given as 7 CE.<sup>19</sup> This legislation severely forbade life entertainment circles and political associations,<sup>20</sup> demanding that all associations obtain governmental permission before they can exist.<sup>21</sup> This was a significant step against unwanted associations, and all later legislation against illegal associations make this law their point of reference. During the Empire, another legislation of great significance was promulgated by a decree of the senate, known as the *senatus consultus* and came into effect. De Robertis has discussed in detail its date concluding that its emanation must have been during the reign of Claudius, between 41 and 55 CE.<sup>22</sup>

These legislations established sanctions that permitted and gave a recognised legal capacity to certain associations, while prohibiting others ordering their immediate dissolution.<sup>23</sup> It gave legal rights and existence to the *tenuiorum* associations which resembled burial clubs that provided burial services to the common populace. The requirements of the senate consulate was that such associations should have monthly meetings, a monthly subscription, a common chest, and funerary aims and assistance.<sup>24</sup> Such provisions were however very elastic, especially in their application. Thus several illicit associations took advantage of this, hiding under the banner of *tenuiorum* associations. This meant that the state had to step in whenever that was discovered.

Referring to the second century when associations flourished in the Roman Empire, Meeks writes:

Roman officials and literary opponents of Christianity often identified the Christian groups with such clubs, especially the sort of secret and uncontrolled gatherings that were regarded as seedbeds of immorality and sedition often, but not effectively banned.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>17</sup> La Piana, 1927, pp. 236-237. See Waltzing, 1895-1900, I. 90-113.

<sup>18</sup> Most of the major works on associations refer to this Julian law. See Waltzing, 1895-1900, I. 112-117, Poland, 1909, de Robertis, 1973, Heinrici, 1876. See also La Piana, 1927, p. 237 who refers to Suetonius, *Jul.* 42: "Cuncta collegia, praeter antiquitus constituta, distraxit", and Suetonius, *Aug.* 32. Josephus, *AJ.* xiv. 18, 8 shows that this law left undisturbed the Jewish associations.

<sup>19</sup> Lewis, and Reinhold, 1966, p. 270.

<sup>20</sup> See de Robertis, 1973, II. 340.

<sup>21</sup> See Lewis, and Reinhold, 1966, p. 270.

<sup>22</sup> de Robertis, 1973, II. 286-293.

<sup>23</sup> This subject is discussed in full in de Robertis, 1973, II. 390-396.

<sup>24</sup> See *Ibid.* 339.

<sup>25</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 77.



Meeks provides three passages as evidence for this statement,<sup>26</sup> the third being a response by a Christian theologian<sup>27</sup> to counter the accusations made against the Christians. The first of these, Pliny's letter to the Emperor Trajan between 111 and 113 CE, reads in part:

They (the Christians) also declared that the sum total of their guilt or error amounted to no more than this; they had met regularly before dawn on a fixed day to chant verses alternately among themselves in honour of Christ as if to a god, and also to bind themselves by oath.... After this ceremony it has been their custom to disperse and reassemble later to take food of an ordinary, harmless kind; but they had in fact given up this practice since my edict, issued on your instructions, which banned all *hetaerias*.<sup>28</sup>

Christians are here grouped with *hetaerias*. The Latin word is a transliteration of the Greek word ἑταιρεία which means simply an association, a club, a brotherhood, or a companionship. It also had the negative connotation of a political club or union for party purposes. This second usage must be the one referred to here as such political associations were chief among the ones banned by the state, because they were, as political parties, potentially dangerous. The rest of the letter, as well as the fact that Pliny had to write to consult with the Emperor indicates that the charges of immorality and sedition were not explicitly proven against the Christians. This raises a few questions: Why were they grouped with *hetaerias*? If they were a *hetaeria* how did they manage to exist as such for at least eight decades after the *senatusconsultum* without being discovered? Or did they change over the years from a licit association into an illicit one? The only logical explanation seems to be that they survived in the early days of their existence as a *tenuiorum* association. Here, possibly their growing size was met with personal suspicion and resistance. Moreover, the legality of Christians as a licit association is not the issue here. The real issue was their response to the ban on political associations, which was enforced by the edict Pliny mentions. The same edict seems to have called into question the legal status of a fire-fighters' association.<sup>29</sup> It is curious that what seems to have happened as Pliny relates is that the Christians banned themselves, not that anyone else questioned their legal status.

In the other passage, Origen quotes Celsus referring to the Christians as "associations contrary to the laws", and an "obscure and secret association."<sup>30</sup> Christianity is here depicted as an illegal and disruptive movement. Wilken thinks that Celsus was simply

<sup>26</sup> Pliny *Ep.* 10.96, and Celsus *apud* Origen *C. Cels.* 1.1.

<sup>27</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 38. 1-3.

<sup>28</sup> I am using here the translation in Wilken, 1984, p. 33.

<sup>29</sup> Pliny, *Ep.* x. 34.

<sup>30</sup> *C. Cels.* 8.17. See Wilken, 1984, p. 45.

“making a debater’s point.”<sup>31</sup> The third passage, the apology by Tertullian the Christian theologian, is much later but relevant for our purpose. Tertullian uses the language of associations to talk about the Christians. This is important since he was responding to the charge that Christians were an illicit association:<sup>32</sup> In the next chapter, he refers to the Christians as an association, a party (*Christianae factionis*), a society (*corpus*), a sect or school of God (*secta Dei*), a meeting of Christians (*coito Christianorum*), and a council or senate (*curia*). He also used familiar language of associations to talk about “the offerings of Christians: *arca* (chest), *honoraria* (gifts), *stips* (contribution).”<sup>33</sup> His aim was to show what a different kind of association Christianity was both to the category of his opponents, and to associations in general. But even so, it shows that the Christians themselves had no problem with being identified as an association, and that the categories ‘school’ and ‘association’ are not mutually exclusive.

But all these references describe situations in the second century CE, at least about six decades after the founding of the Pauline churches. Suetonius’ mention of the Christians is therefore significant, although no mention of association is made. In one reference, he mentions the expulsion of the Christians from Rome because of a “disturbance at the instigation of Chrestus.”<sup>34</sup> Another text refers to the Christians as “a class of men given to a new and mischievous superstition.”<sup>35</sup> Benko discusses all the difficulties the explanation of these texts brings and concludes that the disturbances referred to “had to do with Messianic controversies” and quoting Dio Cassius points out that it must not be necessarily expulsion that was the issue, but possibly the Jews were forbidden to meet and thus, simply had to go away to places they could practice their religion.<sup>36</sup> What this situation shows is that the Christians were not singled out in this attack, and that the whole situation is shrouded in the

---

<sup>31</sup> Wilken, 1984, p. 45.

<sup>32</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 38. 1-3, “I proceed. Was not a rather gentler treatment in order? Should not this school have been classed among tolerated associations, when it commits no such actions as are commonly feared from unlawful associations? For, unless I am mistaken, the reason for prohibiting associations clearly lay in forethought for public order - to save the state from being torn into parties, a thing very likely to disturb election assemblies, public gatherings, local senates, meetings, even public games, with the clashing and rivalry of partisans, especially since men had begun to reckon on their violence as a source of revenue, offering it for sale at a price. We, however, whom all the flames of glory and dignity leave cold, have no need to combine; nothing is more foreign to us than the state. One state we know, of which all are citizens - the universe.” (LCL translation).

<sup>33</sup> Wilken, 1984, p. 46.

<sup>34</sup> Suetonius *Claudius* 5. 25.4 which refers to the edict issued in about 49 CE. See Stephen Benko “Pagan Criticism of Christianity During the First Two Centuries CE” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der Neueren Forschung II* (Walter de Gruyter: Berlin and New York (1980),1056-1118.

<sup>35</sup> Suetonius, *Nero* 16.2

misunderstanding of who the Christians really were. Similarly, Tacitus describes the fire of Rome under Nero in 64 CE, in which he demonstrates that the treatment of the Christians shows “Nero’s depravity” in trying to repress the Christians whom he hated.<sup>37</sup> Nero’s hatred of the Christians is because he regarded them a “‘pernicious superstition’ and a danger for the security of the state.”<sup>38</sup>

From these two writers, it is confirmed that at first, Christianity was never thought of as an illegal association. From another perspective, the possibility is allowed that it was seen as simply a religious association whose beliefs sometimes appeared superstitious. If this is correct, then it must mean then that they fitted neatly under the umbrella of the tolerated associations: the *tenuiorum* associations. But this is only a guess. To be fair, as Pliny shows, it does not seem possible to arrive at a strict legal definition of their legal status. This question of analogies between the Christian groups and the associations of the day, was suggested by scholars of the nineteenth century<sup>39</sup> and is now renewed by modern scholars.<sup>40</sup> At least in this respect of legal right and status, an analogy between the associations and the early Christian groups, can be deduced, whatever doubt there is on the suggestion. Sanctions like those against the Christians of Bithynia under the governorship of Pliny the Younger, do seem to be the common lot of most illicit associations once discovered. Pliny reports that many of the Christians had responded to the ban, implying that he was dealing with the disobedience of his decree. Moreover, at Bithynia, the ban was against *hetaeriae*, and not on all associations.<sup>41</sup>

### 3.3 Organisational Structure.

The interest here is on qualifications for membership including entry conditions, offices and activities; the ultimate aim being its relationship to the question of finances. The focus is on the religious associations or on a broader scale, the *tenuiorum* associations, which provide the closest parallel to the Pauline churches. The evidence at our disposal is very limited. Fortunately, de Robertis has contended

---

<sup>36</sup> Dio Cassius 60.6.6.

<sup>37</sup> Tacitus *Ann.* 15. 44. See the extensive discussion of this and the last two texts in Benko, 1980, pp. 1062-1068.

<sup>38</sup> Benko, 1980, p. 1068.

<sup>39</sup> Hatch 1892, 26-55; Heinrici 1876 and 1890, 409-417. See Meeks, 1983, p. 221, n. 15.

<sup>40</sup> These include Wilken, 1970 and 1971; Judge, 1960a, 40-48. The emphasis by Malherbe, 1983, 87-91, of the importance of trades and crafts in early Christianity and the possible connections with craft organisations (see Meeks, 1983, p. 221, n. 16), may not be stretched too far. See also de Robertis, 1973, I: 338f.; II: 64-89.

<sup>41</sup> It is proper to point out here that I am not using these categories for a legal definition of the Christians. Rather, the point is to show that it was a social model that seemed plausible to at least

that the statutes of the *tenuiorum* associations had a common source, and that this common source was the legislation of the *senatus consultum*.<sup>42</sup> If this is correct, then the few inscriptions available are sufficient evidence to represent the practice of all associations of this kind.

On the *tenuiorum* associations, we have an inscription from Lanuvium, a town in southern Italy dated 136 CE, which is complete. The association here was “organised primarily to provide decent burial for its members,”<sup>43</sup> though religious worship was incorporated into its activities. It was dedicated to the goddess Diana, and is reported as “licensed” by the Roman senate.<sup>44</sup> The bylaws of this society<sup>45</sup> begin with a statement on entry conditions:

It was voted unanimously that whoever desires to enter this society shall pay an initiation fee of 100 sesterces and an amphora of good wine, and shall pay monthly dues of 5 *asses*.

The payment of dues was one of mandatory duties members had to perform. Failure brought disastrous consequences:

It was voted further that if anyone has not paid his dues for six consecutive months and the common lot of mankind befalls him, his claim to burial shall not be considered, even if he has provided for it in his will.

In addition to a decent burial, members who paid their dues regularly received other benefits:

It was voted further that upon the decease of a paid-up member of our body there will be due him from the treasury 300 sesterces, from which sum will be deducted a funeral fee of 50 sesterces to be distributed at the pyre (among those attending); the obsequies, furthermore, will be performed on foot.

Other benefits include detailed provisions for arrangements of funerals of members who died away from home. Those on the membership list took turns, four at a time to provide entertainment for the gatherings of the association:

Masters of the dinners in the order of the membership list, appointed four at a time in turn, shall be required to provide an amphora of good wine each, and for as many members as the society has a bread costing 2 *asses*, sardines to the number of four, a setting, and warm water with service.

---

some contemporary observers, including the Christians themselves.

<sup>42</sup> See de Robertis, 1973, II. pp. 26-32.

<sup>43</sup> Wilken, 1984, p. 41.

<sup>44</sup> Wilken, 1984, p. 37. The clause from the decree of the senate is supplied: “These are permitted to assemble, convene, and maintain a society: those who desire to make monthly contributions for funerals may assemble in such a society, but they may not assemble in the name of such society except once a month for the sake of making contributions to provide burial for the dead.” See Lewis, N. and Reinhold, M. eds. 1966, p. 273, giving this clause as part of the inscription *CIL* Vol. XIV, No. 2112.

<sup>45</sup> See Lewis, N. and Reinhold, M. eds. 1966, pp. 74-275.

These detailed bylaws also include regulations for the membership of slaves, their responsibilities as well as benefits. Also, members who commit suicide lose their claim to burial by the association.

The activities of this association, in addition to ensuring a decent burial for its members, include dinners and birthdays. The bylaws in question include the following statement about these:

Calendar of dinners: March 8, birthday of Caesennius ... his father; November 27, birthday of Antinoüs; August 13, birthday of Diana and of the society; August 20, birthday of Caesennius Silvanus, his brother; ... birthday of Cornelia Procula, his mother; December 14, birthday of Caesennius Rufus, patron of the municipality.

Three offices are mentioned in these bylaws: the *quinquennalis* (the chief officer of the society, who held office for a five-year period), the secretary, and a messenger. They had the privilege of exemption from providing for dinners. In addition, the *quinquennalis* received a double share of all distributions, while the other two offices received a share and a half:

It was voted further that any member who becomes a *quinquennalis* in this society shall be exempt from such obligations (?) for the term when he is *quinquennalis*, and that he shall receive a double share in all distributions. It was voted further that the secretary and the messenger shall be exempt from such obligations (?) and shall receive a share and a half in every distribution.

As a mark of honour, and as an incentive to new and prospective *quinquennales*, persons who discharged their duties well continued to enjoy preferential treatment in distributions, receiving a share and a half. λ d

We also have an inscription that provides information on an association organised primarily for a religious purpose. It is a Greek inscription, dating from shortly before 178 CE: the society of Bacchi (*Iobacchi*), which was a cult to Dionysus, and an Attic association.<sup>46</sup> Tod describes this inscription as “a curious medley” because it contains “religion, drama, good fellowship”, and “banqueting.”<sup>47</sup> Entry into this association required a very formal procedure:

No one may be an Iobacchus unless he first lodge with the priest the usual notice of candidature and be approved by a vote of the Iobacchi as being clearly a worthy and suitable member of the Bacchic Society. The entrance-fee shall be fifty denarii and a libation for one who is not the son of a member, while the sons of members shall lodge a similar notice and pay, in addition to twenty-five denarii, half the usual subscription until the attainment of puberty.

<sup>46</sup> The text is in *Inscriptiones graecae* II-III<sup>2</sup>, 1, 2 (Berlin, 1916), no. 1368. It is cited in Wilken, 1984, pp. 41ff. Translation as in Tod M.N. *Sidelights on Greek History* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1932), 71ff.

<sup>47</sup> Tod, 1932, p. 92.

The inscription adds also that brothers can not share a libation or the entrance-fee, but a father can share those from his son if he is "an acolyte living outside." Even after the application has been accepted and the vote secured, acceptance is not automatic. The formal procedure continues:

... the priest shall hand him a letter stating that he is an Iobacchus, but not until he has first paid to the priest his entrance-fee, and in the letter the priest shall cause to be entered the sums paid under one head or another.

The main duties of the Iobacchi were the payment of monthly dues and the maintenance of order at meetings. Failure of the payment of dues attracted at the worst, exclusion from the meetings. Fines were charged on those guilty of disrupting order. It was the duty of each Iobacchus to share with the rest of the society his joys and successes:

And if any of the Iobacchi receive any legacy or honour or appointment, he shall set before the Iobacchi a drink-offering corresponding to the appointment, - marriage, birth, Choes, coming of age (ἐφηβεία), citizen-status, the office of wand-bearer, councillor, president of the games, Panhellen, elder, thesmothetes, or any magistracy whatsoever, the appointment as συνθύτης or as justice of the peace, the title of ἱερονεύκης, or any other promotion attained by any Iobacchus.

The Bacchic society, at least as it appears on this inscription, seems to have had no fixed calendar apart from the monthly meetings held on the ninth day of the month, the founder's anniversary, and "any extraordinary feast of the god," which each member was required to "take part in word or act or honourable deed." Unlike the Lanuvium inscription, this had a bigger list of offices. At least seven offices existed at one time, and sometimes eight. There was the arch-bacchus who does seem to have occupied an honorary position. There was also a patron. These two, along with the priest had the major role of approving the activities of the society. The arch-bacchus had in addition, a specific role that is described as follows:

And the arch-bacchus shall offer the sacrifice to the god and shall set forth the drink-offering on each tenth day of the month Elaphebolion. And when portions are distributed, let them be taken by the priest, vice-priest, arch-bacchus, treasurer, bucolicus, Dionysus, Core, Palaemon, Aphrodite and Proteurythmus; and let these names be apportioned by lot among all the members.

The priest appears to be the active leader of the society with the vice-priest assisting him. He saw to the smooth running of the group, especially ensuring that things are done orderly and formally, as in the case of accepting new members referred to above. He was usually nominated by his predecessor. His other duties are described as follows:

The priest shall perform the customary services at the meeting and the anniversary in proper style, and shall set before the meeting the drink-offering for the return of Bacchus (τὰ καταγώγια) and pronounce the sermon, which Nicomachus the ex-priest inaugurated as an act of public spirit.

The treasurer was elected "by ballot" for a two year term, and had to ensure that the fees, subscriptions and fines were duly collected. He had other duties which had their privileges:

... he shall provide out of his own pocket the oil for the lights on each ninth day of the month and on the anniversary and at the assembly and on all the customary days of the god and on those days when legacies or honours or appointments are celebrated. And he shall, if he wish, appoint a secretary at his own risk, and he shall be allowed the treasurer's drink-offering and shall be free from the payment of subscriptions for the two years.

The orderly was either chosen by lot or appointed by the priest for specific and significant duties:

... he shall bear the thyrsus of the god to him who is disorderly or creates a disturbance. And anyone besides whom the thyrsus is laid shall, with the approval of the priest or of the arch-bacchus, leave the banqueting-hall: but if he disobey, the 'horses' who shall be appointed by the priest shall take him outside the front door and he shall be liable to the punishment inflicted upon those who fight.

Order was required at the gatherings and in the worship, and no one was allowed to do anything without the permission of the priest. Those who fought or acted disorderly were fined twenty-five drachmas and excluded from the meetings until they paid the fines. The orderly, who acted as the policeman of the association, ensured that order was maintained.

The natural question that follows on from this is: Was the situation in the Pauline churches similar to that described above about these associations? Can we talk about the Christians of the Pauline mission as having a similar organisational structure with similar entry conditions, offices, activities, and duties of members as well as their responsibilities? Addressing the question of the formation and nature of the Christian communities, Heinrici makes the following statement:

If we assume the Corinthian community as having formed in the manner of a religious society, then they would have had to perform a body of secluded belief as in a mystery. They would gather on certain days to exhort and partake in communal meals, the cost of which would be covered by payments of membership or perhaps by a wealthy member. Each member would contribute to the communal meal according to their own means. Communities can support one another. Problems would be solved within the community, and they would decide about duties and appoint a president and teacher whom they would 'pay' (*unterhalt*). ... <sup>48</sup>

Later in the next page, he calls this an inference from our knowledge of the Hellenistic communities and that the Corinthian correspondence supports it. All these points, apart from the issue of members contributing according to their own means, and that of communities supporting one another, can be seen clearly happening in the

---

<sup>48</sup> Heinrici, 1876, p. 503 (My paraphrased translation of the German text).

two communities referred to above. Heinrici however does not supply examples from such religious associations where contributions were rationed according to means as well as those that helped one another. It is doubtful that the Christian communities had the same entry conditions as the associations. It is true that most associations were opened to all categories of persons, as were the Christian communities. Nevertheless, there is no indication anywhere that the prospective Christians had to pay some entry fee before being admitted. There is also no evidence that Christians had to pay any subscription. Also, "the Christian groups were exclusive and totalistic in a way that no club nor even any pagan cultic association was."<sup>49</sup>

There is also a degree of contrast between the offices in these two associations and the early church. Not only were the offices different, but also the method of appointment and the terminology.<sup>50</sup> Discussing the history of the constitution of the early church, Lietzmann devotes a great deal of space for offices.<sup>51</sup> They fall into two categories, he says: charismatic offices (apostle, prophets and teachers), and non-charismatic offices (ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι) which were appointed by the communities. In the *Didache*, they are seen as equal, but in practice, particularly in the Pauline churches, the non-charismatic offices are subordinate to the charismatic offices and receive little honour. He describes apostles as wandering missionaries who had no possessions; prophets as the 'high priests' who had the ability to get a revelation from God and pray at the Lord's meal, and as those who got the 'first-fruits' of the community; and teachers as those who taught the communities but got very little payment in return. He describes the non-charismatic offices as those who were responsible for the practical business of the church, taking care of its money, and charity needs of the poor, and therefore had to be trustworthy and not avaricious (ἀφιλαργυρία, *Did.* 15:1; I Tim. 3:3,8; Tit. 1:7).<sup>52</sup> Charismatic and non-charismatic offices, are found in both the *Didache* and the Pauline churches.<sup>53</sup>

There is however evidence for common titles of offices between the Pauline groups and the associations in general. Three titles come under this heading: ἐπίσκοπος,

<sup>49</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 78.

<sup>50</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 79. He adds that Phoebe is referred here by Paul as female *patronus*.

<sup>51</sup> Lietzmann, H. "Zur Altchristlichen Verfassungsgeschichte" in *ZWT* 55 (1914), 97-153, esp. 98-118, 133-153. For a discussion of offices in general, see Thomas Kramm, "Amt" in *RAC* (1981), pp. 351-401.

<sup>52</sup> Lietzmann, 1914, pp. 98-99.

<sup>53</sup> References for the non-charismatic offices in the letters of Paul include Phil. 1: 1; Rom. 16: 1; I Cor. 16: 15-16; II Cor. 8: 4; 9: 1; 12: 13; 11: 8. For the charismatic offices, see Rom. 12: 6-9; I Cor. 12-14.



διάκονος, and προστάτις.<sup>54</sup> Meeks<sup>55</sup> thinks that the first two, as used in the Pauline letters, “may have a technical sense designating a local office”; and that the third can have one of three designations: as a functional designation, as a title, and as *patronus* in places with strong Roman influence (of which Corinth and Cenchreae were). He contends that διάκονος, as it appears in inscriptions of associations, seems always to refer to persons who have a function that centres on serving tables. The point that Meeks makes here is that because Paul uses προστάτις in the sense of *patronus*, a sense that is absent in the usage by associations; and because διάκονος in association inscriptions does not refer to the technical sense in Paul’s letters; only ἐπίσκοπος is likely to have been borrowed by the apostle from the language of associations.<sup>56</sup> And even with ἐπίσκοπος, he thinks it was just beginning “to make its appearance in Christian terminology.”

Poland’s discussion<sup>57</sup> of ἐπίσκοπος reveals that this officer had the primary function of management and finances which includes announcing the honour, receiving it, and writing the gift. It also had a low cultic function. He therefore concludes that because the word had several connotations, it can not be said that the Christian usage developed directly out of the ancient community life - it was more complex. On διάκονος, he provides evidence<sup>58</sup> that the number of the persons serving in this office in a particular community varies. He points out that there is evidence for a single official, for five, and for nine. Although the function may be varied, he says, the term indicates helper of the priest of the state or private cult. He concludes that the Christian usage could have developed from this pagan usage.

So, where does this leave us? Both scholars are certainly right in their own way. What this indicates is that the apostle Paul did borrow from the language of associations or municipal administration, but that he was capable of giving what terms he borrowed a new sense. And that is most likely what he did here. Hatch’s lecture on two of these offices opens up a whole realm of information on the subject.<sup>59</sup> His thesis was that ἐπίσκοποι and ἐπιμελητής were closely related terms used for the officers of administration and finance, and that διάκονοι worked with them as subordinate officers who ensured the administration of the finances got

<sup>54</sup> Phil. 1:1; Phil. 1: 1 and Rom. 16: 1; and Rom. 16:2 respectively.

<sup>55</sup> Meeks, 1983, pp. 79-80.

<sup>56</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 80.

<sup>57</sup> See Poland, 1909, pp. 377, 381.

<sup>58</sup> See pp. 391-393.

<sup>59</sup> “Bishops and Deacons” in Hatch, 1881, 26-54, which is lecture II.

to its designated end.<sup>60</sup> He shows also that ἐπιμελητής was used contemporarily in the general sense of 'commissioner' or 'superintendent' for private associations and for municipalities, and the same is true for ἐπίσκοποι.<sup>61</sup> These were permanent offices most of the time, but sometimes were *ad hoc* offices "entrusted with the administration of funds for any special purpose."<sup>62</sup> He continues:

these offices "were known collectively by the name which is common in both relations - that of *ordo* : they were known individually as well as collectively by a name which was common to the members of the Jewish συνέδρια and to the members of the Greek γερουσία of Asia Minor - that of πρεσβύτεροι: they were also known - ... by the name ἐπίσκοποι.<sup>63</sup>

This means that these names of officers of Christian communities were identical to those of the senate of municipalities, and those of the committees of associations. So the office of the bishop was not from the beginning one occupied by an individual as it later came to be, but by a governing body who had financial and administrative functions.

The financial management of ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι did not only fund the institution of Christian charitable giving. It also funded the institution of Christian hospitality. It was a duty both for the individual ἐπίσκοπος or διάκονος, and for the governing body to ensure that this virtue is practised. The Pastorals and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers are emphatic about this.<sup>64</sup> There is evidence that this practice was open to abuse, as early as the beginnings of the church. To combat this, strangers had to carry certificates of membership from their community which qualified them to receive hospitality in the church they were visiting, a system which dates from Apostolic times and adopted by philosophical schools.<sup>65</sup> But it does seem that this system was not obligatory until much later. Hatch also refers to another function of the ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι: caring for the means of subsistence for dependent church officers.<sup>66</sup> This however, is a later development that has no evidence from the beginnings of the church.

---

<sup>60</sup> Hatch, 1881, 50. Evidence for this is Clement, *Epist. ad Jacob.* 5, *Hom.* 3. 67; cf. *Const. Apost.* 3. 19.

<sup>61</sup> Several references are provided in Hatch, 1881, p. 37, nn. 25-27.

<sup>62</sup> Hatch, 1881, p. 38.

<sup>63</sup> Hatch, 1881, p. 38.

<sup>64</sup> I Tim. 3: 2; Tit. 1:8; Herm. *Sim.* 9: 27; St. August. *Serm.* 335, etc. See Hatch, 1881, p. 44.

<sup>65</sup> Acts. 18: 27; II Cor. 3: 1; Cf. Epict. *Diss.* t 2. 3. 1; Diog. Laert. 8. 27.

<sup>66</sup> Hatch, 1881, pp. 45-46.

### 3.4. Financial Organisation.

#### 3.4.1 Arca Communis.

This is the lifeblood of the associations. Each association, whatever its nature, had a common chest, manned by its treasurer, but no impression should be created of fixed budgets.<sup>67</sup> Waltzing notes that terms referring to the financial possessions of the communities are found in juridical texts.<sup>68</sup> These include in addition to *arca communis* terms like *ratio communis* which refers to the accounts of the community, and *pecunia communis* which refers to the money or wealth of the community; as well as *res communes* which refers to landed property, especially flats or buildings, as distinct from *arca communis* which has the import of cash. Evidence for the existence of an *arca communis* in a *tenuiorum* or religious associations can be seen in the inscription from Lanuvium already cited.<sup>69</sup> It contains the phrases, "It was voted further that upon the decease of a paid-up member of our body there will be due him from the treasury 300 sesterces..." and "he shall pay 30 sesterces into the treasury."<sup>70</sup>

The Attic inscription on the Iobacchi, discussed by Tod and already referred to,<sup>71</sup> talks about the "property of the Bacchic Society."<sup>72</sup> The implication seems to go beyond just money. Poland's discussion of the subject of possessions of associations<sup>73</sup> confirms that the Iobacchi and other religious associations had landed property which included places of worship, kitchens for the preparation of meals for their feasts, as well as a *ταμείον* (a treasury esp. for the greater shrines). In discussing the question of common property, Waltzing<sup>74</sup> refers to 'the law,' and says that the property of an association does not legally belong to the association, but to the individuals that make up the association. This means that at the dissolution of an association, they are shared among the individual members of the association. If a

---

<sup>67</sup> Poland, 1909, p. 489 makes this point about Greek associations, but there is no reason to suppose that this was not the case in the other associations of the empire.

<sup>68</sup> Waltzing, 1895-1900, 1970 edition, IV. 626, referring to Gaius *Dig.* III. 4, 1,1; 47. 22, 1, 2, 3; *Apul., Met.*, VII, 4; *Liv.*, 39, 18. etc. Cf. I. 449-450, and II. 446-447 where these are discussed.

<sup>69</sup> See above under 3.2.

<sup>70</sup> Again the translation is from Lewis and Reinhold, 1966, pp. 274-275.

<sup>71</sup> See above, pp. 10-12.

<sup>72</sup> Translation as in Tod, 1932, p. 91.

<sup>73</sup> Poland, 1909, ch. 5, pp. 453-498.

<sup>74</sup> Waltzing, 1895-1900, 1970 edition, II. 438-439.

legacy is made to the association, he says, it becomes null, but each member receives his/her part if it is made to the members.<sup>75</sup>

There is no specific reference to a common chest or safe in the Pauline churches. Even when Paul gives instruction about the collection for Jerusalem, he does not ask the Corinthians to collect the weekly offering set aside for this purpose into a common safe, but asks the individuals to set it aside by themselves.<sup>76</sup> This however should not lead to any fast conclusion. It seems unthinkable that apart from the collection, the Pauline churches did not engage in charitable giving as its day to day way of life, or that it had to call on its members to give for each specific charity need. Moreover, the reference to ἐπίσκοπος and διάκονος in Phil. 1: 1 hints to the possibility that these officers looked after the purse of the church as well as taking on administrative roles.<sup>77</sup> This certainly makes sense given the fact that Paul writes to thank the Philippians for their financial assistance, as Phil. 4: 10-20 shows! As to why these titles are not used elsewhere in the Pauline correspondence may be given the fact that the situations in those other letters did not call for the mention of those offices. Conversely, the fact that Paul does not mention a προστάτης; or the charismatic offices of prophet, apostle and teacher in the Philippian correspondence does not mean that there were no such persons in that church.

### 3.4.2 Sources of Income.

Sources of income for associations in general are many and varied. Waltzing, dealing with professional, religious and tenuiorum associations, supplies documents for fifteen such sources, ten regular and five irregular.<sup>78</sup> Not all of these sources are applicable in the tenuiorum or religious associations, as we shall see below.

#### 3.4.2.1 Regular Sources of Income

i) Entrance Fees. I have already made reference to the payment of entrance fees both in the religious association at Athens, and the burial association at Lanuvium.<sup>79</sup> In both cases, no one could become a member without the payment of this fee into the community treasury. There may have been exemptions, particularly among the professional associations. In some associations, relations of old members were given

<sup>75</sup> He refers to *Dig.* 1, 8, 6, 1; 47, 22, 3; 34, 5, 20.

<sup>76</sup> I Cor. 16: 1-2.

<sup>77</sup> See the discussion on offices above.

<sup>78</sup> Waltzing, 1895-1900, 1970 edition, IV. 626-672.

<sup>79</sup> See above under 3.3.

concessions to pay half the entrance fee.<sup>80</sup> I have not been able to lay hands on any evidence, not even a hint, from the Pauline correspondence or anywhere in the NT that this was practised in the early church. This would have nullified Paul's emphasis on salvation by grace through faith (which perhaps emphasises the contrast).

ii) Monthly Contributions and/or Sigilla. In the Digest, this is presented as a permission on the condition that those who contribute meet once a month in a society of the lower classes,<sup>81</sup> presumably on the day the contribution is made. The society at Lanuvium and the one at Athens (see above) emphasised the payment of this fee. In the Bacchic association, defaulters were excluded from its meetings; but the officials were exempt from these dues. The inscription from Lanuvium, uses the word *sigillis* which clearly means fee or dues.<sup>82</sup> The *quinquennalis*, the secretary and the messenger were, in this association, exempt from paying the *sigillis*. Again, we have to conclude that the early church was distinct from the associations of the day in this area of its finances.

iii) Honorary Sums. This refers to the sums paid by officials and dignitaries in response to the honour accorded them by the associations. It was a normal practice both in the professional associations and the municipal administration.<sup>83</sup> In his defence of Christianity, Tertullian makes reference to *honoraria summa*.<sup>84</sup> The translation in the LCL renders it 'money paid in entrance fee', which is probably wrong. In any case, the point that Tertullian makes is that Christianity is different from the associations, with the emphasis that Christianity is not 'a matter of contract'.

iv) Regular Duties (*munera*). There is evidence for this both in the professional and private associations like the *tenuiorum* and the religious associations.<sup>85</sup> The new and the old members contributed equally in this respect.<sup>86</sup> The bylaws in the Lanuvium inscription stipulate that members had the duty of providing in turns for the feasts of

---

<sup>80</sup> Poland, 1909, p. 493, referring to Greek associations, but this was likely among Roman associations as well.

<sup>81</sup> Justinian *Dig.* 47. 22. 1; translated in Lewis and Reinhold, 1966, II. 270.

<sup>82</sup> This has been the position of scholars right from Mommsen's time (see Waltzing, 1895-1900, 1970 edition, IV. 628), to the present day.

<sup>83</sup> See the long list of documents provided for this in Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV. 628-630.

<sup>84</sup> Tertull. *Apol.*, 39. 5.

<sup>85</sup> The inscriptions on this are supplied by Waltzing. See Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV. 630-31.

<sup>86</sup> Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV. 630 here quoting Mommsen as his authority on this.

the association, but its officers were exempt.<sup>87</sup> Fines were imposed on those who failed to perform this duty well:

It was voted further that if any master, in the year when it is his turn in the membership list to provide dinner, fails to comply and provide a dinner, he shall pay 30 sesterces into the treasury; the man following him on the list shall be required to give the dinner, and he (the delinquent) shall be required to reciprocate when it is the latter's turn.

There is no evidence of obligations like these in the Pauline churches, only the obligation of love for the brethren.<sup>88</sup> But even here, the individual had the freedom to decide exactly what to do or what to give. Really, there is remarkably little about practical details in Paul's letters. We do not know for instance who provided the food, supplied the wood, or arranged the meeting venues.

v) Grants or Salaries. These were paid by the state to associations which performed services of public usefulness.<sup>89</sup> One of the inscriptions supplied by Waltzing states the salaries that were paid to diverse employees and associations for the transportation of wine.<sup>90</sup> It is not clear how many associations enjoyed this source of income, or how substantial the grants were. The relationship between the state and the early church at this time certainly does not seem likely, and so it is not possible to know if the Pauline churches enjoyed this privilege. In any case, the letters of Paul do not give any hint in this direction.

vi) Work by Slaves and Freedmen. This refers to rich associations in which class division is marked, and the slaves and freedmen are engaged in services that produced an income to the group.<sup>91</sup> It is obvious that this does not provide any likely parallel for the Pauline churches. The church was not in favour of slavery because it goes against the basic understanding of the gospel and its emphasis on equality of all before God, even though slavery is never condemned. The reference to work in the Pauline letters are to Paul's 'working with his hands',<sup>92</sup> which he hopes the churches would emulate.<sup>93</sup> The circumstances are however different. The slaves and freedmen in the associations worked for their income, while the apostle worked for a living.

---

<sup>87</sup> *CIL* Vol. XIV, 2112. "Masters of dinners in the order of the membership list, appointed four at a time in turn, shall be required to provide an amphora of good wine each, and for as many members as the society has a bread costing 2 asses, sardines to the number of four, a setting, and warm water with service." The translation is as in Lewis and Reinhold, 1966, p. 275.

<sup>88</sup> The references for this are too numerous to be cited.

<sup>89</sup> Inscriptions on this are supplied by Waltzing, [1970 edition, IV. 630-31, 539, and 584.

<sup>90</sup> *CIL*. VI. 1785.

<sup>91</sup> The evidence for this source of income is supplied by Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV. 340 and 429.

<sup>92</sup> I Cor. 4: 12; I Thes. 2: 10.

<sup>93</sup> I Thes. 4: 11.

vii) Funds Constituted by the Members of the Association. One inscription<sup>94</sup> provides evidence for this source of income. It is an inscription from Ostia which is not very clear to me. Presumably, it refers to money collected by this association for the celebration of birthdays of its members. This unique situation certainly has no parallel in the early churches, at least as far as our sources permit.

viii) Donations and Legacies. These were usually made to associations by a member or even a stranger for the annual celebration of feasts. The feasts that were celebrated by associations were varied and come under several headings, and there were donations and legacies designated for them and for other services:

a) Funeral feasts in honour of a benefactor or one of their members. Waltzing supplies a list of 65 different inscriptions of donations and legacies made by a whole range of persons, including husbands to their wives or sons, wives to their husbands or sons, sons to their parents, etc., and especially those made in honour of a benefactor.<sup>95</sup> The celebration of feasts was very popular among associations, with nearly all kinds of associations included in this category. Certainly the *tenuiorum* associations as well as the religious associations were included in this.

b) Diverse feasts instituted by the same benefactor. There is evidence of this in the association of Aesculapi and Hygiae, as well as that of the worshippers of Diana and Antinoëtis at Lanuvium.<sup>96</sup> Waltzing, speaking about the former, notes that in each of its feasts, a distribution, with the interests of 60000 sesterces, was made to the members present at the feasts. In the Lanuvium inscription, the interest promised by the patron was 15000 sesterces.

c) For the religious feasts of the annual sacrifices. As evidence here is an inscription of a donation or legacy by a man to his wife, and one other inscription.<sup>97</sup>

d) For the celebration of the birthday of the donor. Several inscriptions are cited as having this designation.<sup>98</sup>

e) For the celebration of the birthday of the emperor. Here too, a number of inscriptions are cited as having this designation.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> *CIL* XIV, 326, in Waltzing, 1970 edition, p. 429. It reads: "Nomina eorum qui pecuniam [contulerunt], et quibus diebus natalis eorum [celebretur]."

<sup>95</sup> Waltzing, 1970 edition, pp. 533-541.

<sup>96</sup> *CIL* VI and XIV respectively. See Waltzing, 1970 edition, pp. 631-632.

<sup>97</sup> *CIL* XI and V respectively in Waltzing, 1970 edition, p. 633.

<sup>98</sup> See Waltzing, 1970 edition, pp. 633-636.

<sup>99</sup> See Waltzing, 1970 edition, pp. 636-637, 436 and 608.

f). For the maintenance of a statue erected by the donor. Seven inscriptions, four from Brixia with the other three from other places refer to donations or legacies with this specific designation.<sup>100</sup>

g) For the maintenance of a statue erected by the college of the donor.<sup>101</sup>

h) For the maintenance of the premises. The one inscription on this indicates that the donation or legacy was made by the patron of the association.<sup>102</sup>

i) For a use not indicated.<sup>103</sup>

The Pauline epistles give us no hints on the possibility of legacies in the churches addressed. The nearest we get to this is the passing statement on parents saving up for children.<sup>104</sup> The administration of the Lord's supper provides at least a remote parallel here. It is usually understood that the celebration of the Lord's supper was financed by the rich members of the churches or by the individuals, each providing his meal. I think the second option is most likely, hence the problem about the rich and poor during the meal discussed in I Cor. 11: 17-22.

ix) Annual Revenue from the Blocks of Flats owned by the Associations. A number of these blocks of flats were either bequeathed or given without any conditions to the associations. There is evidence that some of these were formally property of associations that have been dissolved, and some included the land around the buildings.<sup>105</sup> Quite a few others had an unknown origin.<sup>106</sup> Poland notes that the revenue from these blocks of flats, or shrines and estates amounted to little income, especially during the empire, and that they were usually dedicated for specific feasts.<sup>107</sup> We have no hint of the Pauline churches owning any buildings either given freely or bequeathed. The impression given in Paul's letters is that some members of the community, that is, those who owned houses, offered the use of their homes for the religious meetings of the groups.<sup>108</sup>

#### 3.4.2.2 Irregular Sources Income.

<sup>100</sup> CIL V 4203, V 4294, V 4418, V 4449, V 7906, XII 4354, and XIV 367. 431. See Waltzing, 1970 edition, pp. 637.

<sup>101</sup> See the three inscriptions on this in Waltzing, 1970 edition, pp. 638.

<sup>102</sup> CIL V 2864, Waltzing, 1970 edition, p. 638.

<sup>103</sup> Quite a few inscriptions. See Waltzing, 1970 edition, pp. 638-639.

<sup>104</sup> II Cor. 12: 14.

<sup>105</sup> See Waltzing, 1970 edition, p. 639.

<sup>106</sup> See Waltzing, 1970 edition, p. 640.

<sup>107</sup> Poland, 1909, p. 491.

<sup>108</sup> Rom. 16: 1-2, Phoebe; Rom. 16: 3-5, Aquila and Priscilla, cf. I Cor. 16: 19; Rom. 16: 23, Gaius; Philem. 2, Philemon. These are discussed fully in the exegesis of these texts.



i) Irregular Allowances. These could be voluntary or ordered by the statutes of the association.<sup>109</sup> The bylaws in the inscription from Lanuvium stipulate that if a slave member gains his freedom, he is to provide the association with an amphora of good wine.<sup>110</sup> There is no hint of this in the Pauline churches. We do not know what happened when a member of the church died.

ii) Extraordinary Contributions. Again, these could be voluntary or decreed, and were occasioned by a variety of needs: funeral, building of common monuments, building of temples, consecrating a statue to a god, raising a statue to a man, and those unknown.<sup>111</sup> A remote parallel for this may be suggested for the early church: the collection for the 'poor among the saints in Jerusalem.' However, the collection was a charitable act.

iii) Product of Fines. Fines were levied for all sorts of reasons by all kinds of associations. Some of these fines were stipulated in the bylaws of the associations.<sup>112</sup> The revenue from this source was very meagre and humble,<sup>113</sup> and certainly depended on the presence of defaulters in the association. There is no hint of this in the Pauline churches.

iv) Sale of Space in the Funeral Monument. Waltzing shows that this was a common practice,<sup>114</sup> although we have no way of knowing how much they cost. Poland remarks that sale of sacred things and sacrifices brought only very meagre incomes,<sup>115</sup> which may be true for this too. It is not known whether the Pauline churches owned funeral places, and there is no hint to any such transactions among its members. Whether members had their burial places individually, or whether rich members of the communities donated such places to poorer members out of their love for the brotherhood which Paul encourages, is not known. Later practice in relation to Christian use of catacombs (e.g. in Rome) is beyond the scope of this thesis.<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> See at least five inscriptions supplied as evidence in Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV. pp. 644-645.

<sup>110</sup> *CIL* XIV 2112.

<sup>111</sup> The evidence for this can be seen in Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV. pp. 645-647.

<sup>112</sup> The inscriptions on this are provided in Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV. pp. 647-451.

<sup>113</sup> Poland, 1909, p. 494.

<sup>114</sup> pp. 499 and 501.

<sup>115</sup> Poland, 1909, p. 494.

<sup>116</sup> This practice had its beginning only at about 150 CE, and it became fully developed much later. See Stevenson, J. *The Catacombs: Rediscovered monuments of early Christianity*. (Thames and Hudson Ltd.: London, 1978); especially pp. 12ff.

v) One-off Liberalities. The subjects and designations of this source of income are varied, for which the inscriptions are extensive.<sup>117</sup> They include money given for immediate use and whose purposes are unlimited. Also included are liberalities given specifically for the *schola* or the temple of the association. Objects of furniture meant for the school, altars, statues of divinities given to the association, and statues of the emperor given to the association, all come under this. There were also liberalities given for the premises of the burial place: funerary monuments, outbuildings, furniture and ornaments of the monument. There were also several liberalities whose nature was doubtful. Finally, there were one-off gifts and banquets offered by a whole range of persons: patrons of the association, masters in honour of the *quinquennalis* or the association, rectors, prefects, curators, magistrates, members of the college as well as strangers. Poland calls this : Greek generosity which, he says, took care of cases where a collection would have been necessary. He says also that it got to a point where associations became so used to it that it was characteristic for imperial times to have set donations for officers vying for positions of leadership.<sup>118</sup> This was true for the whole of the Greco-Roman world of the imperial period. The formal name for this kind of practice is benefaction, on which the ancient world depended for its existence. It relied on the generosity of the influential (wealthy and powerful) members of the communities, who in turn got the respect of the communities in terms of the honours they received. A.S

One parallel in the Pauline churches to the one-off liberalities of the association is the collection project. There are however differences. The motivation behind the one is charity, and for the other, it is not. Also, the collection for Jerusalem was an act by whole communities, rather than individuals undertaking acts of goodwill for their members. Another parallel is the whole system of informal patronage which the early church practised. I have already shown that several of the venues for their meetings were provided in this way.<sup>119</sup> It is possible that other needs in the various Christian communities were met in this way.

### 3.4.3 Expenditure.

i) Expenses Relating to the *Schola* or the Temple. This was a necessary expenditure, and the number of inscriptions on this confirms it.<sup>120</sup> Coming under this is the

<sup>117</sup> Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV. pp. 651-672.

<sup>118</sup> They would try to surpass one another on this, and so the associations were on the advantage. See Poland, 1909, pp. 497-498.

<sup>119</sup> See above, pp. 23-24.

<sup>120</sup> See Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV, pp. 672-674.

acquisition of the site (premises), construction, and furniture of the *schola* by the association, and the payment of rent by associations that were unable to afford a place of their own. Again, Paul's letters are silent about this. What is clear is the fact that the hospitality of some members of the community supplied the churches' need of meeting venues, as already seen above.

ii) Expenses for the Site (premises) of the Tomb. Waltzing notes that the common sepulchre was often donated or bequeathed by the members of the association, and cites eight inscriptions of instances where the associations paid for the burial place.<sup>121</sup> The Pauline epistles do not say anything about the existence of burial arrangements for members of the church who died. This may be explained by the fact that most, if not all of the letters were written at a time when there were relatively few or no deaths yet among the brotherhood.<sup>122</sup> Moreover, the letters addressed specific situations in the churches, and naturally the question of burial would not arise if it was not the specific problem. This seems to have been the concern in I Cor. 15: 12-58 and I Thes. 4: 13-5: 11 addressed from the standpoint of the resurrection. There is even suggestion that the "enigmatic reference to 'baptism of the dead' in I Cor 15: 29" should be taken as a serious hint towards the funeral practices of the early church.<sup>123</sup> But there is nothing about the financial arrangements.

iii) Expenses for the Cult. This covers, in addition to the construction of the temple already referred to, the dedications to the god and the sacrifices. The inscriptional evidence is very extensive.<sup>124</sup> The Pauline epistles do not make reference to dedications, or to sacrifices in the OT sense. Christ is referred to as the sacrifice that God has provided for the atonement of the Christians (Rom. 3: 25), and the Passover lamb of the church that has been sacrificed (I Cor. 5: 7). The only sacrifices the Christians were asked to make was the sacrifice of their bodies (Rom. 12: 1), and this would not have incurred any material expenses at all. This metaphorical channelling of 'sacrifice' language in the Pauline churches meant that officers in the church as 'priests' of the new covenant had no material benefit to look forward to. It is

---

<sup>121</sup> Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV, pp. 674-675.

<sup>122</sup> Granted that the second missionary journey (through which the churches mentioned in the epistles were born) took place at about 49-50 CE (See Alexander, L.C.A. "Chronology of Paul" in eds. Hawthorne, G.F, et al. *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters* [Intervarsity Press: Illinois and Leicester, 1993], 115-123), and Romans which is most likely the last of the authentic letters to be written at about 56-58 CE (see *ibid*, p. 838), then we are given a period of about ten years. It is highly unlikely that many would have died then depending on the condition of their health when they became Christians. I Thes. which indicates that there were in fact deaths in the church addresses only the question of the resurrection; nothing is said about burial arrangements.

<sup>123</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 78.

<sup>124</sup> See Waltzing, 1970 edition, pp. 457-483; 433-437; 672; and 675.

interesting that the *Didache* redirects 'tithes' (part of the priestly support system in the OT) towards support for church teachers.<sup>125</sup>

iv) Expenses Incurred Because of the Funerals and the Cult of the Dead. This would form a great percentage of the expenses of the associations, particularly for funeral associations. Waltzing provides an extensive list of inscriptions to prove the point.<sup>126</sup>

The inscription from Lanuvium<sup>127</sup> serves as a good illustration. It states that those delegated to carry out the funeral of a member who dies away from town:

will be given money for the funeral expenses, and in addition a round-trip travel allowance of 20 sesterces each. But if a member dies farther than twenty miles from town and notification is impossible, then his funeral expenses, less emoluments and funeral fee, may be claimed from the society, in accordance with the by-laws of the society, by the man who buries him, if he so attests by an affidavit signed with the seals of seven Roman citizens, and the matter is approved, and he gives security against anyone's claiming any further sum.

The bylaws had to include measures that ensured there was no fraud.<sup>128</sup> These by-laws go on to talk about a token funeral for a slave who dies and his master or mistress refuses unreasonably, 'to relinquish his body for burial'.

In comparing this with the Pauline churches, it has to be noted that there is no way of knowing how the funeral expenses of the dead members of the Pauline churches were met. Also, there is no way of knowing whether or not there was a cult of the dead in these churches. The silence permits the reader to guess one way or the other. But the whole ethos of the Pauline letters seems to militate against the development of such a cult, at least in the early decades of the Pauline churches when the stress was still on the imminent eschatological expectation. Again the development of such practices in the later history of the Christian church (e.g. evidence for regular 'birthday feasts' in the catacombs for the veneration of saints and martyrs) is beyond the scope of this thesis. Yet the evidence from the associations is valuable in indicating how much such practice was customary and expected in the ancient world.

v) Material Advantages Granted to the Leaders and to Certain Members. This was done as a mark of honour to the leaders for their services to the associations. Again,

---

<sup>125</sup> See above under 3.3.

<sup>126</sup> Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV, pp. 522-527; 528; 529; 531-532; 675.

<sup>127</sup> *CIL* VI, 2112. The translation is from Lewis and Reinhold, 1966, p. 274.

<sup>128</sup> "Let malice aforethought attend! And let no patron or patroness, master or mistress, or creditor have any right of claim against this society unless he has been named heir in a will. If a member dies intestate, the details of his burial will be decided by the *quinquennalis* and the membership."

the evidence for this is very extensive.<sup>129</sup> Beneficiaries included patrons, *quinquennales*, and other leaders. The inscription from Lanuvium cited above<sup>130</sup> provides an illustration. There, it will be recalled, the *quinquennales* received in addition to exemption from providing for dinners a double portion of all distributions, and the secretary and treasurer both received a share and a half.

The evidence from the Pauline churches on this aspect of financial management is very limited. One clue we have on the situation in the churches is the desperate plea by the apostle that leaders in the churches be given a bit of respect.<sup>131</sup> Another, which parallels the unequal distribution of portions referred to above, is given in a passage that discusses the issue of the celebration of the Lord's Supper in Corinth.<sup>132</sup> Theissen discusses the problem of factions in this meal; the attitude of the wealthy members who would have provided for the meals; and the exhortation by Paul (or as he calls it, 'Paul's compromise') in terms of what was customary, and "differing expectations, interests, and self-understanding that are class-specific."<sup>133</sup> These, he said, manifested themselves in social conditions of different groups at the Lord's Supper, variable beginnings of the meal, different amounts of food and drink, and meals of different quality; as well as intentions with a social character from the apostle's position of compromising for the rich by asking them to eat at home instead of at the Lord's supper. This "realistic and practical" compromise, he says, was further developed into the love-patriarchalism seen "clearly in the household codes (*Haustafeln*) of the deutero-Pauline letters (Col. 3: 18ff.; Eph. 5: 22ff)."

vi) Expenses Caused by the Honours Awarded. Beneficiaries of honours awarded by associations of the Greco-Roman world include emperors, imperial functionaries, governors of provinces, municipal magistrates, patrons of the cities, and benefactors of the cities, as well as leaders of the associations and their patrons, and benefactors.<sup>134</sup> There is also evidence that domestic associations awarded honours to their masters and patrons,<sup>135</sup> and that women were included in such honours.<sup>136</sup> The nature of the honours was varied, including statues, portraits, inscriptions, steles,

<sup>129</sup> Waltzing, 1970 edition, IV, pp. 676-678.

<sup>130</sup> See above under 3.2.

<sup>131</sup> I Cor. 16: 15-16.

<sup>132</sup> I Cor. 11: 17ff.

<sup>133</sup> Theissen, 1982. pp. 145-174

<sup>134</sup> See Waltzing, 1895-1900, pp. 678-681.

<sup>135</sup> *CIL* V 4340, and II 3229. See Waltzing, 1895-1900, p. 681.

<sup>136</sup> See Waltzing, 1895-1900, pp. 682-683.

images, etc.<sup>137</sup> There is evidence that the financial burden of these honours were not always borne by the associations. Sometimes they were borne by the honoured personalities or in some cases by their parents.<sup>138</sup> When borne by the associations, they represent a nearly regular recurring expense, coming from the treasury of the group which was mainly filled with membership fees.<sup>139</sup>

Reading this, one can not but wonder why the early church was reluctant to honour, or even just respect its leaders. That they laid so much emphasis on Paul's message of the equality of all believers before God, is a very likely reason. The hierarchical structures of the society of the day were probably burdensome to many who would grab everything that looked like an opportunity to avoid them. Theissen's discussion already referred to is however to be noted.

vii) Banquets and Sportules . These were very central in fulfilling the convivial purpose of the associations, and therefore a very significant aspect of their lives. Most associations had several banquets in a year, all in a specially arranged order: six for the *negotiatores eborarii et citriarii* , about three for the *corpus piscatorum et urinatorum* , seven for the association of *Aesculapi et Hygiae* , five for the association of *Silvani* , and six for the association of Diana and Antonius at Lanuvium.<sup>140</sup> Accompanying these banquets are the distributions that are made of the *sportules* . These are rations distributed in kind or in cash to all attending at the banquets.<sup>141</sup> The responsibility for the organisation of these feasts lay in the hands of the officials or leaders of the associations.<sup>142</sup> Usually, the cost is borne by the benefactor who has given a capital sum for the purpose. In the absence of this, and this is rarely the case, the chest of the association has to be visited.<sup>143</sup>

Paul's epistles do not say whether or not the early church celebrated anniversaries of some of its founders apart from the celebration of the Lord's Supper. In the latter,

---

<sup>137</sup> See the extensive evidence in Waltzing, 1895-1900, pp. 683-684.

<sup>138</sup> See the extensive evidence in Waltzing, 1895-1900, pp. 684-685.

<sup>139</sup> Poland, 1909, p. 495.

<sup>140</sup> The specific inscriptions, and the special orders of these feasts are given in Waltzing 1895-1900, IV, pp. 685-687.

<sup>141</sup> Waltzing supplies an excellent description of the nature of this *sportules* , and its content in Waltzing 1895-1900, IV, pp. 687-688. He shows that the nature of some *sportules* is not indicated; otherwise, in kind it is the meat, bread and wine, as well as (sometimes) the first course of the meal; and or in cash. See also pp. 689-694.

<sup>142</sup> See Waltzing 1895-1900, IV, pp. 696-698.

<sup>143</sup> The evidence for this is *CIL* XIV 2112 for Caesennius Rufus funding the feasts of that association at Lanuvium, *CIL* VI 10234 for Marcellina and Zeno funding that of the association of Esculapi and Hygiae, as well as No. 1414. See Waltzing, 1895-1900, IV, p. 699.

which is the obvious and closest analogy, it was certainly not the responsibility borne by the church as a body, but by a wealthy member or by the individual members.<sup>144</sup> Also, we have no indication that any distributions of the sort described above took place during these meals. If there were, the lack of evidence prevents us from making any definite comment. But the discussion of the Lord's Supper by Theissen referred to above, applies here also.

viii) Work of Public Usefulness. These were usually construction or reparation work, of public places, undertaken by the associations at their own expense.<sup>145</sup> The evidence shows that this was not undertaken by all associations, and it certainly was not a major expense for the associations that undertook it. The Pauline epistles do not give any hint to the possibility of anything like this. In fact it seems reasonable to suggest that the church was not in the position to do this in the Pauline period. But this is as far as the argument goes.

ix) Sharing of the Association's Money. There is evidence, though very limited, that sometimes an association did share out the contents of its safe.<sup>146</sup> It is not clear, but certainly doubtful that the whole contents of the safe was shared out. There is no parallel for this in the Pauline churches.

### 3.5 Conclusion.

The overriding issue here is that the subject of associations is not used as a model into which the practices of the early church have to fit. Rather the use of the model is to bring out clearly the points of contrast and comparison between the two. One can not read through this paper without noticing the striking contrast between the associations and the Pauline churches. This however does not rule out the question of analogy between the two. That Christians were often identified with the clubs and associations by Roman officials and literary opponents of Christianity, is confirmed. Similarly, that the Christians themselves had no problems with the identification, is likewise confirmed. So this was a social model which seemed plausible to at least some contemporary observers, the Christians themselves included.

Although we have not been able to arrive at a strict legal definition of the status of the Christians, it seems most plausible that the Christians came under the umbrella of the *tenuiorum* associations. Most voluntary associations fell into this category. At least a

---

<sup>144</sup> See Heinrici, 1876, p. 503.

<sup>145</sup> The evidence for this is supplied in Waltzing 1895-1900, VI, pp. 567-568.

partial analogy can be seen in the aspect of organisational structure. In the Pauline churches, as in the associations, the celebration of the Lord's Supper replaced the celebration of the birthday of the founder, or some other feasts. Officers, especially officers of administration and finances had almost the same names in the Pauline churches as in the associations. This fact, which is recorded in only one of the Pauline letters, appears to have come down to us almost by chance. This does suggest that there is possibly quite a lot that we do not read in the letters, not because it did not happen, but because the circumstances did not arise for it to be written.

A strong point of similarity is seen in the question of finances, on the aspect of liberalities, and/or free donations. In both the associations and the Pauline churches, patrons and benefactors played a significant role. Both depended to some extent on this institution of patronage and benefaction. There is however, no recorded evidence of legacies in the Pauline churches. There is however a significant contrast between the two in the area of the administration of finances. Apart from the exceptions already summarised above, the Pauline correspondence provides no parallels to the sources of income and the expenses observable in the associations. This is striking! At any rate, it simply demonstrates how little we know about the practical details of what went on in the churches, and therefore forbids any fast conclusions.

---

<sup>146</sup> See Waltzing, 1895-1900, VI, pp. 700, 695; I, p. 483.



## Chapter 4. HELLENISTIC SCHOOLS.

### 4.1. Introduction.

A consideration of Hellenistic schools is vitally important for the study of the Pauline churches.<sup>1</sup> There are two things here: the social structure of these schools, and the production of literature. The latter, is not much disputed because such literature can easily be referred to. But because it has no direct bearing on the finances of the early churches, the partial analogue offered by the social structure of these schools is our primary concern. Meeks admits that philosophical schools offered the Christian churches, particularly the Pauline mission, “not only ideas and patterns of language,” “but also a social model.”<sup>2</sup> However, his review of scholarship on this results in the conclusion that caution should be exercised in “any discussion of a Pauline school”, and that any scholarly activity that took place in the Pauline communities is “ancillary.”<sup>3</sup> First, he considers Hans Conzelmann’s proposal of a ‘school of Paul’ “in a more concrete sense” which was located according to him at Ephesus, and which “pursued ‘Wisdom’ or carried on theology as wisdom-instruction,” and rejects it on the grounds that no suggestions are offered by Conzelmann “about the structure of the supposed school, nor does he (Conzelmann) relate it to any contemporary social forms except the very vague category ‘Jewish Wisdom.’” Second, Judge’s suggestion of a “retinue” of Paul’s followers which “followed principally rhetorical models, founding groups that were not organised as cultic communities, as the ancients understood cult, but as ‘scholastic communities’ pursuing an ‘intellectual mission in ways that often resembled a ‘debating society,’” is rejected on the ground that it does not take into account “critical questions” on the “kind of sources” being used here.

Robert Wilken puts forward the thesis that it was a deliberate and shrewd analogy put forward by Christians themselves to “deflect the suspicion that had fallen on the movement as a newfangled cultic association of the sort that was always regarded with distaste by the aristocracy and by imperial officers on the watch for groups that

---

<sup>1</sup> Alexander, L. “Schools, Hellenistic” in *ABD*. Vol. 5 (Doubleday: New York & London, 1992) 1005-1011, here, p. 1005. She notes, “It has long been recognised that their social structures provide a partial analogue to the early Christian groups; and they produced a large body of literature (much of it still extant) which needs to be taken into account in any study of the literary background of the NT.”

<sup>2</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 83.

<sup>3</sup> Meeks, 1983, pp. 82-84.

might turn subversive.”<sup>4</sup> The basis for Wilken’s thesis is Justin Martyr’s insistence in the second century that Christianity is “the true philosophy;” a comparison the “apologists of the second and third centuries” maintained. Later, appealing to Galen and Lucian, Wilken shows that Christianity (and Judaism) was seen as a philosophical school. It differed from the rest of the schools in its appeal to faith, but even in this, it was not alone as some philosophical schools did the same.<sup>5</sup> Generally speaking, Meeks’ discussion does not challenge this thesis; neither does it affirm it. It simply raises the questions. It is therefore necessary for me to test it against the evidence that is available. Included in the category of schools to be investigated are philosophical and rhetorical schools, as well as schools that lead to the acquisition of specific skills. In an even more recent article, Alexander sets out to answer a set of questions regarding the social structure of the schools and the possible points of comparison with the early church, and concludes:

(1)...that Christians could plausibly be seen as the adherents of a school by an outsider like Galen; and (2) that the Hellenistic schools were in many aspects of structure and behaviour remarkably like the early church.<sup>6</sup>

So, despite Meeks’ doubts, Alexander feels that these possible points of comparison (at least as seen from the outside) are still worth pursuing. In what follows, I intend to investigate again, though briefly, this partial analogue provided by these schools, each in its specific aspect. This is meant to serve as a step towards a consideration of the financial organisation of these schools, and how they relate to the finances of the Pauline mission. Central in this will be a consideration of the place of patronage and hospitality in the organisation of such schools. Other means of financial support such as working, begging, and inheritance, will be investigated. Also to be investigated is the whole question of teachers’ pay.

Culpepper<sup>7</sup> has presented a valuable attempt to clarify multitudinous ways the term ‘school’ has been used in biblical studies with specific reference to the Johannine school: ‘school of thought’; a particular group or ‘circle’ denoting a group of individuals or congregations; a group of writers; “a (heretical?) sect or conventicle;” a kind of a *haburah* ; “a community or group of individuals whose primary corporate activities are teaching, studying, writing, and worshipping, though not necessarily in that order.” This indicates a wide range of connotation the term ‘school’ can have,

<sup>4</sup> Wilken, 1971, pp. 268-91. Here p. 281.

<sup>5</sup> Wilken, 1984, 72-77. This point is clearly demonstrated by Alexander in her “Paul and the Hellenistic Schools: the Evidence of Galen” in ed. Troels Enberg-Pederson, 1994, 60-83.

<sup>6</sup> Alexander, 1994, pp. 60-83, esp. p. 82.

<sup>7</sup> Culpepper, R.A. *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools*. (Scholars Press: Missoula, 1975) 35-36.

and forms the bases for our consideration in what follows. The first and the last of these categories best represent the understanding of school adopted here, although the others are not ruled out.

Ancient schools were characterised by certain specific features. One is what has been described as “a lively interest in the ideal of friendship (φιλία) or fellowship (κοινωνία),” and another is “a sense of tradition.”<sup>8</sup> The degrees to which the individual schools manifested these characteristics varied. Alexander has proposed a taxonomy of the use of the word ‘school’ in relation to certain well-established phenomena:<sup>9</sup>

- a) “loyalty to the teacher” who is imitated “as a model”; as well as “the basic teacher-student relationship” which can be extended to include any “chain of tradition.”
- b) A relationship between “fellow-students” which is even intensified when the group of apprentices live together in the home of the teacher - a kind of “a modified ‘family’.”
- c) “groups of teachers and/or researchers engaged in a common enterprise.”
- d) “an agglomeration of geographically-scattered groups professing adherence to the same ideals and teaching tradition.”

Not all of these would be true of any one ‘school’; for instance (d) was quite rare in the ancient world. The advantages of this taxonomy over Culpepper’s clarification is that it has a broader outlook and is not limited to one school.

## **4.2. Philosophical Schools.**

### **4.2.1. The Pythagoreans.**

The founder was Pythagoras of Samos, born in 570 BCE, “who first united science with religion.”<sup>10</sup> Tradition tells us that in about 530 BCE, “he founded at Kroton in southern Italy a society which was at once a religious community and a scientific school.”<sup>11</sup> Scholars have noted their way of life and characteristics and how closely monasticism came to resemble them.<sup>12</sup> These include the community of goods, a

---

<sup>8</sup> Culpepper, 1975, 251-3.

<sup>9</sup> See Alexander, 1992, p. 1005.

<sup>10</sup> Burnet, J. 1968, p. 28.

<sup>11</sup> Burnet, J. 1968, p. 30.

<sup>12</sup> See Alexander, 1992, p. 1007. See also Meeks, 1983, p. 83, though he does not say explicitly that monasticism resembles them.

carefully ordered daily regimen, and strict taboos on diet and clothing.<sup>13</sup> Meeks feels it is impossible to determine whether or not these were “the result of later idealising or, unfortunately, whether any communities of (neo-)Pythagoreans existed at the time of the early Roman principate.”<sup>14</sup> The question here rests on the nature of the sources and their reliability, a question Culpepper has clearly summarised.<sup>15</sup> Very briefly, the problem is that our main sources Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry, and Iamblichus, who belong to the group called “neo-Pythagoreans” are quite late - 3rd to 4th centuries CE. Thus, how sure can we be that the neo-Pythagoreans were following the original school as they claim, and not idealising it? In addition to the question of continuity between the two is that of the origin of the latter - whether or not it was already started by the first century, and not the 3rd and 4th centuries from which our main sources come. These “must remain open to question.”<sup>16</sup>

A more recent discussion by Clark<sup>17</sup> rules out any “major Pythagorean revival, and any need for information” as reasons for the work, attributing to it, as its “necessary background,” the “pagan-Christian debate of the third and fourth centuries.” According to Clark, Iamblichus was “reaffirming his own tradition” in the light of the “Christian challenge, officially sanctioned by Constantine.” Although the early school may not have lasted beyond the fourth century, it had a significant “influence on Greek thought about the nature of the philosophic life, re-emerging as a conscious ideal in the first century BCE.”<sup>18</sup> Thus, the existence of the ideal may be as significant for our purposes as the existence of the reality. The ideal of ‘the community of goods’ has been shown to have been sought in Jewish as well as in Hellenistic societies. Mealand notes that Acts 4: 32 contains slogans “used in the literature of Greek Utopianism,”<sup>19</sup> and concludes that Luke saw Christianity as “fulfilling the hopes, the promises, and the ideals not only of Deuteronomy, but also of that same

---

<sup>13</sup> Diogenes Laertius VIII. 12-13, 19-20, 24, 34; Porphyry *Vit. Pythag.* 7, 15, 34, 44; Iamblicus *De Vita Pythagorica liber* 25, 68-69, 100, 106-107; Philostratus *Vita Apollonii* I. i, VI. xi; and Herodotus IV. 95.

<sup>14</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 83. See also Clarke, 1971, p. 55 who notes in addition that admission was after a period of probation which required from prospective students or members a five-year period of silence, simplicity and moral self-discipline.

<sup>15</sup> Culpepper, 1975, pp. 39-43. Cf. Guthrie, W.K.C. *History of Greek Philosophy* 3. vols. (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1962; and especially Hermann Diels and Walther Kranz, *Die Fragment der Vorsokratiker*, 3. vols.; (Weidmann: Dublin, 1966).

<sup>16</sup> Culpepper, 1975, p. 42.

<sup>17</sup> Clark, G. *Iamblichus: On the Pythagorean Life* (Liverpool University Press: Liverpool, 1989), pp. ix-xxi.

<sup>18</sup> See notably, Alexander, 1992, pp. 1005-1011.

<sup>19</sup> Mealand, D.L. “Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts II-IV” *JTS* New Series, Vol. 28 (1977): 96-99, referring to the phrases οὐδὲ... ἴδιον and πάντα κοινά.

Greek Utopianism.”<sup>20</sup> More recently, and forcefully, Pattison has put forward the thesis that with the summaries in Acts 2: 42-47; 4: 32-35; and 5: 12-16, Luke was idealising the church in a similar fashion as Jewish descriptions of communities, as well as Greco-Roman utopianism and epideictic rhetoric about communities.<sup>21</sup>

In this respect, it is significant to ask whether or not Paul was influenced in any way by this philosophic ideal. Paul admonishes the churches to bear each other’s burden, or support one another by their surpluses, and expect to be supported by another church when they are hard pressed and the other church in surplus (see Gal. 6: 2; II Cor. 8: 13-14). But can we conclude from this that Paul employs the ideal of the community of goods here? In Romans 15: 26-27 Paul uses the word *κοινωνία* to talk about the collection for Jerusalem. Was he by this appealing to this widespread ideal, or was he referring to something else?

#### 4.2.2. The “Socratic” School.

The founder was Socrates, one of the philosophers of Athens who flourished during the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, born around 470 BCE and died around 399 BCE.<sup>22</sup> His doctrine shared a lot of things with the Pythagoreans,<sup>23</sup> but he differed significantly from them in the organisation and structure of his school. He did not set up a closed society, but as Alexander notes, he “is portrayed in the dialogues of Plato as conducting purely informal instruction sessions in the streets of Athens and in the private houses of friends.”<sup>24</sup> His school was clearly made up of associates (*ἑταῖροι*), who gathered around him.<sup>25</sup> and young men who were influenced by him in the course of his public mission.<sup>26</sup> His asceticism was popular, and so also was his insistence that philosophy was different from and should not be sold like the skills of a profession such as medicine or flute-playing. And yet despite his asceticism, he can not be likened to the Cynics, beggars; although the Cynics claimed him as founding

<sup>20</sup> Mealand, 1977, p. 99. Cf. TDNT sv. *κοινός* A-C where Behm traces the use of the word in secular Greek, as well as the Old Testament and Judaism.

<sup>21</sup> Pattison, S.E. *A Study of the Apologetic Function of the Summaries of Acts* (U.M.I. Dissertation Information Service: Michigan, 1992), see esp. pp. 75-102 on Greco-Roman utopianism and pp. 111-207 on ‘community idealisation within the Jewish apologetic tradition.’

<sup>22</sup> Burnet, 1968, pp. 103-4.

<sup>23</sup> See Burnet, 1968, p. 109.

<sup>24</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1007. See also Plato, *Republica* 327a-c, and 328b-c. Alexander however thinks this fact should not be taken as absolute, and rightly so, because “Aristophanes’ description of Socrates’ ‘Phrontisterion’ or ‘Thinking-shop’ (See *Nu.* 94) gives the indication that he had a school structured like that of the Ionians.

<sup>25</sup> See Burnet, 1968, p. 111. See also pp. 123-125 where a list of these associates are given.

<sup>26</sup> Clarke, 1971, p. 58.

father.<sup>27</sup> Socrates was first to condemn the practice of charging fees for instruction, blatantly objecting to the idea of accepting pay for the teaching of philosophy.<sup>28</sup> He, and Plato with him, strictly refused to accept fees; which for them enslaves the teacher, placing him under obligation to teach the person who has paid. Xenophon says of Socrates:

ἐκεῖνος γὰρ πολλοὺς ἐπιθυμητὰς καὶ ἀστοὺς καὶ ξένους λαβῶν οὐδένα πώποτε μισθὸν τῆς συνουσίας ἐπῆρατο, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἀφθόνως ἐπήρκει τῶν ἑαυτοῦ.

For although he had many eager disciples among citizens and strangers, yet he never exacted a fee for his society from any of them, but of his abundance he gave without stint to all.<sup>29</sup>

This is a key text which underlines Socrates' stance on the question of fees, which also implies that he had some independent means from which he could give out liberally.

The Pauline principle of not accepting pay while ministering to a congregation is not inherently different from Socrates' position on this. The question I think should be asked however, is the motivation which ensured that such a difficult stance is maintained. I shall have to come back to this question later. Paul's use of the language of kinship and his insistence that his congregations treat one another as members of the same family finds a perfect analogy here.

#### 4.2.3. Plato and the Academy.

Plato, the founder of the Academy, is another of the Athenian philosophers of the fifth and fourth century. The difference between him and Socrates is "that he gave his school a permanent centre."<sup>30</sup> This was in a private property he acquired at the cost of 3,000 drachmae, a property near a gymnasium, which most likely had a house and a garden.<sup>31</sup> It therefore became a closed institution reserved only for the "geometer" (i.e. someone who has studied mathematics at school), who has been formerly admitted.<sup>32</sup> Here, he set up a school which was probably influenced by his knowledge of the Pythagoreans, a school which was constituted "legally as a *thiasos*

<sup>27</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1007.

<sup>28</sup> Forbes, C.A. *Teachers' Pay in Ancient Greece* (University of Nebraska Press: London, 1942), p. 12.

<sup>29</sup> *Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 60 (Loeb translation). Cf. i. 6. 3 and 11. See further Forbes, 1942, p. 23.

<sup>30</sup> Clarke, 1971, p. 59.

<sup>31</sup> Clarke, 1971, p. 59. Cf. Cicero, *Fin.* V. 2; Apuleius, *De Plat.* I. 4; D.L. III. 5; Plutarch, *Mor.* 630b.

<sup>32</sup> Elias in *Arist. Categ.* 118, 18 quoted in Alexander, 1992, p. 1008.

or cultic community dedicated to Apollo and the Muses”, and one which was to outlast him by about a thousand years.<sup>33</sup> One of the similarities between the Academy and the Pythagoreans was that its students had “to embrace a frugal lifestyle.” This is not however to say that the Academy was exclusive in all respects. It was as Lynch notes “exclusive in one respect, on economic grounds, just as much as the most expensive sophistic schools.” Even though Plato did not charge fees, he says, only those who could afford to provide themselves with a livelihood for a number of years would be able to be members of Plato’s school.<sup>34</sup> No fees were charged, but gifts from friends and well-wishers were gladly received.<sup>35</sup> Plato, probably influenced by Pythagoreans who abhorred the acceptance of pay for instruction, regarded those who did as “innkeepers in their mercenary and vulgar aspects.”<sup>36</sup> In general, Platonists, as evidenced by the boastful statement of the Neoplatonist Olympiodorus in the sixth century CE, faithfully kept to Plato’s principle.<sup>37</sup> A further characteristic of the school was the celebration of the founder’s birthday marked by “a festival with offerings, a festal meal, and a public disputation.”<sup>38</sup>

Culpepper thinks there were “entrance requirements or even an entrance examination” for admission into the Academy, the essence for which is “Plato’s resolve to test Dionysius’ devotion to philosophy or from the later practice of the Academy.”<sup>39</sup> It is however methodologically wrong to lay so much weight on such evidence that is referring to a one-off incident or to read back into Plato’s practice what took place later. Lynch contends that the Academy operated with Plato as the master doing the thinking but not necessarily being the sole leader. Other individual thinkers contributed their wisdom to the development of the school. Thus there was no “orthodox metaphysical doctrine” dished out to those who attended, but a sharing of ideas as members “subscribe to the theory of ideas.”<sup>40</sup> Marrou describes the organisation of the Academy in terms of a “School of Higher Studies and at the same time an educational establishment,” with the structure of a “confraternity or sect” in which “all its members were closely united in the bonds of friendship,” rather than “a

---

<sup>33</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1008. See also Clarke, 1971, p. 59.

<sup>34</sup> Lynch, P.J. *Aristotle’s School: A Study of a Greek Educational Institution*. (University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1972), p. 57.

<sup>35</sup> Lynch, 1972, p. 62.

<sup>36</sup> *Iambli. Vit. Pythag.* xxxiv. 245. See further, Forbes, 1942, p. 24.

<sup>37</sup> Olympiod. *in Plat. I. Alcib.* 119A.

<sup>38</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1008.

<sup>39</sup> Culpepper, 1975, p. 73, here appealing to Plato, *Ep.* vii. 340B-341A.

<sup>40</sup> Lynch, J.P. 1972. pp. 55-56.

commercial enterprise."<sup>41</sup> The link between master and pupil is described as "emotional" or possibly "amorous." It was in juridical terms a "religious association - θάσος - a brotherhood dedicated to the Muses." After his death, Plato was apotheosised and the school was dedicated to him. Friendly conversations occupied a prominent place in the method of teaching, particularly during the drinking parties that characterised the life of the Academy, making it essentially a place where "communal life between master and pupil, and possibly a collegiate organisation," existed.

Plato had "made provisions for its administrative continuation after him" so that when he died in 347 BCE Speusippus succeeded him in an institution that had its "physical permanence and continuation" secured.<sup>42</sup> Speusippus was in turn succeeded by Xenocrates who arranged Plato's philosophy making it into "a doctrine that could be taught and learnt," as well as formalising the rotating position of the *archon* who "supervised the religious rites and symposia of the Academy."<sup>43</sup> The next leader was Polemo (314/313-270) under whose tenure the students made huts for themselves to live not far from the shrine of the Muses and the lecture-hall.<sup>44</sup> He was followed by Arcesilaus (d. 242/241) during whose period scepticism entered the Academy.<sup>45</sup> Carneades (from before 155-137/6) still lectured in the Academy despite its being destroyed in about 200 by Philip; but the violent destruction of the Academy during first century BCE probably dealt it a deadly blow, forcing it to move into the city. The school however continued until the Emperor Justinian closed it in 529 CE.<sup>46</sup> David Sedley has pointed out that its hold to the private property around the public gymnasium of the Academy itself was however lost by the end of the fourth century BCE, not long after Plato handed over to his successor, and notes "that later Stoics' discovery of a dogmatic Plato, and their attempt to appropriate him as a forebear," did actually influence its first-century leader, who advocated "a dogmatist, Stoicising brand of Platonism within the Academy" - which itself did not last beyond his successor.<sup>47</sup>

A number of analogies can be seen between the Academy and the Pauline churches. First, the Pauline churches were all cultic communities, though a different kind of cult

<sup>41</sup> Marrou, H.I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. (Sheed and Ward: London, 1956), pp. 67-68.

<sup>42</sup> Lynch, J.P. 1972. p. 60.

<sup>43</sup> Diogenes Laertius V. 4 discussed in Culpepper, 1975, p. 80.

<sup>44</sup> Diogenes Laertius IV. 16; Cf. Culpepper, 1975, p. 81.

<sup>45</sup> Diogenes Laertius IV. 19.

<sup>46</sup> See Culpepper, 1975, pp. 81-82.

<sup>47</sup> Sedley, D. "The end of the Academy" in *Phronesis* XXVI (1980): 67-75; especially p. 67.



is involved. Second, the Lord's supper is in a sense a kind of a festal meal. This analogy may not however be extended too far. Also, the Pauline communities were, to some extent, closed societies in the sense that only those who have accepted the faith of the church can be free in it, though the doors remained constantly opened for any who would come in. The non acceptance of fees and the willing acceptance of gifts from friends provide some kind of analogy with the Pauline mission. I shall discuss this further later on under the section on the question of teacher's pay. However, granted that the Academy was non-existent in its original form after the mid-first century BCE,<sup>48</sup> these parallels are, if anything, only academic. During the period of the Pauline mission, Platonists were not referred to as a 'school' (σχολή, διατριβή), but simply as a 'persuasion' and a 'school of thought', carrying no institutional overtones. Further differences between the two include the fact that the Pauline mission had no buildings as did the Academy. Also, the Pauline mission was not limited to one location as was the case in Plato's original school.

#### 4.2.4. Aristotle and the Peripatetic School.

Aristotle's association with the Academy is well known. He spent a total of 20 years there (from age 17 to 37, 367 - 348/47 BCE) and another 3 years or so thereafter in the company of Academics (until 345/44 BCE). Also, even during the years that he was away from Athens and the Academy, "he was still considered an Academic and was even eligible for the head-ship of the school at Athens."<sup>49</sup> This long contact with the Academy meant that his school bore a resemblance to the school of Plato. This last statement has to be qualified. The resemblance was to be seen in a number of ways including: a) the organisation of the school "as a complex and diverse community rather than as a simple group consisting of a master and his pupils," (b) the school "was not established as an Aristotelian school in a sectarian sense," (c) its openness "as opposed to the exclusiveness of a Pythagorean community," (d) like Plato, Aristotle accepted gifts of money from friends, and only people of independent means could support themselves during their period of study in these institutions.<sup>50</sup> However, in many respects, the Peripatos was quite different from the Academy:<sup>51</sup> (a) the school was organised as a community described by words such as κοινωνία (κοινωνεῖν) and other "συν- compounds other than συνουσία." (b) "Aristotle had

<sup>48</sup> Sedley, D. (1980) p. 68.

<sup>49</sup> Lynch, J.P. 1972. pp. 70-71 and quoting the work of Merlan, P. "The Successor of Speusippus," *TAPA* 77 (1946) pp. 103-105.

<sup>50</sup> These points of resemblance are fully discussed in Lynch, 1972, pp. 75-83.

<sup>51</sup> See the detailed discussion of these and others in Lynch, 1972, pp. 83-96.

more faith in the written word than Plato.” (c) “Aristotle had more faith in the communicative value of the word, and he developed a number of pedagogical techniques to facilitate the process of instruction.”

Two traditions completely opposed to each other relate his return to Athens when he founded his school. The one relates that his school was founded in “polemical opposition to the Academy under the head-ship of Xenocrates, and the other, that it “was formed as a kind of branch of the Academy, in a spirit of friendliness and co-operation with Xenocrates’ school.”<sup>52</sup> The institution took its name, “like the Academy and the Stoa,” from its site. Aristotle acquired the site and built his school there.<sup>53</sup> Thereafter, the site and all that it contained became the property of the head of the school who passed it on to the next head in his will, and this in turn required the “importance of establishing the ‘succession’ of heads.”<sup>54</sup> Aristotle was not too rigid about the question of accepting fees for instruction because “he thought it ethical for philosophers to receive some recompense for their genuine wisdom”, himself receiving some recompense for the education of Alexander.<sup>55</sup> In fact, for him, teachers, like parents and gods can never be fully repaid for their favours. Yet he shared Plato’s sentiments about the sophistic practice, and did not seem to have accepted pay for “his ordinary instruction at the Lyceum.”<sup>56</sup> His successors however, exemplified in Athenion, exploited his authorisation.<sup>57</sup> Aristotle’s successor Theophrastus (about 370-288 BCE) was like him a metic. He was helped by his friend Demetrius of Phalerum, it appears, who permitted him to buy a garden and control the property of the school.<sup>58</sup> By his death however, the school appears to have been well organised, possessing a considerable amount of property, and a trust fund at the disposal of Hipparchus.<sup>59</sup> Not long after him, the school started declining

---

<sup>52</sup> On the Peripatos as an institution opposed to the Academy, see Diogenes Laertius V, 2. On the Peripatos as a kind of branch of the Academy, see Cicero, *Academica* I, 4. 17; *Vita Marciana* 24, p. 101. See also Lynch, 1972, p. 73, who insists that “there is no basis for deciding between the two traditions.”

<sup>53</sup> The suggestion that the *peripatos* was the private property of Theophrastus because it is mentioned in his will is rejected by Lynch, and rightly so, because it does not take into account the fact that the sources in support of it are a fabrication. (See Lynch, 1972, pp. 73-74).

<sup>54</sup> Alexander, 1992, p.1008.

<sup>55</sup> Aristot. *Eth. N.* ix. 1. 7. See further Forbes, 1942, p. 25.

<sup>56</sup> See Forbes, 1942, p. 25.

<sup>57</sup> Posidonius *FGrHist.* 87F 36.

<sup>58</sup> Diogenes Laertius V. 39. Cf. Culpepper, 1975, p. 94.

<sup>59</sup> Diogenes Laertius V. 51-53. Cf. Culpepper, 1975, pp. 95-96.

due to loss of library,<sup>60</sup> and this gradually led to its being superseded by the Stoics and the Epicureans.<sup>61</sup>

The analogies between the Peripatetic school and the Pauline churches are essentially the same as those noted above under the Academy. This is to be expected as the discussion above would support. In addition, Paul does seem to use the metaphor of parental provision for children (perhaps via a 'will') when he talks about parents saving up for their children in II Cor. 12: 14.

#### 4.2.5. The Epicurean School.

This took its name from its founder, Epicurus, who was highly venerated by the members. They were devoted to his words, celebrated his birthday, and carried his "image on their rings and cups."<sup>62</sup> Alexander notes that Epicurus contrasts with the other founders of philosophical schools by setting "out deliberately to create a community withdrawn from the world" discouraging any preparation for public life and "participation in the earlier stages of encyclic education."<sup>63</sup> The school was located in a house and a garden Epicurus bought in Athens,<sup>64</sup> and which survived as the centre of the movement for many centuries. In it the members lived forming a communal life that pursued "moral excellence." The communal life was possible because of some sort of a hierarchical structure, seen in the fact that they all set out "to correct and discipline each other in striving towards the ethical ideal."<sup>65</sup> In a brief but well presented article, De Witt<sup>66</sup> argued the case for the hierarchical structure of

<sup>60</sup> Sedley, D. "Philosophical Allegiance in the Greco-Roman World" in *Philosophia Togata* eds. Griffin, M. and Barnes, J. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1989): 97-119, esp. 100.

<sup>61</sup> Culpepper, 1975, p. 98.

<sup>62</sup> Cicero, *Fin.* V. 3. See also Alexander, 1992, p. 1008, who notes that this aspect of its life, though practised in other philosophical schools, was "particularly marked among the Epicureans."

<sup>63</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1008.

<sup>64</sup> Epicurus was able to buy land in Athens because he was a citizen even though he was born in Samos. See Culpepper, 1975, p. 102.

<sup>65</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1008.

<sup>66</sup> De Witt, N.W. "Organisation and Procedure in Epicurean Groups," in *CPh* 31 (1936) 205-211. He concludes: "This, then, was the organisation of the Epicurean brotherhood: σοφός, φιλόσοφοι, φιλόλογοι, καθηγηταί, συνθηεῖς and κατασκευαζόμενοι. These differed from one another only in the varying degrees of their advancement toward wisdom, and none attained so near to perfection as to be immune from error. Each looked to those above him as his leaders, and all looked beyond their immediate leaders to Epicurus as their model. All were commanded to cultivate a feeling of gratitude toward him for having discovered the true way of life and to their fellow-adherents for assisting them to follow it. All aimed to habituate themselves to receive admonition kindly and to administer it frankly and gently. All were to be animated by good will, and everyone was urged to become an apostle, never ceasing to proclaim the doctrines of the true philosophy. Lastly, the leaders were genuine psychiatrists, engaged in purifying men of their faults just as the physician purified the

the organisation of this school, noting particularly the importance and procedure of correction, the bases for it which is love (*φιλία*), the bases for the hierarchy which is the superiority of wisdom, the special vocabulary developed for the correction of one another; as well as the missionary outlook of the school, which was a significant aspect of the Epicurean movement. On this front, it should be added that as a school, it included women because it did not prepare its students for public life.

Culpepper's discussion of the nature of the Garden and the history of the school is instructive for our purpose.<sup>67</sup> First, he notes the veneration of Epicurus and the fact that the school turned into something like a 'sect' or a 'cult' of Epicurus. Epicurus was seen as father, and the members as 'children'.<sup>68</sup> Secondly, he demonstrates that Idomeneus, and probably other people, contributed annually to support the Garden; and that some kind of dues may have been paid by some of the communities outside Athens. Also, as Diogenes Laertius notes, the will of Epicurus made provisions for funeral offerings of his family and for dinners and celebrations:

And from the revenues made over by me to Amynomachus and Timocrates let them to the best of their power in consultation with Hermarchus make separate provision (1) for the funeral offerings to my father, mother, and brothers, and (2) for the customary celebration of my birthday on the tenth day of Gamelion in each year, and for the meeting of my School held every month on the twentieth day to commemorate Metrodorus and myself according to the rules now in force. Let them also join in celebrating the day in Poseideon which commemorates my brothers, and likewise the day in Metageitnion which commemorates Polyaeus, as I have done hitherto.<sup>69</sup>

This quote indicates that the practice was well established before Epicurus' death. Also noteworthy, says Culpepper, is the fact that unlike the others, this school, being a private organisation, owned private property; as well as the fact that Epicurus wrote much and that his School had a phenomenal missionary outlook. This last point is the issue that aroused several rivals for the School, hence the refutations his successors had to make which in turn resulted in slight but significant developments on his philosophy. Lucretius the Epicurean poet philosopher manifests some of these points. Cyril Bailey demonstrates that he was "first and foremost a missionary, whose purpose was to deliver men's minds from the tyranny of religious fears ..." as well as

---

bodies of disease." See also, Cicero, *Fin.* II. xv. 49; Clarke, 1971, pp. 69-82; and Alexander, 1992, p. 1008.

<sup>67</sup> See Culpepper, 1975, pp. 106-117.

<sup>68</sup> De Witt, N.W. *Epicurus and his Philosophy* (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1954), pp. 97-99.

<sup>69</sup> Diogenes Laertius, X. 18. LCL translation.

providing a refuge from social and political fears.<sup>70</sup> He shows also that Lucretius was faithful to the teaching of Epicurus despite being different in character, mind, and temperament. Because he “deemed fruitless the sophistic education for which he had paid,” Epicurus refused to accept pay for his teaching and his followers followed in his steps.<sup>71</sup> But to live, they had to depend on the hospitality of others, and particularly on the contributions of 120 drachmas from each student for their livelihood, which they would not call a fee.<sup>72</sup>

Clearly, there is some analogy here for the Pauline churches, at least as it appeared to the outsiders. First, the celebration of the Lord’s supper fits the category of communal meals. Second, like the Epicureans, the churches consisted of both sexes. Third, the churches of the Pauline mission administered some form of discipline aimed at correcting their members (cf. I Cor. 5) that would have looked to the outsider, or even the insider, to resemble the practice of the Epicureans. Fourth, the church was clearly a missionary organisation, whose members took their faith wherever they went. Fifth, Paul’s “psychagogy” (“guidance of the soul”) has very close affinities to that of the Epicureans.<sup>73</sup> There were also gifted apostles like Paul himself and the team of his retinue, and others, who had the right to live by the gospel. In addition, the geographical spread of this school presents a better parallel than say the Academy. There is also the use of letters. Thus, it is right to conclude that there was at least a partial analogy for the churches of Paul here.

#### 4.2.6. Stoicism.

Clarke fills us on a number of details on the founding of this school.<sup>74</sup> First, he notes that the name stoicism is taken from the Stoa Poikile in Athens, the location from which Zeno the founder of the school used to give his lectures. Second, he points out that it differed from the other schools in that it “had no recognised headquarters and little organisation.” It was never a closed institution like some of the schools. Third,

<sup>70</sup> Lucretius *De Rerum Natura* Edited with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus Translation, and Commentary, by Cyril Bailey. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1947). I. pp. 9ff.

<sup>71</sup> Forbes, 1942, p. 27. See the references cited there.

<sup>72</sup> Epicurus *Fr.* 41. See Forbes, 1942, p. 27.

<sup>73</sup> Glad, Clarence E. *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy* NovTSup. (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995). ‘Psychagogy’ is described as “a mature person’s leading of neophytes in an attempt to bring about moral reformation by shaping the neophyte’s view of himself and of the world” (p. 2). It is characterised by moral exhortation (p. 17), and other features of the affinity include “a shared epistolary psychagogy, a positive view of the friendship of many, and participatory psychagogy” (p. 186). There was “mutual exhortation, edification and correction in both these communities” (p. 335).

<sup>74</sup> Clarke, 1971, p. 63.

he remarks that Chrysippus, its 'second founder', "taught at the Lyceum, and at the end of his life, in the Odeum." This relates to taxonomy because it is called a school in the sense of 'loyalty to a teacher' (see 4.1. above). Next, he notes that there is no record of Zeno "bequeathing property or making provision for the future of his school," and yet it survived, with a regular succession of heads. This indicates that "it acquired some degree of organisation." Also, Clarke tells us that the method of election for a school head who "normally held office for life," varied between bequests in wills and conferring by vote. This is true, not only for Stoicism, but also for other schools like the Academy and the Peripatetic school.<sup>75</sup>

If Stoicism had no headquarters and little organisation, and if it had no permanent place as the above shows, what was it that made one a Stoic? Alexander answers this question by remarking that it required only a profession of "adherence to a set of doctrines and a body of wisdom passed down from Zeno and the great masters," plus possibly studying under a teacher who professes to be a Stoic. Joining the 'school' was therefore not a criterion in the same way as it was for the Academy or the Garden. All the same this did not affect the feeling of fellowship between members, and they showed great "preference for 'personal converse and daily intimacy with someone' over the reading of philosophical books".<sup>76</sup>

Two points need to be made about the practice of Stoicism. First, as exemplified in Seneca, is the emphasis on moral exhortation encouraged by the teaching of Attalus, particularly on the blessings of poverty.<sup>77</sup> This emphasises moral exhortation and comes from a period contemporaneous to Paul.<sup>78</sup> Second, is the point exemplified by Chrysippus' work,<sup>79</sup> who states three options the Stoic or the wise man had on how to live his life: living in the court of a king, living with friends, and charging fees from students.<sup>80</sup> Rawson discusses the whole question of philosophic advisers in the courts of rulers, showing that the Greeks were more at ease with this practice and in

---

<sup>75</sup> Clarke, 1971, pp. 63-64.

<sup>76</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1008. Cf. Seneca, *Epist.* VI. 4.

<sup>77</sup> Seneca *Ep.* cviii. 13-14; cviii. 12; and cviii. 6-7, 23. See Culpepper, 1975 p. 135 who comments in addition that the teaching of Attalus influenced Seneca's works and that many other students were attracted by "witty phrases" it contained. Also, referring to *Ep.* cviii. 12, he says that Seneca was here possibly addressing "a class of students aspiring to become evangelists." (n. 91).

<sup>78</sup> Culpepper, 1975, p. 135, dates this as between 4 BCE/1-65 CE.

<sup>79</sup> See Culpepper, 1975; pp. 132-133. Chrysippus lived and wrote in the third century BCE, but his works were popular in the first century CE when they "were used as texts in Epictetus' school, see also Gould, J.B. *The Philosophy of Chrysippus.* (State University of New York Press: Albany, 1970), p. 12-14.

<sup>80</sup> von Arnim, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, III, Fr. 693 referred to in Culpepper, p. 133.

fact influenced the Romans.<sup>81</sup> For the Hellenistic period, the Stoics Sphaerus and Persaeus, are singled out as the best known philosophers who engaged in such a practice.<sup>82</sup> On the question of charging fees, three of the greatest of their teachers, Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus, are reputed to have accepted fees for their teaching.<sup>83</sup> Most Stoics did likewise.<sup>84</sup>

The emphasis on moral exhortation finds a clear parallel in Paul. On the question of attaching oneself to royal courts, Paul stands in strict contrast to the Stoics. The feeling of fellowship among the members of the school presents an analogy for the churches of Paul. The churches, and of course the individual members, felt a sense of belonging to each other, or at least they were expected to feel that way and to express it. So, there was certainly an analogy for the Pauline churches in the doctrine and life of the Stoics. Thus in a recent article, Engberg-Pedersen<sup>85</sup> argues from the evidence of Paul's letter to the Philippians that any perceived tension in Paul's mind that is evident in this letter is not a tension between Christian and Stoic ideas, but "on the contrary ..., it is where Paul is at his most Stoic that he is also at his most Christian."<sup>86</sup>

#### 4.2.7. Cynicism

Cynics are usually included among the philosophical schools though they are not, in the real sense of it, a school, but simply a way of life. They are described as a philosophical school because they "lectured or preached, and sometimes wrote;"<sup>87</sup> because they profess adherence to the same ideals and teaching tradition (see taxonomy above in 4.1); and because of their close relationship with the Stoics,<sup>88</sup> and their professed allegiance to the Socratic ideal. Clarke<sup>89</sup> notes further that like the

<sup>81</sup> Rawson, E. "Roman Rulers and the Philosophic Adviser" in Griffin and Barnes, 1989: 233-257.

There was an ideological problem as seen in the Platonic and Socratic epistles.

<sup>82</sup> Rawson, 1989, p. 234.

<sup>83</sup> See Quint. xii. 7. 9.

<sup>84</sup> Chrysippus *Frag. Mor.* 693; 701. See further Forbes, 1942, pp. 26-27.

<sup>85</sup> Engberg-Pedersen, 1994, pp. 256-290.

<sup>86</sup> Engberg-Pedersen, 1994, p. 257.

<sup>87</sup> Gellius XII. 11.1; Julian, *Or.* VII. 204a; and Epictetus III. 22.17. In the last reference, they are described as the "common educator of mankind". See Clarke, 1971, p. 85. where these are discussed. Further evidence is supplied and discussed in Moles, J.L. "'Honestius quam ambitiosius'? An Exploration of the Cynic's Attitude to Moral Corruption in his Fellow Men" in *JHS* Vol. 103 (1983) 103-123; especially p. 104.

<sup>88</sup> Clarke, 1971, p. 85.

<sup>89</sup> Clarke, 1971, p. 84. For the history of Cynicism see the detailed discussion in Dudley, D.R. *A History of Cynicism*, (Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung: Hildesheim, 1967). Dudley notes: "All

Stoics, they had no central administration or organisation; each member was free to go his own way. Also, he notes that they were known for their staff and wallet, beard and usually worn out cloak. They were noted for the cultivation of poverty and self-sufficiency (αὐτάρκεια); endurance of hardships, living a life of wandering beggars and nakedness, and thus “financial independence was achieved by begging.”<sup>90</sup> However, the renunciation of wealth was not embraced unreservedly by all Cynics. Dudley cites a passage of Teles in which Crates insists on the philosopher’s ability to be above the enslavement of wealth, rather than renouncing wealth in general:

Crates replied as follows to the question, ‘what shall it profit me to become a philosopher?’ ‘You will be able to open your purse readily and to dip your hand therein, not as now, fumbling and hesitating and trembling, like a paralytic. With equanimity you will see it full, and without regret empty, you will be equipped to employ money readily when prosperous; but if penniless, you will not be harassed by longings for it. Your life will be one adapted to meet the situation, with no cravings for what you do not possess, and undisturbed by the vicissitudes of chance.’<sup>91</sup>

So, “the Cynics, in many ways represent a return to a ‘Socratic’ anti-structure,” as they “taught in the streets, engaging in debate with anyone, rich or poor who would listen,” and also relied on hospitality.<sup>92</sup> They resolved the financial problem by advocating a philosophic ideology of begging, and so the question of accepting fees for their diatribe does not arise.<sup>93</sup>

Moles’ discussion of the question of Cynic’s attitude to moral corruption enlightens our understanding of Cynicism on a number of points. He demonstrates that ‘ostentatious behaviour’, ‘seemingly self-contradictory paradoxes’ as well as the Cynic playing the role of Reconciler, were special characteristics of the Cynics.<sup>94</sup> Moles demonstrates also that the other side of the coin to the Cynic’s “solitary, self-

the evidence for Diogenes emphasises his insistence on αὐτάρκεια (self-sufficiency) of the individual” (p. 36).

<sup>90</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1009 who notes also that their “begging-bowl and staff were also an expression of a philosophical ideology which preached indifference to the goods of this life.” See also Epictetus III. 22. 45. For an exploration of the close affinities between the Cynic tradition and Christian origins, see F. Gerald Downing, *Cynics and Christian Origins*. (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1992).

<sup>91</sup> See Dudley, 1967, p. 49. who gives the Teles reference as Hense, p. 25, 5 and notes, though, that this was probably meant for the consumption of the public rather than the Cynics themselves. The emphasis is mastery of the situation “without being worsted” by it.

<sup>92</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1009. See also Malherbe, A.J. *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition*. (Scholars Press for Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study: Missoula, Montana 1977a), p. 163. Noted also is the fact that accepting hospitality offered further opportunity for more discussion and “further spiritual therapy for the host.”

<sup>93</sup> See the discussion in Forbes, 1942, p. 26.

<sup>94</sup> Moles, 1983, pp. 108-109. For a different approach and line of argument see e.g. Kindstrand, J.F. “Demetrius the Cynic” in *Philologus* 124 (1980) 83-98.



sufficient passionless figure (μόνος, αὐτάρκης and ἀπαθής ...),” is the “concern for other men” a concern that sheds light on their φιλανθρωπία and their “missionary zeal.”<sup>95</sup> This in turn is seen to be possible because of the Cynics’ understanding of vice as a corruption of humanity’s innocence by civilisation, a corruption that can be corrected, hence the Cynics’ “understanding, even sympathetic, view of human weakness.”<sup>96</sup> Malherbe’s compilation of their correspondence adds a wealth of information to what is known about the Cynics.<sup>97</sup> Their ideal of asceticism, which they see as the short cut to achieving a virtuous life is clearly expressed and underlined in many of the letters.<sup>98</sup> Toil is elevated to a position of great importance and something to be greatly valued. Crates, writing to his students says:

Shun not the worst of evils, injustice and self-indulgence, but also their causes, pleasures. For you will concentrate on these alone, both present and future, and on nothing else. And pursue not only the best of goods, self-control and perseverance, but also their causes, toils, and do not shun them on account of their harshness. For would you not exchange inferior things for something great? As you would receive gold in exchange for copper, so you would receive virtue in exchange for toils.<sup>99</sup>

Cynicism is offered as a safe and rewarding alternative to the pursuit of pleasure which ultimately leads to “grievous pains.”<sup>100</sup> As these epistles portray, it also claims to offer a short cut to doing philosophy and thus to happiness.<sup>101</sup> Accepting the Cynic way of life is seen as practising how to die, which makes life sweet and offers complete freedom.<sup>102</sup> The Cynics were encouraged to beg, not from everyone, but

<sup>95</sup> Moles, 1983, pp. 111-116.

<sup>96</sup> Moles, 1983, pp. 116-120.

<sup>97</sup> Malherbe, 1977a. The letters collected in this work have a problem of authenticity. They represent the first century Cynic ideal, not necessarily the actual words of their founders.

<sup>98</sup> Of Anacharsis: 5, 6, 9; Of Crates: 4, 7, 8, 11, 13, 18, 33, 34; Of Diogenes: 7, 12, 14, 15, 19, 26, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 44, 46, 50; Heraclitus: 4, 7; Socratics: 8, 12, 22, 27. The references as in Malherbe, 1977.

<sup>99</sup> φεύγετε μὴ μόνον τὰ τέλη τῶν κακῶν, ἀδικίαν καὶ ἀκρασίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τούτων ποιητικά, τὰς ἡδονάς· μόναις γὰρ ταύταις καὶ παρούσαις καὶ ἐλπιζόμεναις ἐνατενιείτε, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὐδενί. καὶ διώκετε μὲ μόνον τὰ τέλη τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἐγκράτειαν καὶ καρτερίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τούτων ποιητικά, τοὺς πόνους, καὶ μὴ διὰ τὸ τραχὺ αὐτῶν φεύγετε· οὐ γὰρ μεγάλῳ τινὶ ἀντικαταλλάξετε χεῖρω, ἀλλ’ ὅσον χρύσεια χαλκεῖων, πόνων ἀρετῆν. Of Crates: 15. Text and translation as in Malherbe, 1977a, pp. 64-45.

<sup>100</sup> “Now I have often seen beggars enjoying health because of want, and rich people ailing from the intemperance of their unfortunate stomach and penis. For while you gratified these you were titillated for a short time by pleasure, which then displays great and grievous pains” (Of Diogenes: 28). Text and translation as in Malherbe, 1977a, pp. 122-123.

<sup>101</sup> Of Crates: 16, 21, 30.

<sup>102</sup> Of Diogenes: 39. Aune, D.E. “Human Nature and Ethics in Hellenistic Philosophical Traditions and Paul: Some Issues and Problems” in Engberg-Pedersen, 1994, pp. 291-312, discusses this within a wider context, demonstrating that Paul’s use of the death metaphor had at least a partial bases “on the popular philosophical *commentatio mortis* theme in both its cognitive and behavioural dimensions” (p. 310).

only from the wise.<sup>103</sup> It is justified in terms of giving back to God what belongs to him because the wise (i.e. philosophers) are friends of God.<sup>104</sup> This raises the question of reciprocity. Diogenes says he will only accept from those he can bestow some benefit.<sup>105</sup>

A number of analogies stand out clearly here for the churches of Paul. First, Paul and his churches certainly depended on hospitality for their venues for meetings, lodgings for the missionaries, and possibly for food while ministering to a congregation. The missionary character of these two groups are very similar, both in their zeal and their motive. The cynic engaged in missionary activities because he believed humanity's corruption can be cured, and so was the early church. Second, the passage referring to Crates quoted above provides a very good analogy for what Paul says in Phil. 4: 12, where his response to the Philippians is:

‘I know what it is to be in need, and I know what it is to have plenty. I have learned the secret of being content (αὐτάρκειας) in any and every situation, whether well-fed or hungry, whether living in plenty or in want.’ (NIV).

In this way, Paul might have looked like a Cynic to many people, to outsiders and insiders alike. But the analogy may not be extended to include his churches as a whole. Paul had to write this to the Philippians because they expected something else. Also, we have no way of knowing whether or not the church in question took seriously this admonition and followed Paul's example. Similarly, Paul's attitude to death (Phil. 1: 21-24) might have sounded to his readers like the Cynic attitude. This is however only half of the story. Gerald Downing has demonstrated that Paul stands in contrast to the Cynics' tradition of begging.<sup>106</sup> The gospel writers, he says, were far more Cynic than Paul who refused to accept support from the churches for his mission. This point may not however be stressed for the Philippian correspondence, where the apostle is seen to be thanking this church for its gift sent through Epaphroditus.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> Malherbe, 1977a, *Of Crates*: 2, 17, 18, 22, and 36.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.* *Of Crates*: 26, 27. This conception is traced back to Socrates: “Socrates used to say that sages do not beg but demand back, for everything belongs to them, just as it does to the gods” (*Of Diogenes*: 10). The text and translation are in Malherbe, 1977a, pp. 104-105.

<sup>105</sup> Malherbe, 1977a, *Of Diogenes*: 10: “It is all right to beg, if it is not for a free gift or for something worse in exchange, but for the salvation of everyone; that is, to ask people for things that accord with nature, and to ask with a view to doing the same things as Heracles, the son of Zeus, and to be able to give back something much better than what you receive yourself” (cf. 11, and 38).

<sup>106</sup> Downing; 1992, esp. pp. 10; 14; 16; 24; 61-63; and 91-92.

<sup>107</sup> See the section on the exegesis of the text.

### 4.3. Other Hellenistic Schools.

#### 4.3.1. Rhetorical Schools.

The sophists, whose influence on the education of the Hellenistic world can not be overemphasised, fall into this category. So also are the professors of oratory who are closely related to the sophists, though Isocrates "the most illustrious such professor certainly did not count himself among the sophists whom he criticised severely."<sup>108</sup> The sophists formed not so much a school as a movement, which in the fifth century (450-400), brought "social and political changes, in which intellectual and artistic activity was intense;" as well as replaced established patterns of life and experience with new ones, and attacked "beliefs and values of previous generations."<sup>109</sup> It can only be seen as a school in the sense that followers of the movement in subsequent generations imitated them as models, and possibly a relationship existed between the students and the sophists - individual teachers and pupils (see taxonomy above in 5.1). The sophistic movement was not interested in the production of people with professional skills, but of 'politicians' - a kind of a "liberal education", and not the traditional "professional training."<sup>110</sup> It became the "central component in the education of the free-born" through antiquity as far as "the Middle Ages."<sup>111</sup>

Guthrie has presented a discussion of the sophists, which is detail<sup>λ</sup> in its description of the individuals who make up the sophists. These include not only the well known ones as Protagoras, Gorgias, and Prodicus; but also Hippias, Antiphon, Thrasymachus, Critias, Antisthenes, Alcidamas, Lycophron, and anonymous writers.<sup>112</sup> We may include in this list Euthydemus and Dionysodorus.<sup>113</sup> They first came to Athens in the fifth century "encouraged by Pericles, making great successes, and great financial rewards. This, and their different emphasis on what constitutes the best education, "sparked an intense debate which in turn was responsible for the

<sup>108</sup> Forbes, 1942, p. 20.

<sup>109</sup> Kerferd, G. B. *The Sophistic Movement*. (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1981), p. 1. As the title of his book shows, Kerferd nowhere in it conceive<sup>λ</sup> of the sophistic movement as a school.

<sup>110</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1006.

<sup>111</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1007.

<sup>112</sup> Guthrie, W.K.C. *The Sophists*, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1971), pp. 261-319. See also Kerferd, G. B., 1981, pp. 42-58 who includes in addition Callicles, Euthydemus and Dionysodorus, as well as Socrates; and includes in the writings of the sophists the *Dissoi Logoi*, and the *Hippocratic Corpus*.

major fourth-century developments in the fields of rhetoric and philosophy” - a debate which “was partly over the issue of fees.”<sup>114</sup>

The ‘Second Sophistic’ which is a designation of Flavius Philostratus, himself a sophist, flourished during the second century CE.<sup>115</sup> It was a revival of the early movement, sharing in its features and values. The main feature was declamation.<sup>116</sup> The adherents of the movement sought to perpetuate the values of the glorious past because they saw themselves, like everyone else in this period, as inheritors of this glorious past they looked to.<sup>117</sup> Bowersock contends that the movement was clearly “a culmination, not a sudden burst or a fad;” but at the same time it “was a distinctive growth of the high empire, and it would not have been a senseless man who called it new.”<sup>118</sup> It is possible that the sophistic movement was one of the influences of the debate in the Corinthian correspondence, particularly regarding the issue of fees. The existence of this movement, at least in its early stages, is likely during the mid-first century CE. The difficulty however, is the lack of evidence on its existence in the Pauline correspondence.

The organisation of the first sophistic movement was basically ‘archaic’.<sup>119</sup> They were ‘star performers’ who travelled a lot and depended on the welcome and interest shown to their presentations wherever they went. Patronage became an important institution for them. Their success depended on the ability to perform well, because the more the number of those attracted the better, and the higher the fees charged.<sup>120</sup> Declamation for them therefore, became purely display, a digression from the original aim of rhetoric which was “the practical one of assisting litigants to establish their claim to property.”<sup>121</sup> A popular sophist would have students following him wherever he went, and this added to his popularity. Judge, confirming this last point, uses the term ‘sophist’ to include all the philosophers, “ranging from the Stoic Epictetus to the

---

<sup>113</sup> Forbes, 1942, p. 14.

<sup>114</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1006.

<sup>115</sup> Notable among the growing bibliography on this movement are two works both involving Bowersock, G.W: *The Sophists in the Roman Empire*: (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1969); and later another work edited by the same author: *Approaches to the Second Sophistic: Papers Presented at the 105th Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association*. (University Park: Pennsylvania, 1974).

<sup>116</sup> Bowersock, 1974, pp. 17-22.

<sup>117</sup> Bowersock, 1974, p. 4

<sup>118</sup> Bowersock, 1969, p. 9.

<sup>119</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1007.

<sup>120</sup> See below under 4.4.3.

<sup>121</sup> Clarke, 1971, pp. 28 and 44.

vagabond Cynic preachers, and the more religious teachers from the neo-Pythagorean sage Apollonius of Tyana to the charlatan Peregrinus.<sup>122</sup> He goes on to identify a number of features characterising the sophists: “intellectual leaders of great eminence,” who preserved the classical heritage and guided public policy and private morality; they were all travellers and relied on hospitality; experts in speech and persuasion; and they were all committed to their mission. In the first two centuries CE, the term σοφιστής was used for the philosophic sage<sup>123</sup> and Lucian includes Christ in this.<sup>124</sup>

Apart from the isolated examples of Zeno and the fifth century teachers reported by “the late and not too reliable historian, Diodorus Siculus,” “the initiators of this practice of charging fees for private tuition ... were the sophists” whose practice was like a revolution.<sup>125</sup> Zeno’s fee was reportedly 100 minas.<sup>126</sup> For the sophists who initiated the practice, the question is not whether or not they charged fees, but how much money they made from it.<sup>127</sup> Those who were successful in this business were Protagoras, Gorgias, Prodicus, Euthydemus, Dionysodorus, and Hippias of Elis; their average charge being about 100 minas. About Gorgias, Diodorus writes:

The leader of the embassy was Gorgias the rhetorician, who in eloquence far surpassed all his contemporaries. He was the first man to devise rules of rhetoric and so far excelled all other men in the instruction offered by the sophists that he received from his pupils a fee of one hundred minas.<sup>128</sup>

Some, in fact, boasted about the amount of money they made. Plato relates Hippias saying:

Why, Socrates, you know nothing of the beauties of this. For if you were to know how much money I have made, you would be amazed. I won’t mention the rest, but once, when I went to Sicily, although Protagoras was staying there and had a great reputation and was the older, I, who was much younger, made in a very short time more than one hundred and fifty minas, and in one very small place, Incus, more than twenty minas; and when I came home, I took this and gave it to my father, so that he and the other citizens were

<sup>122</sup> Judge, E.A.; “The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community: Part II” in *JRH* 1 (1960b) 125-137, esp. p. 126. He argues that the use of the term ‘sophist’ for the professional rhetoricians as opposed to the philosophers, which was first established in the time of Socrates and consolidated during the second century CE when sophistry flourished, is a distinction that disappeared when the sophists began to care about ideas as much as they originally cared about words.

<sup>123</sup> See eg. Aristid. 2.311J, cf. *Arr. An.* 6.16.5. See also *LSJ sv.*

<sup>124</sup> See *Luc. Peregr.* 13. See also *LSJ sv.*

<sup>125</sup> Forbes, 1942, pp. 5, 11-12. For eighth century teachers see also *Diod. xii. 12. 4*; and for Zeno see also *Olympiodorus, in Plat. I Alcib.* 119A.

<sup>126</sup> *The Latin Dictionary* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1879), s.v. mina values it at 100 Attic Drachmas or Roman denarii, which was calculated then at about \$18.05. The note in *Diodorus xii. 53. 2* (Loeb) values a hundred minas at 1800 dollars and 360 pounds sterling.

<sup>127</sup> Forbes, 1942, pp. 12-19.

<sup>128</sup> *Diodorus xii. 53. 2*; *Plato Protag. 328B*. This is discussed in Forbes 1942, pp. 12-19.

overwhelmed with amazement. And I pretty well think I have made more money than any other two sophists together<sup>129</sup>

The majority of sophists however did not distinguish themselves in the amount of money they made from this practice as did those already mentioned. The evidence points to the fact that many of them “were scarcely able to eke out a living.”<sup>130</sup> Writing against the sophists, and seemingly against the existing philosophies, Isocrates says the following disparaging things about them:

Now, generally speaking, you will find that no one of the so-called sophists has accumulated a great amount of money, but that some of them have lived in poor, others in moderate circumstances. The man who in our recollection laid up the most was Gorgias of Leontini. He spent his time in Thessaly when the Thessalians were the most prosperous people in Hellas; he lived a long life and devoted himself to making money; he had no fixed domicile in any city and therefore paid out nothing for public weal nor was he subject to any tax; moreover, he did not marry and beget children, but was free from this, the most unremitting and expensive of burdens; and yet, although he had so great an advantage toward laying up more wealth than any other man, he left at his death only 1000 staters (a gold coin about equal in value to the guinea).<sup>131</sup>

During the imperial period when the sophists flourished again, this second sophistic enjoyed a golden age in which they became the “best-paid and richest teachers of antiquity.” From about 193-217 CE, names such as Scopelian, Lollianus of Ephesus, Polemo, Chrestus of Byzantium, Apollonius of Naucratis, the wealthy Damianus of Ephesus and Heraclides of Lycia, are among the beneficiaries of this golden age.<sup>132</sup> This is however not the precise picture as we know from elsewhere that these sophists made huge gains from their declamations.<sup>133</sup>

The professors of rhetoric obviously fall under this category. As with the sophists, the pattern of one teacher attracting many students continued, particularly in the fourth century when rhetoric was at its boom. The difference however, was that these rhetorical schools stood out clearly as schools. This has been described as “a proliferation of small schools coupled with a gradual expansion of the ‘higher’ forms of rhetorical training down the educational ladder to successively younger and younger children.”<sup>134</sup> Isocrates was a distinguished rhetorician, and “one of the most

<sup>129</sup> Plat. *Hipp. Maior* 282D-E; See also Philost. *Vitt. Soph.* i. 11.

<sup>130</sup> Forbes 1942, p. 17.

<sup>131</sup> Isocr. *Antid.* 155f. Cf. *Soph.* 4, 7; ps. Plut. *Vitt. Decem Orat.*, *Lycurg.* 842C-D; and Ehippus *Fr.* 14, among others.

<sup>132</sup> Philostratus *Vit. Soph.* provides sufficient evidence: i. 21; i. 23; i. 25; ii. 11; ii. 19; ii. 21; ii. 23; ii. 26.

<sup>133</sup> See above, p. 26. Cf. Jones, 1978 especially Ch. 2. pp. 8-18.

<sup>134</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1007.

famous teachers who ever adorned the Athenian schools."<sup>135</sup> He became a teacher of rhetoric, first at Chios and later at Athens. At Athens, his school which was located near the Lyceum, was very successful and it became difficult to enrol, both because of the numbers of students trooping to it and the cost of studying with him - 1,000 drachmae.<sup>136</sup> He had no problem selling his course and was even prepared to sell it twice to the same person. As a result he became very rich. Other professors of rhetoric, like Isaeus offered private tuition.<sup>137</sup> So, Isocrates, the famous professor of oratory, is noted as "entering the teaching profession for the avowed purpose of making money" and actually "outdid the sophists and was able to undertake the expense of a trierarchy."<sup>138</sup> As part of his benevolence, he gave free tuition to his fellow Athenian citizens, while outsiders were charged the regular fee.<sup>139</sup> His most successful students, Theodectes and Isaeus, as well as other teachers of oratory likewise charged fees.<sup>140</sup>

On the whole, the organisational structure of these schools is not known. What is known, particularly in the case, <sup>^</sup>the school Isocrates set up, is that it was aimed at training the students "for a political or literary career rather than a narrowly professional one."<sup>141</sup> Here too, as in the sophistic movement, mobility was essential. It was however, mobility both of teachers in search for good centres and of students as they troop to the famous teachers, and particularly to Athens. Mobility, which was central in the sophistic movement and the schools of rhetoric, forms a clear analogy with the Pauline mission.<sup>142</sup> Judge demonstrates that the characteristic features of the 'sophists' referred to above (intellectual activity, mobility, reliance on hospitality, expertise in speech and persuasion, commitment to their mission, and tolerance of criticism), are true for the Pauline mission too. He contends: "St. Paul may be called

^ of

<sup>135</sup> Forbes, 1942, p. 20. See also Clarke, 1971, p. 29. The life and career of this famous Athenian teacher is discussed extensively in Marrou, 1956, pp. 79-91.

<sup>136</sup> He however gave concessions to his fellow Athenians who received free tuition. Forbes, 1942, p. 20. See also Clarke, 1971, p. 29.

<sup>137</sup> He did this for Demosthenes who remained with him for four years receiving the tuition he gave. See Forbes, 1942, p. 21.

<sup>138</sup> Isocrates *Antid.* 161f. See further, Forbes 1942, p. 20.

<sup>139</sup> Isocr. *Antid.* 224 and 226. see further, Forbes 1942, p. 20.

<sup>140</sup> Theopompus *FGrHist.* 115 F 25; Ps. Plut. *Vitt. Decem. Orat., Demosth.* 844F; Ps. Plut. *Vitt. Decem. Orat., Isaeus* 839 F. See further Forbes, 1942, pp. 21-22.

<sup>141</sup> Clarke, 1971, p. 29.

<sup>142</sup> The place and importance of mobility in the Pauline mission has been sufficiently demonstrated by Theissen, 1982. pp. 91-96.

a sophist without prejudice to the value or sincerity of his thought, nor to its independence of other philosophical schools."<sup>143</sup>

This should not lead to a neglect of the other side of the picture as Judge himself shows. Paul was different from the other members of this professional class in the way he "established a set of corporate societies independent of himself and yet linked to him by a constant traffic of delegations."<sup>144</sup> In addition, Paul was against the sophists' tendency to become 'star performers', and the use of words by both the sophists and the teachers of rhetoric to win approval or to ensure the purchase of what they sell (cf. I Thess. 2: 3-6. See also I Cor. 1-4; but the comparison may be too close for comfort). Recent studies on I Cor. 1-4 have confirmed this point.<sup>145</sup>

#### 4.3.2. Medical Schools.

A significant figure here is the physician, Hippocrates of Cos, known to the tradition as the first to separate medicine from philosophy.<sup>146</sup> Evidence has been supplied concerning the various centres in which physicians lived and taught their art.<sup>147</sup> These include Cos, Athens, Laodicea, Smyrna, Pergamum, Corinth, and Alexandria. Alexandria maintained its reputation throughout antiquity and was seen by Galen as the place medical students should at least visit. The structure of such medical schools is centred on the ideal of filial relationships, an ideal which scholars have recognised and underlined.<sup>148</sup> The skill was handed down from father to son; and when students from outside the family came to join the school to learn the skill, the same principle was followed. The Hippocratic oath, apart from being "a landmark in the ethics of medicine," includes a written contract of apprenticeship which supports the filial relationship between student and teacher:

To hold my teacher in this art equal to my parents; to make him partner in my livelihood; when he is in need of money to share mine with him; to consider his family as my own brothers, and to teach them this art, if they want to learn it, without fee or indenture; to impart oral precept, oral instruction, and all other instruction to my own sons, the sons of my teacher, and to indentured pupils who have taken the physician's oath.<sup>149</sup>

<sup>143</sup> Judge, 1960b, pp. 125-137, esp. p. 125.

<sup>144</sup> Judge, 1960b, p. 135.

<sup>145</sup> See for instance Clarke, A.D. *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of I Corinthians 1-6*. (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln, 1993), esp. pp. 89-107.

<sup>146</sup> Clarke, 1971, p. 108, the authority to which he refers being Celsus, *Med.* I. pr. 6-9.

<sup>147</sup> Clarke, 1971, p. 110. See the references in nn. 4-6.

<sup>148</sup> Clarke, 1971, pp. 110-111; See also Alexander, 1992, pp. 1008-1009.

<sup>149</sup> ἡγήσασθαι μὲν τὸν διδάξαντά με τὴν τέχνην ταύτην ἴσα γενέτησιν ἐμοῖς, καὶ βίου κοινώσασθαι, καὶ χρεῶν χρήζοντι μετάδοσιν ποιήσασθαι, καὶ γένος τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῖς ἴσον ἐπικρινεῖν ἄρρεσι, καὶ διδάξαι τὴν τέχνην ταύτην, ἣν χρήζωσι μαυθάνειν, ἀνευ



The students learned as they observed the doctor (teacher of medicine) at work and at the same time offered their services to him while they learned. Such schools remotely resembled boarding schools, as we have them today. The “apprentice” system was central. Later, the family system of training was replaced by schools like the ones in Laodicea and Smyrna, and Alexandria, which looked more like modern teaching institutions. In these, as the example of Galen’s displays in the temple of Peace in Rome shows, anatomical demonstrations constituted an important part of the training.<sup>150</sup> Fraser demonstrates that in Alexandria, particularly in the field of medicine, this development was remarkable due to the ‘favourable atmosphere of royal patronage,’ the result of which was a level of “scientific or academic medical work, the equivalent of that carried out in the universities and teaching hospitals today, by highly skilled specialists.”<sup>151</sup> By and large, medical schools, beginning with Hippocrates<sup>152</sup> and through all ranks and files of the profession adopted the practice of accepting fees for tuition; and this was the case throughout antiquity.<sup>153</sup> The Hippocratic oath, indicates that the practice was adopted fully by doctors of antiquity.<sup>154</sup>

Some analogy can be seen between the Hippocratic schools and the Pauline churches. One analogy, and indeed a strong one, is the filial relationship that existed between the teacher of medicine and his students on the one hand, and on the other the close ‘family’ ties that existed among the members of the Pauline churches at least as the exhortations of Paul emphasise. Just as the students of medicine were expected to treat their professors and members of their families as their blood relations, the Pauline churches were expected to treat one another as members of the same family, certainly with some financial implications. This blends into the ‘family’ model. There is a very strong parallel between the Hippocratic oath in the aspect of filial relationship to what Paul says in Gal. 6: 6. The apostle is here talking about how best Christians can and should relate to one another, the central point being carrying each other’s burdens (v. 2). Then in verse 6 he says:

---

μισθοῦ καὶ συγγραφῆς, παραγγελίης τε καὶ ἀκροήσιος καὶ τῆς λοιπῆς ἀπάσης μαθήσιος μεταδόσιν ποιήσεσθαι υἱοῖς τε ἐμοῖς καὶ τοῖς τοῦ ἐμῆ διδάξαντος, καὶ μαθητῆσι συγγεγραμμένοις τε καὶ ὠρκισμένοις νόμῳ ἰητρικῷ, ἄλλω δὲ οὐδενί. “The Hippocratic Oath” in *Hippocrates* Vol. 1. LCL. pp. 298-299.

<sup>150</sup> Clarke, 1971, pp. 112.

<sup>151</sup> Fraser, P.M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria* Vol. 1. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1972). For Alexandrian Science, see 1: 336-446; and for Alexandrian Scholarship in general, see 1: 447-479.

<sup>152</sup> Plat. *Protag.* 311B, quoted in Forbes, 1942, p. 35.

<sup>153</sup> Plat. *Meno* 90C-D; Ath. iv. 184B-C, quoted in Forbes, 1942, p. 35.

<sup>154</sup> See Forbes, 1942, p. 35.

Anyone who receives instruction in the word must share all good things with his instructor (NIV).

Κοινωνεῖτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχοῦντι ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς.

The student of the word, like the apprentice doctor is under obligation to share everything with his teacher (see further under 8.2). In other words, what the apprentice doctor had to do because of the indenture, the student of Paul had to do to fulfil the law of Christ (v. 2). Here also lies the difference, namely, that the former was under obligation because of the oath taken in the name of Apollo Physician, Asclepius, Health, Panacea and all the gods and goddesses; while the latter's obligation arose on account of the law of Christ - love.

#### 4.3.3. Schools of Mathematics and of the Technical Subjects.

Included here are schools of architecture, and the schools of the technical experts such as engineers, surveyors and sailors. Again, as in the case of the medical schools, very little is known about the structure of these schools. For mathematics, all that is firmly established is the fact that it was "an element in *paideia* since classical times," with the teacher of such a school finding his livelihood from the small fees paid by the pupils of such a *paideia*.<sup>155</sup> Apart from that, nothing is known about their structure. For architecture and the other technical subjects, the structure of their schools, like that of the medical schools continues the traditional system of apprenticeship under a professional, with the filial relationship playing a significant role in its practical application; and this includes a theoretical as well as a practical side to it as in the case of Vitruvius.<sup>156</sup> For the other technical subjects, the same can be said about the structure of their schools.

These then, have the same parallel with the Pauline churches as do the medical schools. The analogy is seen only in the kind of ties that existed between the technicians and the apprentice on the one hand, and the close relationship that the churches exhibited or were expected to express.

<sup>155</sup> Marrou, 1956, pp. 243-255; 378-79; Clarke, 1971, pp. 45-54; and see also Alexander, 1992, p. 1009.

<sup>156</sup> Clarke, 1971, p. 113; Cf. Vitruvius IV. 3. 3; VI. pr. 5, X. 11. 2; See also Alexander, 1992, p. 1010.

#### 4.4. Means of Financial Support.

Attention is now turned to a consideration of the means of financial support of these schools. Clearly, every institution, in every sense of the word and at all times, needs some kind of financial support to function, so also does every teacher's existence. So the key question here is, how were these Hellenistic schools funded and how does the answer to this question engender an increased understanding of the finances of the Pauline churches? Alexander, in an unpublished paper, notes that broadly speaking, the teacher of antiquity had two options: relying on independent means such as inherited property or a trade that brings in some revenue on the one hand; and, on the other, seeking the support of others by either charging fees - "being a sophist," or "relying on patronage, begging, or hospitality."<sup>157</sup> Ronald Hock's concise work on Paul's Tentmaking discusses four options which the philosopher had,<sup>158</sup> options that all the other teachers of antiquity had too: entering a household as its resident intellectual, working on a trade, begging, and charging fees.

##### 4.4.1. Patronage and Hospitality.

This is a broader conception of Hock's category of entering a household as its resident intellectual. The unique 'Pythagorean lifestyle' of asceticism, and particularly the fact that it became very famous, indicates a peculiarity. Because the Pythagorean community does appear to be a community organised in ways that came to be associated later with monastic societies, a community that is very disciplined and almost self-sufficient,<sup>159</sup> the question of patronage or hospitality most likely never arose. It is therefore not clear whether or not they depended on patronage of some sort or enjoyed some form of hospitality. In the Socratic school, what we see emphasised is Socrates' own personal asceticism. It has however been pointed out that his stance on accepting fees for his teaching,<sup>160</sup> as well as the asceticism of his students is conceivable only if they had independent means.<sup>161</sup> His motivation must have stemmed from his ethical ideal, namely, that virtue should not be sold as a

---

<sup>157</sup> Alexander, L.A. "Hellenistic Schools and the New Testament," (A Short Paper delivered at the British New Testament Conference, Wills Hall, Bristol, Sept. 14th 1989). p. 7.

<sup>158</sup> Hock, R.F. *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship*. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1980), pp. 52-59.

<sup>159</sup> See above under 4.1.

<sup>160</sup> Socrates never accepted fees, but his stance was not completely against accepting fees for instruction as is made clear by what Plato reports him as saying in the Apology: "Although this also seems to me to be a fine thing, if one might be able to teach people, as Gorgias of Leontini and Prodicus of Ceos and Hippias of Elis are..." Plato, *Apol.* 19E. Loeb translation.

<sup>161</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1007.

commodity of merchandise.<sup>162</sup> And since there is no evidence of the Cynic tradition of begging in the case of Socrates, he must have had some means of financial support. It has been suggested that “he lived on a small inheritance left him by his father, who did well at his trade of stone-cutter.”<sup>163</sup> The Socratic letters which appear to be in the main spurious,<sup>164</sup> are in any case evidence for the popular image of Socrates in Paul’s time. One such letter shows that Socrates had given hospitality and possibly patronage to one Chaerophon, as well as point to the fact that hospitality was readily available to the philosopher:

... Hospitality is easily supplied to a philosopher; but travel conditions are unsafe, especially now because of the troubles which have arisen then. If you take care of him, you will have both saved a friend and also shown kindness to me.<sup>165</sup>

If we are to judge from the letter of Antisthenes to Aristippus, the conclusion must be that Socratics rejected the idea of joining royal households to enjoy their patronage, particularly those of tyrants:

It is not right for a philosopher to associate with tyrants and to devote himself to Sicilian tables. Rather, he should live in his own country and strive for self-sufficiency (αὐτάρκεια).<sup>166</sup>

For Plato, the evidence from Olympiodorus writing in the fifth century CE is that he did not charge fees because he had personal wealth to rely on.

Perhaps Plato was able to teach free of charge because he was well off, and this is why up to the present time the property of the Platonic succession has been preserved in spite of the fact that there have been a number of confiscations.<sup>167</sup>

Clarke presents another tradition which thinks of Plato as “a poor man”, and contends that the school in succeeding years and centuries had “acquired a considerable revenue as a result of legacies.”<sup>168</sup> Because there is not enough evidence to choose between the two traditions, Alexander sees a possible blend in which “the financial strength of the Academy rested either on Plato’s wealth or on the accruing

<sup>162</sup> Forbes, 1932, p. 23.

<sup>163</sup> See Stone, I.F. *The Trial of Socrates*. (Little Brown and Co.: Boston, Toronto, 1988), pp. 118f who notes also that his early life shows signs that though not a wealthy aristocrat, he was of the middle class. See also Brickhouse, T.C. and Smith, N.D. *Socrates on Trial*. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1989), pp. 13-17 who note that his marriage of Xanthippe, who was from an aristocratic family indicates a reasonable status. The third century scholar, Demetrius of Phalerum in Plutarch, *Aristid.* 1. reports that he also inherited a dwelling house and a modest capital of seventy *minae* from his friend Crito.

<sup>164</sup> Malherbe, 1977a, p. 27.

<sup>165</sup> Malherbe, 1977a, p. 227 *Socratic Epistles* 2. 17-20

<sup>166</sup> *Socratic Epistles* 1. 1-4.

<sup>167</sup> Olympiodorus, *In Alc.* 140-1; discussed in Clarke, 1971, p. 101.

<sup>168</sup> Clarke, 1971, p. 101.

legacies.”<sup>169</sup> Could this be the right explanation for Plato’s refusal to charge fees? This seems most likely. It is already noted above that Plato and the Academy happily accepted gifts from friends even though they rejected fees.<sup>170</sup> It is however clear that Plato enjoyed the hospitality of Dionysius’s court where he “received over eighty talents.”<sup>171</sup> The longest and the most reliable of the Platonic letters is essentially an explanation of Plato’s involvement in the politics of Sicily, which provides the history of the situation, his defence of his actions, and a presentation of his manifesto.<sup>172</sup> That this defence was necessary suggests that other philosophers disapproved - as we see in the Cynic letters.

The patronage received by philosophical schools was two-fold: patronage for institutions within a city; and patronage for individuals in households or courts. The Academy was originally “a gymnasium in a public park on the outskirts of Athens, where Plato bought land.”<sup>173</sup> Being a citizen, Plato did not need patronage to do this. At the most, he probably enjoyed the goodwill of the authorities of the city. In the case of Aristotle and his school, a clear picture emerges. Both forms of patronage were enjoyed at different times. Because he was “a non-Athenian he could not own land himself”, and so depended on the patronage of the Athenian authorities for its acquisition.<sup>174</sup> Also, Aristotle clearly enjoyed the hospitality of Philip, the king of Macedon to teach the king’s son and as a result received large gifts.<sup>175</sup> The following phrase by Diogenes Laertius in his writing about Aristotle provides the authority for this assertion:

... next that he stayed in Macedonia at Philip’s court and received from him his son Alexander as his pupil.<sup>176</sup>

Similarly, the Stoics who form a “school which taught in a public building” depended on the hospitality and patronage of the authorities of such a building. Ronald Hock has collected evidence for the fact that Stoics too entered households to enjoy their

---

<sup>169</sup> Alexander, 1992, p.1008.

<sup>170</sup> See under 4.2.1.

<sup>171</sup> Diogenes Laertius, 3. 9, 18-22. Cf. Hock, 1980, pp. 54-55, who discusses this, pointing out that many Platonists and Aristotelians followed this practice.

<sup>172</sup> Plato *Ep.* VII.

<sup>173</sup> Diogenes Laertius 3. 7, quoted in Alexander, 1992, p.1008.

<sup>174</sup> Alexander, 1992, p.1008.

<sup>175</sup> Hock, 1980, p. 55.

<sup>176</sup> Diogenes Laertius 5. 1-4; Cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 2. 79. The stories about this in Diogenes Laertius seem to imply some sort of ideological problem with the practice, at least in later traditions.

hospitality while they serve as their resident intellectuals, and there is evidence that some of them served as royal court advisors.<sup>177</sup>

For Epicurus, like most of the philosophers who were non-Athenians, he could not own land himself, and so depended on the patronage and hospitality of the authorities. Also, because this movement was a strong missionary institution it depended at least to a certain degree on the hospitality it received in new centres. The missionaries would have needed accommodation and at least some means of livelihood. There is evidence that Epicureans entered households and enjoyed their hospitality. "Even the reclusive Epicurus permitted the wise man to pay court to a king, but only if in dire need."<sup>178</sup> The Cynics, who had no problems engaging in a debate with anyone and anywhere, used hospitality quite naturally:

... the Cynics taught in the streets, engaging in debate with anyone, rich or poor, who would listen; hospitality also played a part in their teaching activity, since an invitation to join a rich man at dinner could mean an opportunity for further discussion and further spiritual therapy for the host.<sup>179</sup>

Most Cynics enjoyed such hospitality. However, the more ascetic ones objected on two grounds: that it tempts the philosopher to adopt a hedonistic lifestyle which is not befitting, and that it was slavish.<sup>180</sup> Lucian's criticism of this practice fully illustrates this.<sup>181</sup> Hock<sup>182</sup> notes that this "entire criticism - indeed, indictment - of this means of support is stated in terms of freedom and slavery." A philosopher who does this enslaves himself to "superfluity extravagance, and pleasure (7-8)", subjecting himself to indignities at banquets "that no truly free man would endure" (13-31).<sup>183</sup> There is however the favourable side of the debate presented by those of the Cynics who enjoyed this means of support. In short their defence was simply to mock the freedom of those who refuse it by pointing to their "hunger, cold and disrepute."<sup>184</sup> They would also underline their reason for doing it as out of the "highest motives"<sup>185</sup> and "deepest friendship and love."<sup>186</sup> But this did not satisfy the *αὐταρκεία* principle

<sup>177</sup> Hock, R.F. "Simon the Shoemaker as an Ideal Cynic," *GRBS* 17 (1976) 41-53 esp. 45-46. See also Hock, 1980, pp. 54, 96. On philosophers in royal courts, see Rawson, 1989, pp. 233-257 referred to above.

<sup>178</sup> Hock, 1980, p. 96; See Diogenes Laertius, 10. 120.

<sup>179</sup> Diogenes *Ep.* 38. 3-5, quoted in Malherbe, 1977a, p. 163. Cf. Alexander, 1992, p. 1008.

<sup>180</sup> See the discussion in Hock, 1980, pp. 54-55 and the references cited there.

<sup>181</sup> Lucian, *Mer. Cond.* (Loeb translation).

<sup>182</sup> Hock, 1980, p. 55.

<sup>183</sup> See further below under 8.3.

<sup>184</sup> See Hock, 1980, p. 55.

<sup>185</sup> See Diogenes Laertius, 7. 6-9.

<sup>186</sup> See Diogenes Laertius, 6. 50.

as the one who went into a household lost his independence and self-sufficiency. It also fails to satisfy the principle of *beneficia* which demands that you only accept a benefit if you can give something in return. Presumably the Cynics who enjoyed this means of support would argue that they give something in return by being resident intellectuals, but the feeling of dependence and possibly slavery is never removed.

In the case of the medical schools, especially when there was interest in it not for the profession, but for intellectual exercise, benefaction seems to be what they enjoyed. "Medical authorities" were "among the beneficiaries of the Museum at Alexandria,"<sup>187</sup> and Fraser makes us understand that this was a unique institution, as far as we can tell.<sup>188</sup> For the schools of mathematics and the technical subjects, patronage played a significant role. Alexander notes that "for the major achievements of the Hellenistic world, either patronage or financial independence seem to have been a prerequisite," and goes on to give some possible examples of the third century BCE like Archimedes, Eratosthenes and Apollonius, who enjoyed some patronage.<sup>189</sup> Alexander notes further: "we know, however, that patronage played some role in the development of Hellenistic technology, particularly in the field of siege-warfare."<sup>190</sup> For the schools of rhetoric, evidence for the use of patronage as a means of financial support are ample. When the sophists who were non-citizens went to any city, they depended on patronage for gaining an entrance into such cities and for making clients. Plato's dialogue of the name Protagoras portrays the latter as using the house of his patron to make his first contacts and to hold semi-public debates and instructional sessions.<sup>191</sup>

The above discussion clearly shows a remarkable parallel to the practice of the earlier church, particularly the Pauline churches. Alexander has underlined this point:

... which provides the most obvious parallel to the practice of both Paul and Jesus, ... The role of patronage in the early Christian groups hardly needs stressing: is there anything more than a difference of scale between Philo's gratefulness for the χορηγία of the Alexandrian kings and the reliance of the earlier Christian groups on the patronage of a Phoebe or a Philemon? ...<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>187</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1009.

<sup>188</sup> Fraser, 1972, pp. 369ff.

<sup>189</sup> Alexander, 1992, p. 1010.

<sup>190</sup> Philo of Byzantium, *Belopoeica* pref. Th50. 24-26. See further Alexander, 1992, p. 1010.

<sup>191</sup> Plato, *Protag.* 314b6-316b6. See further Alexander, 1992, p. 1007; and Kerferd, 1981, pp. 17-23

<sup>192</sup> Alexander, 1989, p. 8.

To be sure, Paul entered households, enjoying their hospitality.<sup>193</sup> But Paul's practice can not be equated with that of the Cynics and other philosophers who entered households. He calls Priscilla and Aquila as well as Philemon his fellow-workers. This implies that Paul saw these persons as partners rather than patrons. It is interesting that Paul emphasised the concerns of freedom and slavery as the philosophers who rejected this means of support would. Also interesting is the fact that even when he accepted the support of the Philippians, which he understands as a partnership in the gospel, he emphasised the *αὐταρκεία* principle (Phil. 4: 11). Was Paul following in the steps of such philosophers or did the gospel which was so influential on his outlook on life have any effect on his decision? I shall attempt to answer these questions in the exegesis.

#### 4.4.2. Other Means of Financial Support

Working on a trade to support oneself, offered the philosopher and the teacher of antiquity the freedom as well as financial independence that patronage and hospitality could not give. Unfortunately, it was the most unpopular. The few philosophers who took to this means of support, even for short periods of time, include among others the best known Stoic, Cleanthes.<sup>194</sup> In this category also are "the Platonists Menedemus and Asclepiades" whose trade was milling, but who were clearly exceptions in their school.<sup>195</sup> The school that preferred this means of support is the Cynics, examples of which include Dio Chrysostom who was "a gardener" and did "other unskilled jobs,"<sup>196</sup> Demetrius of Sunium, the porter,<sup>197</sup> and "the cynicizing Stoic Musonius Rufus, who worked on the farm,"<sup>198</sup> all of whom look to Socrates' companion Simon the shoemaker as their ideal.<sup>199</sup> Hock refers to a fragment of a tractate entitled "What Means of Support Is Appropriate for a Philosopher" which is Musonius' "discussion of farming as the most suitable means of support."<sup>200</sup> He notes that there was at least one other occupation that was accepted, but that there was no way of knowing which one it is. He recognises the principles for the choice of

<sup>193</sup> Paul entered the houses of Gaius (Rom. 16: 23); Priscilla and Aquila (Rom. 16: 3); and Philemon (Philem. 22).

<sup>194</sup> See Hock, 1980, p. 56; citing Diogenes Laertius, 7. 168-170, Seneca, *Ep.* 44. 3, Epictetus *Diss.* 3. 26.23, and Plutarch *De Vit. aere al.* 830C-D.

<sup>195</sup> See Hock, 1980, p. 56; Citing Athenaeus *Deipnos.* 4. 168A, and Diogenes Laertius, 2. 125.

<sup>196</sup> Hock, 1980, p. 56; Citing Philostratus *V. Soph.* 488.

<sup>197</sup> See Lucian *Tax.* 31.

<sup>198</sup> Hock, 1980, p. 56; Citing Musonius *Frag.* 11.

<sup>199</sup> Hock, 1980, p. 56, and the numerous references he cites.

<sup>200</sup> Hock, 1980, p. 57, referring to Musonius *Frag.* 11.



occupation as including financial independence and freedom to “work and at the same time engage in philosophical instruction of students.”

Objections to this means of support were widespread<sup>201</sup> and so the debate was ongoing, with each philosopher justifying his choice one way or the other. Those who chose this means of support valued it for the financial independence it offered. Musonius, for instance, says Hock, contends:

... one should endure hardships, and suffer the pains of labour with his own body, rather than depend on another for sustenance.<sup>202</sup>

Musonius goes on to justify this means of support in terms of the philosopher’s freedom:

Is not the one who procures for himself the necessities of life more free (ἐλευθεριώτερος) than the one who receives them from others?<sup>203</sup>

On the other side of the debate were arguments that see this means of support as enslaving and demeaning. Cicero for instance considered the status of work as slavish, particularly with reference to those occupations which he considers “undesirable,” “vulgar” and “unbecoming to a gentleman”: tax-collectors, manual labour, retail sellers, etc.<sup>204</sup> This, as well as the second argument (demeaning oneself) are recognised as “the perspective of the upper classes” regarding their attitudes to work.<sup>205</sup> An example of the second argument, which also contains the first, can be seen in Paideia’s effort to dissuade the young Lucian from becoming a sculptor:

... then you will put on a filthy tunic, assume a servile appearance, and hold bars and gravers and sledges and chisels in your hands, with your back bent over your work; you will be a groundling, with groundling ambitions, altogether humble; you will never lift your head, or conceive a single manly or liberal thought, and although you will plan to make your works well-balanced and well-shaped, you will not show any concern to make yourself well-balanced and slightly; on the contrary, you will make yourself a thing of less value than a block of stone.<sup>206</sup>

The key words in this quote are ‘servile appearance’ (σχῆμα δουλοπρεπές) and ‘altogether humble’ (πάντα τρόπον ταπεινός), which point to a very degrading

<sup>201</sup> See the discussion in Hock, 1980, p. 58 and note the references cited there.

<sup>202</sup> Musonius *Frag.* 11 (p. 57, Hock).

<sup>203</sup> Musonius *Frag.* 11 (p. 57, Hock).

<sup>204</sup> Cicero, *De Off.* 1. 150-151. Cf. Plutarch, *De Vit. aere al.* 829F-831A. See also Hock, R.F. “Paul’s Tentmaking and the Problem of his Social Class” *JBL* 97/4 (1978): 558-561. Also see Finley, M.I. *The Ancient Economy* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California, 1973) 35-94 where the question is considered under the context of the whole question of the tendency to think of work in terms of status and the question of the value of self-sufficiency.

<sup>205</sup> Hock, 1978, pp. 561-562.

<sup>206</sup> Lucian, *Somn.* 13

outlook of the situation. The words δούλος, σχῆμα, and ταπεινός are very close parallels with Phil. 2: 6-11!

Paul's choice of working on a trade rather than accepting support from Corinth betrays echoes of this debate. In II Cor. 11: 7ff Paul clearly betrays the sentiments that saw work as demeaning and slavish, which also provides a clue to Paul's conception of his social status. I shall discuss these issues in greater detail in the exegesis. Hock is of the opinion that the opponents of Paul at Corinth represent "the option of entering a household."<sup>207</sup> This assumes that these two were the only viewpoints current in Corinth at this time, which I think is very unlikely. Were there not some among the opponents who would have thought that charging fees was the best option? Can we be reasonably sure that the problem in Corinth was not because Paul's opponents thought he refused the option they preferred, the option of charging fees for his preaching? Paul's reasons for refusing the offer of support by the Corinthians include one given by the philosophers - financial independence and the maintenance of one's freedom, but not the other - the opportunity to combine the trade with philosophical dialogue. Rather he insists on not being a burden to his clients and not standing in the way of the gospel.

Begging was a means of support "adopted by the Cynics as a way of attacking the greed, as they perceived it, of Sophists and philosophers who became wealthy from charging fees or entering households."<sup>208</sup> But it was not unlikely that some of them begged because they were really poor and of little education.<sup>209</sup> In any case, "the Cynic's begging-bowl and staff were also an expression of a philosophic ideology which preached indifference to the goods of a cultured life."<sup>210</sup> Hock supplies examples of those Cynics who begged<sup>211</sup> including Diogenes,<sup>212</sup> Diogenes' followers Monimus and Crates,<sup>213</sup> Menippus<sup>214</sup> and a host of others from the period of the early empire.<sup>215</sup> It must be said that these certainly found adopting this means of support

---

<sup>207</sup> Hock, 1980, p. 59.

<sup>208</sup> Hock, 1980, pp. 55-56 notes also that for some of them it was a necessary means of support because they had nothing and therefore no option than to beg.

<sup>209</sup> Lucian, *Bis. Acc.* 6; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* xxxii. 9. quoted in Alexander, 1992, p.1008.

<sup>210</sup> Alexander, 1992, p.1008.

<sup>211</sup> Hock, 1980, p. 55.

<sup>212</sup> See Diogenes Laertius, 6. 49, and the several other references Hock cites.

<sup>213</sup> See Diogenes Laertius, 6. 83; and 6. 85-86.

<sup>214</sup> See Diogenes Laertius, 6. 99.

<sup>215</sup> See, e. g. Epictetus *Diss.* 3. 22. 10; Dio *Orat.* 32. 9; Lucian *Frug.* 14, 17; *Pisc.* 35; *Tim.* 57; and Aulus Gellius *N. A.* 9. 2. 1-11, all cited in Hock, 1992, p. 97 n.56.

difficult.<sup>216</sup> It was considered shameful. The Cynic epistles show that the Cynics were at pains to disprove the charge that it was disgraceful to beg:

Doctors have written about one condition of the bowels which, they say, causes indigestion, while Diogenes has written about another which, he says, causes hunger. For the former condition it is not disgraceful to ask doctors for medicine, yet it is for the latter condition. So for this reason despise those who say such base and disreputable things, and beg bread as well as pills. For it is not begging that is base, but not showing oneself as worthy of what is given. It is characteristic of unscrupulous men to beg on account of indigestion rather than hunger, for the former is caused by gluttony that results from wickedness, but the latter by need that result from poverty.<sup>217</sup>

This is an attempt to justify begging, but it clearly shows in what light begging was seen by many. Similarly, a letter attributed to Diogenes attempts a justification:

Do not complain to my associates, Olympias, that I wear a worn-out cloak and make rounds of people begging for barley meal. For this is not disgraceful nor, as you claim, suspect behaviour for free men.....<sup>218</sup>

Also, the practice was easily open to abuse. Diogenes Laertius describes one Menippus who became rich through begging and taking security for the money he lent out to people:

Menippus, also a Cynic, was by descent a Phoenician - a slave, as Achäicus in his treatise on *Ethics* says. Diocles further informs us that his master was a citizen of Pontus and was named Baton. But as avarice made him very resolute in begging, he succeeded in becoming a Theban<sup>219</sup>

This attitude by some of those who begged was met by severe criticisms, not least the one from the lips of Seneca, who describes a situation in which Antigonus was asked for a talent by a Cynic. The latter was refused on the ground that a talent was beyond what he had the right to ask for. He then asked for a denarius but was refused on the ground that a king could not give such an insignificant gift. Seneca continued his criticism of the practice as follows:

... If you ask my opinion, I think the king was right; for the situation is intolerable that a man should ask for money when he despises it. Your Cynic has a declared hatred for money; he has published this sentiment, he has chosen this role - now he must play it. It is most unfair for him to obtain money while he boasts of poverty. It is, then, every man's duty to consider not less his own character than the character of the man to whom he is planning to give assistance.<sup>220</sup>

---

<sup>216</sup> Hock, 1980, p. 56.

<sup>217</sup> See e. g. ps.- Crates *Ep.* 17 (p. 66-67, Malherbe, 1977a).

<sup>218</sup> ps.- Diogenes *Ep.* 34 (pp. 142-145, Malherbe, 1977a)

<sup>219</sup> Diogenes Laertius, 6. 99. See others whose wallets are described as containing gold in Lucian *Pisc.* 45, *Peregr.* 30, *Fug.* 20.

<sup>220</sup> Seneca *De Ben.* 2. 17. 1-2; Epictetus *Diss.* 3. 22. 50; Lucian *Pisc.* 29-37, 40-52; and *Fug.* 30-31. Hock 1980, p. 97 discusses these.

The result was that the practice was vigorously defended by those who practised it with arguments such as “friends have all things in common.” Diogenes is reported to have reasoned as follows:

All things belong to the gods. The wise are friends of the gods, and friends hold all things in common.<sup>221</sup>

Some who were uncomfortable with the practice simply abstained as seen in Dio Chrysostom:

But I could never bring myself to accept money from anyone, although many are willing to give it. Nay, little as I had, you will find that I not only shared it with others, but actually squandered it many a time.<sup>222</sup>

There is evidence that this ideology was prevalent in some of the churches of the Pauline mission. Paul seems to be at pains to dissuade members of the congregation at Thessalonica from continuing in the practice of being idle because they can depend on the charity of others, as the brief statement in I Thess. 5: 14a shows, and which is confirmed by the more elaborate discussion of the issue in II Thess. 3: 6-15. Paul prefers working on a trade to the Cynic ideology. But why? And why did some of the congregations prefer the Cynic ideology?<sup>223</sup> Downing has contended that Christianity was right from the early days not very different from Cynicism. The first paragraph of his conclusion reads as follows:

I hope that I have at least given grounds for accepting that from very early days Christianity looked like a variant of a popular and pervasive - and varied - Cynicism, and that this Cynic strand went on being obvious and entirely acceptable to informed Christian writers in the early centuries, even when they could also be very critical of aspects of the more radical Cynic tradition, and were in competition with its continuing adherents.<sup>224</sup>

The philosophers who did not adopt any means of financial support must certainly have depended on some independent means - an inheritance, may be.<sup>225</sup> Socrates stands out as the best example of this stance. Probably the workshop supplied this independent means. Although evidence is not readily available, it seems reasonable to believe that there were many philosophers in the generations after Socrates who would have followed in his steps. Ramsay, at the beginning of this century came up with a hypothesis which presents Paul as following Socrates in relying on independent means - an inheritance of some family property - for the support of his

<sup>221</sup> Diogenes Laertius, 6. 37, 6. 72; cf. ps. Crates *Ep.* 26 (pp. 76-77, Malherbe, 1977a).

<sup>222</sup> Dio Chrysostom *Orat.* 3.15. Cf. Lucian *Demon.* 4, 8, 63.

<sup>223</sup> Malherbe, A.J. *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care.* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1987) pp. 95-107, discusses this.

<sup>224</sup> Downing, 1992, p. 302.

<sup>225</sup> This has already been pointed out above with reference to Socrates, see under 4.2.5.

ministry including all his legal bills.<sup>226</sup> This is however a hypothesis presented with no evidential backing. Moreover, as Hawthorne notes, this is not what Paul says in his letters.<sup>227</sup> Therefore, there does not seem to be any analogy between this means of support for the Pauline churches.

#### 4.4.3. The Debate on the Question of Teachers' Pay.

The list of terms used in antiquity for teachers' pay includes two which are found in the Pauline writings, and in the passages that are relevant for this study: μισθός and τιμή.<sup>228</sup> It is interesting that Paul uses these terms. This suggests that the question of teachers' pay was a live one at Corinth during Paul's mission there. That large numbers of teachers in antiquity adopted the practice of accepting pay for their tuition, should not lead to a conclusion that the practice was adopted without question. In fact since its initiation by the sophists in the fifth century BCE, a debate was instituted on whether or not it is right for teachers to be paid, and why, and how much. Forbes notes that the reaction to the violation of the tradition of teaching without the "thought of securing material rewards" was "a cry of startled protest mounted to high heaven, and a dispute was inaugurated which did not subside for centuries to come."<sup>229</sup> The accusations against the sophists when they initiated this practice, which represents one side of the debate, branded them as βάνανσοι,<sup>230</sup> 'mercenary', and hunters for the prey of paying pupils.<sup>231</sup> They were regarded as salesmen "who advertised their wisdom just like any other saleable merchandise."<sup>232</sup> Also, the point has already been made that those who received pay for their instruction were criticised for selling their freedom. All these accusations amount to a charge of being greedy for money. The list of people who condemned the practice run from Socrates, to Plato, to Themistius. This is not a very long list, but it is implicit in the Cynic letters. Such accusations, says Hock, were "made to impute to Sophists the motives of deceit and avarice," an accusation that run for all who charged fees.<sup>233</sup> Plato's *Protagoras* describes Socrates in a dialogue in which he likens the sophists to a merchant who is interested only in

---

<sup>226</sup> Ramsay, W.M. *St Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (Hodder and Stoughton: London, 1935) pp. 310-313.

<sup>227</sup> Hawthorne, G.F. *Philippians* WBC (Word UK Ltd.: Milton Keynes, 1991, p. 198.

<sup>228</sup> Forbes, 1942, p. 10.

<sup>229</sup> Forbes, 1942, p. 5.

<sup>230</sup> Aristot. *Pol.* viii. 2. 1, quoted in Forbes, 1942, p. 12.

<sup>231</sup> Plat. *Soph.* 231D, quoted in Forbes, 1942, p. 13. See also the references cited there.

<sup>232</sup> Themist. *Or.* xxiii. 286C, quoted in Forbes, 1942, p. 13. See also Hock, 1980, p. 53.

<sup>233</sup> Hock, 1980, p. 53.

selling his goods, good or bad.<sup>234</sup> Deceit<sup>235</sup> and greed<sup>236</sup> was often associated with this practice.

The Sophists on their part justified their practice in the responses they made. They insisted that "their wisdom was worth a goodly price, and anyway a man values what costs him something."<sup>237</sup> The implication is that they thought highly of their ability and felt those who did not follow their practice were not sure of what they had to offer. They remained unyielding in their defence, and many others who followed them used the same sort of arguments. Antiphon's argument shows that Socrates and those who would not charge fees were considered as not confident of the worth of the wisdom they were imparting:

Socrates, I on my part believe you to be a just, but by no means a wise man. And I think you realise it yourself. Anyhow, you decline to take money for your society. Yet if you believed your cloak or house or anything you possess to be worth money, you would not part with it for nothing or even for less than its value. Clearly, then, if you set any value on your society, you would insist on getting the proper price for that too. It may well be that you are a just man because you do not cheat people through avarice; but wise you cannot be, since your knowledge is not worth anything.<sup>238</sup>

It is clear that Antiphon was here reacting to a charge of avarice, counteracting it with the charge of shame on the part of those who did not charge fees. The implication is that Socrates and others like him were ashamed to charge fees because their instruction was not worth charging fees. The corollary of this argument was that they considered it an honour to their instruction to be able to charge fees.

Isocrates, the chief architect in charging fees is vehement in his arguments. In his attack on professors in general rather than just the sophists, he contents:

More than that, although they set themselves up as masters and dispensers of goods so precious, they are not ashamed of asking for them a price of three or four minae! Why, if they were to sell any other commodity for so trifling a fraction of its worth they would not deny their folly; nevertheless, although they set so insignificant a price on the whole stock of virtue and happiness, they pretend to wisdom and assume the right to instruct the rest of the world. Furthermore, although they say that they do not want money and speak contemptuously of wealth as "filthy lucre," they hold their hands out for a trifling gain and promise to make their disciples all but immortal!<sup>239</sup>

<sup>234</sup> Plato *Protag.* 313 C-D.

<sup>235</sup> Plato *Men.* 92A and *Euthyd.* 277B, as well as Philostratus *V. Soph.* 526 for the sophists. For philosophers who engaged in this practice in general, see Philostratus *V. Apol.* 1.13; Lucian *Nigr.* 25 and *Herm.* 59.

<sup>236</sup> Xenophon *Mem.* 1.2.7.

<sup>237</sup> Plat. *Theaet.* 167C-D; Philost. *Vitt. Soph.* i. 10. See further in Forbes, 1942, p. 13.

<sup>238</sup> Xenophon *Mem.* 1. 6. 11-12 (Loeb translation).

<sup>239</sup> Isocrates *Against the Sophists* 3-4 (Loeb translation); cf. 7. Socrates in Plato *Apol.* 20B speaks with the same sarcasm, but from the standpoint of disregard for the practice of charging fees.

The sarcasm here is unmistakable. The practice of charging small fees is spoken of in terms of shame and folly. In other words, the honourable and wise philosopher values the instructions he gives and demonstrates it by charging a valuable fee.

The practice of charging fees for instruction was also criticised on the grounds that it endangered the freedom of the individual.<sup>240</sup> Xenophon's portrayal of Socrates sees him as refusing fees in order to preserve his freedom, because by refusal he would not be under any compulsion to teach anyone because he had the fee.<sup>241</sup> Socrates was self-sufficient,<sup>242</sup> and he also boasts about his freedom: "What man is more free than I, who accepts neither gifts nor fee from anyone."<sup>243</sup> The argument on self-sufficiency was adopted by other philosophers especially the Cynics.<sup>244</sup> In other words, those who accepted fees for instruction were charged with slavery and dependence. The defence on these charges by the Sophists and those who accepted fees was to condemn the Socratic freedom and self-sufficiency as "a life that would drive even a slave to desert his master."<sup>245</sup> In other words, the argument of Socrates and the others was turned on its head. The implication is that the Socratic freedom was seen to be slavery and the independence no independence at all.

To sum up, the debate on fees was charged with emotional language expressed in terms of self-sufficiency/greed, freedom/slavery, independence/dependence, wisdom/folly. All these, I think, come under the expression 'honour/shame.' The concern of each side of the debate was to present its motives in a favourable light to the discredit of the opponent's. Malina and Neyrey have demonstrated that "honour and shame" were the "pivotal values of the Mediterranean world."<sup>246</sup> For them, the discussion above shows that such honour and shame were dependent "on the vantage point of the actors and perceivers," and the honour had its challenges and ripostes.

A good parallel between the above and the Pauline mission is seen in the controversy at Corinth which was clearly over the issue of Paul's refusal of pay. The beginnings of this controversy in the Pauline congregation at Corinth is clearly the issue in I Cor.

---

<sup>240</sup> See Hock, 1980, p. 53.

<sup>241</sup> Xenophon *Mem.* 1.2.5-6; 6.5.

<sup>242</sup> See Xenophon *Mem.* 1.2.1, 5-6, 14.

<sup>243</sup> Xenophon *Apol.* 16.

<sup>244</sup> ps. Socrates *Ep.* 1.2 (p. 218, 18-20, Malherbe, 1977a); and ps. Socrates *Ep.* 6.1-2 (p. 232, 5-19, Malherbe, 1977a). See also Lucian *Demon.* 4; and *Nigr.* 25-26.

<sup>245</sup> Xenophon *Mem.* 1. 6. 2-3.

<sup>246</sup> Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey "Honour and Shame in Luke-acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World" in Neyrey, J.H. (ed.) *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (Hendrickson: Peabody, Massachusetts, 1991):25-65.

9, where in verse 18 Paul uses the term μισθός (pay, stipend, reward). In II Cor. when the controversy was already heated up, Paul does seem to deliberately avoid terms that indicate payment, using rather a more loose term ὀψώνιον to refer to the support he got from other churches while ministering there (II Cor. 11: 8). With reference to his entire mission, Paul was clearly caught up in the emotional language of this debate over fees. The language of freedom and slavery is employed (I Cor. 9: 1, 19-23; and II Cor. 11: 7, respectively). The theme of independence underlies the discussion in Phil. 4: 11-12. Paul's discussions in I Cor. 9 and II Cor. 11 should best be understood in terms of the challenge to honour and its riposte. These points will be developed more in the exegesis.

#### **4.5. Conclusion.**

This chapter confirms that at least a partial analogy existed between the hellenistic schools and the early church. The means of financial support in these schools are thus very useful in enhancing our understanding of Paul's arguments on the subject. Patronage and hospitality which were vital elements in the schools as means of financial support equally play a vital role in the finances of the early church. Also, Paul's choice betrays the ensuing debate in the schools about which means of support is best. Similarly, his discussion of the question of support from Corinth which he declined, betrays echoes of the debate on teachers' fees. These issues are clarified in the discussion of the Pauline texts.



## **SECTION TWO: EXEGESIS.**

**This section discusses the texts of Paul's epistles. Chapter five looks at Paul's discussion of the question of apostolic rights. Paul's reasons for refusing support from Corinth and his repeated acceptance of the Philippians' support are also discussed. Chapter six considers Paul's option to accepting support from the churches of his mission: working on a trade. Chapter seven focuses on the collection project, and chapter eight looks at the question of the house churches with special reference to finances.**

**In this section, the findings of section one are brought into the discussion. The four social models from the environment are brought in to engender a fresh understanding of what Paul says in the texts considered.**

## **Chapter 5. PAUL AND SUPPORT FROM THE CHURCHES.**

### **5.1. Introduction.**

This chapter looks at three areas: Paul's discussion of Apostolic rights, support from Corinth, and support from Philippi. The concern is on Paul's conception of the issue of support of apostles, and what influenced his conception; as well as the conception of his readers, and the social world of his day. The four social models: the family, the synagogue, clubs and associations, and hellenistic schools, will be consulted for possible readings of the texts.

### **5.2. The Rights of Apostleship. I Cor. 9:1-27.**

#### **5.2.1. Review of Scholarship on the Context of the Passage.**

Two issues very central to the understanding of the finances of the apostle find expression in these verses: the question of Apostleship and apostolic rights, and the question of freedom. Inherently tied up to both of these issues is the question of its context: Is it rightly called an interpolation, or does it fit into the section beginning at 8: 1 right through to 11: 1? The diversity of interpretations given this passage call for a brief review of some of these positions. There are broadly speaking two perspectives. The one represents arguments in favour of the unity of the letter, and the other, partition theories; with each having variations within its camp. Partition theories are represented in Héring's argument that this chapter "opens up a new subject without any transition," and thus he argues, the two chapters belong to two different letters.<sup>1</sup> The function, which he says is evidenced by the series of rhetorical questions revealing "Paul's strong emotions in the face of attacks,"<sup>2</sup> is apologetic. For Héring, Paul is clearly responding to attacks "on his apostolic authority by the Corinthians, incited no doubt by people from Judea for whom the twelve were the only true apostles."<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, Héring is convinced that Paul is here labouring to show that his apostleship "has the same prerogatives as others" and "that he has voluntarily renounced some of his rights in order to minister to his

---

<sup>1</sup> Héring, 1962. p.75. Earlier, he had proposed a simple partition theory in which he sees two letters in canonical I Corinthians. See pp. xii-xv.

<sup>2</sup> Héring, 1962, p. 75 notes that arguing by use of questions was very widespread among preaching philosophers then, e.g.. Epictetus, *Disc.* iii.xxii.48.

<sup>3</sup> Héring, 1962, p. 75.

flocks.”<sup>4</sup> Paul also expresses the general principle that dominated his missionary activities, namely, “the renunciation of certain liberties in order to gain the greatest number of converts,”<sup>5</sup> involving the imposition of certain restrictions on his life, the exercise of self-discipline.<sup>6</sup> But Barrett contends that the fact that a number of partition theories make good sense casts much doubt on any such theories, including this one.<sup>7</sup> It is true that one of these theories might be right, but such an assertion is based on conjecture. Until concrete evidence can be supplied for such theories, I think it is better to make sense of the letter as we have it.

Robertson and Plummer argue for the unity of the letter and the traditional understanding<sup>8</sup> that this passage appears in its proper place as in the original letter, with a paradigmatic function.<sup>9</sup> The strong case against partition theories, they say, is the evidence of the four great Uncial MSS and any version of the letter which contains the whole Epistle.<sup>10</sup> In this position, Paul shows by personal example that the exercise of Christian freedom does not abandon forbearance, but considers others. Thus, I Cor. 9 is part of Paul’s answer to the question raised by the Corinthians on food sacrificed to idols (I Cor. 8: 1-11: 1). So, 8: 1-13 then, is the ‘general principle’ as regards this issue, 9: 1-27 Paul’s ‘great principle of forbearance’, and 10: 1-11: 1 its application.<sup>11</sup> Moffatt, similarly argues for a paradigmatic function, but with an element of ambiguity.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Héring, 1962, p. 76.

<sup>5</sup> See Héring, 1962, p. 81, referring to vv. 19-23.

<sup>6</sup> See Héring, 1962, p. 83, referring to vv. 25-27.

<sup>7</sup> See Barrett, 1968; pp. 14f.

<sup>8</sup> See Fee, 1987. p. 393 who so describes this perspective.

<sup>9</sup> Robertson, A. and Plummer, A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1911); pp. 176-177. They consider it “a mistake to regard this chapter as an independent section in defence of the writer’s claim to be an apostle” and that “the conjecture that 9:1-10: 22 is part of a letter mentioned in 4: 9 is considered not probable.”

<sup>10</sup> See Robertson and Plummer, 1911, p. xix. The argument is that there would have been some trace of this conjecture in some MSS had this been the case.

<sup>11</sup> See Robertson and Plummer, 1911, p. xxvi.

<sup>12</sup> See Moffatt, J. *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, (Hodder and Stoughton: London, 1947). pp. 114f. He seems to imply a paradigmatic function in relation to the wider context (8: 1-11: 1): “the question has raised, to begin with, a broad principle of behaviour which he now turns to illustrate from his own career,” and that “Paul gives a lead.” But he also refers to a challenge on Paul’s authority and a criticism of “his free, liberal views about idol food,” resulting in questioning his Apostleship. He did not attempt to reconcile these two opposing positions.

Barrett, who is strongly against any partition theory for I Cor., reviews some of these theories and then dismisses them all.<sup>13</sup> He goes on to consider chapter 9 as a digression that has a paradigmatic function.<sup>14</sup> In chapter 8, says Barrett, Paul had “appealed to the Corinthians for voluntary limitation of their freedom and surrender of their rights,” and in chapter 9, “he immediately adds that he is not asking them for what he himself will not give. He has voluntarily surrendered his own apostolic rights.” A further digression is added as a reason: “that he has limited his enjoyment of his undoubted rights in the interest of the gospel.” Barrett also argues that this chapter is not an intrusion between two separate chapters that discuss the issue of food sacrificed to idols.<sup>15</sup> Paul suspected and with good reason that his attitude and conduct would provoke opposition in Corinth. He could see his readers questioning, “If this man were a true apostle, and enjoyed apostolic authority, he would not allow himself be restricted in this way - and in other ways, which we have observed in his behaviour in Corinth itself.” So, for Barrett, Paul is answering hypothetical questions about his Apostleship, apostolic rights, and freedom. It is thus a digression serving two functions: paradigmatic and apologetic.

For Bruce, I Cor. 9 is a sudden digression with an apologetic function, but not a surprising one.<sup>16</sup> Paul is defending his Apostleship and therefore his freedom.<sup>17</sup> It is therefore not surprising that Paul here digresses to face this opposition head on. Paul in this chapter shows that he is indeed an apostle, has rights which he deliberately forebears, and that this is a mark of his freedom and independence. The ultimate aim is the progress of the gospel: to save many more. Conzelmann argues for the unity of the letter. He surveys some of the hypotheses on reconstruction, but argues that the circumstances of its composition accounts for ‘the existing breaks.’<sup>18</sup> However, he sees chapter 9 introducing a new theme. For him, the freedom of chapter 8 is different from that of chapter 9. In chapter 9, it is the freedom of the apostle rather than Christian freedom in general. He therefore sees chapter 9 as an

---

<sup>13</sup> See Barrett, 1968, p. 15f, where he says, “At present I record the view that no partition theory in regard to I Corinthians seems more probable than that Paul simply wrote the letter through beginning with chapter 1 and finishing with chapter 16.” He then goes on to discuss arguments in favour of his position.

<sup>14</sup> See Barrett, 1968, p. 16.

<sup>15</sup> See Barrett, 1968, pp. 199f.

<sup>16</sup> Bruce, F. F. *I and II Corinthians*; NCB (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids; and Marshall, Morgan & Scott: London, 1971). pp. 82-3.

<sup>17</sup> See Bruce, 1971, p. 83. Bruce rallies more support for this conclusion from internal evidence within the letter itself. I Cor, 4: 3ff shows that the Corinthians had expressed doubts about Paul’s Apostleship.

apologia in which Paul defends his freedom.<sup>19</sup> Conzelmann thus understands this chapter as a parenthesis, an “excursus” (at least the first 18 verses) in which the apostle introduces a new theme in defence of his Apostleship, and to clear himself of any misunderstanding of his conduct on this matter in Corinth.

Fee contends that I Cor. 9 “is an integral part of his (Paul's) response to their letter.”<sup>20</sup> He rejects the ‘traditional’ answer which sees chapter 9 as a digression with a paradigmatic function as well as all the other propounded suggestions. His explanation is that Paul is here defending a challenge of his authority and conduct (v. 3 shows the certainty and the seriousness of this challenge). There were two sources for this challenge, he says: the matter of material support played against Paul, and the issue of market food in which Paul’s supposed vacillation counts against him. So for Fee, chapter 9 is therefore not a digression or an interpolation. Rather, it is a defence of his conduct on these issues, which, at least with the Corinthians, had a direct and serious consequence on the question of his Apostleship. Paul argues that he is indeed an apostle (vv. 1b-14), and that apostleship for him means the right to their support (even though he has rejected that, vv. 15-18), and the freedom to eat or reject food of any kind (vv. 19-23).<sup>21</sup> The implication of this statement, which Fee probably did not see, is that there is a direct link between the ‘eating and drinking’ of chapter 9 and the ‘idol-meats’ issue.

### **5.2.2. Apostleship and Apostolic Rights (vv. 3-18).**

The above discussion shows the need for another look at the text, which is the concern here. Paul is in this passage defending his Apostleship and his freedom: “Am I not free? am I not an apostle?” (v. 1). Interestingly, there is a close parallel to this in contemporary popular philosophy, exemplified in the discussions of the Cynic way of life. The Cynic is one who is ‘sent’ and who is ‘free’:

Behold, God has sent you the man who will show in practice that it is possible. “Look at me,” he says, “I am without a home, without a city, without property, without a slave; I sleep on the ground; I have neither wife nor children, no miserable governor’s mansion, but only earth, and sky, and one rough Cloak. Yet what do I lack? Am I not free from pain and fear, am I not free?”<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Conzelmann, 1975. p. 4. He argues that “even the complex that gives the strongest offence, chapter 8-10, can be understood as a unity.”

<sup>20</sup> Conzelmann, 1975, pp. 151ff.

<sup>21</sup> Here talking about Paul and the Corinthians respectively, and referring specifically to the issue of food sacrificed to idols in their letter to Paul. See Fee, 1987, pp. 392ff.

<sup>22</sup> See Fee, 1987, p. 363.

<sup>23</sup> Epictetus *Diss.* III. xxii. 46-48.

Paul's rhetoric here is highly persuasive and the tone very emotional. He aims to prove that he has these rights, and not to argue that the Corinthians should allow him their use.<sup>23</sup> The fact that in v. 12b and vv. 15-18 he explains his renunciation, and the fact that the issue seems touchy and is re-addressed in similar fashion in II Cor. 11: 7-12; 12: 13, suggests that it was raised by the Corinthians who probably used it against him to call his apostleship into question.<sup>24</sup> I suggest that most probably, echoes of the debate on the form and content of teaching, and especially of means of support of teachers in contemporary popular philosophy, find expression here.<sup>25</sup>

The final argument Paul employs in support of his claim is the saying or command of the Lord (ὁ κύριος διέταξεν in v. 14). This is not a direct quotation of the saying of Jesus. Dungan suggests that it refers to the whole of the 'mission instructions' of Luke 10: 1-12 and its parallels.<sup>26</sup> Paul's concern here is apostles' entitlement to live by the gospel, and so we may narrow this down to Luke 10: 4, 7-8.<sup>27</sup> There is no question on the fact that this proverb applied by Jesus when sending the 72 was understood as a command. The casual way Paul refers to it may suggest that the Corinthian Christians knew about it,<sup>28</sup> but that we cannot be sure.<sup>29</sup> The question however is: are we right in saying with Dungan that Paul 'set aside'<sup>30</sup> or deliberately disobeyed<sup>31</sup> an explicit command of the Lord? Fee disagrees calling attention to the fact that this is making 'far too much of Paul's use of the verb command.' Moreover, he says, Paul did not see this as a command *to* missionaries, but *for* missionaries, for their benefit.<sup>32</sup> It is very doubtful that Paul would, as Dungan says, disobey what he understood as the Lord's command *to* him. From the context (cf. v. 22), we know that Paul understood himself as being under the law of

---

<sup>23</sup> See Fee, 1987, p. 401.

<sup>24</sup> See Fee, 1987, pp. 398f; See also Theissen, 1982. pp. 27-67; and Hock, 1980. pp 50-65; Also Judge, E. A. "Cultural Conformity and Innovation in Paul: Some Clues from Contemporary Documents." *TynB* (1984). pp. 15-23., who argues for sociological factors behind this.

<sup>25</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 399. See above under 4.3.1. and 4.4.2.

<sup>26</sup> Dungan, D L. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul: The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of the Early Church*. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1971). pp. 40-75.

<sup>27</sup> So Fee, p. 413.

<sup>28</sup> See Dungan, 1971, p. 27 who makes a considerable point that they knew it well.

<sup>29</sup> So Fee, 1987, p. 413.

<sup>30</sup> So Dungan, 1971, p. 20.

<sup>31</sup> Dungan, 1971, p. 3.

<sup>32</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 413, note.

Christ. Fee's position is thus preferred. Also, as Dungan himself admits,<sup>33</sup> Paul is nowhere in the whole of the attack charged with disobeying the Lord's command.

Theissen discusses this issue in terms of legitimation and subsistence, identifying three forms: charismatic, traditional and functional. He concludes that Paul's opponents in Corinth employed the charismatic form of legitimation supplementing it with the traditional, while Paul employed the functional form supplementing it with the charismatic.<sup>34</sup> The former are identified as 'itinerant charismatics,' while Paul is seen as a 'community organiser;' and the controversy in Corinth is understood as a conflict between these two forms of missionaries. In other words, itinerant charismatics understood 'the command of the Lord' (v. 14) as "an apostolic duty" which obliges missionaries to practice charismatic poverty, while Paul labours to show that it is not an obligation but a 'privilege.' Paul was accused of disregarding this command by working for material existence. By calling it a privilege, Paul shows that his renunciation might have offended "against the letter of Jesus' command but was in keeping with its spirit."<sup>35</sup>

It seems clear that the debate over the appropriate means of support for wandering missionaries and philosophical teachers was a live issue in Corinth (see 4.4.3 above). Hock identifies accepting fees, entering a household, begging and working for a living as the four means of support that fit the Corinthian situation.<sup>36</sup> Paul was despised because he worked for a living and refused support, and the authenticity of his Apostleship was doubted. Surely, this explains the rhetoric of this passage. Seen in this light, Paul's arguments in these verses make sense. His right to their support is expressed in terms of a right to φάγειν καὶ πιεῖν, ('eat and drink', v. 4). Contrary to what Fee says above, this eating and drinking has nothing to do with food sacrificed to idols. It is to do with the question of sustenance, his right to their support, which is expressed in an "intensely rhetorical style."<sup>37</sup> The second right he mentions is the right to ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν, "to take along with us a believing wife" (v. 5a). It is wrong to interpret this as an argument for the right to

---

<sup>33</sup> Dungan, 1971, p. 39.

<sup>34</sup> Theissen, 1982, pp. 53-54.

<sup>35</sup> Theissen, 1982, pp. 40-54.

<sup>36</sup> See Hock, 1980, pp. 52-59., where this is discussed. He concludes, "Paul's tentmaking corresponds to one of the options, though the least popular one, and his right to be supported, a right exercised by his opponents, would seem to correspond to the option of entering a household." Cf. also above under 4.4.2.

<sup>37</sup> See Fee, 1987, p. 402. He says that "the μή expects a negatively expressed sentence. *Thís* (lit.), 'can it be that we do not have the right to food and drink?'" / ✓

marry (cf. e.g. 7:2). Rather, it is an argument for the right to be accompanied by a wife and depend on the support of the church being visited.<sup>38</sup>

Paul argues that he and Barnabas too have these rights, implying that they work for a living because they chose to waive their rights. Because this was misunderstood, Paul devotes the next 8 verses, employing every available argument to prove and substantiate this claim. First, he does this through a set of 3 analogies in verse 7, and two more before the end of this section (vv. 10-11, 13), just 'to clarify or to reinforce' his point.<sup>39</sup> Paul therefore does not use these analogies as simple illustrations, but obviously as part of the argument itself.<sup>40</sup> In verse 7, with 3 questions, Paul introduces into the argument the first 3 analogies. The fact he puts forward is that 'for one who is engaged in an activity, there is the expectation that physical needs will be supplied.'<sup>41</sup> So the man in military service receives his supplies, the man who plants a vineyard eats from its fruit, and the man who tends a flock partakes of the milk from the flock.<sup>42</sup> This implies that apostles, and thus Paul and Barnabas, deserve to be supported. The fourth analogy (that of 'workmen on the farm,' 'who plow or thresh,' 'or who by implication sow or reap'), comes up in vv. 10f. The fifth and final analogy in this section is that of priests who serve at the temple expecting to receive a share of that which is offered.<sup>43</sup>

But what does *ὄψωνιους* in v. 7 mean? Does it carry the weight of a 'wage' or 'salary' or something else? Caragounis' extensive work on this word understands it in terms of 'the barest means of life, not the luxury of a salary.'<sup>44</sup> He presents a

---

<sup>38</sup> See Fee, 1987, p. 403. Another interpretation is that *ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα* refers to any Christian woman travelling as spiritual assistant. Yet another proposed by Clement of Alexander is that it refers to an apostle accompanied by his wife but not living maritally with her, but treating her as a sister. Héring rightly regards these views as superfluous and over elaborate, respectively, views that have nothing in the text for support, see p. 77. Robertson and Plummer, 1911, p. 180 say that "the fact that a group of women ministered to Christ could not be supposed to justify such a discretion."

<sup>39</sup> See Gale, H. M. *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul*. (Westminster Press: Philadelphia, 1964), p. 10, who compares this use of analogies by Paul with Jesus' extensive use of parables in his teaching.

<sup>40</sup> See Gale, 1964, p.101.

<sup>41</sup> So Gale, 1964, p.103.

<sup>42</sup> Gale, 1964, p. 101.

<sup>43</sup> On priests enjoying a share of the offerings, as well as on their heritage as a whole see above, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.2.

<sup>44</sup> See Caragounis, C.C. "Ὀψωνιους: A Reconstruction Of Its Meaning," *NovT*. xvi (1974) pp. 35-57. He argues: "The proper rendering seems to be 'whoever serves in an army by providing his own means of life.' 'At his own expense' is perhaps a neater rendering and might be preferred but 'expense' must not be understood in any sense approximating that of 'wages', this should be avoided at all cost. Moreover, 'wages' is unfit as a translation here because it renders the clause a linguistic



number of reasons why the understanding here is not that of 'wages', or salary. Firstly, he notes that Paul's relationship with the Corinthians, was not one of employee - employer, but one of craftsman - handiwork; apostle - seal of Apostleship. Here Paul was clearly the craftsman and the Corinthians were the handiwork; he was the apostle and they were the seal of Apostleship. The implication is that the handiwork or seal of Apostleship cannot assume the position of an employer. The idea of salary raises the question of who Paul's employer was. Secondly, his argument explains why the question of remuneration was delicate in the early church as can be seen in the *Didache* (xi.3-12), where genuine apostles, prophets and teachers were known when they did not ask for money; and in xiii.1ff such prophets and teachers could remain with a congregation if they proved ἀξιός.

No mention of 'salary' or wages is made. Also from the context, one cannot say that the fruit of the vine or the milk of the flock which the labourer takes, amounts to a 'salary.' There is therefore no reason why the word should be understood as 'salary.' The notion of 'salary' carries with it the connotation of a superior - inferior relationship. The one receiving the 'salary' is inferior to and dependent on the employer. This is important for II Cor. where Paul is unwilling to come under such dependence he considers a burden to his converts and therefore a hindrance to the gospel.<sup>45</sup> A document preserved in the John Rylands library and dated in 257 BCE uses the word ὀψωνίον which has been translated as 'salary.'<sup>46</sup> Maron writes to Zenon requesting the latter to increase his ὀψωνίον. But it can easily be understood as a request for an increase of his provision. In fact, Maron's reason for the request, 'to provide for the cost of grinding and for buying water,' does not support the reading 'salary.' One does not give such reason when asking for salary increment.

But what source was Paul drawing these analogies from? What was the biggest influence in his choice of these metaphors? A strong argument that the language of Deut 20: 6 and Proverbs 27:18, 26 and 27, which is so similar to that of I Cor. 9:7, suggests that at least for the first 3 analogies, Paul's choice was influenced by the

---

'nonsense' and a contradiction in terms: no one can pay oneself wages. On the contrary, it is quite meaningful to say that one provides oneself with the means of life. (p. 52).

<sup>45</sup> See below under 5.3.2.3.

<sup>46</sup> P. Rylands Vol. IV, pp. 7-7 = P. Ryland Zen. 6 = SB7642: Μάρων Ζήνωνι χαιρεῖν καλῶς] φαίνεται, εἰς τὸ ὀψωνίον ἔτι (δραχμας) β (τριώβολον) ὥστε π. [ ] ψοῖ εἰς τὰ τε ἄλετρα καὶ ὕδωρ ἀγοράζειν [ ] σοὶ δ' ὡς φαίνεται οὕτω ποιεῖ. πολλοὶ δὲ διατρίβουσι]. φυλακίαι λαμβάνουσι ὀψωνίον (δραχμας) ιε καὶ πυρῶν ἀρτάβας [ ]. "Maron to Zenon, greeting. Please assign me, if you think fit, two and a half more drachmae for my salary ... to provide for the cost of grinding and for buying water... But do just as you think right yourself. Many persons are occupied ... those engaged in guarding receive a salary of 15 drachmae and ... artabs of wheat."

OT.<sup>47</sup> This can hardly be contested. Paul chose these figures because they were known to him from his knowledge of the OT, and because they strengthened or enforced his argument in this passage. Sowing of spiritual seed refers to the preaching of the gospel which founded the churches, and the reaping of material harvest refers to this right to support which has been the centre of the argument here. Paul also employs a quotation from scripture (Deut. 25:4), as though to answer a charge of having no scriptural basis for his claim.<sup>48</sup> This citation, 'Do not muzzle an ox while it is treading out the grain,' demonstrates by analogy what Paul has been arguing for: 'that the labourer is permitted to enjoy the material benefit of the harvest'<sup>49</sup> and by implication, that apostles are entitled to material support.

Paul surprisingly goes on to renounce those rights he had extensively argued for. He devotes vv. 15-18 to explain his restraint. His tone is still high and the words are very 'personal and emotionally charged.'<sup>50</sup> Käsemann, rejecting both a polemical and an apologetic understanding of this chapter, suggests that these verses are a digression.<sup>51</sup> However, nothing calls for this understanding; in fact, the context right from the beginning anticipates them.<sup>52</sup> Paul was forced into defending his rights by the fact that his authority was questioned. Having argued for his rights, he is not now going to start using them, but will stick firm to his practice, which is the basis of his boasting. Also, he takes this position not to hinder the gospel (v. 12 above).

But why boasting? Why is Paul now wanting for himself what he is so opposed to? Is this a different kind of boasting?<sup>53</sup> The point to note is that Paul uses it positively only 'in the things that stand in contradiction to human 'boasting' (Christ crucified, weakness, suffering; cf. 1: 30-31; II Cor. 10-12; Gal. 6: 14).<sup>54</sup> Here too, the boasting is in what God has done: calling him into a unique apostleship and through him,

---

<sup>47</sup> See Gale, 1964, p.105. This confirms the discovery that the OT model of the support of priests influenced Paul's thinking, at least to some extent. See above under 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.2.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. v. 8. Moffatt, 1947, p. 116 captures this nuance of Paul's argument in the words 'oh, you may say, but these are secular, human arguments. What scripture have you for your plea?'

<sup>49</sup> See Fee, 1987, p.406.

<sup>50</sup> Fee, 1987, p.393.

<sup>51</sup> Käsemann, E. "A Pauline Version of the 'Amor Fati'" in *New Testament Questions Today*. English Translation (SCM Press: London, 1969), pp. 21-235, esp. 218.

<sup>52</sup> See Fee, 1987, p. 414.

<sup>53</sup> Fee, 1987, in his footnote, p.84, notes that the word *καυχόμαι* and its cognates is characteristically Pauline. It appears 59 times in the NT but 55 of these are Pauline. 39 of the 55 Pauline usages occur in the Corinthian correspondence (10 in I Cor and 29 in II Cor), mostly used pejoratively.

calling the churches into being. It is a 'boasting in weakness.' For Fee, "almost certainly this present 'boasting' is to be understood in these terms." Preaching the gospel without pay is a calculated decision not to hinder it and his boast.<sup>55</sup> This is explained further in the next two verses. His boasting is not in preaching the gospel because ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι ἐπίκειται ('for necessity compels me to preach', v.16). What Paul means by this is not a reference to something psychological, an 'inner compulsion' connected and resulting from his call, or being 'driven' by a sense of guilt because he formerly persecuted the church.<sup>56</sup> It refers rather to his divine destiny which is not a kind of 'fate' which brings heaviness, but a divine gift and obligation which leads to freedom and joy.<sup>57</sup> His preaching the gospel is not a choice on his part, but something he must do because God 'has taken hold of' him (Phil. 3: 12), an ordained destiny for him revealed during the Damascus Road experience (Gal. 1: 15-16). Paul's argument then is that he cannot receive pay because his preaching of the gospel is not a choice on his part. He is not entitled to such pay because his apostleship is comparable to the work of a steward who was usually a slave entrusted with managing a household.<sup>58</sup> Such persons enjoy some benefit but do not deserve pay, neither does Paul. His benefit derives only from 'his total freedom from all merely human impositions on his ministry.'<sup>59</sup> His rejection of support sets him free from merely human restraints: any kind of 'restriction that patronage might impose' on him.<sup>60</sup> Paul does not mention patronage, but what he says carries that implication. This theme finds full expression in the next section which provides a further reason his choice.

### 5.2.3. Apostolic Freedom. vv. 19-27

In vv. 19-23, Paul is not depicting himself as an example of willing self-restraint for the sake of others, calling to mind 8: 13,<sup>61</sup> or giving a final concluding word on the

---

<sup>54</sup> See Fee, 1987, p. 417.

<sup>55</sup> Fee, 1987, p.418. Orr, W F. and Walther, J A. *I Corinthians*. Anchor Bible, (Doubleday: Garden City, New York, 1976), p.242 give a contrary view when they seem to give the impression that Paul's boasting here is because he presents the gospel free of charge, which is indeed his pride.

<sup>56</sup> See Käsemann, 1969, pp. 228-9.

<sup>57</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 418.

<sup>58</sup> The fact that he compares his Apostleship to stewardship gives a hint to the demeaning nature of his working to support his ministry, at least as was understood by the Corinthians. See below in 5.3.2.2.

<sup>59</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 420f.

<sup>60</sup> Fee, p. 1987, 423.

<sup>61</sup> See Dungan, 1971, pp. 25-26.

issue of material support.<sup>62</sup> He is most likely 'still defending his Apostleship against those who are calling him into question.'<sup>63</sup> He concentrates on his conduct which as shown in these verses could well have been used against him, condemning him as no real apostle whose word on any issue could be heeded.<sup>64</sup> It seems most likely that the issue here has to do with his conduct in regard to marketplace food (cf. the close language affinities with 10: 23-36).<sup>65</sup> V. 19 which introduces this section returns to the question of freedom (v.1). He is 'free from all' which refers primarily to financial independence of all. At the same time, he states that he is the 'servant' or 'slave' of Christ. Again this appeals to the ethos of popular philosophy.<sup>66</sup> In other words, Christ is his master. Again, slaves or servants do get subsistence, but not wages! He was an 'Apostle', an 'Agent' of Christ. The language of servanthood here recalls Phil. 2: 5-8; cf. Gal. 4: 4-5 and 5: 15, which depict Jesus as the paradigm of such servanthood which Paul seeks to emulate (cf. II Cor. 4: 5). The concern is the gospel and its progress: that it gets a good hearing in whatever setting.<sup>67</sup>

1 of

Paul says that his conduct, which to the Corinthians seems chameleon-like, and unworthy of a true apostle, is exercised ἐν νόμῳ χριστοῦ, ('in the law of Christ' v. 22). His argument here seems to look back to v. 14 and to assert that although he has laid aside a command of the Lord (understood as a privilege), he is not acting outside the law of Christ. His conduct and rejection of support is within the law of Christ and its ultimate aim is the progress of the gospel. Vv. 24-27 bring him back to the point of 8:13 as well as conclude chapter 9. By waiving his rights, and by freely limiting his freedom in order not to hinder the gospel, he has given an example of self-discipline which is necessary for the Christian.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>62</sup> Hock, Ronald F. "Paul's Tentmaking and the Problem of his Social Class." *JBL* 97 (1979), 558-61; Ellison, H L. "Paul and the Law - All Things to All Men," in *Apostolic history and the Gospel, Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F F Bruce on his 60th Birthday.* ed W Gasque and R P Martin, (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1970) pp. 195-202.

<sup>63</sup> See Fee, 1987, p. 424.

<sup>64</sup> See Chadwick, H. "All Things to All Men." *NTS* 1 (1954-55), p. 263.

<sup>65</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 425.

<sup>66</sup> Talking about the itinerant Cynic, Epictetus asks, "whether the Cynic should not be undistracted, devoted to the service of God (διακονία τοῦ θεοῦ), able to move freely among men, not tied down to private obligations nor involved in personal relations which if he violates he will cease to keep his character as a good man, and if he maintains (them) will destroy the messenger (ἄγγελος) and scout and herald (κῆρυξ) of the gods..." (*Diss.* III, 26, 69; cf. III, 26, 28; IV, 7, 20). See further, Theissen, 1982, p. 47.

<sup>67</sup> See Fee, 1987, p. 427; See also Bornkamm, G. "The missionary Stance of Paul in I Cor. 9 and in Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts.* (ed). L. E Keck and J. L Martyn; (Abingdon: Nashville, 1966) pp. 194-207.

<sup>68</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 435.

### **5.3. Paul and Support From Corinth.**

#### **5.3.1. Support which Paul did Accept.**

##### **5.3.1.1. Rom. 16. 1-5a.**

The issue here is the services offered to Paul in particular, and to the churches in general by Phoebe (vv. 1-2) and the couple Prisca and Aquila (vv. 3-5a). The question of the context of this chapter of Romans, “the possibility of its independent existence,” as well as “the question of its relationship to the Roman letter as a whole and to the Pauline letters, or of its destination and authenticity,” is a big subject.<sup>69</sup> So also is the important question of its place of origin. Luckily, they have no bearing on the question of finances.

##### **5.3.1.1.1. Phoebe’s Commendation.**

The fact that there is no reference to Phoebe’s future arrival, and the fact that this commendation comes at the end of a letter dealing with other things, leads to the conclusion that she was the bearer of the letter.<sup>70</sup> In this commendation, Paul refers to her as *διάκονον* of the church at Cenchreae (v. 1) and *προστάτις* of many including himself. Paul tells his readers to welcome this woman so described and to assist her in whatever help she may need. He says they should do that *ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἀγίων* (“in the Lord in a manner worthy of the saints”). Dunn sees a connection between the concern here and 12: 13, and says, “the allusion is no doubt to the strong tradition of hospitality and concern for strangers within Judaism.”<sup>71</sup> This is however too narrow as the practice of hospitality was widespread in the Greco-Roman world, not just in Judaism.

The word *διάκονος* is difficult to interpret here. The term can refer to a formal office of the deaconate<sup>72</sup> or simply as a functional term.<sup>73</sup> Dunn’s conclusion offers a third option: a ministry of hospitality which would have been very outstanding in

---

<sup>69</sup> See McDonald, J. I. H. “Was Romans 16 a Separate Letter?” *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 369-72, esp. 372.

<sup>70</sup> Morris, L. *The Epistle to the Romans*, (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1988), p. 528.

<sup>71</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 888.

<sup>72</sup> Morris, 1988, pp. 528f. He argues that “the social conditions of the time were such that there must have been the need for feminine church workers to assist in such matters as the baptism of women or anything that meant contact with women’s quarters in their homes.” There is however no basis for this conception. Cf. Käsemann, E. *Commentary on Romans*. (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1980), pp. 410f.

the port city of Cenchreae.<sup>74</sup> For Dunn, the word προστάτις and the reference to “the diverse roles within the Christian churches (cf. 12: 3-8),” lend support to this understanding. Whelan, using the information on the legal position of women in the Greco Roman world, as well as the role of women in collegia where a number of examples of women as patrons of voluntary associations are known, demonstrates that her work is not limited to women’s work.<sup>75</sup> Fiorenza argues that this title had nothing to do with gender roles, but with “a minister of the whole church.” She questions why διακονος when used for Paul or any male leader is translated ‘minister,’ ‘missionary,’ or ‘servant,’ but in the case of Phoebe is translated ‘deaconess.’<sup>76</sup> We shall return to this point.

The second word, προστάτις (feminine for προστάτης lit. ‘protectress’) is equally difficult to interpret. The word which can also mean “a chief, ruler, leader: the leader of a party,”<sup>77</sup> appears only here in the NT. Käsemann feels that because “women could not take on legal functions,” the word used here has the idea of “the personal care which Paul and others have received at the hands of the deaconess.”<sup>78</sup> Similarly, Morris,<sup>79</sup> though accepting that the word is feminine of the Latin *patronus*, does not accept “that Phoebe was the legal protector of the Christians at Cenchreae.” He opts therefore for a figurative meaning for the word signifying her high standing in society. He argues that the fact that her travelling companions are not mentioned shows that she must have been accompanied by “a retinue of servants, and this too, points to a woman of means.” Both Käsemann and Morris however, do not supply any evidence for asserting that women could not hold the position of a patroness. Fiorenza has however contended that women patrons like this woman “founded house churches and, as prominent patrons, used their influence for other missionaries and Christians,” and Whelan complements this by arguing that the patronage between this woman and Paul was reciprocal.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Ziesler, J. *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*. (SCM Press: London, 1990), p. 350.

<sup>74</sup> Dunn, 1991, p.887. Cf. Murray, J. *The Epistle to the Romans*, NIC Vol. II. (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1965), p. 226.

<sup>75</sup> Whelan, C.F. “*Amica Pauli*: The Role of Phoebe in the Early Church.” *JSNT* 49 (1993): 67-85, esp. 73-77.

<sup>76</sup> Fiorenza, E.S. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. (Crossroad: New York, 1983)168-175, esp. 170. She contends further: “The genuine Pauline letters apply missionary titles and such characterisations as co-worker (Prisca), brother/sister (Apphia), *diakonos* (Phoebe), and apostle (Junia) to women also.” (p. 169).

<sup>77</sup> LSJ s.v. pp. 606f.

<sup>78</sup> Käsemann, 1980, p. 411.

<sup>79</sup> Morris, 1988, p. 530.

<sup>80</sup> Fiorenza, 1983, p. 183; and Whelan, 1993, pp. 79-82.

Dunn<sup>81</sup> has contended for the reading 'patroness' on three grounds:

a) The masculine equivalent was well known and established in the sense of patron or protector, with "two occurrences of it in the Jewish inscriptions from Rome." Equally important was the Latin equivalent *patronus* which Paul's readers would have been familiar with.

b) The feminine gender of the word is now attested "in a second-century papyrus" as well as a "Jewish synagogue inscription" of the third century from Aphrodisias.<sup>82</sup>

c) It is now known that a stronger tradition of women taking on prominent roles existed much more than was realised, a position strengthened by discovering the use of titles such as ἀρχισυνάγωγος or γυμνασίαρχος understood precisely in the sense of protector and benefactors. Also, it is realised that in Judaism of the period, women held "a higher profile ... than has previously been realised."<sup>83</sup>

Therefore, to summarise, given the fact that there were women patrons to associations (see above), and given the fact that Jewish women occupied a prominent position as a result of their services as benefactors, Phoebe was not simply a servant of the church at Cenchreae. Also, it is doubtful that she would have been an official of the church because it cannot be established that the church at this time had a developed system of organisation. Similarly, given the fact that Paul insisted on his freedom and therefore rejected the patronage of the Corinthians,<sup>84</sup> the relationship between Paul and this woman has to be understood differently. Whelan demonstrates that this relationship is best understood in terms of 'mutual patronage,'<sup>85</sup> in which Paul benefited from this woman's high social standing, as well as provided patronage to her in the way described in this verse. This argument clearly makes sense.

### 5.3.1.1.2. Prisca and Aquila. (vv. 3-5a).

---

<sup>81</sup> Dunn, 1991, pp. 888f. Dunn, after noting that there were patrons in Greek cities who ensured the interests of foreign residents were protected (referring to LSJ, προστάτης III.2), concludes, "in view of Cenchreae's role as a port and the description of Phoebe already as διάκονος (v. 1), it may be that we should see the two roles as linked - 'deacon' of the church because of her well-known patronage of 'many' foreign visitors including resident Jews and visiting Christians." Cf. Murray, 1965, p. 226f and Ziesler, 1990, p. 350.

<sup>82</sup> See Horsley, G. "Sophia, 'The Second Phoebe'" in *New Documents* (SNTS, August, 1988): 239-244. This woman's husband who erected this inscription for her saw that she had something common with Phoebe in Romans 16: 2: "The common link must have been perceived to be their provision of patronage" (p. 243). See also *CIL* X 810 and X 811, 813 as evidence of women patrons of guilds and trade associations, and see further Whelan, 1993, p. 76.

<sup>83</sup> He cites here LSJ s.v. where *IGRom* 3: 802 is given as evidence; as well as Brooten, *Women Leaders*. This point is discussed in detail under 2.4.1.

<sup>84</sup> See the discussion above under 5.2.2 and 5.2.3.

<sup>85</sup> Whelan, 1993, pp. 77-85.

We are dependent on Acts 18: 1ff for the connection of this couple with Corinth. Here Paul sends greetings to special friends, a couple he refers to as συνεργούς ('fellow workers'), a term he regularly employs to describe his associates.<sup>85</sup> Acts 18: 1ff relates their first acquaintance with the apostle. There, Paul stayed and worked with them as a tentmaker, but the reference here is to their association in the work of the Lord, their missionary commission, designated by ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.<sup>87</sup> In v. 4 Paul says that 'they risked their necks for my life' (οἱτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν). Paul does not mention the situation in which this self-sacrificial act was committed by this couple, and we are only left to speculate what it was. In any case, Paul says explicitly that he owes them thanks as do all the churches of the Gentiles. The word used is εὐχαριστῶ ('I give thanks'). Morris interestingly notes that this is "the only place in the NT where the verb 'to thank' has a human object."<sup>88</sup> Why was Paul here directing his thanks to this couple when in other similar instances, like in the case of the gifts of the Philippians which he calls partnership in the gospel, Paul directs his thanks to God? And why would all the churches of the Gentile owe them thanks for an act rendered to Paul? Or were the churches giving thanks for what was done for them personally?

Käsemann notes that εὐχαριστῶ is a secular term used here to designate Paul's debt of gratitude and that this couple "are emphatically put first, and they receive almost extravagant praise,"<sup>89</sup> but does not say why this extravagant praise was given. Dunn refers to the language here as "hyperbolic," which in any case "attests not only the esteem and regard in which Paul held Prisca and Aquila, but also the very widespread nature of their influence."<sup>90</sup> But this is the same as saying Paul owes them thanks because of their influence, which is highly unlikely. More likely Paul here adopts the social convention where verbal thanks are used by very close friends, not replacing material gratitude, but as an expression of debt.<sup>91</sup> We do not know why he did this, and how he anticipated repaying that debt. The first part of v. 5 refers to the church that meets in the house of this couple. Scholars are unanimous in finding a verb for this phrase in the word ἀπαύσασθε at the beginning of v. 3.

---

<sup>85</sup> As in 16: 9; I Cor. 3: 9; II Cor. 1: 24; 8: 23; Phil. 2: 25; 4: 3; I Thes. 3: 2; Philem. 1, 24 etc.

<sup>87</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 892.

<sup>88</sup> Morris, 1988, p. 532. Actually it is an indirect object.

<sup>89</sup> Käsemann, 1980, p. 413.

<sup>90</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 893. This could have something to do with the destination of the letter. If Rome, it was because they were well known there from their previous as well as present stay, or if Ephesus because they were still living there.

<sup>91</sup> Four letters containing a term of endearment, and expressing verbal thanks are *P. Leid.* 42; *P.*



They see here Paul saying “greet also the church that meets in their house.”<sup>82</sup> It is possible that the hosting of churches in their home is what has earned them the gratitude. But other hosts of house-churches did not receive this ‘hyperbolic’ praise. Therefore the possibility must be allowed that Paul’s gratitude was for some personal benefit he enjoyed from this couple and which the churches knew about and greatly appreciated it because it rescued their apostle.

### 5.3.1.2. Rom. 16: 23a.

This verse mentions the services of Gaius who was ξένος to Paul and the whole church. The word ξένος which has a wide range of meaning, is most commonly used in the sense of ‘guest’ or ‘host’, with the latter appearing less frequently.<sup>83</sup> It is the majority view that v. 9 of this chapter and the context “support the conclusion that Gaius who is the apostle’s host is the Gaius mentioned in I Cor. 1: 14.”<sup>84</sup> He is therefore not to be identified with the Gaius in Acts 19: 29; 20: 24 and III John 1. The appearance of the name in these other passages only shows that the name was a common,<sup>85</sup> Roman name.<sup>86</sup> He is thus probably to be identified with the Gaius of Acts 18: 7, one of Paul’s first converts and “quite likely a leading figure in the church at Corinth.”<sup>87</sup> But what exactly did that hospitality include? Was Paul referring to the availability of room provided by this man in his house, for his meetings with the ‘whole church’ when he visited Corinth, or did it entail something more than that? Can we consider ‘my host’ as referring to Gaius’ special service to Paul as an individual, and if so, what exactly did it include? What was the convention of this social practice then? What was the essential difference between this offer and that which Paul rejected in Corinth (cf. I Cor. 9: 3-18; II Cor. 11-12)?

‘Whole church’ cannot be a reference to the universal church, that is, “hospitality to travelling Christians,” as Käsemann and others have suggested.<sup>88</sup> Rather, it “must mean that there were other meetings much more frequent than the big meetings of

---

*Mich.* 483; 498; and *P. Oxy.* 963.

<sup>82</sup> e.g. Morris, 1988, p. 532; Dunn, 1991, p. 893; and Käsemann, 1980, p. 411.

<sup>83</sup> LSJ s.v. ξένος; See also Dunn, 1991, p. 910.

<sup>84</sup> Käsemann, 1980, p. 421; See also Dunn, 1991, p. 910; Morris, 1988, p. 544; Goodspeed, E. J. “Gaius Titius Justus” *JBL*. 69 (1950); 382-383; Murray, 1965, p. 238.

<sup>85</sup> Morris, 1988 pp. 543-544.

<sup>86</sup> Ziesler, 1990, p. 356.

<sup>87</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 910. See also Goodspeed, 1950, pp. 382-3.

<sup>88</sup> Käsemann, 1980, p. 421.

the whole church in Corinth.”<sup>99</sup> So Gaius, a member of the church at Corinth, did offer Paul and the church there hospitality, and Paul accepted the offer. The pattern of ‘hospitality’ to the sophists offers a possible parallel to this.<sup>100</sup> The difference however is that Paul did not depend solely on the hospitality of his host here.

### 5.3.1.3. I Cor. 16: 5-11.

In these verses, Paul announces his travel plans and the arrival of Timothy in Corinth. The concern here is with the question of travel expenses. Paul’s itinerary here fits the picture in Acts 20: 1-3, even though the latter is the realisation of the altered plans of II Cor. 1: 15-2: 4.<sup>101</sup> Here the apostle intended visiting Corinth after spending Pentecost at Ephesus and going through Macedonia. The hope is that it will be an extended visit because he will spend the winter there (vv. 5-9). The important point for our purpose is in the words ἵνα ὑμεῖς με προπέμψητε οὐ ἐὰν πορεύωμαι (‘so that you can help me on my journey wherever I go’, NIV v. 6b). The key word here is προπέμψητε which appears in different tenses and moods in the NT.<sup>102</sup> It is a “technical” word denoting “the responsibility of a host to provide for his departing guest,” a provision that includes “food, money, and travelling companions so as to ensure a safe and successful arrival at his or her destination.”<sup>103</sup> The word also has the meaning “to accompany a little way”<sup>104</sup> with the idea of escorting the guest to the boat or ship. While the latter is possible, it does not seem that this is simply what Paul was writing about in these verses. Barrett, assuming the former rendering, sees in the word, a description of “a Christian duty to further fellow Christians on their travels.”<sup>105</sup>

In this passage, Paul looked forward to receiving this kind of support from Corinth both for himself and for his companions. They will have to render this kind of service to him in the future when he comes to them, but now, this “manifestation of

---

<sup>99</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 911.

<sup>100</sup> See the discussion in 4.3.1..

<sup>101</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 818 rightly contends for this understanding.

<sup>102</sup> It appears again in v. 11 of this passage. See also II Cor. 1: 16; Rom. 15: 24; Tit. 3: 13; Acts. 15: 3; III John. 6.

<sup>103</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 819. See also Peter Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians*. (J.B. Mohr: Tübingen, 1987), p. 261. See also Morris, 1988, p. 518 quoting BAGD s.v. ; Dunn, 1991, p. 872, who notes that in early Christianity it was almost a technical term for the provision made by a church for missionary support; and Käsemann, 1980, p. 398.

<sup>104</sup> So Héring, 1962, p. 184.

<sup>105</sup> Barrett, 1968, p. 389.

Christian love” - a support necessary for the “Pauline Mission”<sup>106</sup> has to be given to Timothy. The support in question comes within the confines of the social convention of hospitality,<sup>107</sup> and is thus different from that which Paul insisted he will continue to reject (I Cor. 9: 15-18; cf. below in II Cor. 11: 7-11). Paul says that the church at Corinth must see to it that Timothy fears nothing (ἀφόβως). He does not say what the object of this fear was. But he says also that Timothy should not be despised, and should be sent away ‘in peace’ (v.11). The reason Paul gives for this appeal is because Timothy like himself is doing the work of the Lord. This ‘fear’ is explained differently. Fee suggests that Paul suspected that the “sentiments against him” in this congregation might “overflow to Timothy,” who was there primarily “to remind them of Paul’s ways” (4: 17).<sup>108</sup> In this understanding, ἐξουθενήσῃ (‘to despise’) is explained together with the verb ‘to fear.’ The assertion that the cause of this fear and of being despised “lay within Timothy himself” is questioned by Barrett and Conzelmann who cannot imagine that Paul would send one who is “a coward as his confidential agent.”<sup>109</sup> Fee’s position is the most plausible, but could the two words have been a reference to two different things? Could it be that Paul was soliciting hospitality for Timothy so that he would have no fear of a lack of lodging, or having to go to a public inn?<sup>110</sup> Surely, that is a possible reason why the word ‘to fear’ is used rather than a word denoting a feeling of dejection, or at least it must not be ruled out.

#### 5.3.1.4. II Cor. 1: 15-17.

These verses have rightly been called “the *locus classicus* ... for the attack on Paul for his elasticity of principle.”<sup>111</sup> Paul’s opponents in Corinth have used his change in travel plans, blown it “up out of all proportions”, to discredit him.<sup>112</sup> It seems the plan referred to here was made after I Cor. had been written, altering the original one in I Cor. 16: 5.<sup>113</sup> It is not clear why Paul had to change his travel plans twice.

---

<sup>106</sup> Barrett, 1968, p. 391.

<sup>107</sup> For a discussion of this social convention, see above under 1.4.

<sup>108</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 821.

<sup>109</sup> Barrett, 1968, p. 391; See also Conzelmann, 1975, p. 297.

<sup>110</sup> On Inns and lodging, see Casson, L. *Travel in the Ancient World*. (Allen and Unwin: London, 1974), esp. pp. 197-218.

<sup>111</sup> Chadwick, 1955, p. 262.

<sup>112</sup> Marshall, 1987, p. 318.

<sup>113</sup> Tasker, R. V. G. *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. (Tyndale Press: London, 1968), p. 46. Cf. Hughes, P. E. *Paul’s Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott: London, 1962), p. 31, who reminds us that this, like any reconstruction on the sequence of Paul’s association with Corinth, “must inevitably be conjectural” because “biographical information

But the sensitive nature of his response here, its “ironical and allusive character,” gives a hint to the gravity of the charge levelled on him as a result of this change.<sup>114</sup> The crux of the matter, as far as this subject is concerned, is to do with the phrase δευτέραν χάριν in v. 15. That this word presents difficulties of interpretation is testified by the different interpretations commentators have given it: ‘second benefit,’<sup>115</sup> ‘double pleasure,’<sup>116</sup> “second kindness,” in the sense of ‘favour’ or ‘gift’ taken not “in too concrete a sense,”<sup>117</sup> “second joy,”<sup>118</sup> and “a double opportunity for kindness.”<sup>119</sup> To me, this last interpretation explained in terms of what the Corinthians will have or experience (σχηῆτε), as they help the apostle along the way, to Macedonia and again to Judea, makes the most sense. χάρις is thus understood as a “gracious work” (cf. II Cor. 8: 7). This gives the word the meaning employed all through this epistle especially with reference to the collection, of human material gifts. The word προπεμφθῆναι<sup>120</sup> in v. 16 provides a further clue. Martin sees in it “something more than just ‘escort to the ship,’” and thinks Paul expected a delegation “to join him in bringing the collection to Jerusalem.”<sup>121</sup> But Paul uses the same word in Rom. 15: 24 when speaking of his intended visit to Rome and through Rome to Spain! This is likely, but not necessary. In the case of Corinth therefore,

---

concerning Paul’s movements and actions is so incomplete, and the gaps in our knowledge are so considerable.”

<sup>114</sup> Chadwick, 1955, p. 263.

<sup>115</sup> Moule, H. C. G. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Translation, Paraphrase and Exposition*. (Pickering and Inglis: London, 1963), p. 7. Hughes, 1962, p. 30, favouring this interpretation, sees a parallel to this in Rom. 1: 11, and says it “may mean that they would have had two opportunities, not one, of receiving spiritual communications from him in person.” Tasker, 1968, p. 46, taking this phrase with προπεμφθῆναι in v. 16 remarks that Paul “hoped to be brought on his way, i.e. ‘given a good send-off,’ toward Judea. This would enable the Corinthians to have a second benefit, i.e. the benefit of seeing him twice” (emphasis are his). Hughes’ explanation is suspect because the language in the two passages is different, and it is doubtful that Paul in v. 15 is referring to what he clearly says in the Romans passage. Tasker’s explanation of the benefit of seeing Paul twice seems to me to be too simplistic.

<sup>116</sup> Kruse, C. G. *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: an Introduction and Commentary*. (Inter-Varsity: Leicester, 1987), p. 73. Cf. Bultman, R. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. (Augsburg Publishing House: Minneapolis, 1985), pp. 37f.

<sup>117</sup> Barrett, C. K. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. (Harper and Row: New York & A&C Black: London, 1973), p. 75.

<sup>118</sup> Plummer, A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*. (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1915), p. 32.

<sup>119</sup> Fee, G. D. “χάρις in II Corinthians 1: 15: Apostolic Parousia and Paul-Corinth Chronology.” *NTS* 24 (1977-78): 533-38; See also Martin, R. P. *II Corinthians*. WBC 40, (Word [UK] Ltd.: Milton Keynes, 1991), p.25. These scholars have made reference to the above reviewed positions as well as others such as “a second opportunity for rejoicing,” “double delight,” “a second sign of his esteem,” “a second proof of my goodwill,” “a second blessing” and “a second opportunity of spiritual profit.”

<sup>120</sup> For the discussion on this word and cognates, see the discussion above on I Cor. 16: 6.

<sup>121</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 25.

the sense is more likely that of providing Paul with travelling expenses, to Macedonia and then to Jerusalem. So Paul happily accepted hospitality and travelling assistance from Corinth, a kind of support he accepted from other churches too,<sup>122</sup> and looked forward to accepting it from Rome.

### 5.3.2. Support Which Paul Refused and Why.

#### 5.3.2.1. Background: Relationship With the Corinthians.

Paul's relationship with the Corinthians leaves much to be desired.<sup>123</sup> It is soiled by apologetics and rhetoric of a bitter tone. What accounts for this and what is the origin of this soiled relationship? Has this got anything to do with Paul's refusal of support from Corinth? The first evidence appears quite early in I Cor. 1: 10- 4: 21: Paul's treatment of the issue of divisions in the church.<sup>124</sup> This section follows on right after the introductory thanksgiving of the letter.<sup>125</sup> The division was one that affected the whole church,<sup>126</sup> a division of opinion over leaders who were very unlikely to have been involved in it. Various studies attempting to interpret the nature of this division and how it affects Paul's relationship with this church have been undertaken.<sup>127</sup> It must be said here that the social and philosophical situation of the day has to be taken into consideration, and this relationship seen as a possible reflection of "the current philosophical milieu, with its emphasis both on human understanding and rhetorical skills," which may as well reflect "the position from

---

<sup>122</sup> Philemon 22 shows Paul happily accepting this support from his friend and the church in Colossae. See Carson, H. M. *The Epistle of Paul to Colossians and Philemon*, The Tyndale NT Commentaries, (Tyndale Press: London, 1966), p. 112.

See also Muller, 1967, p. 161; Lohse, E. *Colossians and Philemon*, (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1971), p. 187; Scott, E. F. *The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians*, MNTC (Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1948), p. 98 who believes also that Archippus was Philemon's son and leader of this church at Colossae (p. 114).

<sup>123</sup> None of Paul's relationship with his churches was perfect and each church had its problems. Yet among all the churches of the Pauline Mission, none is comparable to this particular church.

<sup>124</sup> Paul's treatment of this issue in Corinth shows that here it was more severe than that at Philippi. In Phil. 2: 1ff, Paul appeals to the Philippians to be of the same mind and attitude and later in 4: 1f narrows the appeal to the few individuals he names. Here in Corinth, the issue does seem to be more complicated and more widespread involving more people.

<sup>125</sup> Dahl, N. A "Paul and the Church at Corinth According to I Cor. 1:10-4: 21" in *Christian History and Interpretation*. Farmer, W. R; Moule, C. F. D; and Niebuhr, R. R. eds. (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1967), p. 315.

<sup>126</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 56. He reads ἕκαστος ὑμῶν, 'each one of you,' to carry this importation.

<sup>127</sup> Hurd, J. C. *The Origin of I Corinthians*. New Edition, (Mercer University Press: Macon, G A, 1983), pp. 108-113; Cf. Manson, T. W. *Studies in the Gospel and Epistles*. (Manchester University Press: Manchester, 1962), pp. 190-209; Barrett, 1968, pp. 43ff., 114f; Dahl, 1967, pp. 315.

which they are currently judging Paul and his ministry (cf. 4: 1-5).<sup>128</sup> It is not hard to detect the tone of frustration and disappointment in Paul's words in 1: 17. It does seem fairly obvious that the Corinthians, or at least some of them, had despised the apostle for his lack of rhetorical skill.<sup>129</sup> Paul was here then, trying to re-establish his status. ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου (NIV 'words of human wisdom') might have been the reason for favouring Apollos to Paul's disfavour, since the former was, according to Acts 18, ἀνὴρ λόγιος (lit. 'an eloquent man'). Thus Paul takes about 30 verses (1: 18-2: 16) to contrast human wisdom<sup>130</sup> with Christ the Wisdom and Power of God.

Paul's relationship with the Corinthians can be summarised in the following points:

- a) The factions and a Paul-group in this church reveal an opposition to Paul in Corinth. It is a logical conclusion to say that it was an opposition that the Paul-group resisted.
- b) The opposition to Paul included his being despised because he lacked rhetorical skill and wisdom. This was directed against the content of his message and his manner of presentation.
- c) They were able to despise their apostle because they had become arrogant and boastful. Paul went to great lengths to correct this human, worldly understanding of things.
- d) As well as despising Paul, a good percentage at least, were judging Paul and charging him with being untrue as an apostle, and possibly doing that because of his refusal of support (I Cor. 9).
- e) Although frustrated and disappointed, Paul had not given up. He appealed to them as brothers to be united (I Cor. 1: 10-11; cf. 1: 26; 2: 1; 3: 1ff; 4: 6ff). He also reminded them of the bond between them. By calling them his dear children, he was reminding them of their initial response to the gospel brought to them by him, and the relationship created by that. In so doing, Paul was hoping that the relationship would be restored and the unhealthy attitudes removed.

The evidence from II Cor. shows that the situation has further deteriorated. His appeals for unity in I Cor. seem to have fallen on deaf ears. His hopes to re-establish his status in their eyes and to strengthen the bond of friendship appear to have been dashed. The issue of identifying the developmental stages of this deteriorating relationship is beset by a number of literary and historical problems

---

<sup>128</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 65

<sup>129</sup> That must be the import of the words οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου. See Barrett, 1968, p. 49.

<sup>130</sup> Barrett, C. K. "Christianity at Corinth." *BJRL* 46 (1963/64): pp. 275ff notes that the word σοφία and its adjective σοφός occurs with unusual frequency in I Cor. 1-3.

present in the only source available to us: canonical II Cor. This is worsened by the fact that "there is a serious danger of arguing in a circle - from historical reconstruction to literary hypothesis and from literary hypothesis back to historical reconstruction."<sup>131</sup> This fact is illustrated by the numerous theories that abound regarding the composition of the letter and the sequence of events in it.<sup>132</sup> I do not necessarily need to reopen these problems in II Cor. to ascertain the state of the relationship of the apostle and this church. In fact, the literary difficulties do not have a direct effect on the understanding of the relationship. Here it is enough to summarise the historical reconstruction of events after the writing of I Cor.<sup>133</sup>

It seems fair to conclude that Timothy who was sent to Corinth (I Cor. 4: 17; 16: 11), returned with a disturbing report that made Paul change his plan to go first to Macedonia (I Cor. 16: 5), so that he went straight to Corinth (II Cor. 13: 2), possibly hoping to rectify the situation. It turned out to be a 'sorrowful' visit which was short-lived as Paul, embarrassed, probably withdrew to Macedonia to allow things cool off, because he planned to return to Corinth (II Cor. 1: 16). Paul returned to Ephesus from where he wrote the 'Sorrowful Letter' (II Cor. 2: 1-4). This letter was despatched by Titus, while Paul remained in Ephesus. When he was forced to leave Ephesus, he went north to Troas where a favourable door for effective ministry opened for him (II Cor. 2: 12-13), but because of anxiety, he had to abandon it to go to Macedonia hoping to find Titus there so that he could hear news about Corinth. When eventually he met Titus and received news that the 'Sorrowful Letter' had produced favourable effects and that Corinth was sober (II Cor. 7: 8-11), Paul decided to write II Cor. 1-9.<sup>134</sup> A closer look at the evidence is

---

<sup>131</sup> Barrett, 1973, p. 3. See also Marshall, 1987, p. 260.

<sup>132</sup> Talbert, C. H. *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on I and II Corinthians*, (Crosswood: New York, 1987), pp. xviiiiff (cf. Héring, 1962, pp. xiv-xv) has surveyed the startling diversity of opinion on the question of the integrity of this letter; as well as proposing a chronology of Paul's dealings with Corinth. For variants of the chronology of Paul's dealings with this church, see Barrett, 1987, pp. 16-17; Furnish, V. P. *The Anchor Bible II Corinthians. Translation with Introduction and Commentary* V. 32A (Doubleday: Garden City, New York, 1985), pp. 54-55; etc. See also on the literary problems of II Cor. in Martin, 1991, pp. xxxviii-iii who also includes a detailed excursus on the history of the composition of this epistle.

<sup>133</sup> For the details of this summary, see Furnish, 1985, pp. 54-55; Murphy-O'Connor, J. *The Theology of the Second Letter to the Corinthians*, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1991), pp. 15-17; Marshall, 1987, p. 260-62.

<sup>134</sup> There is a variant interpretation which understands canonical II Cor. 10-13 as the 'Sorrowful Letter' because of the harsh tone these 3 chapters portray. So Talbert, 1987, pp. xx, xxiii. See also pp. xvii-xix where Talbert lists others who hold this position. However, whichever position is taken, the picture that comes out is the same: Paul's relationship with Corinth deteriorated after I Cor.

necessary.<sup>135</sup> The picture given in II Cor. 1: 12-2: 13 is that in the judgement of the Corinthians, Paul failed to keep his promise of a long visit (I Cor. 15: 5-6) making only a brief visit instead (II Cor. 2: 1). He had also planned to return to Corinth from Macedonia (I Cor. 1: 16), but did not, possibly feeling it was unwise to return immediately after the painful visit (II Cor. 1: 23; 2: 1). Instead, he wrote the 'Sorrowful Letter' (II Cor. 2: 4). These circumstances placed Paul on an unfavourable position at Corinth. Paul appeared at least to a good number of the Corinthians to be weak, unstable, and a vacillator. Thus, the challenge to Paul's character was also a challenge to his message,<sup>136</sup> and Paul's attitude confirms their opinion of him.

Paul is here at pains to clear the air. He says that his conscience is clear that he has acted sincerely in Corinth (II Cor. 1: 12), and appeals to them not to read between the lines of what he writes (vv. 13f). He then contended that the gospel he preaches is trustworthy because it comes from a trustworthy God (vv. 18-22) and that God is his witness that his failure to return to Corinth had the interests of the Corinthians at heart (vv. 23ff). It is not hard to imagine the tense atmosphere and rejection to which Paul was responding. Clearly his relationship with this church was at breaking point. But there were other problems as well. In 3: 1 Paul asks: 'Are we beginning to commend ourselves again?' The word rendered 'to recommend' is the Greek *συμμοστανειν*. Marshall notes and discusses several recommendation passages in this letter.<sup>137</sup> His discussion perceives a breakdown of relationship of trust. Appealing to the common convention of self-commendation, he sees Paul's unwillingness to commend himself again as a sign of his unhappiness that his friends were requiring him to do that. He notes that the accusation of inconsistency had ended the friendship, hence the need for Paul to commend himself again, at least as the Corinthians saw it.<sup>138</sup> In this understanding, the Corinthians felt justified to demand a second commendation from Paul. By his refusal of aid from them, Paul

---

<sup>135</sup> Whether or not canonical II Cor. 10-13 is the 'Sorrowful Letter' does not really matter. I am here looking at the evidence of canonical II Cor.

<sup>136</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, 1991, p. 24.

<sup>137</sup> Marshall, 1987, pp. 259-277, referring to 3: 1-3; 4: 1-6; 5: 11b-13; 6: 4; 7: 11; 10: 12-18; 12: 11-13

<sup>138</sup> Marshall, 1987, p. 268 summarises his discussion in the following words: "I propose that Paul's relationship with the Corinthians was initiated by recommendation as was his rivals' and that Paul committed himself to a relationship of trust with the Corinthians; also that he was later offended by the need to commend himself a second time to the Corinthians after the breakdown of his relations with them and their acceptance of rival apostles."



had terminated this relationship of trust. He had broken the basis of recommendation: 'reciprocal relationships.'<sup>139</sup>

The issue of accepting support from this church was a big one in II Cor. 10-13. Encouraged by rival apostles, the Corinthians gave it a relational understanding. For them, Paul did not love them enough (11: 11; 12: 15). This agrees with Marshall's sociological interpretation of the recommendation passages. The point that is made forcefully by these issues is that Paul's relations with this church were very sore. Could this be the reason for his non-acceptance of support from them? Or could it be the result of it, or both?

Scholars are almost unanimous in contending that the opposition at Corinth was at least fuelled by outsiders who came in with the one aim of calling Paul's authority into question while at the same time magnifying theirs. These intruders connived with disaffected members in Corinth to oppose Paul. This is confirmed by II Cor. 10: 7-18.<sup>140</sup> This attempt to discredit Paul includes the charge that Paul is unimpressive in person as oppose to being weighty in his letters, and that his speech amounts to nothing (10: 7-11). Subsequently, Paul was seen to be inferior to the 'super-apostles' (12: 11-12), whoever they were. To these, Paul responded with a bitter attack that is filled with irony, comparison and self-praise. Forbes contends that Paul is here making a mockery of the social conventions in question.<sup>141</sup>

It is quite clear that the situation at Corinth at this time was very distressing for Paul. He certainly felt the need for an open attack on his opponents (obviously different from the anti-Paul group), and even branded them 'false apostles', 'deceitful workmen' and 'servants of Satan' (II Cor. 11: 13-15). Could this be why Paul refused support from this church? Was there a different reason for refusal in II Cor. from I Cor? What reasons does Paul himself give for his attitude in Corinth?

---

<sup>139</sup> Marshall, 1987, p.264.

<sup>140</sup> See e.g., Barnett, P. W. "Opposition in Corinth," *JSNT* 22 (1984) 3-17; Murphy-O'Connor, 1991, p. 13; etc. It is the question of the identity of these opponents that is hotly contested. Jerry L. Sumney's book *Identifying Paul's Opponents in Corinth: The Question of Method*, (JSOT Press: Sheffield, 1990), has an excellent review of the various suggestions that have been made.

<sup>141</sup> Forbes, C. "Comparison, Self Praise and Irony: Paul's Boasting and the Conventions of Hellenistic Rhetoric" *NTS*. (1986), 1-30. He concludes: "I will suggest that Paul, responding to his opponents' characterisation of him as inconsistent, and hence as a flatterer, and to the invidious comparison of his opponents, attacks the whole convention of self-advertisement by means of a remarkably subtle and forceful parody of its methods. He characterises his opponents as pretentious and fraudulent, while laying before the Corinthian congregation a powerful statement of his own apostolic position and authority."

### 5.3.2.2. Concerns for the Gospel. (1 Cor. 9:12b, 15-18, 19ff).

In these verses, Paul gives three reasons for his refusal of support from Corinth. Barrett calls them “the fundamental motive” for this as well as for his ‘habitual behaviour’ as in v. 19.<sup>142</sup> I have already discussed these reasons above (see 5.1.3. and 5.1.4.). Here the discussion is taken further to ascertain what Paul means by the reasons he gives. Firstly, in verse 12b Paul says that he and his companions have waived these rights, putting up with (στέγομεν, ‘endure’) all things in order (ἵνα) not to put any ἔγκοπήν (‘hindrance’) in the way of the gospel. The question is, what did Paul mean by hindrance? How would acceptance of support hinder the gospel? A great deal of speculation has been exercised on what Paul meant here. Fee argues that it indicates Paul’s “single passion” to see that nothing stood in the way of “someone hearing the gospel for what it is.”<sup>143</sup> Dungan speculates that in the light of I Cor. 8: 9-12, it means Paul was not willing to ‘injure’ the Christians.<sup>144</sup> The weakness of this position is that it fails to see that Paul was here speaking about the gospel rather than relationships with fellow Christians.<sup>145</sup> Barrett extends Dungan’s speculation that “this meant the consideration that potential converts might think twice about accepting the gospel if they saw that it would lead to financial commitments on behalf of missionaries.”<sup>146</sup> He then suggests two other possibilities: (i) “the fact that Paul would wish there to be no mis-representation in regard to the collection (16: 1)”<sup>147</sup> which he calls “more important”, and (ii) the fact that the gospel which is centred on the love and self-sacrifice of Jesus would not fit well with preachers who are self-centred, interested in the use of authority and seeking after profit. He illustrates this last suggestion with the Peregrinus story told by Lucian which he notes is a remote example read back into the situation at Corinth then, but one that is still a necessary part of the picture representing an early outsider’s view. The social convention on hospitality and its practice in the early church referred to in the *Didache* and III John exemplifies this further.<sup>148</sup>

<sup>142</sup> Barrett, 1986, p. 207.

<sup>143</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 411.

<sup>144</sup> Dungan, 1971, pp. 14ff.

<sup>145</sup> See Fee, 1987, p. 411 n. 81.

<sup>146</sup> Barrett, 1968, p.207.

<sup>147</sup> The suggestion that Paul was avoiding a misrepresentation in regard to the collection is suspect because it indicates that Paul was not sincere. Paul spoke about a hindrance to the gospel and not the collection, unless if the success of the collection is considered a furtherance of the gospel, which is very unlikely what Paul meant. Fee may be right in seeing a clue to this in vv. 15-18. (Fee, 1987, p. 411).

<sup>148</sup> See the detailed discussion on this in 1.4. above.

The second reason Paul gives for his refusal of support from Corinth is his desire to present the gospel free of charge (vv. 15-18). In vv. 15 and 16 he calls this action the basis of his boast which he is unwilling to give up. He also calls it his reward in vv. 17-18.<sup>149</sup> The essential question here is: what did Paul mean by 'I may offer it free of charge'? Could this be used as grounds for the idea of 'salaried' apostles in Corinth, or for the 'Socratic-Cynic analogy of the true philosopher'? What precisely did Paul have in mind when he wrote these words?

Peter Marshall has argued against both positions on the grounds that the evidence does not support any such supposition. He however indicated that the issue of money, gifts and other services in the NT require further study.<sup>150</sup> The issue is centred around the use of the word μισθός. Héring contends that the word as used in the Gospels and Paul always refers to "a favour since in the last resort we are never more than unfavourable servants," and adds that it "does not necessarily mean 'reward,' but used as a synonym for a meritorious act or an extraordinary thing as in Mt. 5: 46; Lk. 6: 32-35."<sup>151</sup> The implication is that the idea of pay is not necessarily present in Paul's use of the word here. This is highly unlikely. Lucian's essays have some interesting ideas on the term μισθός which show that the philosopher or teacher who enters a house of the wealthy, enters into paid employment.<sup>152</sup> The issue as Lucian makes clear, has to do with freedom and independence. He points out that such philosophers or teachers, who enter into great houses, do so on account of 'seeking to escape poverty,' of seeking a 'form of wage-earning which is easiest, in search for pleasure; but end up losing all those things.'<sup>153</sup> They end up enslaved with the worst kind of slavery in which their "labours are burdensome and genuine, inexorable and continuous" where all freedom will be lost and hope of regaining it completely gone.<sup>154</sup> The extent and magnitude of such slavery is captured in the words: "... and now you pity yourself for imagining that you are alive when you are really nothing at all." (ἄρτι δὲ οἰκτεῖρεις σεαυτὸν, ὡς τὸ

---

<sup>149</sup> For the meaning of the word boast, see the discussion under 5.1.3. Paul's boast and his reward are found in his weakness of working with his hands, so Fee, 1987, p. 421.

<sup>150</sup> Marshall, 1987, pp. 165ff; see also his conclusion, p. 397. This is against Dungan, 1977, pp. 22-23, 28-29, 36-40 who contends that Paul is less than honest here especially in v. 15 when he says he has not used his rights. He insists that Paul accepted gifts from Philippi which is contrary to what he says here.

<sup>151</sup> Héring, 1962, p. 80.

<sup>152</sup> μισθός is used in the sense of a salary a number of times in these essays. Lucian depicts the friend of the rich man who intervenes between him and the philosopher on the question of 'stipend' saying ... οὐκ ἔχω ὅπως σε τῆς εὐποτίας μακαρίσω, ὅς καὶ προσλήψῃ μισθὸν τῆς τοιαύτης εὐδαιμονίας (I cannot sufficiently congratulate you on your good luck, since you are actually to receive pay for such felicity. Lucian, *Merc. Cond.* 20. Cf. 19, 23, 36, 38, *Apol.* 11 ).

<sup>153</sup> Lucian, *Merc. Cond.* 5-8.

μηδὲν ὧν εἶτα ζῆν ὑπολαμβάνεις).<sup>155</sup> Interestingly these words find a close parallel in what Paul says in II Cor. 12: 11: "... for I am not in the least inferior to the 'super-apostles,' even though I am nothing" (οὐδὲν γὰρ ὑστέρησα τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων εἰ καὶ οὐδὲν εἰμι). Given the fact that freedom and independence were hot issues in the debate on the question of teachers' pay,<sup>156</sup> these sentiments illustrate that the debate was still a live one in the second century. Paul shows here a remarkable sensitivity to the issues of this debate, indicating that it must have been ongoing then.

The above contentions do not answer all the questions raised. It would seem that the reference to hindrance in v. 12b was looking forward to this issue of a free gospel. If so, the first suggestion of Barrett on v. 12b must be correct. It would mean then that Paul did not want to place any financial burden on those who accepted the gospel. However Fee thinks that it is possible to relate this to II Cor. 2: 17 (cf. I Thess. 2: 5-10). Paul here distances himself from the "itinerant philosophers and missionaries who peddled their wisdom or religious instructions."<sup>157</sup> In any case, this passage does not discuss all the issues in the debate on appropriate means of support for teachers. Certainly, there is no reference to working on a trade, or begging.

Thirdly, Paul indicates that he rejects financial assistance from Corinth because he is truly free (9: 1) and does not want to be dependent on anyone (vv. 19-23). Fee infers from these verses that the freedom Paul refers to here is the freedom "from the restrictions that patronage might impose."<sup>158</sup> This seems a very legitimate inference as the context shows. As already pointed out, Paul had argued vigorously for his right to be supported and for his right to waive that right. The fact that he insists vehemently on being 'free' and on belonging to no one, gives credence to this inference. Was he avoiding the obligation of reciprocating their gifts with a greater gift, or becoming forced into a position of a client dependent on his patrons? Peter Marshall has argued that although refusal of a gift was hardly discussed, it was indeed allowable on a number of grounds. Particularly so, refusal was allowed on the grounds of freedom, injury, inconvenience or risk to a worthy benefactor. One who rejects an offer remains free rather than becoming dependent on the

---

<sup>154</sup> Lucian, *Merc. Cond.* 22-23.

<sup>155</sup> Lucian, *Merc. Cond.* 16.

<sup>156</sup> See above under 4.4.2.

<sup>157</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 411.

<sup>158</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 423.

person who made the offer.<sup>159</sup> But freedom was achieved in other ways too. For instance, Cynic freedom (financial independence) was possible because they could beg, as well as toil. Paul's freedom however, was not linked with begging but with the fact that he worked to support himself and his mission.

### **5.3.2.3. Support for Missionaries: Its Misuse. II Cor. 10: 1-12: 18.**

As seen above, the situation at Corinth was very tense and the charges against Paul, numerous. In the section II Cor. 10-13, Paul defends himself against these charges, giving reasons for his actions. In 10: 12-18, Paul gives a description of what might be termed 'proper boasting'. This section, 11: 1-12: 13, is Paul's own exercise of boasting. 12: 14-18 is a response to a further charge we have not dealt with, namely, the charge of trickery (v. 16). The central issue here is Paul's rejection of support from this church, specifically discussed in 11: 7-12. Hock's reading of these verses as a defence of Paul's understanding of a working apostle,<sup>160</sup> is suspect. True, ταπεινῶν ('humbling') could be alluding to Paul's trade, but Paul is not here simply defending his right to work. He clearly refers to his refusal in relation to acceptance from elsewhere, the adverse effect of that on his relationship with the church at Corinth; and later (vv. 12f) in relation to the practice of his opponents. We can identify at least two serious criticisms against Paul in these 5 verses. The first of these is not as explicit as the second, finding its expression in the word ταπεινῶν which denotes servile status - a demeaning status. By working for his living Paul had demeaned himself before the Corinthians.<sup>161</sup> This attitude was typical of the Greek 'upper class' who treated labour with disdain; and it is possible also that Paul's opponents reflected the Sophists' belief that teaching, if it was worth anything should never be given freely.<sup>162</sup> Therefore, the criticism was probably that Paul was too demeaning because "he could not be very sure of his apostolate."<sup>163</sup> The second criticism was that Paul refused support from this church because he does not love them. The offer of aid by some wealthy members of this church was not understood outside the confinements of the social conventions of the day. It was therefore understood as an offer of friendship, its rejection signifying enmity. They were insulted, felt dishonoured and treated as inferior especially knowing that, as

---

<sup>159</sup> Marshall, 1987, pp. 223f, 244.

<sup>160</sup> So Hock, 1980, pp. 50-68.

<sup>161</sup> See Marshall, 1987, p. 324.

<sup>162</sup> So Hock, 1980, pp. 59-65; Martin, 1991, p. 344. The question of working as a means of support has been discussed already. See above under 4.4.2.

<sup>163</sup> Strachan, R. H. *The Second Epistle of Paul to The Corinthians*. MNTC (Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1948), p. 22.

Paul confirms here, he did accept support from other churches even while with them.<sup>164</sup> In making this charge the Corinthians clearly felt they were right and Paul was not. These verses therefore, are Paul's response to these serious criticisms. He was clearly unhappy and "his irony is here at its most bitter."<sup>165</sup> Dungan refers to these verses as a confession of "inconsistency, deceitfulness, and confused thinking" by Paul whose first explanation in I Cor. 9: 19-23 is "now thrown back into his face with deadly effectiveness."<sup>166</sup> This reading among other things, fails to see the irony and sarcasm with which Paul makes his point in these verses which are better construed as Paul's vexation at the charges.

Paul here gives reasons for not accepting support from Corinth. The first occurs in 11: 9, and 12: 13, 14, 16: his desire not be a burden to anyone. Pastoral concerns find great expression in this passage. That he presented the gospel free of charge, and burdened no one, is what Paul calls his boast (v. 10; cf. I Cor. 9: 15). Paul is particular about the region of Achaia when he insists that he will allow no one to stop this boast. One cannot help but ask why this insistence with reference to Achaia while he accepts aid from Macedonia. The answer must lie in the way he understood the relationship with this church. These verses echo I Thess. 2: 9 where Paul reports that he worked night and day so as not to be a burden to the Thessalonians while preaching to them. When he received the support of the Philippians, it was after he had left Philippi. This has led to the conclusion that Paul as a general rule did not accept support from a church while ministering there.<sup>167</sup> I Cor. 11: 9 contains sincere pastoral concerns from one who genuinely had the spiritual welfare of his congregations at heart (11: 2, 3, 28, 29). But how was acceptance a burden to those who voluntarily offered support and longed for him to accept?<sup>168</sup> This is the crucial question which has reference to financial burden.<sup>169</sup> But this raises more questions. Why was this not an issue in Philippi even when Paul himself refers to the Macedonian church as poor (II Cor. 8: 2)? To be sure

---

<sup>164</sup> Marshall, 1987, pp. 246, 257.

<sup>165</sup> Barrett, 1973 p. 281.

<sup>166</sup> Dungan, 1971, pp. 37-39. See also Marshall, 1987, pp. 252-253, who rejects Dungan's ordering of events, the weight he places on the saying of Christ, and what Dungan describes as Paul's curiously deceptive behaviour.

<sup>167</sup> Hock, R. F. *The Working Apostle: An Examination of Paul's Means of Livelihood*, (Ph.D. Yale, 1974; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms Inc., 1978), pp. 126-127, esp. n. 40; p. 133, 137-38. See also Plummer, 1915, p. 304.

<sup>168</sup> This church offered Paul support more than once, even after he had refused the first offer. At least the testimony of Paul's words here gives support to this conclusion.

<sup>169</sup> Strelan, J. G. "Burden Bearing and the Law of Christ: A Re-examination of Galatians 6: 2," *JBL* 94 (1974) 266-76, especially p. 269, and here agreeing with Dungan, 1971, pp. 36-39.

some of the Corinthians were poor (I Cor. 1: 26; 11: 17-22), but at least those who made the repeated offer were rich. What accounts for this difference?

The issue of boasting runs through this whole section and Paul here attacks the whole convention. "By means of sharp sarcasm and subtle irony he makes the procedure appear ridiculous."<sup>170</sup> In other words, by a parody Paul displays the weakness of this whole convention and shows that the charges levelled on him have no grounds. Could the situation at Corinth, their pride and 'self-advertisement' have been the reason for his action? In other words, did Paul foresee when the first offer was made, that accepting would cause injury, inconvenience or risk? But refusal caused equal problems!

Paul gives a second reason for his action in Corinth - his love for them (II Cor. 11: 11; 12: 15). This is a moral, ethical reason, based on the understanding of God's love expressed in the self-sacrifice of Jesus on the cross. Paul, the missionary of the gospel of this love of God shares in that love expression. Paul's response shows that this too was a charge. Paul appeals to God for the truth of what he says. This response "mirrors both his pastoral concern (see 12: 15), and his response to the implied innuendo that he did *not* love the Corinthians."<sup>171</sup> It is interesting that in v. 11 Paul "does not bother to dignify their accusations with a reasoned reply. Instead, calling upon God as his witness, he simply affirms his love for his readers."<sup>172</sup> Paul also takes the discussion to a different level as he brings in an illustration with the analogy of a father-child relationship (v. 14b). As their spiritual father, he would happily 'spend and be spent' (*δαπανήσω καὶ ἐκδαπανηθήσομαι*) for them. The two words express the intensity of Paul's love for the Corinthians, stressing that "he will not withhold any resources he has, including himself."<sup>173</sup>

The parent-child relationship is a social institution, a proper knowledge of which does shed light on the understanding of Paul's argument here. The close analogy between this and *patria po. testas* and the fact that Paul appealed to this convention has already been established (see 1.2. above). Reciprocity, an unequal relationship in the case of parents and children, is conceivably indirectly seen in the children's complete loyalty to the head of the family who had absolute powers. Paul clearly did not demand loyalty, but expected it. It is doubtful that Paul expected to leave

---

<sup>170</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, 1991, p. 106.

<sup>171</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 348.

<sup>172</sup> Kruse, 1987, p. 189.

<sup>173</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 443.

behind for his converts any material inheritance, but there is reason to believe that he was thinking of his non-acceptance of support from them.

Paul also shows that by demeaning himself he wanted the Corinthians to be exalted. He might have looked humble in their eyes, but he did that for their good. In using ταπεινῶν and ἰψωθῆτε he alludes to II Cor. 8: 9 (cf. Phil. 2: 5, 11), to Christ's self-abasement.<sup>174</sup> With this irony, Paul gives the controversy a totally different slant. He adds ironically 'Did I commit a sin in abasing myself that ye might be exalted because I preached to you the gospel of God for nought?'<sup>175</sup> Furthermore, Paul responds to the charge of being untrue as an apostle and that his refusal of support was a sign of bad conscience by referring to his acceptance from other churches even while in Corinth (v. 8). The irony continues as he uses a strong word ἐσύλησα ('I robbed'), but "the language is saved from being extravagant" by what follows on immediately. The robbing consists in taking ὀψώνιον from them to serve the Corinthians.<sup>176</sup> Here we have "a bold military metaphor." The first word is an aorist from συλάω ('to pillage', or 'plunder'), used of an army despoiling or pillaging the enemy.<sup>177</sup> ὀψώνιον is a word that refers to a soldier's "money for buying rations," "rations," or "wages."<sup>178</sup> Caragounis has rightly argued that ὀψώνιον means simply provisions.<sup>179</sup> It is therefore wrong to construe from this that the Philippians gave Paul "financial support in sufficient amount so that it can be termed a salary."<sup>180</sup> The fact that the sending churches of these brethren are not mentioned indicates that the Corinthians knew who they were. Barrett is right in seeing a reference to this operation in Phil. 4: 15.<sup>181</sup> Most scholars identify these brethren from Macedonia with Silas and Timothy.<sup>182</sup> But there is no evidence that these persons ever served Philippi as emissaries. Epahroditus is surely the more likely candidate.

II Cor. 12: 16-18 shows that Paul's actions were completely misunderstood in Corinth. Again the verses are marked by sharp sarcasm and irony which reveal the

---

<sup>174</sup> See Best, E. *Second Corinthians*. Interpretation. (J. Knox Press: Atlanta Georgia, 1987) p. 106.

<sup>175</sup> This translation belongs to Hughes, 1962, p. 383.

<sup>176</sup> See Plummer, 1915, p. 303.

<sup>177</sup> See Hughes, 1962, p. 385.

<sup>178</sup> See Deissmann, A. *Bible Studies*. (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1923), p. 266.

<sup>179</sup> See Caragounis, 1974, pp. 35-57 for details. See also above 5.1.3.

<sup>180</sup> So Dungan, 1971, p.29. Martin, 1991, p. 346 argues convincingly against this erroneous reading.

<sup>181</sup> Barrett, 1973, p. 283.

<sup>182</sup> See e.g. Martin, 1991, p.346; Tasker, 1968), p. 152 etc.



intensity of Paul's feelings as he deals with this further charge. Most scholars argue that the charge of trickery was possibly a cover up of Paul's opponents, who at this time felt unsafe by their acceptance of support from this church.<sup>163</sup> The charge is that "Paul has made a great show of asking for no money, but he has instituted what he purports to be the collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem, and has pocketed the proceeds for himself."<sup>164</sup> Hughes feels that the reason for this charge possibly lies in the fact that the money which now goes for the collection would have gone to these opponents.<sup>165</sup>

II Cor. 11: 12 is both the ultimate aim for Paul's actions in Corinth, as well as his attack on these opponents. He has not and will not accept support from Corinth so as to ἐκκόψω them. The word which betrays Paul's emotions can have a horticultural meaning 'to cut off or prune,' as well as a medical sense of 'to amputate.'<sup>166</sup> This verse shows that the presence of these 'interlopers' and their practices in Corinth, was instrumental to Paul's refusal of support here, or at least for his decision to continue to refuse. The presence of these outsiders in Corinth has affected the relationship between the apostle and the church, and given a focal point to the opposition against Paul. That the outsiders accepted support from Corinth, and that they attacked and tried to discredit Paul because he was acting to the contrary, is undisputed. Paul implies that by accepting, they show that they do not love the Corinthians and are prepared to burden them. However, the situation would be clearer if the time of their arrival in Corinth can be ascertained. Also, could it be that Paul was unwilling to accept support in the consideration that they were already supporting these 'interlopers' and by accepting would add to their financial burden?

It should be clear by now that there is no easy explanation for Paul's refusal in Corinth. Marshall's review of the situation is instructive. Firstly, the economic consideration sees the Corinthians as poor (I Cor. 1: 26; 11: 22) and assumes that Paul did not want to impose on them an economic burden. But II Cor. 8: 1-5 and II Cor. 11: 7-9 taken together show that "Paul's acceptance and refusal of aid was not motivated simply by socio-economic considerations."<sup>167</sup> Also, Paul was not hesitant in asking the Corinthians to contribute to the collection (I Cor. 16: 1-4; II Cor. 8-9).

---

<sup>163</sup> See e.g., Martin, 1991, p. 445. Really we do not know what was going on behind the scenes.

Didache xii. 1-5 is a useful text. The term χριστέμπορος suggests an invective against those who accepted more than the minimal support.

<sup>164</sup> Barrett, 1973, p. 424.

<sup>165</sup> Hughes, 1962, p.465.

<sup>166</sup> Martin, 1991, p.348.

<sup>167</sup> Marshall, 1987, p. 234.

Moreover, as seen above, the issue at Corinth was that at least some wealthy persons in this church have repeatedly offered aid to Paul which has been refused. Secondly, the pastoral consideration states that Paul had a general policy of not accepting support from those he was converting. The acceptance in Philippi becomes an exception, and even there the offer was after Paul had left that church. However, in the case of Corinth, though the first offer might have been made while Paul was still with them, he refused to accept subsequent offers made while he was somewhere else. Marshall suggests that "Paul may have seen in the original offer the factional interests of his would-be benefactors, the acceptance of which would have placed an obstacle in the way of the gospel then and at any time thereafter."<sup>168</sup>

The third explanation is that general moral or ethical grounds guided Paul's actions in Corinth. Paul avoided any appearance of selfishness when he emulated the love and self-sacrifice of Jesus in his presentation of the gospel. But Paul himself calls acceptance a right (*ἐξουσίαν*) of apostles including himself (I Cor. 9: 3-14), and therefore not inconsistent with the gospel. Moreover, it was Paul's refusal rather than the acceptance by his opponents that was seen to be immoral by the Corinthians. In addition, there is nothing to suggest that the acceptance of the Philippians' offers of aid was at any time seen to be immoral either by Paul himself or the Philippians or anyone. A fourth explanation attributes Paul's refusal to philosophical concerns. Paul was dissociating himself from preachers and philosophers and especially his opponents who accepted fees, and in that way adhering "to the Socratic-Cynic tradition of the working philosopher, at the same time distancing himself from mercenary Sophists." The problem however, says Marshall, is that Paul accepted aid from other churches as he himself testifies (II Cor. 11: 8). His refusal seems to be only a reaction to the situation in this church: an attempt to discredit his rivals.

A fifth explanation understands Paul's refusal in Corinth and a supposed 'hesitancy or reluctance' in Phil. 4: 10-17 in psychological terms. Paul continued to struggle with the severe reversals of his social status for the sake of the gospel and so appeared negative to anything that touched his personality, especially money matters. Against this, says Marshall, is the fact that Paul enjoyed "a happy relationship with the Philippians and 4: 10 shows that he deeply appreciated their gifts." Similarly, the point of I Cor. 9 was simply his freedom to accept or to refuse an offer of aid whichever he chooses. A sixth explanation suggests that underlying

---

<sup>168</sup> Marshall, 1987, p. 237.

Paul's refusal was the fact that he did not want anything to stand in the way of the collection. However, the evidence supports the opposite. The problems about the collection in Corinth, the suspicion that comes to expression in II Cor. is the result of Paul's refusal of aid from this church and the 'preferred' acceptance of the aid from Philippi.

In the light of the inadequacies of these explanations, Peter Marshall ventures his own suggestion: that the social conventions of giving and receiving, a look at the moral questions on acceptance and refusal, and especially an understanding of the grounds for refusal of a gift and the consequences of such an action provide a better explanation for Paul's action in Corinth.<sup>189</sup> Paul was aware of this, but presents the familial relationship of the parent child ties as the bases for his action. His refusal was in line with parental duties (II Cor. 12: 14-15). This is why Paul was bitter when they misunderstood him, and did not reciprocate his love (v. 15).

Marshall's arguments are very much welcomed. However, a few questions remain unanswered, and this I think requires an extension of his position. The parent-child relationship is clearly not responsible for the concerns expressed in II Cor. 11: 2, 3, 28, 29. Couldn't those concerns be understood in terms of pastoral care of a genuine apostle for his congregations rather than those of a social tie? What is the place of the gospel in the social convention of giving and receiving? Can we explain II Cor. 11: 12 in the light of social conventions? As already seen,<sup>190</sup> Theissen discusses these issues in terms of legitimation and subsistence: "The fact is that the social legitimacy of itinerant preachers depends to a great extent on how they provide for their own subsistence."<sup>191</sup> Paul and his opponents were in rivalry each trying to validate their choice of subsistence.<sup>192</sup> His opponents accused him of neglecting Jesus' command by being too concerned about his subsistence and therefore worldly minded rather than wholly dependent on his belonging to Christ; and of not being a genuine apostle and therefore not free. Paul on his part accuses his opponents of measuring themselves by themselves (II Cor. 10: 12); and insists that he is free, has rights, and belongs to Christ even more than his opponents. This, rather than social conventions, explains II Cor. 11: 12, as well as the reference to the 'law of Christ.' Paul therefore appeals to social conventions but also to popular philosophical *topoi* in his arguments in this letter. These are taken in conjunction with pastoral concerns, which are naturally the influence of the gospel on his life.

---

<sup>189</sup> Marshall, 1987, pp. 242-58.

<sup>190</sup> See under 5.1.3.

<sup>191</sup> Theissen, 1982, p. 28.

<sup>192</sup> The details of this argument can be read in Theissen, 1982, pp. 27-67.

So, Paul employs social conventions, but also allows the truths of the gospel influence his arguments.

#### **5.4. Support From Phillippi: Partnership In The Gospel.**

##### **5.4.1. A Review of Some Explanations.**

Philippians 1: 3-11; 2: 25-30; and 4: 10-20, at the least, allude to Paul's acceptance of support from this church. Paul's attitude here violates his basic principle to maintain his independence as he presents the gospel free of charge and without putting a hindrance in its way (I Cor. 9: 15-18). What accounts for this? A number of explanations have been put forward. Some of them are reviewed below. First, Sampley understands this relationship in terms of 'consensual *societas*' which "required neither witnesses nor written documents nor notification of authorities. Simple agreement was all that was required."<sup>193</sup> He finds support for this understanding in ἀπέχω and εἰς λόγον which he designates commercial terms and the phrase ἐκοινωνήσεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήμψεως which he calls 'the commercial terminology of bookkeeping' which for him is consistent with *societas*' provision of remuneration or reimbursement for expenses for the partnership.<sup>194</sup> Also lending support for his understanding, says Sampley, is κοινωνία as partnership and τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν as *societas* terminology.<sup>195</sup> Thus, he understands χρεῖα in Philippians as 'need-request' implying that Paul had requested as remuneration for the preaching of the gospel on behalf of this church the support he received. He thinks that Paul had this relationship with this church because "the church was apparently little marked by internal strife; it was early and enduringly a stable, unified Christian community."<sup>196</sup> This last point does not take into account 2: 1-5 and 4: 2-3 which clearly addressed internal strife, though not of the scale in Corinth.<sup>197</sup>

---

<sup>193</sup> Sampley, J.P. *Pauline Partnership in Christ: Christian Community and Commitment in Light of Roman Law*. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1980), p. 13. He explains it as a reciprocal relationship that is verbal but legally binding and as a partnership or association between two persons concerning a common goal. It is characterised by the contribution of property, labour, skill or status by each member for accomplishing that common goal. The partners who should have the same mind share in the *societas* and receive remuneration if they incurred any expenses on behalf of the *societas*. It lasts till, open to all including slaves, and is 'analog' for κοινωνία (see pp. 12-17).

<sup>194</sup> Sampley, 1980, pp. 57, 74.

<sup>195</sup> For Sampley (1980, pp. 60-61), κοινωνία is the basic idea behind *societas*: "The commercial technical terms associated with *koinonia* ... leave it unmistakable that the partnership is *societas*." On τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν see pp. 62-67.

<sup>196</sup> Sampley, pp. 54-55; 104.

<sup>197</sup> In fact, Peterlin, D. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Light of Disunity in the Church* NovTSupl. Vol. LXXIX (E.J. Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995), contends that the theme of

A death

While welcoming Sampley's attempts to place Paul in a social context, Peterman disagrees entirely with Sampley's arguments.<sup>198</sup> Peterman demonstrates that the so-called technical commercial terms are in fact also social terms<sup>199</sup> and argues that Sampley has not demonstrated that *societas* and κοινωνία are connected. The fact that κοινωνία can mean "partnership" he argues, does not demonstrate that it is equal to *societas*. Also, he contends that 'though *societas* demands being of the same mind, being of the same mind does not demand *societas*' and that τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν can have a more general meaning.<sup>200</sup> On χρεῖα as request-need, Peterman argues that this does not agree with the context, is suspect because it appeals to a less common meaning, and does not recognise that in Paul χρεῖα always means 'need.' Similarly, Peterman speaks of Paul's preaching the gospel, not as representative of the Philippians, but the latter working alongside Paul and in their respective contexts. Peterman then concludes that understanding this relationship in the sense of *societas* is too narrow a framework. He suggests rather the framework of the social practice of giving and receiving. In other words, Paul had a good relationship with the Philippians because it was established in accordance with the social convention, and the exchange of gifts<sup>201</sup> consolidated this relationship.

While Peterman is right in identifying the flaws in Sampley's arguments, his discussion does not provide an adequate explanation for the reasons for Paul's engagement in this relationship or the acceptance of the gifts from Philippi which is contrary to the argument in I Cor. 9. This calls for another look at the texts.

#### 5.4.2. The Gifts in the Salutation and the Epistolary Thanksgiving 1:1-8.

##### 5.4.2.1. The Salutation vv. 1-2.

Philippians is addressed to the saints in Philippi, but with a special reference to ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνους ('overseers and deacons'). This special mentioned is certainly not accidental. This recalls the discussion above (see 3.3.) where it was noted that these two titles were used for officers of administration in clubs and

---

disunity runs through the whole epistle and that it formed the primary aim of this letter around which all the other secondary aims revolve (see esp. p. 225).

<sup>198</sup> Peterman, G.W. *Giving and Receiving in Paul's Epistles: Greco-Roman Social Conventions in Philippians 4 and in Selected Pauline Texts*. (PhD Dissertation Submitted to the University of London, Sept. 1992); see especially pp. 230-233.

<sup>199</sup> On this, Peterman follows Marshall; see Marshall, 1987, pp. 157-164.

<sup>200</sup> See p. 231.

<sup>201</sup> Paul gives the gospel and the Philippians give materially or financially as in Rom. 15.

associations. It is reasonable to suggest that Paul, following the usage in such associations, and having received the gifts from this church, addresses the individuals responsible for its running and who thereby handled its finances.

#### 5.4.2.2. *The Thanksgiving Report. vv. 3-6.*

In vv. 3-11, Paul employs an epistolary convention of his day and “reworks it to make it express the intensity of his devotion to God and his feelings to his friends.”<sup>202</sup> Like his contemporaries, Paul introduces the main themes of his letter with the epistolary thanksgiving.<sup>203</sup> Here then we have a preliminary reference to the gifts in 4: 10-20. Paul begins with thanks to God,<sup>204</sup> and then says: ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μείρᾳ ὑμῶν. This phrase has been interpreted in two ways: “every time I mention you (remember you) in my prayers” (objective genitive), and “for all your remembrance of me” (subjective genitive). The first rendering gives it a temporal sense denoting the frequency of Paul’s prayers during which he remembered his friends.<sup>205</sup> O’Brien, with six points argues forcefully in favour of the causal understanding.<sup>206</sup> The strongest, in my opinion, is the last point about the ‘verbal parallels’ between this epistolary thanksgiving and 4: 10-20 which speak explicitly about the Philippian gifts. It cannot be unreasonable to conclude that the terms and ideas here, developed and expanded in 4: 10-20 have “anticipatory reference” to the kind gesture expressed in the gifts.<sup>207</sup> Also such a reading agrees with v. 5 where the reason for Paul’s thanksgiving is the partnership of his friends expressed in this

<sup>202</sup> See Hawthorne, 1991, p. 15.

<sup>203</sup> Schubert, P. “Forms and Functions of the Pauline Thanksgiving” *ZNW* 20 (1939) 7-82. He shows that these verses are closely “connected with each succeeding section of the letter,” noting “striking continuities and similarities in theme and vocabulary between Phil. 1:3-11 and 4:10-20.” See also Jewett, R. “The Epistolary Thanksgiving and the Integrity of Philippians.” *Nov T* 12 (1970) 40-53, esp. 53 who says “when one adds to this analysis the observation that the themes of suffering (1:7), joy (1:4), and mental attitude (1:7) which so dominate the last three chapters of the letter are all announced in the epistolary thanksgiving, the letter takes on an impressive unity.”

<sup>204</sup> Deissmann, A. *Light From the Ancient East* ET, Second Edition (Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1927), p. 168, n.3 points to the fact that most letters of the day began in this way. Cf. Hawthorne, 1991, p.15.

<sup>205</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, pp. 16-17; and Silva, M. *Philippians* WEC. (Moody Press: Chicago, 1988), pp. 48-49; among others have argued for this understanding. The grounds in support of this understanding are discussed in O’Brien, P. T. *Introductory Thanksgiving in the Letters of Paul*, *NovTSup.* 49 (Brill: Leiden, 1977), p. 42f.

<sup>206</sup> See O’Brien, 1977, pp. 43ff where these are detailed out.

<sup>207</sup> O’Brien, P.T. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1991), pp. 59-60. Peterman, 1992, pp. 105-107 supplies an extensive comparison of the verbal and conceptual similarities between 1: 3-11 and 4: 10-20, which he says, confirms that the latter is not an after thought; that κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is important and the primary thing in Paul’s evaluation of the meaning and significance of the gift; and is interesting that the letter begins and ends with the reference to the gift.

kind gesture of love which is one of many such instances of their “remembrance of him.” Paul expresses these thanks to God in each (πάσῃ) of his moments of prayer, and he does so with joy (v.4). The second reason for the thanksgiving is expressed in the words ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (v.5 “because of your partnership with me in the gospel”). This reading which connects these words with the main verb in verse 3, making verse 4 a parenthesis, is supported by the evidence and is preferred against that which takes this verse as a ‘prepositional phrase with χαρᾶς’ giving the sense of “I pray for you with joy *because* you are partners with me.”<sup>208</sup> That verse 5 connects with the main verb has the backing of a strong scholarly consensus.<sup>209</sup>

This verse contains some of the verbal parallels between this epistolary thanksgiving and 4: 10-20. This is seen in the use of κοινωνία and cognates; and in ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης κτλ. which corresponds to ἐν ἀρχῇ κτλ. of 4: 15. But what is partnership in the gospel and what exactly does ‘from the first day until now’ mean? These questions, in my opinion, relate directly to the subject of Paul’s finances. Κοινωνία, certainly a key word in this verse and context, “is a distinctively Pauline word” whose verb form means ‘to have something in common.’<sup>210</sup> It is an abstract noun which contains the ideas of participation and association. One of these can sometimes be used to the exclusion of the other.<sup>211</sup> It has four different constructions.<sup>212</sup> Here, the genitive of the person is used. As it appears here, and especially strengthened by εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, it can be

Λ e d

<sup>208</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, pp. 18-19. He contends that: (a) There is evidence for using εὐχαριστῶ without an object when it can be inferred from the context (cf. Matt. 15:36; 26:37); and therefore the possibility that the Philippians are the inferred object of Paul’s gratitude. (b) Paul uses other constructions more frequently than εὐχαριστῶ with ἐπί and the dative (used in I Cor. 1:4 only, cf. 11 Cor. 9:15) to express the object of his thanks. (c) The demand for the definite article before ἐπί is unreasonable because Paul was not a writer of literary Greek.

<sup>209</sup> Vincent, M. R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians and to Philemon*, ICC, (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1902), p.6; Omanson, R. L. “A note on the translation of Philippians 1:3-5” *BT* (1978) 244-5; and others like Gnllka, Lightfoot, Martin, 1976, Muller, etc. The following arguments have been posited in its favour: (a) The verb εὐχαριστέω in verse 3 will be left without an object if verse 5 is related to verse 4. (b) This partnership in the gospel is not the subject of Paul’s prayer (δέησις), but of his thanksgiving. (c) The preposition ἐπί (‘because of’) is used by Paul with verbs such as εὐχαριστέω (see I Cor. 1:4, cf. II Cor. 9:15), but never with δέησις and cognates. Moreover, the Greek does not support the latter.

<sup>210</sup> See Hawthorne, 1991, p.19.

<sup>211</sup> So Panikulam, G. *Koinonia in the New Testament: A Dynamic Expression of Christian Life*, (Pontifical Biblical Institute: Rome, 1979), p. 1; See also Campbell, J Y. “Κοινωνία and its cognates in the N. T.,” *JBL* 51 (1932) p. 352-80, esp. p.7; Michael McDermott, S. J. “The Biblical Doctrine of κοινωνία,” *BZ* 19 (1975): 64-77, 219-33.

understood in a passive sense making it equivalent of 'your faith', or in an active sense which denotes the Philippians' co-operation in aid of the gospel. The former understands the genitive that goes with it as an objective genitive, the latter as a subjective one. Hawthorne thinks that both might be intended here.<sup>213</sup> O'Brien however rightly argues for an active sense on the grounds that it best fits the context.<sup>214</sup> The point therefore, is that Paul gives thanks because of the active co-operation of his friends with him in his ministry. The phrase 'from the first day until now' indicates that the Philippians have done this from the time they became Christians and this last gesture shows its continuation. O'Brien conceives this co-operation in its widest sense including monetary support of the past instances and of course of the most recent time (cf. v. 3), as well as everything else they have done including praying for him, the actual proclamation of the gospel, and their suffering with Paul for the gospel.<sup>215</sup>

The third ground for this thanksgiving is Paul's confidence in God (πεποιθώς αὐτὸ τοῦτο). This is 'a causal participial construction' which depends on the main verb in v. 3, and it points to what follows rather than what has preceded.<sup>216</sup> His confidence is not in the Philippians but in God to whom he gives thanks because He will bring to completion the good work He started in his friends. This 'good work' (ἔργον ἀγαθόν), contrary to what Martin<sup>217</sup> and many others think, must not be understood in a loose sense meaning 'God's redeeming and renewing work.' This would dissociate it from the reference to the Philippians' partnership in vv. 3 and 5. It refers rather to their participation in the gospel and finds its definition within the context.<sup>218</sup>

#### **5.4.2.3. Paul's Affection for his Friends vv. 7-8.**

This section sheds light on the preceding verses. It shows that Paul's partnership was one with genuine friends. He has special feelings for them, denoted by the word φρονεῖν, a word that combines the idea of attitudes and feelings, with that of thought, emotions and the mind. It is Paul's favourite word used ten times in this

---

<sup>212</sup> Panikulam, 1979, p. 2.

<sup>213</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p. 19.

<sup>214</sup> O'Brien, 1978, p. 11.

<sup>215</sup> See O'Brien, "The Fellowship Theme in Philippians," *RTR* 37 (1978) 9-18, here, p. 11.

<sup>216</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p. 20; See also O'Brien, 1991, p. 63.

<sup>217</sup> Martin, 1959, p. 61.



short letter. What he means then is that he has the right frame of mind and attitude towards them,<sup>219</sup> and that it is proper for him to be so disposed towards *all* of them.<sup>220</sup> The reason for this is given as διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς. This is an ambiguous construction in the Greek that can mean either 'because I have you in my heart' or 'because you have me in your heart', with the latter referring back to the Philippians' gesture of love already referred to. Three reasons heighten this ambiguity: (a) there is no pronoun modifying καρδίᾳ. (b) The word order με ... ὑμᾶς does not guarantee any of the two readings. (c) The context is fairly neutral with v. 7 favouring 'you have me in your heart' and v. 8, 'I have you in my heart.'<sup>221</sup> Silva argues for the reading 'because I have you in my heart' on the grounds that: (a) II Cor. 2: 13; 8: 6 provide examples of διὰ τὸ ἔχειν. Even though διὰ is not actually used in these verses, two accusatives occur though, and the grammatical requirement is that the one nearer the infinitive should be regarded as the subject. (b) Chrysostom, himself a Greek speaker who weighs alternate positions takes με as subject and shows no awareness of the alternate possibility.<sup>222</sup> This well considered, the evidence leans heavily in support of 'because I have you in my heart.' If this is correct, Paul must have made this statement as his response to his friends' affection towards him. In other words, he was reciprocating their concern by assuring them that he too has always been genuinely concerned about them. Paul was concerned about all his churches, but there was something special about the concern shown here. This genuine concern for them comes out more clearly in the words of verse 8 where he says: μάρτυς γάρ μου ὁ θεὸς ὡς ἐπιποθῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς ἐν σπλάγχνοις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ('for God is my witness that I yearn for you all with the love of Christ Jesus'). This kind of language is unique in the Pauline corpus. The nearest we can find is II Cor. 11: 11: διὰ τί; ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαπῶ ὑμᾶς; ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν ('Why? Because I do not love you? God knows I do!' NIV). The context in II Cor. is clearly polemical. In Philippians, however, there is nothing polemical about what Paul writes. The words 'God is my witness' therefore, do not imply an apology, but portray the intensity of

---

<sup>218</sup> See Hawthorne, 1991, p. 21.

<sup>219</sup> Silva, 1988, p. 20; Hawthorne, 1991, p. 22.

<sup>220</sup> πάντων ὑμῶν is not accidental here, but Paul uses it deliberately to stress the idea of unity which he develops later in chapters 2 and 4.

<sup>221</sup> See Hawthorne, 1991, pp. 22-23.

<sup>222</sup> So Silva, 1988, pp. 56-57.

his feelings for *all* of them. He wants to leave no doubt that he very much appreciates their concern. He yearns for them with the affections of Jesus Christ.<sup>223</sup>

In the second half of verse 7 Paul shows that he is thus concerned about his friends because they are 'co-partners' (συγκοινωνούς) with him in the 'grace' (χάριτος) that was given to him. The compound noun συγκοινωνούς has the same basic meaning and function with κοινωνός (cf. v. 5). Again it refers to their participation in the gospel; hence Paul says they are co-partners with him in his grace. But what does χάριτος mean? Several references from his letters leave no doubt that when Paul uses χάρις as a personal endowment, he means his calling as an apostle.<sup>224</sup> This distinguishes it from the other use discussed in II Cor. (see 5.3.1.4. above). Paul therefore calls the Philippians his partners in the gospel, and he must have had in mind their repeated gifts.<sup>225</sup> Their gifts which have alleviated his sufferings in 'chains' (δεσμοῖς), plus previous gifts on other occasions are understood as partnership in his ἀπολογία and βεβαιώσει of the gospel.<sup>226</sup> The words ἀπολογία and βεβαιώσει are technical, legal terms common in the law courts of the first century.<sup>227</sup> They refer therefore to his present trials in which the opportunity to defend the gospel arose. Their recent gifts assured him of their support in it.

#### 5.4.3. Epaphroditus, The Emissary of the Philippians. 2: 25-30.

These verses centre around the figure of Epaphroditus mentioned in v. 25 and in 4: 18 as the bearer of the Philippians' gifts. Very little is known about this man whose name appears only here in the entire N. T.<sup>228</sup> Most scholars agree that he is not the Epaphras of Colossae even though Epaphras is the shortened form of the name. They come from two different places, and the longer form of the name is always used for the Philippian emissary while the shortened form for the Colossian

---

<sup>223</sup> See O'Brien, 1991, p. 71.

<sup>224</sup> Rom. 1: 5; 12: 3, 6; I Cor. 3: 10; and Gal. 2: 9. See further Hawthorne, 1991, p. 23.

<sup>225</sup> So Davies, J. L. "Saint Paul's χάρις" *Expositor 4th Series*, 5. (1892): 343-46; See also Hawthorne, 1991, p. 23.

<sup>226</sup> O'Brien, 1991, p. 70.

<sup>227</sup> Deissmann, 1923, pp. 104-106; Moulton, J. H and Milligan, G. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, p. 108; Hawthorne, 1991, p. 24.

<sup>228</sup> See Culpepper, R. A. "Co-workers In Suffering, Phil. 2: 19-30" *Rev. Exp.*, 77 (1980) 349-58, esp. 356.

teacher.<sup>220</sup> This man is the emissary of the Philippians sent to deliver their gifts; and to remain with Paul indefinitely as one of his companions to minister to him in his chains. Clearly they were not expecting him back, at least not so soon, and so Paul had to instruct them to 'welcome him back in the Lord with joy' (v. 29). Paul, with a very "warm and emphatic" commendation which begins in verse 25 now sends him to them as the bearer of this epistle.<sup>230</sup>

Five beautiful terms are employed for this commendation. In particular, he is their ἀπόστολος ('an apostle, an envoy'), and their λειτουργός ('a minister') sent to minister to Paul's needs. Ἀπόστολος here should be understood in the sense of 'envoy' and not the absolute 'apostle.' This distinguishes him from Paul and the other apostles although Paul calls him fellow worker and fellow soldier.<sup>231</sup> Λειτουργός is a very old word appearing in inscriptions and papyri dating from the 5th and 4th centuries BC. It originally referred to public servants of all kinds, including those who served at their own expense. In the LXX, it was a cultic term for priests serving in the temple. Here, Paul adopts the cultic meaning possibly because he "views Epaphroditus' mission to meet his needs as a religious act, a priestly function." This is further confirmed by his use of θυσία, a sacrificial term in 4: 18, to refer to the gifts which he brought.<sup>232</sup> O'Brien's assertion that elsewhere in the NT. it is used with a non-cultic sense to refer to all kinds of services to meet the needs of humanity,<sup>233</sup> does not take into consideration the fact that all services given in aid of the gospel are in Paul's estimation worship acceptable to God (Rom. 12: 1-2).<sup>234</sup> Τῆς χρείας μου ('my needs') must refer to Paul's physical, human needs of comfort, companionship and possibly menial duties in his present imprisonment.

---

<sup>220</sup> See e.g. Lightfoot, J. B. *St Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, (Macmillan: London, 1878), pp. 61, 122; O'Brien, 1991, p. 329; Collange, 1979, pp. 118f; Beare, F. W. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians*, (A&C Black: London, 1959), p. 96; Cf. Vincent, 1902, who even doubts that the two names are identical, that one is a shortened form of the other.

<sup>230</sup> See O'Brien, 1991, p. 330.

<sup>231</sup> See Silva, 1988, p. 161 who refers to Hawthorne as being fanciful in stressing that this word is used by Paul "to stress his equality with him."

<sup>232</sup> See Hawthorne, 1991, p. 117. See also Buchanan, C. O. "Epaphroditus' Sickness and the Letter to the Philippians," *EvQ* 36 (1964) 157-66.

<sup>233</sup> See O'Brien, 1991, p. 332 who identifies only four other occurrences of the word in the NT. : Heb. 8:2; Rom. 13:6; Heb. 1:7; and Rom. 15:16. Only Heb. 8:2 has a cultic meaning but in reference to Christ. Peterlin, 1995, pp. 195ff puts forward a similar argument. He contends that because the service was not "to someone's need (as opposed to the person, that is, God)" it is unlikely that a cultic association is intended. He concludes that the secular use of the term, in which magistrates and other public offices gave liturgies in exchange for honour and respect, is most appropriate here.

<sup>234</sup> See Hawthorne, 1991, p. 117.

Paul resumes his commendation in vv. 29-30, this time with more vigour. This was possibly an attempt to dispel any whispering that might arise over what seems a failed mission on the part of this man Paul highly valued.<sup>285</sup> Paul therefore commands them to 'welcome him in the Lord with great joy,' and to 'honour men like him.' He risked his life to fulfil this mission. His service to Paul is called the work of Christ confirming the point already made on v. 25. In this statement is support for the suggestion that Epaphroditus' service to Paul was understood as part of this partnership. He was to remain with Paul as one of his team of co-workers.<sup>286</sup> They had sent him with their gifts to remain with Paul to serve him. They wanted this man to represent them in this partnership with Paul. The combination of a command and an explanation for this commendation indicates "that Paul anticipated problems at Philippi over his unexpected return."<sup>287</sup> This strengthens the understanding that he had been sent to remain with Paul indefinitely. But what did Paul mean when he said that Epaphroditus' service to him makes up for what the Philippians could not give him? Are these words meant as a sarcasm or a implied criticism? They were certainly not implying a censure, or a rebuke of the inadequacy of their duty to Paul. Rather, they are a statement with the "most delicate, courteous and sympathetic tribute to both Epaphroditus and to the Philippians" as a church.<sup>288</sup> In praising Epaphroditus, Paul praises the whole church as well as reaffirming the credibility of this man in the face of what seems an apparent failure and encourages them to give him a befitting welcome.

Paul tells them to give him a befitting welcome. His costly service has earned the respect Paul calls for on his behalf, and Paul "wanted no underrating of his worth, no questioning of his character, no erosion of his authority."<sup>289</sup> Paul is sending Epaphroditus because Timothy or himself (both possibilities for the future) are unavailable now. This option is necessary as he ἠγησάμην ('I considered') it. The word is aorist, but here it must be understood as "epistolary aorist, that is to say that Paul here projects himself into the time-bracket of his readers." This means that Epaphroditus was in all likelihood the bearer of the letter, a fact confirmed by vv.

---

<sup>285</sup> See Craddock, *Interpretation*. p. 51.

<sup>286</sup> See Hawthorne, 1991, p. 119.

<sup>287</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p. 119.

<sup>288</sup> Vincent, 1902, p. 78; Beare, 1959, p. 99; Craddock, *Interpretation*. p. 51; Hawthorne, 1991, p. 120.

<sup>289</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p. 121.

29-30 as noted above.<sup>240</sup> It is not accidental that the verbs πέμψαι (v. 25), and ἔπεμψα (v. 28) which Paul uses here are absolute, accompanied by no modifier. The implication is that Paul was "sending him" rather than "sending him back" to them because he now belongs with Paul. He was from this church, but had been given to Paul on permanent leave. The decision lay with Paul. This is further confirmed by the phrase σπουδαιότερως οὖν ἔπεμψα αὐτόν. The word σπουδαιότερως is a comparative adverb from σπουδαῖος, which, although through general usage it comes to mean 'earnest,' 'serious,' has as its root the idea of haste, and here it means 'more hastily.'<sup>241</sup> Paul therefore sends Epaphroditus to Philippi without delay. Using two strong words, Paul gives two reasons in v. 26 for why he has taken this decision. First, Epaphroditus was longing for all of them (ἐπειδὴ ἐπιποθῶν ἦν πάντας ὑμας). Ἐπιποθῶν denotes a 'yearning' or 'longing' that is deep and here means homesickness. The second reason expressed in the word ἀδημονῶν means 'distress' of a severe kind. Interestingly Epaphroditus' deep longing and distress was for the whole congregation in Philippi denoted by πάντας. He had the whole church in heart. Paul too in sending him to them was concerned for their joy which in turn indicates that they too were concerned about him, and thus resolves his unbearable circumstances, the Philippians' worry, and Paul's own burden. That Epaphroditus' situation was causing Paul sorrow is understood in the word ἀλυπότερος ('less sorrowful').

Epaphroditus' homesickness and distress has baffled scholars. Moffat<sup>242</sup> shows that this reveals an unselfish concern on his part. A second century papyrus letter from a soldier to his mother provides a parallel.<sup>243</sup> The soldier was worried, in fact annoyed because his mother had heard that he was ill through an exaggerated report. He explained that he had not written because of the pressure of his military duties and urges his mother not to grieve about him.<sup>244</sup> Sickness is the cause of worry and concern in both cases, and the verbal parallels are remarkably close.<sup>245</sup> This explains Epaphroditus' action, since as Paul tells us, he nearly died (v. 27).

<sup>240</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p. 115; See also O'Brien, 1991, p. 330.

<sup>241</sup> See Hawthorne, 1991, pp. 117-119.

<sup>242</sup> Moffat, J. "Philippians 2:26 and II Tim. 4:13" *JTS* 18 (1927) 311-12.

<sup>243</sup> *P.Oxy.* 1481. It reads in part: γεινώσκεις σε) θέλω ὅτι διὰ τοσούτου χρόνου οὐκ ἀπέσταλκά σοι ἐπιστόλιον διότι ἐν παρεμβολῇ ἡμι καὶ οὐ δι' ἀσθένει(λαν, ὥστε μὴ λοιποῦ. λείαν δ' ἔλοιπίθην ἀκούσας ὅτι ἤκουσας· οὐ γὰρ δεινῶς ηθθένησα. μέμφομαι δὲ τὸν εἶπαντα σοι.

<sup>244</sup> See also Michael, J. H. *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians*. (Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1946), p. 124.

<sup>245</sup> The verbs ἀκω (twice by the soldier) and ἀσθενέω are used by both Paul and the soldier. Also,

#### 5.4.4. Paul's Thanks for the Philippians' Gifts. 4: 10-20.

Over the years, scholars have given roughly three distinct contexts for the setting of this passage. This in itself gives a clear indication of the difficulty it presents. Firstly, following Lightfoot, the verses are understood as Paul's appreciation proper for the gifts sent through Epaphroditus (cf. 2: 25-30). Epaphroditus had fallen sick in the process, became concerned that the Philippians have heard about his sickness, and subsequently became homesick. On his recovery, Paul decided to send him with this letter which he dictated. Paul however thought it wise to write this last section with his own hands expressing his thanks for their concern. He delayed discussing it till the end of his letter because of its sensitive nature.<sup>266</sup> Understood in this way, the passage is an integral part and one of the major reasons for writing the letter. Secondly, attempting to explain why Paul delayed his appreciation till the close of the letter, a number of scholars have argued that these verses are a separate letter, written earlier, soon after the arrival of Epaphroditus, in which Paul registers his thanks for the concern of his friends. This position perceives at least three letters compiled into one as it now appears in our Bibles.<sup>267</sup> In this understanding, Paul responded promptly to the Philippian gifts. In compiling the three letters, the compiler placed the first letter almost at the end. But this raises the question why a compiler would place these verses at such an odd place if in fact it was a separate letter. Surely s/he would have fitted them neatly elsewhere, say after 2: 30 or even earlier. Thirdly, in an attempt to explain why Paul does not give a straightforward thanks but alternates his appreciation with his claim of independence and self-sufficiency, and the fact that descriptions of the passage have genuinely included terms such as 'tense,' 'detached,' 'distant,' and 'discourteous,' another context has been suggested.<sup>268</sup> It is argued that these verses are not Paul's first response to the

---

both Epaphroditus and the soldier were grieved for the addressees of the respective letters.

<sup>266</sup> Lightfoot, 1878, p. 163 who adds that "the δὲ arrests a subject which is in danger of escaping." See also Vincent, 1902; Muller, J. J. *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians and to Philemon*, (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1967); Martin, R. P. 1976 and 1959; Mackay, B.S. "Further Thoughts on Philippians" *NTS* 7 (1961): 161-170; Silva, 1988; Hawthorne, 1991; O'Brien, 1991; etc.

<sup>267</sup> See Beare, 1959, who sees the three letters as (a) 4: 10-20. (b) 1: 1-3: 1, 4: 2-9, 21-23 sent with Epaphroditus. (c) 3:2-4:1; Collange, 1979, who identifies the three letters as (a) 4: 10-20. (b) 1: 1-3: 1a + 4: 2-7 +4:21-23. (c) 3:1-4:1 + 4: 8-9; Rahtjen, B. D. "The Three Letters of Paul to the Philippians", *NTS* 6 (1959-60) 167-73 who gives the three letters as (a) 4: 10-20, (b) 1: 1-2: 30 + 4: 21-23, (c) 3: 1-4: 9.

<sup>268</sup> See Craddock, 1966, p. 76.

gifts, but a second in which he clarifies certain points the Philippians misunderstood.<sup>240</sup>

I have noted above the major difficulty that beset the second perspective. Also, I find no compelling reason to reopen the argument on the third perspective which has since been abandoned by scholars. Moreover, it is in my opinion, based on conjecture, its strong point centred on the conception of a hypothetical letter written earlier on. It is certainly not decent exegesis to construe a big argument on a hypothetical point. I think therefore that the first perspective is to be preferred. This is confirmed by a study of hellenistic letter-forms especially 'family letters' which supply a good parallel to Paul's letters, especially Philippians.<sup>250</sup> Alexander demonstrates using one of the soldiers' letters that the 'thanks' section probably did not have to come at the beginning of a letter after all.<sup>251</sup>

#### 5.4.4.1. *The Christian Secret. vv. 10-13.*<sup>252</sup>

Right at the beginning of this section Paul resounds the note of joy which runs through the entire epistle - the 'joy expression.'<sup>253</sup> Because the joy was 'in the Lord,' it was "no ordinary or selfish joy."<sup>254</sup> There is no need to understand ἐχάρην ('I rejoiced') as an epistolary aorist.<sup>255</sup> Rather, following Silva,<sup>255</sup> I contend that the verb is a 'genuine past tense' pointing back to the time of Epaphroditus' arrival with these gifts, or more correctly, an "aorist ingression, denoting the beginning of

---

<sup>240</sup> Michael, J. H. "The First and Second Epistle to the Philippians," *ExpTim.* (Dec., 1922) 106-109. He bases this study on the work of Zahn, and elaborates this position when he wrote his commentary in 1946, pp. 208ff. See also Scott, E. F. "The Epistle to the Philippians," *The Interpreters Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttick et. al. (Abingdon Press: New York, 1955). The understanding is that the Philippians had responded to his letter of thanks in which he said he was not really in need, and wondered whether his claim of independence meant a sign of ingratitude. It is inferred that the content of such a letter included a questioning as to why Paul said he was not really in need.

<sup>250</sup> Alexander, L. "Hellenistic Letter-forms and the Structure of Philippians," *JSNT* 37 (1989): 87-101.

<sup>251</sup> Alexander, 1989, pp. 97-98, referring to a letter of Theognas expressing thanks to his mother for sending him gifts, certainly not at the beginning of the letter, with a remarkably close parallel to Phil. 4: 10-20 in terms of its hesitancy (102.7-9). She concludes: "In fact the critical unease with Paul's apparent lack of courtesy here may well have arisen not from the study of ancient letter-forms but from unconscious adaptation to the conventional epistolary courtesy of our own day, where 'Thank you...' is a common formula for the beginning of a letter-body."

<sup>252</sup> This heading is borrowed from Beet, J. A. "The Christian Secret" *Expositor*, 3rd Series vol. 10 (1889): 174-89.

<sup>253</sup> Alexander, 1989, p. 98 observes that 'an expression of joy is the normal accompaniment to the receipt of a letter, while the direct expression of thanks was not the normal custom.'

<sup>254</sup> Beet, 1889, p. 174. Lightfoot, 1889, p. 162 gives it the reading "it was a matter of great and holy joy to me."

<sup>255</sup> So Hawthorne, 1991, p. 196; Vincent, 1902, p. 141; and many others.

his joy at the arrival of Epaphroditus."<sup>257</sup> This is not to say that Paul has stopped rejoicing, but this reading sees in this verse Paul's expression of thankfulness that has filled his heart since then. Surely he could not have rejoiced greatly with godly joy and still feel ungrateful. However, surprising and baffling to the twentieth century mind is the absence of the word εὐχαριστεῖν in these verses. Fortunately, Peterman has settled the matter demonstrating that the social convention of verbal gratitude reveals that such gratitude was 'withheld from' close friends, was not as important as 'gratitude in the form of repayment,' and when 'offered it took the form of an expression of debt.'<sup>258</sup> He concludes that "the absence of εὐχαριστεῖν cannot be used to argue that Paul censures the Philippians" and that this response was "in keeping with the thankless thanks practised in the first century Greco-Roman world."<sup>259</sup>

The reasons for this joy introduced by the conjunction ὅτι are contained in the words ἀνεθάλετε and φρονεῖν with its cognate ἐφρονεῖτε. The second word group has already been used in this letter. In 1: 7 Paul uses it to describe his frame of mind towards this church, a genuine concern that expresses itself in thoughtful feelings of love as well as concrete actions (cf. 2: 2, 5; 3: 15; 4: 2). Here Paul uses this word to indicate that he sees in their gifts a genuine concern exhibiting "a very positive trait in their attitude."<sup>260</sup> This confirms that Paul was indeed thankful for their gifts. Paul rejoiced because of their thoughtful concern for him. The second reason for his joy strengthens the first: "Paul had come to realise that the Philippians were not to blame for the slow arrival of help, but rather the circumstances were beyond their control."<sup>261</sup> The verb ἀνεθάλετε describes how Paul pictures this concern coming alive again, like plants 'sprouting afresh', or trees and flowers in spring time 'bursting into bloom again.' "It is a highly metaphorical word, filled with poetic boldness, beautiful in its idea, chosen no doubt to convey affectionate understanding."<sup>262</sup> ἤδη ποτέ ('now at last') therefore contains not the "slightest insinuation" of reproach, and Paul leaves no doubt about that by adding the phrase

---

<sup>255</sup> Silva, 1988, p. 235.

<sup>257</sup> Muller, 1967, p. 145.

<sup>258</sup> Peterman, G.W. "Thankless Thanks": The Epistolary Social Convention in Philippians 4: 10-20." *TynB* 42.2 (1991): 261-70. He employs a first century letter, *P.Merton* 12, and other papyri for this demonstration. See also Peterman, 1992, pp. 141-143.

<sup>259</sup> Peterman, 1991, p. 270.

<sup>260</sup> So Silva, 1988, p. 236; See also Hawthorne, 1991, pp. 196f.

<sup>261</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p. 197.

<sup>262</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p.197. ἀνεθάλετε can be understood transitively as 'you revived your concern for me', or intransitively as 'you have revived with regard to your concern for me.' Hawthorne notes



ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ ἐφρονεῖτε, ἡκαιρεῖσθε δέ, a phrase Hawthorne describes as a "criss-cross ending in an unusual fashion with a conjunction δέ." Possibly the lack of a messenger had prevented them from showing their concern, and Paul praises them for using the first opportunity they had.

But having so described his joy Paul was not prepared to leave any doubt about its grounds. He did not want to take chances on the possibility of his words being misunderstood. In vv. 11-13 therefore, Paul explains exactly what he meant.<sup>263</sup> His expression of joy is not "in a language dictated by want,"<sup>264</sup> or "a beggar's thanks for charity."<sup>265</sup> Hence the words οὐχ ὅτι καθ' ὑστέρησιν λέγω, which, taken together with the words of these verses, have been described as Christian contentment,<sup>266</sup> God-sufficiency,<sup>267</sup> and grace sustained self-sufficiency.<sup>268</sup> The question however, is what made Paul independent, self-sufficient and detached from the gifts? Ramsay thought Paul must have fallen heir to some family property or wealth which paid all his expenses including the cost of the appeal to Caesar.<sup>269</sup> But this is an unnecessary conjecture, which gives the impression that Paul was not very sincere in what he says here. Paul himself says ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔμαθον ('for I have learned'). The ἐγὼ is emphatic, and the ἔμαθον is a "constative aorist used here for linear actions which having been completed are regarded as a whole" and Paul was referring here to a growing experience of his Christian life, all that he has learned in his experience regarding contentment.<sup>270</sup> He can be so detached from outside assistance because he has learnt self-sufficiency, expressed by the term αὐτάρκης, and that, for all circumstances (ἐν οἷς εἶμι ... εἶναι). The word αὐτάρκης appearing only here in the N. T., is an adjective whose noun αὐτάρκεια is used in II

---

also that whichever way it is taken, it makes no difference. The point is that "Paul is most happy because of this blossoming." Cf. Muller, 1967, p. 146; Silva, 1988, pp. 235f.

<sup>263</sup> Beet, 1889, pp. 74ff.

<sup>264</sup> O'Brien, 1991, p. 520 who here quotes Lightfoot, 1889, p. 163.

<sup>265</sup> Beet, 1889, p. 175; Hawthorne, 1991, p. 197. Bormann, L. *Philippi: Stadt und Christengemeinde zur Zeit des Paulus*. NovTSup Vol. LXXVII (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995); pp. 138-151, sees in these three verses a line from the *peristasis* catalogue as known from the stoic-cynic diatribe which interprets experiences like those in II Cor 11. 23-33 to describe marks of apostolic duty and proof of the apostle's credibility and the truth of his gospel. Bormann's discussion stresses the religious-historical background of these *peristasis* catalogues.

<sup>266</sup> See Silva, 1988, p. 234.

<sup>267</sup> O'Brien, 1991, p. 5221.

<sup>268</sup> Marshall, 1987, pp. 239f.

<sup>269</sup> Ramsay, 1935, pp. 310-13.

Cor. 9: 8 with respect to the collection. It “was used to describe the person who through discipline had become independent of external circumstances, and who discovered within himself resources that were more than adequate for any situation that might arise.”<sup>271</sup> For the Cynics, the word described an independent spirit and a free outlook on life, marks of a truly wise man,<sup>272</sup> sustained by begging and reducing their needs to a bare minimum. The other mainstream philosophers used this word to express their doctrine that “man should be sufficient unto himself for all things, and able, by the powers of his own will, to resist the force of circumstances.”<sup>273</sup> The significance of αὐτάρκεια here, it seems, is that Paul wants to distance himself from Cynic methods of pursuing this virtue, and from that of the philosophers in general. His was a self-sufficiency that was dependent on Christ as verse 13 makes clear, even though Christ’s name is not mentioned. For him, ‘true being’ (*eigentliche Sein*) is marked by weakness, and human strength is at the same time and fundamentally a gift of divine grace.<sup>274</sup>

In vv. 11-12, Paul expands on what he has learnt. Martin, following Frederick, Gnilka and Lohmeyer and others see a poetic framework of two three-line strophes here.<sup>275</sup> In this view, Paul uses two finite verbs in verse 12, οἶδα (‘I know’ used twice), and μεμύημαι (‘I have been initiated’); and in verse 13 uses another, ἰσχύω (‘I am able’), to make clear what he means. Many scholars interpret μεμύημαι as a technical term borrowed from the mystery cults and used here “as if the vicissitudes of his life were the rights of admission into a secret society.”<sup>276</sup> The reason for this may lie in the fact that the word appears only here in the N. T. The possibility that Paul exploited the original meaning in the mystery religion is thus advanced. Silva however thinks that Paul here uses the non-technical sense of the verb merely as a colourful stylistic variant for ἐμαθον (v. 11) and οἶδα (v. 12).<sup>277</sup> Both positions have their strong points, but a look at a few passages on initiation into the mystery cults support the first argument. Plato and Cicero show that these initiations included ‘religious teaching’ which was in all probability the noblest

---

<sup>270</sup> So Hawthorne, 1991, p. 198; O’Brien, 1991, p. 520, contr. Martin, 1976, p. 163 who opts for a simple aorist “suggesting a specific time when this truth broke upon him; he did not acquire it through patient discipline and concentrated effort.”

<sup>271</sup> See Hawthorne, 1991, p. 198.

<sup>272</sup> See Malherbe, 1977a, 124. 25; 174.12, 244.4; quoted by Hawthorne, 1991, p. 198. See also O’Brien, 1991, p. 521 who adds that αὐτάρκεια was regarded as the essence of all virtues.

<sup>273</sup> Plato, *Tim.* 33 D. See also Vincent, 1902, p. 143; and Register, 1990, p. 134.

<sup>274</sup> Bormann, 1995, p. 142; see also p. 145.

<sup>275</sup> See Martin, 1976, p. 163. See also Hawthorne, 1991, p. 199.

<sup>276</sup> Beare, 1959, p. 153. Cf. Martin, 1976, p. 163; Hawthorne, 1991, p. 199; etc.

teaching of the heathen world.<sup>276</sup> Paul could have felt justified in thinking of a Christian initiation, but this does not inform the subject of finances.

Paul makes clear that he has learnt his lesson well using *οἶδα* twice for emphases. What he knows well is *ταπεινοῦσθαι* (infin. 'to be humbled' or 'to be brought low'), and *περισσεύειν* (also infin. 'to abound,' 'to overflow,' 'to have more than enough,' 'to be extremely rich'). The one is the antithesis of the other, and they all allude to the Christ-hymn, to Christ's humiliation and exaltation (2: 5ff). Paul here does seem to identify himself with Christ. He says also that he is initiated to cope with every situation or circumstance, either to be full or to be in need, re-echoing v. 11 (cf. Rev. 19: 21; Matt. 14: 20; 4: 2; 12: 1). The verb *ισχύω* is not Paul's favourite appearing only here and Gal. 5: 6, but in using it he affirms his self-sufficiency which is dependent on *ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με* ('in union with the one who strengthens me' - Christ). Elsewhere, Paul boasts only of his weakness, which he calls his strength (II Cor. 12: 9-10; cf. Phil. 3: 10 where Paul desires to know the power of Christ's resurrection).

But what did Paul mean by *all things*? Most translations and commentators take on a literal rendering, but Hawthorne rightly calls that misleading and false, insisting that the context should determine the meaning.<sup>279</sup> Paul is referring here to a power outside himself and that power is not limited by any circumstance or situation. So Paul in this section rejoices over the concern the gifts expressed, but at the same time uses popular philosophical *topoi* to make clear that he was not desperate. So why then did he accept the gifts? The next section addresses this question.

#### 5.4.4.2. Partnership in Giving and Receiving, vv. 14-16.

Most commentators see in the sentence that begins this section the closest that Paul gets to saying 'thank you', and that *πλὴν καλῶς ἐποιήσατε* is an idiomatic expression that means 'you have done well' (cf. Acts 10: 33; II Pet. 1: 19; III John

<sup>277</sup> See Silva, 1988, p. 234.

<sup>278</sup> Plato *Phaedo*, p. 81a; Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, 11. 14. Cf. Dam. 11:18, 19, 28, the Apocrypha (Wisd. 8:4; Sirach 27:16, 17; Tobit 12:7 and Judith 2:2) and even more so Matt. 13:11; Mark 4:11; Luke 8:10 which are all in closer accord with the classic use. Other Biblical references include Matt. 11:25; Rom. 16:25; I Cor. 2:10; Ephes. 3:4, 5 where the word 'reveal' is the exact counterpart to mystery. See Beet, 1889, p. 181.

<sup>279</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p. 201.

6; Mark 7: 37; and re-echoes Gal. 6: 9).<sup>260</sup> The particle πλὴν ('nevertheless, in any case, however'), at the beginning of this section is the clearest example in Paul of its functioning as a balancing adversative.<sup>261</sup> Paul certainly does not want the disclaimer in vv. 11-12 to be understood as indifference or ingratitude. This shows further that Paul delayed discussing this issue until now because it was sensitive to him. In other words, the gifts were very timely in meeting his needs (cf. v. 16), but he wants to avoid the impression that he was desperate. What the Philippians have done well is explained by the phrase συγκοινωνήσαντές μου τῇ θλίψει ('became my co-partners in tribulation'). The verb here is aorist participle "used circumstantially to describe manner" and it refers to their recent gesture of love and kindness. Also, θλίψει though used sometimes apocalyptically, is here used "in a non-technical sense of severe hardships, afflictions, burdens and so on."<sup>262</sup> Admittedly, Paul's words here might have included the thought of his whole apostolic task understood apocalyptically, but certainly the phrase is primarily circumstantial, possibly looking backwards to their previous acts of kindness (cf. v. 14). Moreover, the whole letter betrays a very personal character that taking these words as signifying a sharing with Paul on a personal level cannot be conceived as out of place. Also, though Paul does not tell us the nature of his tribulation, he gives the indication that these gifts relieved it. II Cor. 8: 1ff implies that they made sacrifices to do this. Paul saw their concern to be genuine (cf. φρονεῖν and cognate in v. 10). As partners in the gospel, they shared in his suffering for Christ.<sup>263</sup>

The theme is continued in the next two verses which are one sentence in the Greek, served by one verb, οἴδατε ('you know') and two clauses each beginning with ὅτι ('that'). In the first clause, he reminds his readers that they alone among the churches ἐκοινωνήσεν ('entered into partnership') with him. In the second, he reminds them that they have sent gifts to meet his needs on several occasions.<sup>264</sup> This must be what he means by partnership in the gospel from the first day until

---

<sup>260</sup> See O'Brien, 1991, p. 528. But as seen above, the search for verbal thanks is unnecessary. Peterlin, 1995, p. 207 is convinced that the 'stock phrase καλῶς ἐποιήσατε' taken along with ἐχάρην in v. 10 and the interpretation of the gift as an offering pleasing to God, leave doubt that Paul appreciated the gift of the Philippians.

<sup>261</sup> See Thrall, M. E. *Greek Particles in the NT: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*. (Brill: Leiden, 1962) p. 21, and quoted by O'Brien, 1991, p. 527.

<sup>262</sup> See Hawthorne, 1991, p. 202; But see contr. Martin, 1976, p. 164, who disagrees saying the term "signifies not sharing with Paul as a private individual but sharing in his apostolic task," and that it could be understood apocalyptically.

<sup>263</sup> So Muller, 1967, p. 148.

<sup>264</sup> See Morris, L. "Καὶ ἀπαξ καὶ δις." *NovT* 1 (1956) 205-208. He argues that the phrase means "both (when I was) in Thessalonica and more than once (in other places)," indicating that Paul received a total of four gifts from them.

now (1: 5). II Cor. in all probability, is referring to these earlier gifts, and most likely the first. If so, then it confirms and clarifies this reference in Philippians. Here it is called partnership in the matter of giving and receiving (εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήμψεως), which have been called financial terms.<sup>265</sup> This has led to the speculation that "Paul had a banking arrangement with a wealthy Philippian and had received several loans,"<sup>266</sup> and support is sought from Greek literature and the papyri which attest to its use for business transactions.<sup>267</sup>

But Peter Marshall has examined the phrase in the light of its possible contribution to the understanding of social conventions in Paul's relations. He contends that: (a) Greek and Roman authors constantly resorted to commercial language and ideas to describe friendships of all kinds despite having a distaste for merchandised relationships. (b) The phrase in question is "an idiomatic expression indicating friendship." (c) δόσις καὶ λήμψις "denote two of the obligations of friendship", and "continue to appear at times to have become an idiom expressing the mutual interchange of gifts and services of which friendship consists." (d) The two terms "refer to the pecuniary transactions derived from two sides of the ledger." He concludes that Paul draws on 'familiar notions of friendship to acknowledge his friends' recent gifts and that there is no 'tension or embarrassment on Paul's part over the gift.'<sup>268</sup> That is why, he says, Paul gladly accepts the gift as well as recalling their mutual relationship of the past, and looks up to God to reciprocate on his behalf this kindness of his friends (v. 19).

Marshall basically understands this partnership as a special relationship of intimate friendship between the apostle and this church.<sup>269</sup> O'Brien,<sup>270</sup> who is in agreement, notes in addition the following features about the partnership: a) It began with their conversion ('the beginning of the gospel' 4:15). b) Their financial support had been given on several occasions. c) The whole congregation, (ἐκκλησία in v. 15) was involved in this partnership and God will in turn supply its every need (v. 19). This

---

<sup>265</sup> See e.g. Beare, 1959, p. 151 who gives it the translation 'partnership with me in an accounting of receipts and expenditure.' Cf. the NEB, 'my partners in payment and receipts.' So also Sampley noted above in 5.4.1.

<sup>266</sup> See Marshall, 1987, p. 158 for references to such an understanding.

<sup>267</sup> e. g. Poxo. 275. 19, 21; Thuc. 3. 46; Polyb. 11. 28. 8; Demosthenes 8. 47; 30.15; Hdt. 3. 142, 143; See also O'Brien, 1991, pp. 533f. This is the basis for Sampley's argument referred to above. See section 5.4.1.

<sup>268</sup> For details see Marshall, 1987, pp. 157-64. This is Peterman's position as noted above in 5.4.1.

<sup>269</sup> This agrees with Peterman's position. See above, section 5.4.1. The following ancient texts provide strong support for this: Philo *Cher.* 122-123; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4.1; Cic. *Amic.* 16.58.

third point stresses the cohesive undertone of the *κοινωνία*- word group used a lot in this letter and twice in this section.<sup>291</sup> McDermott refers to this use of the word group as the “dynamic meaning” which has the sense of “to make one a participant,” a sense very rare with Greek writers.<sup>292</sup> But he does not provide reasons why this rare meaning should be accepted as what Paul intended. Also, I have discussed in another context objections to this understanding, accepting rather that which sees a reference to establishing a special relationship (see below under 7.4.). Malinowski’s suggestion that “Paul accepted gifts only from the Philippian church because the women there would not take no for an answer”<sup>293</sup> misses the point because it does not make any reference to the *κοινωνία*- word group. Moreover, it gives the impression that Paul was forced into this relationship by their insistence and ignores the fact that Paul elsewhere boasts about this congregation (cf. II Cor. 8), not about individuals in it.

Quite clearly, Paul here stresses the generous initiative of his friends, not the granting of apostolic privilege (v. 16).<sup>294</sup> It seems Paul accepted these generous offers of the Philippians because he saw in them a genuine concern to share in his apostolic work. He saw right from the beginning that they desired to share in the grace of God given to him to be an apostle. He therefore regarded them as true friends, and felt obliged to receive their gifts in aid of his ministry. Indeed, he regarded them as partners with him in his work. In fact, it seems there was a definite agreement between the apostle and this congregation about sharing in Paul’s apostolic work as the discussion on 2: 25-30 above indicated. The next section takes this up a bit further.

#### **5.4.4.3. Investing for Compound Interest. vv. 17-20.**

This section combines a commercial metaphor with a religious or cultic one. First, however, Paul again detaches himself from the gifts with the clause *οὐχ ὅτι* as in v. 11. He has received the gifts not because he was badly in need of them, but because of the benefit the givers will receive by giving. This is expressed by the compound verb *ἐπιζητῶ* (‘seek eagerly for’), repeated in v. 17. The preposition

---

<sup>290</sup> O’Brien, 1978, 9-18.

<sup>291</sup> See Yamsat, P. *The Ekklesia as Partnership: Paul and threats to Koinonia in I Corinthians*. (PhD Thesis, Sheffield, 1992), p. 49 where he argues strongly for the cohesive nature of this word group, and important point he argues for all through his thesis.

<sup>292</sup> McDermott, 1975: 64-77, 219-33; esp. 71.

<sup>293</sup> Malinowski, F. X. “The Brave Women of Philippi.” *BTB* 15 (1985) 60-4.

which compounds this verb intensifies both Paul's detachment as well as his reason for accepting their support. By detaching himself from the gifts, he does not want them to think that he desires more, but he softens this detachment by saying that he desires the benefit they will get.<sup>295</sup> This affirms Peterman's point that Paul writes this section to correct the Philippians' understanding of his acceptance.<sup>296</sup>

What Paul eagerly seeks is τὸν καρπὸν τὸν πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν ('the fruit increasing to your account'). In this context, καρπὸν can mean 'profit, credit, interest,' a sense encouraged by its cognates καρπεία and καρπίζεσθαι,<sup>297</sup> but most appropriately in relation to ἀναθαλετε, an agricultural metaphor. Similarly, though πλεονάζοντα ('increase, multiply') can easily be understood as a commercial term referring to "financial growth,"<sup>298</sup> it is best understood as a continuation of this agricultural metaphor. Its appearance elsewhere "as a technical term belonging to the vocabulary of banking" is not attested. The fact that it is surrounded by business words and phrases supports this commercial reading,<sup>299</sup> but does not rule out its use in strengthening the agricultural metaphor. Also, εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν, a prepositional phrase which should be read as "to your account", is a commercial phrase,<sup>300</sup> but has a social sense as well. Paul therefore understood the gifts as an investment, a credit account which increases and pays dividends, re-echoing Jesus' words, "store up for yourself treasure in heaven" (Matt. 6: 20; cf. Acts 20: 35). Again, this kind of language is not alien in an agricultural setting. Also, fruit here affirms its use in 1:11, a fact confirmed by epistolary conventions.<sup>301</sup> This same concern is expressed in different ways in II Cor. 9: 6-9 and Gal. 6: 8.

This kind of language continues with the use of the verb ἀπέχω, "a technical expression used for drawing up a receipt for payment in full in discharge of a

---

<sup>294</sup> Silva, 1988, p.237.

<sup>295</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p. 205.

<sup>296</sup> He sees Paul's correction as a theologically OT based understanding as against the Greco-Roman understanding of his friends. See Peterman, 1992, pp. 173ff.

<sup>297</sup> See Moulton, J. H. and Milligan, G. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. p. 321, quoted by Hawthorne, 1991, p. 206.

<sup>298</sup> Martin, 1976, p. 167.

<sup>299</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p. 206.

<sup>300</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p. 206.

<sup>301</sup> In such an epistolary convention, a word that appears in the introduction becomes crucial for an overall understanding of the letter. See Alexander, L. 1989, pp. 87-101; cf. Yamsat, 1992, p.49

bill.<sup>302</sup> Again this word was not alien to the language of friendship. The verb usually translated 'I have all' (KJV, JB, LB and Phillips) taken with πάντα can mean 'here is my receipt for everything.' Paul was therefore saying that by receiving the gifts, he is fully supplied and does not expect any more gifts. This is clearly spelt out by the next two verbs, περισσεύω ('I have more than enough') and πεπλήρωμαι ('I am filled'). With the gifts brought by Epaphroditus (cf. 2: 25-30), he is filled and does not expect any more. All this does not disqualify Peterman's point made above that these terms need not necessarily be seen as financial terms as they can be taken in a social way (see 5.4.1.).

Three expressions from the language of sacrifice with their origin in the O. T. sacrificial practice: ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, θυσίαν δεκτὴν, and εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ ('an aroma of fragrance, an acceptable sacrifice, well pleasing to God'), provide a description for these gifts in cultic terminology.<sup>303</sup> Silva notes:

The use of such O. T. cultic terminology to describe Christian worship became common in the early church, in part no doubt because the O. T. itself recognises that outward rituals be but a manifestation of inward realities...<sup>304</sup>

By using these terms, Paul shows that the gifts, though given to him, have God as the ultimate recipient. This forms a dynamic climax for his praise of the gifts. Paul shows that giving from material resources is not any less spiritual than his apostolic ministry, or any religious service, but central in Christian sanctification (cf. Rom. 12:1; Ephes. 5:2 and Phil. 2:5-1 where Christ's death provides the pattern).

Quite in line with the social convention of his day, Paul felt obliged to reciprocate. But he knows also that their gifts to him were ultimately given to God who is the greatest giver. He therefore says ὁ δὲ Θεός μου πληρώσει πᾶσαν χρείαν ὑμῶν ('And my God will supply all your needs').<sup>305</sup> The big question is whether

---

<sup>302</sup> See Deissmann, 1927, pp. 110-112 for an early attestation of this reading. He shows prove for this with examples from papyri and Ostracs. Deissmann also thinks this alludes to Mark 14: 41. See also Hawthorne, 1991, p.206.

<sup>303</sup> This forbids a reading that understands commercial terms used here as referring simply to a commercial transaction.

<sup>304</sup> Silva, 1988, p. 239. He calls to mind I Sam. 15:22; Pss. 51:16-17; Isa. 1:11-20; Hos. 6: 6; etc. where the prophets had insisted that obedience is better than sacrifice and notes also that the N. T. writer of Hebrews (13: 15-16) took up this idea, showing that Christian praise corresponds exactly to Jewish religious sacrifices.

<sup>305</sup> The verb πληρώσει (fut. ind., 'will fill'), has a variant reading of πληρώσαι (aorist optative, 'may fill'). Both readings have manuscript evidence, but the future indicative does carry the upper hand. Hawthorne, 1991, p. 208; See also Silva, 1988, p.241 who notes that the "Main Western" MSS with some minuscules as 33 and 1739, read the optative," but goes on to say that nonpersuasive



this was a wishful prayer or a statement of fact. Hawthorne argues for the first option, contending that such a reading does four things: (a) spares Paul of saying what God will or will not do, (b) allows God his freedom to do as he wishes, (c) does not have to worry with disappointments and disillusionment when material needs are not met and (d) prevents having to make excuses for God.<sup>308</sup> Impressive as this appears, it does seem to me that Hawthorne overstretches his points. Paul was here at the end of this section concerned with trying to “encourage the community with the *assurance* that God can and does provide all that believers need to enjoy true contentment.” This fact is confirmed by the doxology.<sup>307</sup> Moreover, Paul does not consider material and spiritual resources as mutually exclusive categories, as is evident from the text and elsewhere in Paul. His real concern is with joy, true contentment (self-sufficiency), and peace in the power of God (4: 4, 6-7, 11-13).

Worth noting is a fact that Paul in an unusual way used the personal pronoun *μου* to talk about God supplying the needs of his friends (v. 19, cf. 1:3), obviously to distinguish his needs from theirs in this respect.<sup>308</sup> But what does *κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος ἐν δόξῃ* mean? Some scholars have understood the phrase in an eschatological sense signifying what God will do by placing them in glory.<sup>309</sup> The phrase however, reflects a Hebrew adverbial construction meaning in a glorious manner or an adjectival construction qualifying riches and means “God’s glorious or marvellous riches.”<sup>310</sup> Paul says God will meet these needs *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* (‘in Christ Jesus’), a prepositional phrase that stresses the central importance of Christ in what he is saying. Thus, “God makes his wealth known and fulfils needs because of, and in Christ.”<sup>311</sup>

To sum, our study of the Philippian text takes Peterman’s thesis a step further. Paul’s relationship with this church is best understood in the light of the social convention of exchange of gifts. But also, and in addition, Paul entered this

---

motive is conceivable as an influence for the change in either direction, and that the variation is probably accidental.

<sup>308</sup> See Hawthorne, 1991, p. 208 for more arguments for why the optative reading is preferred.

<sup>307</sup> See Silva, 1988, p. 24. See also O’Brien, 1991 whose discussion answers the questions raised by Hawthorne.

<sup>309</sup> Usually Paul refers to God as ‘our’ God (cf. v. 20 where in the doxology he says ‘our God’).

<sup>308</sup> See e.g. Lightfoot, 1902, p. 167.

<sup>310</sup> Martin, 1976, p. 168; Hawthorne, 1991, p. 207.

<sup>311</sup> Hawthorne, 1991, p. 209.

relationship and accepted their support because he saw their genuine concern for him and for the gospel. They were his partners in the gospel.

### **5.5. Conclusion.**

The discussion in this chapter then demonstrates that Paul had more than one influence in his conception of the issue of apostolic support. In his defence of apostolic rights, he shows a remarkable awareness of the contemporary debate on the question of 'support of teachers' which was a life issue then in the schools. Thus, the model of hellenistic schools which seems to have influenced his conception enhances our understanding of the subject. Also, because Paul draws heavily from his rabbinic background, the model of the synagogue is very helpful.

Similarly, on support from Corinth, Paul shows how conversant he was with the social milieu of his day. His acceptance of hospitality and travelling expenses is best understood in the light of the social convention in his day, embracing the practices in all four models. His non-acceptance of support here reflects the convention on exchange of gifts and services and questions of reciprocity in the ancient world. The same point is to be made about his acceptance of support from Philippi. Thus the understanding of Paul's conception on the issue of support for apostles is enhanced by the study of these social models. The conception of his audience corresponds to that in these models, and Paul does seem to seek answers to problems created by these models in each case. However, in addition, this study reveals that the overriding influence in Paul's self-understanding on these issues is his conception of the gospel and the central place it occupied in his life.

## Chapter 6. PAUL AND HIS WORK.

### 6.1. Introduction

Paul clearly accepted and looked forward to the hospitality and assistance of the churches in his travels; and because of the most cordial relationship and mutual understanding of the gospel with the Philippians, he entered into a partnership in the gospel with them, and accepted their repeated offers of aid for his mission. Nevertheless, this was not the only means of funding he had. In the Corinthian epistles, Paul makes a number of references to his hard labour<sup>1</sup> as an option to their support. This subject receives special mention in I Thess. 2: 1-12; and in 4: 9-12, it is included in his paraenesis to this church. It appears that Paul's work was an important and a safe option to depending on support from the churches. The purpose of this section then is to determine using the evidence in his epistles how important this option was to Paul himself, how this relates to the contemporary valuation of it, and the biggest influence on Paul's choice.

### 6.2. Paul's Trade In Thessalonica. I Thess. 2: 1-12.

The literary and historical questions raised by these verses cannot be separated: is it an apology? If it is, who were the opponents? If not, how can the apologetic rhetoric contained in these verses be explained? Also, if there were opponents in Thessalonica as in Corinth, when did they arrive and how does that affect the dating of this epistle? On the surface, these questions appear to be unrelated to our subject. However, when considered carefully, they provide an interesting, and useful background to the question of Paul's labours which comes up in the last six verses, and especially verse 9. I therefore begin with a brief discussion of these questions.

Wanamaker regards as unconvincing and unnecessary the old option that Paul was defending himself against a negative criticism by "someone who was impugning his integrity and his apostolic authority."<sup>2</sup> He suggests rather that Paul was responding to charges levelled against him by non-Christians, and probably at the instigation of

---

<sup>1</sup> See I Cor. 4: 12; 9: 6; II Cor. 6: 5; 11: 23, 27; 12: 10, 15.

<sup>2</sup> Wanamaker, C.A. *The Epistle to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1990), p. 60. This old option sees a situation similar to that at Corinth, finding its basis in the antithetical terms used frequently in these verses, and seeks for a historical occasion for these verses. Several other modern scholars have come to the same conclusion about this 'older option' though the variations they present are great.

the Jews in Thessalonica.<sup>3</sup> Wanamaker was here affirming the position of Lyons, and Malherbe. Lyons' argument is passionate and convincing:

Antithetical constructions require a literary and rhetorical rather than a historical explanation. They were far too common in the normal synagogue preaching of Hellenistic Judaism and the moral discourses of itinerant Cynic and Stoic philosophers in clearly non-polemical settings to assume, as the consensus of NT scholarship has done that Paul's antithetical constructions uniformly respond to opposing charges.<sup>4</sup>

Malherbe had argued along the same lines.<sup>5</sup> He demonstrated with examples that "there are verbal and formal parallels between Paul and Dio that must be taken into account in any consideration of I Thess. 2," and he extends these parallels to Cynicism in general. He argues that Dio has never been supposed to have been responding to specific charges because there are no obligations to that effect. Consequently, he argues that Paul likewise should not be supposed to be defending himself against charges.<sup>6</sup> Thus the antithetical terms Paul uses to describe his apostolic mission in Thessalonica, he says, are not necessarily denials of accusations, but a simple adaptation of the literary and rhetorical conventions of his day. Paul, like the Cynic philosophers exercises boldness and frankness of speech to describe his ministry here, and "consciously makes use of descriptions of the ideal moral Philosopher."<sup>7</sup> Earlier, Malherbe brought out clearly the similarities between Paul's description of his ministry in I Thess. 2: 1-8 and Dio's description of the ideal Philosopher.<sup>8</sup> Paul's courage in preaching the gospel (ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα), his doing it without error or uncleanness (ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας), or with guile (οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ), his not using flattery (ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας) and not seeking glory (ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν), are ideas that are strikingly similar to those in Dio. This makes sense, given the fact that Paul wrote this letter soon after leaving this church immediately following its founding.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, the suggestion that

<sup>3</sup> See Wanamaker, 1990, pp. 60f. His view here disagrees with that of Holtz.

<sup>4</sup> Lyons, G. *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding*, SBLDS 72, (Scholars Press: Atlanta, 1985), p. 184.

<sup>5</sup> Malherbe, A.J. "Gentle as a Nurse": The Cynic Background to I Thess. 2." *Nov T* 12 (1970) 203-17; a position he emphasised again in his *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic tradition of Pastoral Care*. (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1987), p. 55.

<sup>6</sup> Malherbe has also given a good review of the trend of scholarship on this passage and especially on this specific issue.

<sup>7</sup> Malherbe, 1987, p. 55.

<sup>8</sup> Dio *Orat.* 32. 11-12. See Malherbe, 1987, pp. 3-4.

<sup>9</sup> This assumes the position of most commentators. See for example Morris, L. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, Revised Edition (Inter-Varsity Press: Leicester, 1984), p. 20f.

this might be an extension of the opposition that drove Paul from this city in the first place,<sup>10</sup> in my opinion, should not be ruled out completely.

Very interesting and relevant is the so-called “first-class textual problem in v. 7”<sup>11</sup> on whether the variant reading *νήπιοι* (‘infants’) or the other, *ἡπιόι* (‘gentle’) is the original here. There is MSS evidence for the former, but the latter fits in with the preceding 2 verses. Dittography or haplography may account for the variant in both directions since the last letter in the preceding word is *ν*.<sup>12</sup> Bruce prefers the reading ‘gentle’ because ‘infants’ which according to him is probably due to dittography “is inappropriate in the immediate context, where the writers go on to compare themselves not to infants but to a nurse or a parent caring for her children;” and argues further that “‘being gentle’ also provides a fitting contrast to ‘being burdensome’ in the preceding clause.”<sup>13</sup> An extensive list of striking similarities between Paul and Dio, sketched by Malherbe, includes this issue. He refers to Dio as representing “the view that the philosopher should not consistently be harsh (*βαρύς*), but should on occasion be gentle (*ἡπιός*) as a nurse.”<sup>14</sup>

Paul uses the analogy of a nurse, a maternal metaphor, to describe the loving concern he exhibited in his dealings with this church. In v. 11, he uses the analogy of a father dealing with his children. The former speaks of how Paul cares for his converts and the latter of how he instructs them, and this fits with the use of the maternal and paternal figures in the OT, of God and Israel (cf. Isa. 66: 13; Psalm 103:13).<sup>15</sup> But what impact did the use of these analogies have on the Thessalonians? How would they have understood them? Because we have no record of the response this letter received, only a guess is possible. Maybe they honoured what Paul says just as moral philosophers were honoured; or maybe they accepted them as divine injunctions.

The central issue here is Paul’s work - his toils and labours in v. 9. Paul here reminds them of what they know about his hard labours from the time he was preaching the gospel to them. In v. 10, he says that the Thessalonians as well as

---

<sup>10</sup> According to the evidence of Acts 17: 1ff, which there is no compelling reason to reject, esp. as I Thess. 2 and 3 also paints a picture of opposition.

<sup>11</sup> So Morris, 1984, p. 68.

<sup>12</sup> Best, E. *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistle to the Thessalonians* (A&C Black: London, 1972), p. 101.

<sup>13</sup> Bruce, F.F. *First and Second Thessalonians* WBC Vol. 45 (Waco, Texas, 1982), p. 31.

<sup>14</sup> Malherbe, 1970, pp. 216-217.

<sup>15</sup> Bruce, 1982, p. 36

God are witnesses to this practice. This is in line with what he had just said in the second part of v. 9: Paul and his companion's toil and irreproachable character in Thessalonica was 'in order not be a burden to anyone.' The reason given is the same as in II Cor. 11: 9; 12: 13, 16. Two words, κόπον and μόχθου, are used to describe this work. The first word, which relates to κόπτω and with the meaning 'to strike' ('a blow'), carries with it the idea of tiredness and wearisome toil; the second, having the root with the idea of difficulty explicates the fact that this was not just simple and casual work. Together, they stress the idea of 'laborious toil' and not just 'token work,' and, 'night and day' intensifies its seriousness.<sup>16</sup> The words 'night and day' carry with them the suggestion that Paul started working on his trade well before daylight and ended well after sunset, all in the effort to make ends meet. These two words provide a good clue to the nature of Paul's trade. Hock comes to the same conclusion, reading νυκτός καὶ ἡμέρας as 'during the night and day' rather than 'through the whole night and day,' which is why the accusative case, and not the genitive, is used. Taking this with the 'durative imperfect' ἐργάζοντο of Acts 18: 3, the impression is given that "Paul began working before sunrise and continued working much of the day."<sup>17</sup> I shall come back to this later when more clues come by. Here it is enough to reiterate that Paul's trade engaged him in laborious toil for long hours. One would have expected Paul to make reference to the gift he received from Philippi while ministering at Thessalonica,<sup>18</sup> as he does in II Cor. 11: 8-9. This can easily be explained by the fact that there was nothing confrontational between the apostle and this church as there came to be in Corinth.<sup>19</sup> However, this passage and Phil. 4: 15, 16 need to be reconciled. If Paul worked night and day in Thessalonica, what happened to the gift from Philippi? Best thinks this gift was insufficient "to allow him the necessary time off to preach."<sup>20</sup> This possibility must be allowed as we have no evidence one way or another.

The background for Paul's practice of combining his apostolic calling with plying a trade must be explored. The traditional argument, which is still strongly contested is that "it was a Jewish custom, emphasised in the teaching of the Rabbis that every boy should learn a trade," a view arising "from sheer economic necessity," and

<sup>16</sup> Morris, 1991, p. 73.

<sup>17</sup> Hock, R.F. *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship*, (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1983), p. 31. Hock shows that apprentices' contracts show that manual labourers worked from sunrise to sunset (daylight hours only) and so Paul's practice was unusual.

<sup>18</sup> See the discussion on Phil. 4: 15, 16.

<sup>19</sup> So Bruce, 1982, p. 35.

which Paul here adapts.<sup>21</sup> By the second century, it became a requirement by rabbis on parents to teach their sons a craft,<sup>22</sup> and Hengel contends (against Hock), that the practice goes back to the early Pharisaic period of the first century BCE.<sup>23</sup> This, Hengel says, was a welcome practice which provided a secure source of income for Pharisaic scribes, giving them freedom and independence to order their lives.<sup>24</sup> Paul's deliberate refusal of support and his insistence on working for a living could have been influenced by this 'ideal' of independence. A corollary of this is the rabbinical ideal of combining Torah education with the learning of a trade: "Excellent is the study of Torah with worldly occupation."<sup>25</sup> Most scholars have concluded from this that Paul must have adhered to this ideal.<sup>26</sup> The implication here is that Paul learned his trade while a rabbinic student, and not from his father. Hengel however, thinks there is a third possibility: Paul could have taken up his trade later as a Christian who wanted to be an independent missionary.<sup>27</sup> Hock has rejected the conception of a Rabbinic ideal on the grounds that "the very practice itself is difficult to establish before the mid-second century," that "the connection between Paul's trade and this rabbinic background" is very "problematic."<sup>28</sup> He argues that "Paul learned his trade in a familial context, most likely from his father" in a two-three-year period of apprenticeship at ages 12 -13, a practice that was found in all of Greco-Roman society.<sup>29</sup> Hengel contests this, arguing that Hock here claims to know too much.<sup>30</sup> Whatever position is taken, the fact that Paul worked on a trade in Thessalonica cannot be disputed. Also, while Paul's practice of working

---

<sup>20</sup> Best, 1972, p. 104.

<sup>21</sup> See e.g. Morris, 1991, p. 72; Best, 1972, p. 103 who notes that this was a Jewish practice unacceptable to the Greeks and Romans who looked at hard labour with disdain, and belonging to the slaves and servants; Bruce, 1982, p. 34; etc.

<sup>22</sup> *T. Qidd.* 1.11.

<sup>23</sup> Hengel, M. *The Pre-Christian Paul*. (SCM Press: London, and Trinity Press International: Philadelphia, 1991).

<sup>24</sup> Hengel, (1991). pp. 15f. Cf. Jeremias, J. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into the Economic and Social Conditions During the NT Period*. (SCM Press: London, 1969): 31-57.

<sup>25</sup> *M. 'Abot* 2.2. See above 2.4.3.

<sup>26</sup> See for instance, Bornkamm, G. *Paul*. Tr. Stalker, M.G. (Hodder and Stoughton: London, Sydney, Auckland, and Toronto, 1969), p. 12: "With Paul, too, theological training in Judaism was combined with the learning and practice of an occupation;" and Bruce, F.F. *Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free*. (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1977), p. 108: "Many rabbis practised a trade ... Paul scrupulously maintained this tradition."

<sup>27</sup> Hengel, (1991). p. 16.

<sup>28</sup> Hock, 1978: 555-64 especially 555-57. See also Hock, 1983, pp. 22-23 where he emphasises the same point.

<sup>29</sup> Hock, 1983, pp. 23f.

<sup>30</sup> Hengel, 1991, p. 16, who writes, "We cannot simply draw conclusions from apprentice's articles in papyri, where the trade of tentmaker does not appear, to Paul's education in a trade, and we know too little about family conditions to be able to draw sufficiently probable conclusions about his training and his social status." On social status, there is a problem if the Acts' account of Paul's citizenship is believed. Cf. Lentz, J.C. *Luke's Portrait of Paul* (Cambridge University Press:

so as not to be a burden to his converts did not give the desired results in Corinth (i.e. the progress of the gospel), its value here in Thessalonica does not appear to be in doubt. Hock comments that what was earned from this toil and hard labour “would have gone for necessities: food, clothing, perhaps even part of his householder’s rent, to judge from contemporary practice in Rome.”<sup>31</sup>

### 6.3. Paul’s Paraenesis On Work. I Thess. 4: 9-12.

It is most appropriate to take these verses as a unit. Vv 9-10 refer to brotherly love and vv. 11-12 to its practical outworking.<sup>32</sup> The four verses come at the centre of Paul’s paraenesis to this church which runs from 4: 1-5: 24. Paul’s exhortation in the previous section centres on ‘sexual purity.’ The exhortation to love the brethren is an appeal to the Thessalonians to excel in what they are already doing. This church needs no reminders about the teachings of brotherly love because they have already been taught by God.<sup>33</sup> What they need is the appeal to ‘abound more and more’ (περισσεύειν μάλλον, v. 10b) in it. The details of this are then set forth clearly in vv. 11-12. Paul has 3 parallel injunctions for the Thessalonians in v. 11. First he exhorts them to strive to lead a quiet life. φιλοτιμείσθαι ἡσυχάζειν (lit. ‘be ambitious to be unambitious’ or ‘seek strenuously to be still’), is a striking paradox,<sup>34</sup> or in fact an oxymoron.<sup>35</sup> With it Paul underlines that the Thessalonians are consciously and energetically seek to live a quiet life. Secondly, and giving the direction of this powerful exhortation he says καὶ πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια (‘mind your own affairs’). This phrase has been interpreted variously. Best, taking it with the next phrase, ‘work with your hands,’ as well as employing the further clue in II Thess. 3: 10, 11 where the writer rebukes some who were living ἀτάκτως, understands this phrase as having the sense “retire from public life.”<sup>36</sup> Similarly, Bruce understands it in the light of II Thess. 3: 11. He does not give it that particular sense of ‘retiring from public life,’ but of avoiding being “idle busybodies” which affects the whole Christian community marring its image and

---

Cambridge, 1993), arguing for high social status. See below under 6.6.

<sup>31</sup> Hock, 1983, p. 31.

<sup>32</sup> As most commentators, e.g. Best, 1972, pp. 170f; Bruce, 1982, pp. 88ff; Morris, 1991, pp. 127ff; etc.

<sup>33</sup> On brotherly love (φιλαδελφία) as taught by God (θεοδίδακτοί), see Malherbe, 1987, pp. 104-105, who shows that this conception distinguishes Paul’s interest in community from Cynic and Epicurean attitudes, and consequently the “anthropocentric connotations that ‘friends’ carried among the Greeks (*philos*) and Romans (*amicus*) ...”

<sup>34</sup> Morris, 1991, p. 131.

<sup>35</sup> Best, 1972, p. 174; Bruce, 1982, p. 90.



reputation.<sup>37</sup> Morris,<sup>38</sup> following Frame,<sup>39</sup> suggests a view that sounds a bit anachronistic: that it “points to a tendency to interfere in the running of the church on the part of those who were not church officers,” and that idle members of the church who had a parasitic mode of life here attempted to make the church take up the responsibility of their maintenance. He suggests a further explanation: Paul here condemns undue interference in affairs of one’s neighbour and follows commentators in understanding it in the light of II Thess. 3: 11.<sup>40</sup>

These various interpretations raise more questions. Was Paul exhorting against Christians’ involvement in public affairs of a political nature, or was he concerned only with religious politics? Or can we take this as a reference only to the idle busybodies who meddled into other people’s affairs? The answer to these questions lies in the proper understanding of ἀτάκτος. This term and cognates has many possible translations. The RSV renders it by ‘idle’ which is really “an interpretation rather than a translation.”<sup>41</sup> The word can be translated by ‘disorderly’ both in a military sense of ‘not at one’s post’ and in the general sense of ‘out of order,’ as well as by ‘undisciplined,’ ‘disorderly,’ ‘irregular,’ and ‘lawless’ behaviour.<sup>42</sup> Here it could not have had a military sense, or the idea of lawlessness, but clearly that of disruptive behaviour which has a social dimension.<sup>43</sup> Hock has proposed that the language Paul uses here “is unmistakably political as withdrawal from politics is often termed ‘quietism’ (ἡσυχία) and taking part in politics is often termed ‘attending to public affairs’ (πράσσειν τὰ κοινά).”<sup>44</sup> He argues that there was historical credence for this. Quietism was an Epicurean sectarian practice which by the first century was already being adopted by many, some of whom advocated what Paul commands here. Further historical credence is seen in the Stoics.<sup>45</sup>

‘Quietism’ or ‘retiring from public life’ as a philosophical *topoi*, is a creation of Plato and refers to a life dedicated to knowledge.<sup>46</sup> With him however, the

---

<sup>36</sup> Best, 1972, pp. 174f. On retiring from public life as a philosophical *topos* see below in this section.

<sup>37</sup> Bruce, 1982, p. 91.

<sup>38</sup> Morris, 1991, pp. 131f.

<sup>39</sup> Frame, J.E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1946), p.162.

<sup>40</sup> Morris, 1991, p. 132.

<sup>41</sup> Malherbe, 1987, p. 92.

<sup>42</sup> LSJ. s.v. ἀτάκτος.

<sup>43</sup> Malherbe, 1987, p. 92.

<sup>44</sup> Hock, 1983, p. 46.

<sup>45</sup> See Macmullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order* (Oxford University Press: London, 1967), p. 51.

<sup>46</sup> Plato *Rep.* 6.496D uses πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια. See further Jaeger, W. *Aristotle: Fundamentals of the*

'theoretic life' was not distinct from the practical and aimed at enhancing it. Under Aristotle the break between the two began to emerge.<sup>47</sup> By the first century CE, the break was clear: a life of contemplation is seen as distinct from the public life. Seneca argues that for a Stoic, the choice for the former (*otium*), is in fact a necessity.<sup>48</sup> He argues that by *otium* the philosopher serves the larger commonwealth and therefore God.<sup>49</sup> Given the fact that Paul refers to a citizenship distinct from the socio-political structures of his communities (Phil. 3: 20), he probably reflected Seneca's arguments here. In fact, as Malherbe argues, ἡσυχία (quiet living) "was a well known *topos* in Paul's day."<sup>50</sup> His injunction however has an emphasis on communal interest as he seeks to establish community morality, and has as their motivation, fear of God and devotion to Jesus.<sup>51</sup>

Paul's third injunction here is καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς (ἰδίας) χερσὶν ὑμῶν ('and work with your hands'). Two reasons have been suggested for Paul's inclusion of a precept on work in his paraenesis. Firstly, Paul had worked hard while in Thessalonica (I Thess. 2: 9) setting an example of what he commands here.<sup>52</sup> But this does not explain why he should include work in this paraenetic section. Secondly, some commentators have argued that the inclusion of this precept shows how Jews and Christians held different views on work from those of their pagan neighbours.<sup>53</sup> However, this statement can easily be contested on both counts. First, craftsmen in Greek and Roman society were clearly not all slaves.<sup>54</sup> Second, if Paul regards work as πρῶτος and κοπιος (see further below), isn't he upholding the traditional view of 'work' as demeaning? Surely, his language, as we shall see,

---

*History of his Development* Second Edition (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1962), pp. 426-461, here, p. 428. He refers to the use of anecdotes and apophthegms on well philosophers intended to give witness to the existence of this phenomenon from very early times.

<sup>47</sup> Aristotle *Pol.* VII. 3, 1325b 23 discussed in Jaeger, 1962, p. 452 who remarks: "Aristotle himself already taught that the theoretical life has pre-eminence over the practical only because the philosopher at the same time occupies the highest level of creativity: he is the 'architect' of the intellectual and social world."

<sup>48</sup> Beginning with the argument that the wise man should not participate in public life where the state is corrupt, and showing that there is no state that is not corrupt, Seneca writes: "But if the state which we dream of can nowhere be found, leisure begins to be a necessity for all of us because the one thing that might have been preferred to leisure nowhere exists" (*De Otio* viii. 3, LCL translation). See Griffin, M.T. *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1976), pp. 315-366, here, 332.

<sup>49</sup> Seneca *De Otio* iv. This is seen as a preferable choice (iv. 2, cf. vi.4). Cf. Griffin, 1962, pp. 330ff.

<sup>50</sup> Malherbe, A.J. *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1989), pp. 61f.

<sup>51</sup> So Malherbe, 1989, p. 61.

<sup>52</sup> This was the conception advanced by Bruce, 1982, p.91.

<sup>53</sup> See e.g. Best, 1972, p. 177 and Morris, 1991, p. 132, who contends in addition that only slaves did work with their hands in Greek cities.

<sup>54</sup> Burford, A. *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society* (Thames and Hudson Ltd.: London, 1972); contends that "they were, legally speaking, citizens, slaves or free resident aliens." (p. 16).

supports this conception. Thus, the reason for its inclusion here probably lies in his concern for community morality, and work rather than living ἀτακτως which was itself a vital element.

While in Thessalonica, Paul and his companions had told their converts by word of mouth (καθὼς ὑμῖν παρηγγείλαμεν) what they now command. The command is therefore basically a reminder. The context indicates that Paul here insists that “brotherly love demanded sober industrial habits.”<sup>55</sup> We do not know the situation in this church beyond what we are told here. Paul, however knew his audience very well, and knew that they needed such a command. But was there an actual situation at Thessalonica that precipitated this scenario. Why was this precept given orally and repeated in the writing? Bruce has listed three suggestions:<sup>56</sup>

a) the influence of gnosticizing visitors in Thessalonica. He notes the absence of a clear evidence for this in Thessalonica at any time. In addition, I contend that the time between the founding of this church and the writing of this Epistle does not allow for such an influence to have so manifested itself.

b) some were taking advantage of brotherly love to be lazy. This is a possibility.<sup>57</sup>

c) unsettled minds as a result of the expectation of the Parousia. Bruce notes that there is evidence for this in I Thess.

Others have advocated the ferment of ‘eschatological expectation’ or ‘Second Advent Speculations.’<sup>58</sup> But although “eschatological notes surround this passage (e.g. 4: 6; and 4: 13-18) and eschatology formed a central theme of Paul’s missionary preaching (so 1: 9-10; 2:12),” and although “some influence of eschatology probably cannot be denied here,” it is methodologically unsound to place these eschatological influences in the foreground neglecting “what the text explicitly says.”<sup>59</sup> Hock understands this passage in the light of contemporary practice finding a parallel to Paul’s precept in Dio Chrysostom. Paul’s purpose for this precept, that the Thessalonians might conduct themselves in a seemly fashion (εὐσχημόνως) before outsiders, and at the same time be in need (χρεῖαν ἔχητε) of nothing (v.12), is strikingly similar to Dio’s recommendation. He notes that “Dio recommended the urban poor to work with their hands, that is, take up handicrafts

<sup>55</sup> So argued Bruce, 1982, p. 91.

<sup>56</sup> For details, see Bruce, 1982, p.92.

<sup>57</sup> Brotherly love was necessary for the new Christians who faced problems with their relationships when they were converted, hence the concentrated use of kinship language in this letter. It carried with it social responsibilities, which were on Paul’s insistence to be extended to outsiders as well. See Malherbe, 1987, pp. 48-49.

<sup>58</sup> E.g. Best, 1972, p.175; Morris, 1991, p.130 etc.

<sup>59</sup> Hock, 1983, pp. 42-47.

(χειροτέχναι, 7. 124),” and concluded that “since working with one’s hands would meet one’s needs (χρεΐαι, 7. 124), ... there were many opportunities of making a living that are neither unseemly (ἀσχήμων) nor injurious to men who are willing to work with their hands (αὐτουργεῖν)’ (7.125).” For Hock then, Paul’s paraenesis and the precept rests on this reasoning, rather than Paul’s eschatological message.<sup>60</sup>

Malherbe discusses this passage in terms of “elements derived from the Hellenistic moralists” or “terms derived from philosophic discussions of political and social conduct, which suggest that Paul fashioned an ethic that would be intelligible in such a context.”<sup>61</sup> For him, this means that Paul was concerned about his converts who had just come out of that context. The concern in such discussions centred on ἡσύχαζειν (to be quiet), τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττειν (to mind one’s own affairs) and μὴ πολυπραγμοεῖν (not to be a meddler or busybody). Malherbe notes how Plato commends one who does these things:

ταῦτα πάντα λογισμῶ λαβὼν ἡσύχῳ εἶχων καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττων,  
for all these reasons I say that the philosopher remains quiet and minds his own affairs.<sup>62</sup>

Persons who retired from politics came to be described in these terms. The Stoics are a good example.<sup>63</sup> Seneca and Plutarch severely criticised this attitude, while Chion’s comments reflect the widespread debate over these issues.<sup>64</sup> Thus, ‘serious’

<sup>60</sup> Hock, 1983, p.45. Hock concludes as follows: “Therefore Paul’s missionary instructions - namely, to stand aloof from public life and to work at a suitable occupation - should be regarded, not as expressing a Jewish regard for the value of toil, or as arising from eschatological problems due to eschatology or even as representing ‘workshop morality,’ but as reflecting Paul’s clear familiarity with the moral traditions of the Greco-Roman philosophers” (p. 47). But Hock’s strong contrast is hardly necessary.

<sup>61</sup> Malherbe, 1987, pp. 96-107. On such discussions before Plato, see Ehrenberg, V. “Polypragmosyne: A Study in Greek Politics.” *JHS* 67 (1947): 46-67; and Adkins, A. W. H. “*Polypragmosyne* and ‘Minding One’s Own Business’: A Study in Greek Social and Political Values,” *CPh* 71 (1976): 301-27.

<sup>62</sup> Plato *Resp.* 496D. Cf. 433A where citing a common saying he writes Καὶ μὴν ὅτι γε τὸ τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττειν καὶ μὴ πολυπραγμοεῖν δικαιοσύνη ἐστὶ (‘And again that to do one’s own business and not to be a busybody is justice’).

<sup>63</sup> Dio Cassius *Roman History* 60. 27. The issue of Stoic withdrawal from participating actively in the life of the society is discussed by MacMullen, 1966, chap. 2. See Malherbe, 1987, p. 97. See also Griffin, 1976, pp. 315-366, and see above.

<sup>64</sup> Seneca *Ep.* 14.8; 56; 68; and 73; Plutarch *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1043A-1044B. On Chion, see Chion of Heraclea *Ep.* 16.5: “I had a natural bent for a quiet life (πρὸς ἡσύχῳ) that even as a young man I despised everything that could lead to an active and disturbed life. When I was settled in Athens, I did not take part in hunting, nor did I go on shipboard to the Hellespont with the Athenians against the Spartans, nor did I imbibe such knowledge as makes men hate tyrants and kings, but I associated with a man who is a lover of a quiet life and I was instructed in a most godlike doctrine. The very first precept of his was: seek stillness. For that is the light of philosophy, whereas politics and meddlesomeness wrap it in gloom and make the way to philosophy hard to find for those who search.” See also the discussion of this in Düring, I. *Chion of Heraclea: A Novel in*

philosophers had to justify their choice of the contemplative life and prove that their “higher calling” is different from those meddling busybodies. Dio Chrysostom, for instance justifies his choice by saying that he:

goes about as neither farmer nor trader nor soldier nor general, nor as shoemaker or builder or physician or orator, nor as one engaged in any other customary occupation, but, on the other hand, comes and goes in this strange fashion and puts in an appearance in places where impulse or chance may lead him.<sup>65</sup>

The contention Dio makes here is that by his choice of the philosophic lifestyle, he has earned his freedom, and not that he has become a meddler.<sup>66</sup>

The reasons Paul gives for his precept indicates that it would have had practical benefits to this church. First, the church would be conducting itself in a seemly fashion (εύχημόως), and therefore make the gospel favourable. This would enhance its growth. This, says Malherbe, is what distinguishes Paul from the Stoics and other philosophers whose “retirement was to be filled with contemplation and cultivation of personal growth.” It also distances Paul from the Epicureans who retired in the company of friends, with no concern for society. Secondly, they would be in need (χρείαν ἔχητε) of nothing (v. 12). Again this shows that Paul was concerned with the behaviour of his converts on the economic and social levels, and not on the political level.<sup>67</sup> Also, with the emphasis on work, Paul distances himself from the Cynics who were parasitic, meddling and contributed nothing to society, as Lucian satirically comments:

You shall see what will happen presently. All the men in workshops will spring to their feet and leave their trades deserted when they see that by toiling from morning till night, doubled over their tasks, they merely eke out a bare existence from such wage earning, while idle frauds live in unlimited plenty, asking for things in a lordly way, getting them without effort, acting indignant if they do not, and bestowing no praise even if they do.<sup>68</sup>

If Malherbe is right, the precepts about work in this passage fit into a wider philosophical discussion about manual labour. This suggests at the very least that the debates within the hellenistic philosophical schools provide some of the underpinning for Paul’s attitude to manual labour in general, and has some bearing on his own adoption of manual labour as a means of support. If so, Paul was

*Letters* (Wettergren & Kerbers: Gothenburg, 1951), 75.

<sup>65</sup> Dio Chrysostom *Discourse* 80.1. Cf. *Discourse* 31. 2-3.

<sup>66</sup> See Malherbe, 1987, p. 101.

<sup>67</sup> Malherbe, 1987, p. 98.

<sup>68</sup> Lucian *Fug.* 17; cf. *Icar.* 31. On this Bruce says: “If all the able-bodied members worked with their hands, they would be able to support themselves and their dependants, and not fall into destitution or become a charge on the generosity of others.” See Bruce, 1982, p. 91. Cf. Morris, 1991, p. 133; Best, 1972, pp. 177-78. Bruce goes on to note that the early church took for granted the fact that one who is destitute by no choice of their own should be supported by the church.

appealing to the philosophical discussion of ethics, but at the same time distancing himself from the Cynic meddlesomeness, Epicurean unfavourable attitude toward society, and the association of these issues with politics by the Stoics and other philosophers.

#### **6.4. Paul The Artisan Missionary. I Cor. 4: 11-12a; 9: 6.**

Here Paul makes explicit statements about working hard for a living. In I Cor. 4: 12a, he says καὶ κοπιῶμεν ἐργαζόμενοι ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσίν ('we worked hard with our hands.' NIV). The 'we' presumably includes his companions, although it is possible to read it in the light of (9: 6). I Cor. 4: 11-12a comes within the wider context of 4: 1-13 where Paul attempts to correct the Corinthians' misunderstanding of his Apostleship.<sup>69</sup> In vv. 8-10, Paul employs a rhetoric that is full of sarcasm and irony, which in v. 10c refers to his loss of status, at least in the eyes of the Corinthians. This should be the understanding of the word ἄτιμοι.<sup>70</sup> In vv. 11-13, Paul abandons that kind of rhetoric "for straight talk" and gives "a catalogue of apostolic tribulations."<sup>71</sup> I suggest that this list is, to some extent, work-related.<sup>72</sup> This is to say that they relate to Paul's work as an artisan, who despite his long hours at work (I Thess. 2: 9), was not able to make ends meet at all times. Hence, his experiences included hunger, thirst, nakedness, ill-treatment and homelessness (v. 11). To these can be added being cold (II Cor. 11: 27) and tired (II Cor. 6: 5; 11: 27). He was hungry and thirsty because he could not afford the luxury of regular meals and drinks. The ill-treatment may have been the lot of artisans in general. The homelessness and cold were most likely due to inadequate financial resources, and the tiredness is clearly due to his 'exhausting toil' (τὸν κόπον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν μόχθον: 2: 9; cf. I Cor. 4: 12; 2 Cor. 11: 27). For nakedness, there is evidence that it should be understood not literally, but as 'insufficiently dressed.'<sup>73</sup>

There is ample evidence that the experience of artisans, generally speaking, matched the circumstances here depicted by Paul. To be sure, a few artisans enjoyed a prosperous business. Philelus the smith 'had plenty of everything' and

<sup>69</sup> So Fee, 1987, pp. 156-57.

<sup>70</sup> Hock, 1983, p. 36, rightly stresses this understanding.

<sup>71</sup> See Fee, 1987, p. 177.

<sup>72</sup> This is against Héring, 1962, p. 30.

<sup>73</sup> See Epictetus *Dis.* 3. 22. 45-47, where the Cynic is described as having nothing and naked, and a few lines down the nakedness is explained as having 'one rough cloak.' Hock, 1983, p. 84, n. 94 supplies two other possibilities with reference to Paul's Tentmaking: 'his general lack of clothing,' and 'his being "stripped" for work.'

always earned enough for himself, his wife and daughter to live on before his death.<sup>74</sup> But cases like this are very isolated. Mycillus the shoemaker as depicted by Lucian dreamed of much gold but could earn only seven obols which were sufficient to provide a poor meal at the end of each day, and possibly only a single dirty cloak.<sup>75</sup> Lucian goes on to portray him as one who was eager to lay down his knife and leather and die,<sup>76</sup> and as one whose life is described as always hungry, poorly clothed, and cold.<sup>77</sup> Other examples include a certain Ammonius (19 CE), a weaver who somehow disposed of his house and left, presumably because his trade could not provide him a means of livelihood; as well as one Orsenouphis (41-54 CE) whose landlord reported to the authorities the fact of his disappearance owing to circumstances similar to those of Ammonius.<sup>78</sup> Others simply wished that the competition would leave so they could be the sole artisan in their trade in the particular area.<sup>79</sup> Hock is therefore right in seeing a very hard life for Paul the artisan apostle.<sup>80</sup> This is more true since he had to preach as well. The list of tribulation is therefore clearly work-related.

Life was very difficult for the artisan because the social world of the time was hostile to artisans. Hock has demonstrated how artisans were “stigmatised as slavish, uneducated, and often useless,” as a result of which they “were frequently reviled or abused, often victimised, seldom if ever invited to dinner, never accorded status, and even excluded from one Stoic utopia.”<sup>81</sup> This gives an insight into Paul’s feelings as he wrote these verses. A high degree of uneasiness best understood in the light of the social stigmas artisans faced is perceivable in the rhetoric he employs. But was Paul unaware of these social stigmas when he made the choice to work for a living? Surely he was not forced by circumstances as he himself argues. He had the right to be supported by the churches, but decided for the sake of his

<sup>74</sup> Lucian, *D Meretr.* 6. 293.

<sup>75</sup> Lucian, *Gall.* 1 (his dreaming of gold), 22 (the poor meal), and 9 (the dirty cloak).

<sup>76</sup> Lucian, *Tyr.* 15.

<sup>77</sup> Lucian, *Tyr.* 20 writes, “...never again will I go hungry from morning to night or wander about in winter barefooted and half-naked, with my teeth chattering for cold! Who is to get my knife and my awl?”

<sup>78</sup> P. Oxy. 2. 252 (Ammonius); and 33. 2669 (Orsenouphis).

<sup>79</sup> See Dio *Orat.* 77/78. 3-14.

<sup>80</sup> See Lucian, *Fug.* 13-14; Cf. Juvenal *Sat.* 3. 293-94; Lucian *Gall.* 22. See further, Hock, 1983, p. 35.

<sup>81</sup> Hock, 1983, p. 36. Hock concludes: “Paul’s own statements accord well this general description. He too not only found his tent making to be exhausting and toilsome (I Thess. 2: 9), as we have seen, but also perceived that in taking up his trade, he had thereby enslaved himself (I Cor. 9: 19) and humiliated himself (II Cor. 11: 7). His trade also is to be seen as at least partially responsible for his accorded no status (I Cor. 4: 10: ἀτιμος) and perhaps also a cause of his being reviled (4: 12).”

freedom and the progress of the gospel, not to use that right (I Cor. 9) but to work. The gospel's progress and freedom were vitally important to Paul.

Verse 12a provides the best clue in the epistles concerning the nature of Paul's trade.<sup>82</sup> Hock is right in looking for more evidence in Acts 18: 3 where Luke names Paul's trade as σκηνοποιός. He interprets this word as 'tentmaker' and concludes that Paul's trade was leather-working and that 'tentmaker' was "a specialised title," which he says, "reflects the widespread tendency among artisans to use the specialised titles, even though they made more products than their titles would suggest."<sup>83</sup> Hock came to this conclusion not failing to recognise the textual and lexical problems that surround this word,<sup>84</sup> as well as assessing the interpretations of modern scholars. Understanding Paul's trade as a leather-worker precludes the assumption that Paul was a tanner, a job greatly despised in his day. But was Paul unaware of the debate on the appropriate means of support for teachers? Studies on this subject have stressed the importance of freedom for whichever choice a philosopher or preacher made.<sup>85</sup> Given the fact that as Hock and others rightly show, working for a living was the least popular option in this debate,<sup>86</sup> what was Paul's reason for his choice? Hock's conclusion that Paul was acting in line with Musonius<sup>87</sup> has been questioned by Peterman<sup>88</sup> on the grounds that even with farming,<sup>89</sup> total freedom was not secured if the individual had to depend on the buyer of his farm produce. However, Peterman does not attempt giving a solution to the problem. The question of freedom was certainly important to Paul too. Farming was impracticable for Paul because he could not secure land in each new location and especially since his centres were metropolitan. With tentmaking he simply needed a few tools and possibly a friendly colleague in each town where he can share their shop.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>82</sup> See Hock, 1983, p. 20, who has championed this argument.

<sup>83</sup> Hock, 1983, pp. 20-21.

<sup>84</sup> These include the fact that few Western manuscripts omit entirely the clause "for they were tentmakers by trade," and the textual problem that borders on the renderings of σκηνοποιός and its obscure meaning. For a discussion of these, see Hock, 1983, pp. 20ff.

<sup>85</sup> See e.g. Hock, 1983, pp. 52-59; Cf. Peterman, 1992, pp. 234-41.

<sup>86</sup> See above in 4.4.2-4.4.3 where this and the other means of support (patronage, fees, and begging) are discussed.

<sup>87</sup> Hock, 1983, p. 57.

<sup>88</sup> Peterman, 1992, p. 241.

<sup>89</sup> One should be aware that farming was a special kind of 'work,' more acceptable (at least in theory) than craft work.

<sup>90</sup> Theissen, 1982, pp. 36-38 makes this point while discussing socio-economic factors of the 'Legitimation and Subsistence' of apostles and missionaries.



Hock has made a strong case of the association with Barnabas in I Cor. 9: 6.<sup>91</sup> He contends that Paul's method of working for a living, "the fact that tent making was his primary means of livelihood in the various cities of his missionary journeys" was a practice that possibly covered the whole period of his apostolic mission. In this conception, Hock pictures Paul at work during "the so-called second and third missionary journeys." So, for Hock, the evidence shows that Paul worked at Thessalonica (I Thess. 2: 9), at Corinth (I Cor. 4: 12), at Ephesus (I Cor. 4: 11, understanding ἀχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας, 'up to this very moment' as meaning that Paul was working at Ephesus where he wrote the letter, cf. I Cor. 6:8), and later for a second time at Corinth (II Cor. 12: 16). The verse being considered then refers to the so-called first missionary journey.<sup>92</sup> Regarding the period before these, Hock notes "the paucity of information" but thinks that it is likely that Paul worked then too.<sup>93</sup> While this is a possibility, it is simply based on conjecture. Therefore, we can not be very sure. Also, it does not answer the question why Paul, and here Barnabas with him chose to work at a trade. As the rhetorical question implies, Paul and Barnabas certainly had the right to refrain from working, with the implication that they had the right to demand support from the churches. Later, in his argument in this chapter, Paul gives as reasons for his action, concern for the gospel: not to hinder the gospel of Christ (v. 12b), and to offer the gospel free of charge (v. 18). But how do these reasons reflect his perception, and interpretation of the social conventions of his day regarding support for preachers/teachers? We have noted how philosophers who chose to work appealed to the freedom and independence that this afforded them (see above under 4.4.2). The possibility must be allowed that Paul shared their inclinations. Another possibility is to take on board Hengel's arguments and to see Paul as applying the rabbinic ideal to his situation. But what was Paul's attitude to the choice he made? What was his sentiments about working for a living while preaching the gospel?

### **6.5. Paul's Attitude To Manual Labour I Cor. 9: 19-23; II Cor. 11: 7.**

The central issue in these passages is freedom (cf. 9: 1). The key to understanding the first of these passages lies in the correct reading of v. 19. The options are either to read the verse as a concluding part of the last paragraph and thus providing "an

<sup>91</sup> Hock, 1983, pp. 26-27; see also p.77, n. 1.

<sup>92</sup> Hock, 1983, p. 26. See also his "The Workshop as a Social Setting for Paul's Missionary Preaching." *CBQ* 41 (1979) esp. p. 440. Barrett, 1968, p. 204 thinks to the contrary: that Barnabas might have rejoined the Pauline mission. We however have no evidence of this conjecture anywhere.

indirect reference to Paul's working at a trade," or as opening the next paragraph (vv. 19-23) and providing "a general missionary principle that is exemplified by what is said in vv. 20-23."<sup>94</sup> Hock, here following Stanley<sup>95</sup> and against most modern commentators argues for the former of the two readings, where the words ἐμαυτὸν ἐδούλωσα ('I have enslaved myself') are seen as referring to Paul's plying a trade. Paul is thus seen to be arguing in a similar fashion with Socrates, that he values his economic freedom. Paul can boast of his freedom because he has chosen a method of support that has given him independence (working at a trade), though "by entering the workshop, he had brought about a considerable loss of status" upon himself.<sup>96</sup> Hock argues that reading the verse in this way gives the words ἐλεύθερος, ἐδούλωσα and κερδήσω their specific meaning rather than making them "become merely a general Christian concept."<sup>97</sup> The implication is that it provides an important clue to the understanding of the problem of Paul's class. Hock understands v. 19 to be a true representation of Paul's attitude towards working at a trade - not a positive one, but one from someone who "sensed a considerable loss of status."<sup>98</sup> This implies further that Paul considered himself a man of some social status. You cannot lose what you do not have in the first place. Hengel, concentrating on the pre-Christian Paul, appeals among other things, to his origin and citizenship, upbringing and education and Pharisaic study of the law in Jerusalem, to demonstrate Paul's high social status.<sup>99</sup> Similarly, Lentz demonstrates using the Lucan material "that Luke portrayed Paul as a man of high social status and moral virtue," but is convince that it would have been improbable for a Jew of strict Pharisaic background to have held, let alone be proud of, Roman citizenship and citizenship of the city of Tarsus.<sup>100</sup> λ d

Hock understands vv. 20-23 along with v. 19 as demonstrating "the lengths to which Paul would go for the sake of the gospel." He made himself available to all people so that he can gain converts. The loss of status "was worth the gain in

<sup>93</sup> Hock, 1983, p. 26.

<sup>94</sup> Hock, 1978: 555-64, esp. 558.

<sup>95</sup> Hock, 1978, pp. 558-61; cf. Stanley, A. *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (Murray: London, 1958) p. 156.

<sup>96</sup> Hock, 1978, p. 559.

<sup>97</sup> Hock, 1978, p. 559. Cf. Malherbe, 1987, p. 4 who recognises the parallel with Epictetus 3. 22 ('Cynic discourse).

<sup>98</sup> Hock, 1978, p. 564.

<sup>99</sup> Hengel, 1991, pp. 15ff. Hengel does not see a contradiction between the Epistles and Acts on this.

<sup>100</sup> Lentz, 1993, pp. 23-61, esp. pp. 59ff. He concludes: "By the end of Acts, the Paul who has been described is, quite frankly, too good to be true."

converts.”<sup>101</sup> Paul understands his loss of status, his enslaving himself, as freedom from all. Fee agrees with Hock and understands this as primarily referring to financial independence of all because he is, in the true sense of it, a slave of Christ (cf. v. 21: ‘under the law of Christ’), owned by Him and no other.<sup>102</sup> Fee however, does not say how and why Paul was financially independent. That Paul’s working on a trade enabled him to be financially independent seemed to be assumed.

If this argument is accepted, the question it raises is: how important was the gain in converts to Paul, and why was it important? Why was freedom or independence so important in this gain of converts that Paul was prepared to accept a loss in status so as to maintain it? In II Cor. 11: 7 Paul says: “Was it a sin for me to lower myself in order to elevate you by preaching the gospel of God to you free of charge?” (NIV). This verse provides a clue “about Paul’s attitude toward his working as a tentmaker.”<sup>103</sup> Paul’s acceptance of aid from other churches mentioned in vv. 8-9, he says, may be construed as part of what was demeaning (ταπεινῶν) to him, but Paul’s working on a trade was certainly a big issue, if not the central one here. For Hock, reading only a religious meaning which understands this word “against the background of the teaching of Jesus,” neglects the ‘social sense’ which “was also used to express upper class attitudes toward work.” Lucian uses this word with a social sense:

... you will put on a filthy tunic, assume a slavish appearance, and hold bars and graves and sledges and chisels in your hands, with your back bent over your work; you will be a groundling, with groundling ambitions, altogether demeaned.<sup>104</sup>

The context is Paideia’s effort to dissuade the young Lucian from becoming a sculptur. The key phrases σχῆμα δουλοπρεπές (a slavish appearance) and πάντα τρόπον ταπεινός (altogether demeaned), have a close parallel to the Christ hymn of Phil. 2: 5-11. In any case, they clearly have a social meaning here. Paul’s use of ταπεινῶν therefore seems to be no accident.

The above discussion is interesting and shows that Paul was well aware of the language and culture, and conversant with the social milieu of his day (see above under 4.4.2). The implication is that any reading of Paul that neglects his social background is bound to be incomplete. Judge sees Paul as a (high status) ‘Sophist’

<sup>101</sup> Hock, 1978, p. 560.

<sup>102</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 426.

<sup>103</sup> Hock, 1978, p.558. In pp. 561-2, he argues passionately for this position.

<sup>104</sup> Lucian, *Somn.* 13. The Greek is χιτώμιόν τι πιναρόν εἰδύση καὶ σχῆμα δουλοπρεπές ἀναλήμψη καὶ μοχλία καὶ γλυφεῖα καὶ κοπέας καὶ κολαπτῆρας ἐν ταῖν χερσὶν ἕξεις

who attempts to dissociate himself from the sophists whom he denounces, but who was himself attacked on the same charges.<sup>105</sup> Like Dio Chrysostom, Paul “denounces sophists, yet makes ‘sophistic’ speeches.”<sup>106</sup> This provides a good place to resume the discussion of the problem of Paul’s social class. From I Cor. 9: 19-23, it was established that Paul’s attitude towards his working at a trade was not positive, a position confirmed by II Cor. 11: 7. Hock insists that Paul’s use of servile language to talk about his trade as seen in these passages, “corresponds more closely to that of the upper class than to that of the lower.”<sup>107</sup> In my opinion, the soundness of this argument is not in doubt. But this conception of Paul’s social class and his attitude towards his working on a trade intensifies the seriousness of the questions raised above. Something definite and serious must have been responsible for Paul’s stance on this question. But what was it? These passages confirm that Paul’s desire to maintain his economic independence, the fact that he valued highly his freedom, paradoxically costs him a loss of his social status. He had to enslave and demean himself in order to remain independent. He rejected entering houses, but ended up a very lowly person both in his eyes, and with a more serious implication, in those of his converts. His opponents capitalised on this in their attacks on him.<sup>108</sup> He argues that he wanted to present a free gospel and not hinder it, but the end result of his action did constitute to some degree what he was avoiding. Did Paul not foresee that?

### **6.6. The Personal Cost Of Working. II Cor. 6: 5, 10; 11: 23, 27; 12: 15.**

This section looks at Paul’s own testimony on the personal costs of his choice. These references, apart from the last one, occur in the ‘catalogue of trials,’<sup>109</sup> or ‘peristasis catalogues.’<sup>110</sup> The lists certainly include Paul’s trials in other areas of his life and practice. Here however, the concern is with those trials that are related to his work. It will be recalled that in the discussion of I Cor. 4: 11-12a above, the

---

κάτω νενευκῶς εἰς τὸ ἔργον, χαμαιπετῆς καὶ χαμαίζηλος καὶ πάντα τρόπον ταπεινός

<sup>105</sup> Judge, 1960b, pp. 125-137.

<sup>106</sup> Jones, 1978, p. 45. Dio’s ‘conversion’ to philosophy is seen as a turn from sophistry to a favourable disposition towards Cynicism and then to Stoicism (pp. 47-49).

<sup>107</sup> Hock, 1978, p. 564 concludes: “Therefore Ramsay’s view of Paul’s aristocratic origin is confirmed - indeed, strengthened - because Paul’s tentmaking is no longer problematic for that view. By working at a slavish and demeaning trade Paul sensed a considerable loss of status, a loss that makes sense only if he were from a relatively high social class.”

<sup>108</sup> See the discussion in 5.3.2.3.

<sup>109</sup> This is a description used by several scholars including Hughes, P.E. *Paul’s Second Epistle to the Cor.* (Marshall, Morgan and Scott: London, and Edinburgh, 1962), p. 406; Martin R.P. *II Corinthians*, WBC, (Word Incorporated, Dallas, Texas, 1986, [UK]Edition, 1991)p. 379; and goes back to Betz, H. D. *Der Apostel Paulus und die Sokratische Tradition.* (Mohr: Tübingen, 1972).

catalogue of Paul's trials there was identified as work-related, at least to some extent. The discussion in this section will amplify and critically evaluate that identification, especially as they occur in the above named passages. Paul talks about his experiences in II Cor. 6: 5 to include "... hard work, sleepless nights and hunger" (NIV). ἐν κόποις here has been understood differently. Some commentators see these experiences as either voluntary actions on the part of Paul so as to devote more time to praying and fasting, or forced upon the apostle because he was so busy preaching the gospel.<sup>111</sup> Hughes' argument is somewhat complex.<sup>112</sup> On the one hand, he understands the sleepless nights and the fasting in a religious sense: Paul "shortened his hours of rest in order to devote more time to his evangelical work," and also "spontaneously went without meals rather than interrupt his work."<sup>113</sup> On the other hand, he argues that Paul could have fasted because of "his determination to preach the gospel for nought." Martin represents the view that this word refers to the "fatigues" that came about through his apostolic mission, thus giving it a specifically religious connotation.<sup>114</sup> The strength of this argument is that when Paul uses this word group, it "often means specifically Christian work."<sup>115</sup> Its weakness is inherent in its strength: some of the references cited do not have to refer to Christian work. The latter certainly allow for a reference to Paul's working at a trade. The verse in question as well as I Thess. 2: 9 (see above), Rom. 16: 6, 12; and I Cor. 4: 12 fall under this category. This strengthens the argument that this word refers to Paul's working on a trade, and the fatigues that this brought him because he was also doing missionary work. Murphy-O'Connor, groups 'labours, sleepless nights and hunger' together and refers to them as difficulties that Paul had "in paying his way."<sup>116</sup> Similarly, Furnish contends that these experiences: labours, sleepless nights and times without food, are "to be explained as references to" Paul's working at a trade so as not "to be a financial burden on the newly founded congregations."<sup>117</sup> This understanding gives the other two experiences, sleepless nights and times without food, a different slant.

---

<sup>110</sup> So Marshall, 1987, p.174.

<sup>111</sup> See Martin, 1991, pp. 174-75.

<sup>112</sup> Hughes, 1962, pp. 225-226.

<sup>113</sup> Acts 20 where Paul preached on and on into the night could be cited as evidence for this religious sense, though Hughes does not.

<sup>114</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 174 says, "it is unlikely Paul has in mind the 'physical' labour of an occupation or trade." Cf. Hughes, 1962, p. 225 had earlier argued in favour of the same position.

<sup>115</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 174. Barrett, 1973, p. 295, referring to II. Cor. 11: 23 comes to the same conclusion, and gives the following references in support: I Cor. 15: 58; II Cor. 6: 5; 10: 15; I Thess. 1: 3; 2: 9; 3: 5; II Thess. 3: 8; Rom. 16: 6, 12; I Cor. 4: 12; 15:10; 16:16; Gal. 4: 11; Phil. 2: 16; Col. 1: 29; I Thess. 5: 12.

<sup>116</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, 1991, p. 64.

As in the discussion of I Thess. 2: 9, and I Cor. 4: 11-12, sleepless nights and times without food are conditions that expand the first one - labours at a trade, as was the case in Paul's day. They are experiences of the artisan who is struggling to make ends meet and is not succeeding. This last point explains why Paul, while working in Thessalonica, and in Corinth accepted the support of the Philippians (II Cor. 11: 8-9; and Phil. 4: 14-15). In other words, Paul was forced to work even at nights because he was combining the ministry of the gospel and his tentmaking, and even so had not enough to eat regularly. In this understanding, these experiences were not voluntary, or a choice on the part of Paul himself to keep a vigil and to fast.<sup>117</sup> May be he wasn't very good at tentmaking. But if so, why did he choose this particular trade? Or was he more successful after he met Priscilla and Aquila? These are probably questions we may never have answers to.

Verse 10 shares the same context as v. 5 discussed above. The concern here is with *ὡς πτωχοὶ πολλοὺς δὲ πλουτίζοντες, ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες* ("poor yet making many rich; having nothing, yet possessing everything." NIV). It is clear that the poverty here is the fact that Paul had nothing of the world's goods and possessions. For Hock, it is poverty brought about by his work as a tentmaker.<sup>118</sup> Hock however, does not say how Paul though poor enriched many. Presumably he would say that Paul, though poor according to worldly standards enriched his converts with the riches of the gospel. I guess that it is the same reason that led Martin and others with him to say that the poverty was spiritual.<sup>120</sup> The question however, as Martin himself rightly asks is how Paul who is poor can make many rich. It is true that Paul elsewhere contrasts heavenly riches to this world's riches (see the discussion of Rom. 15 under 7.4. and II Cor 8 & 9 under 7.3. esp. 7.3.2.). But if Paul's poverty in this verse was spiritual, how did he enrich many? Wouldn't it be more correct to say that Paul is combining two concepts here - the poverty being physical as the context makes clear, and the 'making others rich' being spiritual? If so, is it not right to say that Paul's poverty was self imposed with the furtherance of the gospel brought to the forefront?

II Cor. 11: 23b begins another catalogue of trials that runs through to v. 33, presenting the same argument as in 6: 5c. On the one hand, the word *κόπος* is seen

---

<sup>117</sup> Furnish, 1985, p. 355.

<sup>118</sup> Furnish, 1985, p. 355. See also Barrett, 1973, p. 186.

<sup>119</sup> Hock, 1987, p. 64.

<sup>120</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 184. He says that Paul was "not alluding to the economic condition of poverty here, however true it may be that in some cases, especially for the benefit of the Corinthians he had chosen to forsake any remuneration for service rendered to the churches."

as “a word for physical toil, but applied to Christian service...”<sup>121</sup> On the other hand, it is seen as referring to Paul’s toil as a craftsman which both he and the Corinthians considered demeaning, and is specified in v. 27.<sup>122</sup> Again, as in 6: 5c, the argument is balanced on either side. Verse 27 is an interesting verse. Apart from the reappearance of the word κόπῳ and the addition of a synonym μόχθῳ,<sup>123</sup> the list of experiences is bigger. In 6: 5c, Paul adds only sleepless nights and hunger to his hard work. Here, as part of his experiences related to ‘labour and toil,’ is added λιμῶ (‘hunger’, ‘famine’) which intensifies νηστείας (‘fasting’) giving it a different slant, δίψει (‘thirst’), ψύχει (‘cold’), and γυμνότητι (‘nakedness’). The hunger (‘famine’) in ‘hunger and thirst’ is equivalent to that in I Cor. 4: 8-9. Furnish argues that it is not likely a reference to “voluntary abstention from food and drink” or “the more general notion of ‘famine and drought’ because the context does not allow for such understandings.” Rather, he contends that they were experiences forced on the apostle by his circumstances. His tentmaking made him poor and therefore unable to feed properly at times.<sup>124</sup> Martin, against Furnish, thinks that “Paul’s suffering here may witness to his poverty; more likely it describes his rigorous life of travel, not an involuntary fast. A slightly different argument is that of Barrett who contends that these words as Paul uses them suggest voluntary fasts although Paul does not say why he has taken them. Barrett seems to link the ‘abstinence’ with the ‘work.’”<sup>125</sup> For Héring, these were not experiences that depend solely on poverty, but due “to the lack of resources in sparsely populated areas.”<sup>126</sup>

A major objection to Héring’s position is that it is a remote conjecture, but it does take into account the connection with travel. In other words, Paul’s rigorous life of travel is a likely cause for the experiences he mentions in these verses. The overall perception is that these experiences point to Paul’s poverty. This is acceptable since it confirms what was suggested in the discussion of 6: 10. But was the ‘hunger and thirst’ voluntary or involuntary? Were these experiences the result of Paul’s ascetic practice or were they circumstances forced on the apostle because of his practice of working at a trade to support his mission? Here, the argument of Hock, which is the

<sup>121</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 376.

<sup>122</sup> So Furnish, 1985, pp. 536- 537.

<sup>123</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 380 calls the pair a “virtual synonym,” a pair which occurs also in I Thess. 2: 9; II Thess. 3: 8.

<sup>124</sup> Furnish, 1984, p. 519. Hughes, 1961, p. 413, maintains basically the same position.

<sup>125</sup> Barrett, 1973, p. 300.

<sup>126</sup> Héring, 1967, p. 86.

position Furnish takes as seen above, seems weightier.<sup>127</sup> Against Martin's conclusion is the fact that experiences of hunger and thirst are very much the result of a life of poverty as they can be the result of a rigorous life of travel. Although travel was relatively much more difficult in the ancient world than it is today,<sup>128</sup> a wealthy person is less likely to have suffered the kind of the experiences Paul talks about here. Moreover, there is nothing in the text that compels such a reading. Similarly, against Barrett's conjecture is the fact that abstinence on account of a determination not to be supported is not quite the same as a voluntary fast, or an ascetic tendency. The last two experiences mentioned in this verse, being cold and nakedness, lend credence to the position taken above. The suggestion that they "refer to raids by brigands,"<sup>129</sup> though likely, is not necessary. Moreover, why would Paul be referring to this experience in such an ambiguous way when earlier in v. 26 he had clearly referred to 'danger from bandits'? Rather, they should be understood as experiences that "certainly would be caused by lack of money."<sup>130</sup> With these, Paul indicates the lowest he had gone in demeaning himself. 'Cold' and 'nakedness' are "marks of extreme loss, including a loss of dignity and self-esteem."<sup>131</sup> They were experiences that were the result of Paul's poverty caused by his effort to make a living as a craftsman,<sup>132</sup> while at the same time carrying out his mission as an apostle without accepting support. Nevertheless, the possibility must be allowed that these experiences are linked to travel. In any case, I do not think these two explanations have to be understood as mutually exclusive. In other words, these could have been experiences he had on his travels as a result of refusing to be supported by the churches and his insistence on his independence.

---

<sup>127</sup> See, Hock, 1987, p. 64.

<sup>128</sup> Such dangers and difficulties include rough roads (donkey tracks only at times), no protection from sun, rain, snow, and so on, and the attacks of bandits, and robbers on the roads. See Carson, 1974, pp. 38-41. Travel by sea was equally dangerous, involving the risks of capture by pirates as well as shipwrecks (pp. 72-73). Connolly, A.L. "The Dangers of Sea Travel" in Horsley, G.H.R. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* vol. 4 (The Ancient History documentary Research Centre: Macquarie University, 1987): document 26, pp. 113-117; discusses with sufficient evidence the difficulties sea travellers encountered to include shipwrecks, attacks by pirates or even by criminals on board, fire from the shore, and generally stormy weather. As a result, he shows, sailors who arrived safely to their destinations were known to make vows which were fulfilled by the shaving of their heads, and undertake sacrificial rites including thank-offerings. Cf. *New Documents*. 1977, 25; and on Travel risks in general, see *New Documents*. 1978, 18.

<sup>129</sup> So Héring, 1967, p. 86.

<sup>130</sup> Barrett, 1973, p. 300.

<sup>131</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 380.

<sup>132</sup> Furnish, 1985, p. 519 gives an example of Lucian, *Gall.* 9, and *Tyr.* 20, where Micylus speaks of being half-naked.



### **6.7. Conclusion.**

The discussion in this chapter demonstrates how important Paul's choice to work on a trade was to him. It cost him his social status, and Paul felt a degree of unease about that. Yet he was determine<sup>λ</sup> not to use his right to the support of the churches. Also, he did this conscious of the social valuation of work in his time. His valuation of work corresponds to that of his readers and the social world around him. His discussion demonstrates an awareness of the social milieu with all the arguments for and against the choice he made. This makes his choice even more remarkable. λ d

Paul did seem to have had more than one influence in his self-understanding of work. As demonstrated above, his rabbinic background surely had a part to play. He was also very much conversant with the philosophical discussion and argument about work. In this regard, the four social models, especially that of the schools and the synagogue, prove very useful. A third influence, and one that appears to be the overriding one is the influence of the gospel. As his arguments demonstrate, his insistence on independence had ultimately the furtherance of the gospel in mind. This indicates how vitally important the gospel was to Paul and how it affected his valuation of life as a whole.

## Chapter 7. PAUL'S COLLECTION PROJECT

The collection was a significant project for Paul. It took much of his time,<sup>1</sup> and there is at least some reference to it in his major epistles (Gal. 2: 10; I Cor. 16: 1-4; II Cor. 8 & 9; and Rom. 15: 25-33). It is a vital element in the total picture we have of Paul's churches as social groups. The purpose of this chapter then is to ascertain how Paul (and the churches themselves) understood and expected their 'trans-local' finances to be administered. The four social models will be used to suggest possible readings of these references.

### 7.1. Paul's Eagerness to Remember the Poor Gal. 2: 10.

The overall context of this verse is Paul's autobiographical sketch which has an apologetic function and runs through from 1: 1 to 2: 14, providing Paul's account of the conference in Jerusalem (1: 10).<sup>2</sup> Here Paul says:

ΜΟΝΟΝ ΤῶΝ ΠΤΩΧῶΝ ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ  
τοῦτο ποιῆσαι.

only we were to go on remembering the poor, the very thing I was eager to do.

By μόνον, Paul continues his insistence (which started in 1: 11) that he and his gospel are independent of the 'pillar apostles.'<sup>3</sup> Guthrie rightly understands this statement as a request: "They extended the right hand of fellowship so as to make it plain that we went to the Gentiles and with the one proviso that we should not forget the poor."<sup>4</sup> This agrees with what Paul said in verse 6. Schmithals similarly rejects the suggestion that this verse refers to a concession Paul received and which he "here clothes ... in the form of mutual agreement in order to stand with Barnabas beside the 'pillars' as an equal in rank."<sup>5</sup> Such a suggestion, he says, plays down Paul's

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Lüdemann, G. *Paul Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology*. (SCM Press Ltd: London, 1984), p. 99 who reckons it took between 3 and 4 years to organise in Macedonia and Achaia.

<sup>2</sup> The discussion of this conference does not in itself form part of this subject. This is true also of a number of questions that go along with the subject of the conference: 1) the question of Paul's visits to Jerusalem which is also tied up with the question of the chronology of Paul's ministry; 2) the relation between Paul's account of the conference and Luke's; as well as 3) Paul's purpose in reporting the conference.

<sup>3</sup> Bruce, F.F. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Testament*, NIGTC (The Paternoster Press: Exeter, 1982), p. 126 whose knowledge of Greek comes to play here. He remarks: "the 'pillars' imposed no conditions, made no stipulations, apart from the request for Christian aid."

<sup>4</sup> Guthrie, D. *Galatians*: NCB (Nelson: London, 1969) pp. 85f.

<sup>5</sup> Schmithals, W. *Paul and James: Studies in Biblical Theology* 46 (SCM Press Ltd: London, 1963), p. 46, against Haenchen.

insistence that his mission was independent of the pillar apostles. Paul here appeals to his eagerness to remember the poor. This underlines the spontaneity of his acceptance of the request, and excludes any understanding of a concession accepted reluctantly. Similarly, Munck rejects the suggestion that Jerusalem imposed a compulsory levy on the mission to the Gentiles and that Paul's remark here is "a euphemistic mention" of it. This view, he says, implies that "Paul's account of the apparently harmonious meeting in Jerusalem would be evidence of the ill-will that the mission to the Jews cherished towards the mission to the Gentiles, and of Paul's dependence on the original disciples of Jesus."<sup>6</sup> Such an understanding depicts Paul as a dishonourable character who told lies to get his way through. I doubt that it is sound scholarship or good exegesis to so condemn a character on an argument that is based on conjecture. The accounts in Acts agree with Paul's statement here that there was a harmonious relationship between Jerusalem and the Gentile mission. Also, both accounts do not give any hint that there was a levy imposed on the Gentile mission.

But Paul's defensive tone in Gal. 2:1-10 shows that he was defending the project of the collection. It seems Paul was accused of using the collection to:

buy the acceptance of his ministry from Jerusalem, an attempt that demonstrated at the same time his inferiority to Jerusalem. Or, possibly the assertion circulated that Paul was under obligation to raise a levy for Jerusalem.<sup>7</sup>

Paul therefore labours to show that the collection was his own initiative, not something he was obliged to organise because of his dependence on Jerusalem.<sup>8</sup> The fact that Paul mentions his willingness to grant the request of the 'pillars' is in itself an argument against the conception that it was a sign of Jerusalem's superiority. If that were the case, Paul would have been contradicting his argument by mentioning it. For Paul then, the fact that Jerusalem requested his assistance strengthens his contention that the 'pillars' recognised his ministry, and that in turn means that he was not obliged to do what he was doing. This agrees with his description of the collection as *κοινωνίας* (see below). Hall's assertion that Paul's eagerness started even before the conference under discussion, as the aorist *ἐσπούδασα* indicates, may have some weight;<sup>9</sup> and so is the fact that Paul mentions it emphatically, but I do not

<sup>6</sup> So Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (SCM Press Ltd: London, 1959) pp. 286-7, against Lietzmann and Knox. See also Lüdemann, (1984), pp. 71ff.

<sup>7</sup> So Hurtado, L. W. "The Jerusalem Collection and the Book of Galatians" *JSNT* 5 (1979) 46-62, esp. 51. While I go along with Hurtado's assertion here quoted, I do not accept that Gal. 6: 6-10 still refers to the collection. See also Bruce, 1982, p. 127.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Bruce, 1982, p. 127.

<sup>9</sup> Hall, D. R. "Paul and Famine Relief: A Study in Gal. 2:10" *ExpTim* 82 (1970-71) 309-11. I am not going to be drawn into the debate on the relationship between the accounts of Paul and Luke. I

however see any compelling reason to accept this reading which identifies Paul's eagerness with the famine relief mentioned by Luke in Acts 11.

There are however other reconstructions which arrive at an entirely different conclusion. Nickle sees in this verse allusions to both the famine relief and the collection which Paul organised. He argues that this brief mention of the subject "bespeaks" the fact that it was well known to his readers.<sup>10</sup> Lüdemann's reconstruction excludes the possibility of any reference to such alms brought to Jerusalem during or before the conference, arguing that an imperfect tense rather than the aorist tense ἐσπούδασα would have been used.<sup>11</sup> Similarly, Georgi contends that Gal. 2: 10 gives no 'hints' of a collection before, or delivered during the conference; there is nothing in the verse "to infer that the fund raising had already been started in Galatia at the time" and that Paul here looks back to his eagerness "after the convention had come to an end."<sup>12</sup> The reconstructions which see here a reference to a collection delivered before or at the conference, pose the problem why Paul did not refer explicitly to it when he defends the collection as something he initiated.<sup>13</sup> A look at the rest of the Pauline epistles confirms that wherever possible Paul substantiates his arguments by appealing to his readers as witness, or in the absence of that, to God.<sup>14</sup>

---

am discussing the evidence from the Pauline letters only. Cf. Ramsay, W. *Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen* (Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1935) p.57. who paraphrases this verse as: "...the only advice and instruction which we have to give is, that you continue to do what you have been zealously doing." Hall brings in the verb μνημονεύω to support his point (p. 10) and appeals to the references in Moule, C.F.D. *An Idiom-Book of the New Testament Greek* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1953) p. 16 citing verses where the aorist in Greek requires a pluperfect in English. Bruce, 1982, p. 126 independently argues along the same lines: "But the aorist ἐσπούδασα is noteworthy: it does not refer only, or even chiefly to that relief fund. Paul means not only that he henceforth adopted this policy, but that he had already done so - he thinks of the famine relief which he and Barnabas brought to Jerusalem from Antioch, according to Acts 11:30. The aorist ἐσπούδασα fits in well with the fact that Paul had actually just brought alms to Jerusalem: it is almost a pluperfect." He refers here to the relief fund of I Cor. 16:1-4; II Cor. 8&9; and Rom. 15: 25-28 which according to him "is an eloquent commentary on this statement."

<sup>10</sup> Nickle, K.F. *The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy* (SCM Press Ltd: London, 1966), 59-62.

<sup>11</sup> Lüdemann, 1984, pp. 78ff; cf. Jewett, R. *Dating Paul's Life*. (SCM Press Ltd: London, 1979), p. 72, who thinks there is not a hint in Gal. 2: 1-10 about any famine relief brought to Jerusalem by Paul during the Conference.

<sup>12</sup> Georgi, D. *Remembering the Poor: The History of Paul's Collection for Jerusalem* (Abingdon Press: Nashville, 1992), pp. 43; 45.

<sup>13</sup> Georgi, 1992, p. 45 writes, "Paul would at least have referred to it by writing something like, 'As you know' ..."

<sup>14</sup> On his readers as witnesses, see Phil. 4: 15 '...as you Philippians know..', I Thess. 2: 1 'You know brothers,' 2: 10 "You are witnesses and so is God." On God as witness, see II Cor 11: 11 'Why? Because I do not love you? God knows I do!'

Nickle understands Paul's defence in Gal. 2: 1-10 as reacting to hostilities to the collection which was seen by the opponents as "an open infringement of the Temple, since in their eyes, Paul was competing with the traditional Temple tax."<sup>15</sup> While it is very likely that Paul was here reacting to hostilities towards the collection, I doubt that such hostilities are to be understood in the way Nickle does. There is no evidence, either from what Paul says here or anywhere in the NT, that there was any competition with the traditional Temple tax. Moreover, this contradicts part of Nickle's thesis that Jerusalem had a definite say about the organisation of the collection and appointed representatives to work with Paul to supervise it.<sup>16</sup> Why would Jerusalem be hostile towards a project in which they had a vested interest, and which they controlled? Also, there is no proof that these hostilities were primarily against Paul and his deviations from the arranged course of action.

It seems at least clear, that in describing the collection as "for the poor" (τῶν πτωχῶν),<sup>17</sup> Paul is allowing himself to present it as a form of *benefaction* (almsgiving) which places the donors in a position of superiority. Also clear from this discussion so far is that Paul's concern for the poor, as well as this conception of charity as a form of benefaction has Jewish antecedents. The model of 'the Synagogue' then, enhances the understanding of this section (see 2.4.1), as well as the model of 'clubs and associations' (see 3.4.2).

Interestingly, this passage contains no instructions about the collection. I Cor. 16: 1-4 mentions the instructions given to the 'churches in Galatia', and implies that the project was instituted in Galatia before Corinth and Macedonia. The fact that Paul tells the Corinthians to do as he had instructed the Galatian churches indicates that these instructions had worked there<sup>18</sup> or at least were working. How then can we explain Paul's silence about the instructions in Galatians? Bruce has suggested that "the general admonitions" in Gal. 6: 2, 6-10 could be seen as covering such a fund, but recognises also that there are no "practical directions about its collection and administration in Galatians as in I Cor."<sup>19</sup> I think that such an identification is arbitrary. Paul does not leave any doubt about any reference to the collection when he discusses it elsewhere. Georgi's reasoning that this was as a result of the temporary

<sup>15</sup> Nickle, 1966, pp. 59-62.

<sup>16</sup> See Nickle, 1966, pp. 17-22. Cf. Betz, H. D. *A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Church in Galatia*. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1979), p. 101. who refers to it as a 'concession' to be explained simply as a 'philanthropic gesture' whatever he meant by that.

<sup>17</sup> On who 'the poor' were, see below under 7.4.

<sup>18</sup> So Betz, 1979, p.103.

<sup>19</sup> Bruce, 1982, p.127.

cessation of the collection is a possibility, but not one that can be absolutely proven. The answer, I think, lies in the fact that Paul was addressing different issues in this letter, and the issue of the success of the collection in Corinth, did not arise. This is reasonable given the fact that Paul in his letters addresses specific issues that have arisen in the churches he writes to, or issues he wants to draw their attention to.

## 7.2. A Practical Admonition on the Collection. I Cor. 16: 1-4.

This passage is a "brief mention of the collection,"<sup>20</sup> dealing with practical "matter-of-fact directives" to the church at Corinth on how they should go about the collection and "what will happen to it" when the apostle arrives and it is completed.<sup>21</sup> What Paul says here "is said concisely."<sup>22</sup> It was the general consensus among scholars that Paul is here responding to a question the Corinthians have raised in their letter to him,<sup>23</sup> until Mitchell strongly challenged that conception.<sup>24</sup> The clear indication here is that the subject of the collection was well known to this church, at least enough to decide to participate. This raises the question often referred to: what was it they heard and how did they hear it, as well as what their letter to Paul said.<sup>25</sup> It is idle speculation and almost pointless to pursue this question. Only a guess is possible, but unnecessary. What is certain is that Corinth knew about the collection and was prepared to participate.

<sup>20</sup> So Munck, 1959, p. 289, who goes on to note that it "does not enlighten us about the apostle's motives."

<sup>21</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 811.

<sup>22</sup> Munck, 1959, p. 288.

<sup>23</sup> Περὶ δὲ here as in 7:1, 25; 8:1; 12: 1, and still to come in this chapter, 16:12; are understood as points at which Paul picks up a new issue the Corinthians have raised in their letter.

<sup>24</sup> Mitchell, M.M. "Concerning περὶ δὲ in I Corinthians," *NovT* xxxi, 3 (1989): 229-256. Using a large number and wide ranging collection of Greek literary and epistolary (literally and private letters) texts, she demonstrates that περὶ δὲ must not necessarily refer to a topic in the Corinthians' letter, or to Paul introducing such a topic from their letter; and must not necessarily indicate that Paul was following the order of topics they had raised in their letter. The texts, she says, do not make this clear; and the source of information can also be verbal, or something commonly known to the writer and reader, or some other source.

<sup>25</sup> See among others, Fee, 1987, p. 811. Barrett, 1971, p. 385 assumes this question when he speculates that "it is probable that the Corinthians had heard, perhaps from the Galatians" about this project. Similarly, Grosheide, F.W. *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott Ltd: London and Edinburgh, 1954)p.397 assumes this question when he suggests speculatively the possibility that Paul had spoken about it in Corinth or that Paul had written about it to this church in his first letter which is now lost.

The word Paul uses in this passage is λογεία.<sup>26</sup> There have been attempts to identify this project "with the Didrachma tax paid into the Temple at Jerusalem by all Jews."<sup>27</sup> Nickle's discussion and identification is curious.<sup>28</sup> In comparing Paul's collection and the Temple tax, he recognises 8 similarities and 6 differences between the two. Having surveyed the administration of the Temple tax from the OT right through to the time of the early church and how Christians paid this tax, and having reviewed the charitable provisions for the poor in the OT as well as the evidence from Qumran, Nickle implies in a carefully worded statement that Paul's collection can be identified with the Temple tax except for the voluntary element in Paul's project.<sup>29</sup> But this conception does seem to rely simply on the use of λογεία in I Cor. 16: 1-2, failing to take seriously the fact that Paul uses other terms to talk about this project. It is, in addition, doubtful that in organising the collection, Paul 'borrowed much heavily' from the organisation of the Temple tax. The evidence, as shall become clear below, indicates that Paul's organisation of the collection depended on the response of the churches in each location, and in addition, borrowed from Greco-Roman concepts of benefaction and the exchange of gifts as well.

The practical admonition is given in vv. 1b - 2. The Corinthians were to do what Paul had asked the Galatians to do. The key word here is διέταξα. Fee notes that this word "can go the range from 'command' to 'arrange,'" and that "here it means 'ordered' in the sense of 'directed' rather than 'commanded.'"<sup>30</sup> The reference to Galatia here indicates that this province was at least in the process of gathering the collection. This raises the question why Paul did not include Galatia in his list of the participants of this project in Romans 15. Did Galatia not complete the collection? If they did, why did Paul only refer to Achaia and Macedonia in Rom. 15: 26? Georgi refers to a temporary cessation of the project as a whole, and assumes that after its resumption the completion must have come at a different time.<sup>31</sup> Unfortunately, this can only be guessed as our sources are silent about it. We know about the collection

---

<sup>26</sup> This is the only occurrence of the word in Paul's discussion of this project in all of his letters, cf. the plural λογείαι in v. 2. Fee, 1987, p. 812 has concluded from this that "its use here is most likely a reflection of the Corinthians' letter."

<sup>27</sup> See Barrett, 1971, p. 386 for a summary of the arguments for and against this conception.

<sup>28</sup> Nickle, 1966, pp. 174-99.

<sup>29</sup> "From the foregoing material, it is seen that, although Paul's collection reflected several aspects of contemporary Judaism, he borrowed much heavily for the organisation of his collection from the Jewish Temple tax. This is evident both in the external elements and in the symbolic significance which that tax bore for dispersed Judaism. It was because the symbolism of the Temple tax corresponded so precisely with the hopes for the unity of the church with which Paul had invested his project that he was led to borrow and use so many other aspects of that tax." Nickle, 1966, p. 99.

<sup>30</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 812.

<sup>31</sup> Georgi, 1992, pp. 43ff; and 122ff.

in **Philippi** only because Paul used the favourable response in this congregation to spur the Corinthians in contributing to the project. This indicates, I would venture to suggest, that the most probable reason for the lack of any record about the collection from this congregation is that the occasion never arose for Paul to report about it.

The details of this διέταξα are given in v. 2. The reference to the first day of the week is intriguing, especially in its relevance to the debate of the origin of Sunday worship, but not for this subject. What is relevant is whether there were other collections in the Pauline churches apart from this project, say for the less privileged. Did the Pauline churches not have a common fund for the widows and the poor among them as in Acts 6: 1ff? As far as I know, no scholar has raised this question. Given the fact that Paul encourages the Galatians to 'bear each other's burdens' (see 8.2), it is highly unlikely that there was no collection for charitable purposes. The fact that there is no record of it can easily be explained by the fact that the letters addressed specific issues and that the need for the discussion of this did not arise.

Paul tells the Corinthians to set aside each Sunday some amount for this project, each by her/himself in her/his house saving it ἐαυτῷ τιθέτω θησαυρίζων. Fee rejects the suggestion that this is supposed to mean "let him take to himself what he or she has determined 'privately' to give," a position he thinks is reached only because it "assumes a contemporary picture of the church, including church officials, regular offering, and a building."<sup>32</sup> He suggests instead that this phrase, taken with the next ('saving it up') implies almost certainly a thing done individually 'at home.' While this makes perfect sense, his argument about the 'contemporary picture,' especially about church officials, raises questions. It may be right for regular offerings, and certainly for buildings; but did the early church not have officials? In II Cor. 8 & 9 as will be seen below, Paul talks about delegates of the churches for this project. Surely were these not officers of the church? Can we rule out the possibility of the existence of the post of treasurer in the early church? Was it because there were no officials, especially a treasurer, that Paul says each Corinthian is to save her/his collection, and therefore act as treasurer for her/himself until the arrival of Paul and the dispatch of the gifts to Jerusalem? This recalls the discussion of offices in clubs and associations (see 3.3 above). There it will be recalled, it was discovered that ἐπίσκοπος, διάκονος, and προστάτης are titles Paul uses which find a parallel in the associations, and that the first two were titles for officers of administration and

<sup>32</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 813 is here rejecting this view advanced by several scholars such as Hodge, C. *An Exposition of the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*; repr. (Banner of Truth Trust: London, 1958), p. 364; Morris, 1958, p. 238; etc.



finance. Interesting is Paul's description of what should be saved each Sunday as ὁ π ἐὰν εὐοδῶται ("in keeping with his income," NIV). The word εὐοδῶται is a subjunctive of εὐοδόομαι which means "be well led," "do well," "prosper," and so here gives the meaning whatever he can afford. This underlines the voluntary nature of the project. This last point comes out clearer in the passage of II Cor. discussed below. Paul offers this arrangement in place of a collection when he comes. It is possible that Paul hoped that "such a plan will ensure a greater gift than a single collection at the time of his arrival."<sup>33</sup> Paul exhibits wisdom and transparency of character in the organisation of the collection. Although he asks the Corinthians to each save their gifts until he arrives, he is not going to act as treasurer when the money is collected. Such moneys will be entrusted into the hands of people tested and approved (δοκιμάσητε), as well as chosen by the Corinthians themselves. This is clearly an effort to guard against slander.<sup>34</sup> These chosen and approved members of the Corinthian congregation will be given letters of commendation to convey the money to Jerusalem. However, there was more to it than just avoidance of slander. Fee has suggested in addition, the fact that Paul expected it to be a huge sum and that the large company of those accompanying it will ensure its safety.<sup>35</sup> This makes sense given the fact that transfer of funds then was not as easy as it is today.<sup>36</sup> Also, Fee thinks, there was the fact that it would serve a "greater concern" - "the unity of the church." This is fair considering the fact that Paul sees the collection as a debt (Rom. 15: 25-33, discussed below) which appeals to the convention of social reciprocity, uniting giver and receiver.

Paul finishes this section by showing his uncertainty about going to Jerusalem himself at this stage of the project. He says, ἐὰν δὲ ἀξιὸν ᾖ τοῦ κἀμὲ πορεύεσθαι ("if it is worthwhile for me to go"). This phrase clearly expresses his hesitation about the journey. But what accounts for that? The key word is ἀξιὸν

<sup>33</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 814. He also refuses to read a reluctance on the part of the Corinthians here as Hurd, 1983, pp. 201-202 has done. He notes that as Paul here says, this was the instruction he had also given to Galatia, and that what Hurd says does go beyond the evidence.

<sup>34</sup> See Barrett, 1971, p. 387.

<sup>35</sup> See Fee, 1987, p. 815 for the details of this conception.

<sup>36</sup> Rostovtzeff, M. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. Vol. 2 (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1972), p.1285; reports on the transfer of funds "from one account to another without money passing" in Ptolemaic banking. Cf. his *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1926) p. 170. But this is mainly to do with transactions within the same city, and even if it were possible between cities, this was a royal bank. It is highly unlikely that Paul and the churches of his mission would have had access to this facility. Finley, M.I. discusses banks mainly with relation to money-lending and money-changing with no reference at all to transfer of funds. See his *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* edited with introduction by Shaw, B.D. and Saller, R.P. (Chatto & Windus: London, 1981), esp. pp. 67-74; cf. his *The Ancient*

which can be translated 'advisable' but also 'worthy.' Hence, a number of scholars have read the gift of the Corinthians as the subject of this word and therefore implying that his going depended on whether or not it is substantial enough.<sup>37</sup> Fee contests this reading on the grounds that the grammar does not allow it.<sup>38</sup> If as Fee contends, this word is translated as 'fitting,' 'advisable' or 'worthwhile,' what was it that will make the circumstances fitting for Paul? Can it be inferred from this that some of the churches of the Pauline mission sent a delegation with their own contributions to Jerusalem unaccompanied by Paul? If so, is this why Paul in Rom. 15 refers only to Achaia and Macedonia as the contributors of the collection he was carrying to Jerusalem? I would like to think that these are very likely possibilities.

### 7.3. Organisation Details II Cor. 8 & 9

These chapters are concerned with practical details of the project;<sup>39</sup> but also contain the most profound theological statements which have "rich theological significance."<sup>40</sup> They are significant because they present the longest record of the subject available, provide insight into the difficulties Paul encountered in its administration in a particular church and how he handled such difficulties, and reveal the tact and effort the apostle put into the organisation of this project in Corinth.

Scholarship has produced a lot of heated and extended debate about the integrity of these two chapters. Broadly speaking, there are two basic positions: 1) that the two chapters belong together in one letter as part of canonical II Cor., sent to Corinth and the differences in emphasis only reflect breaks in periods of dictation;<sup>41</sup> and 2) that the two chapters belong separately to two different letters, which explains the change in emphasis at the beginning of chapter 9.<sup>42</sup> That these chapters are two independent,

---

*Economy*. Second Edition (Hogarth Press: London, 1985), esp. pp. 115-121, 141-144, 197-198.

<sup>37</sup> See e.g. Morris, 1958, p. 239; Findlay, *St Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians* ET. (W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1961), p. 946; etc.

<sup>38</sup> He notes that the adjective is impersonal and followed by an articular infinitive of purpose. It can only mean "if it is fitting (proper, worthwhile, advisable) that I should go." p. 816.

<sup>39</sup> Héring, J. *The Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* Originally CNT, Tr. Heathcote, A.W. & Allcock, P.J. (Epworth Publishing Company: London, 1967), p.58.

<sup>40</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, 1991, p. 76. Murphy-O'Connor notes that only once in I Cor. 16: 1-2 does Paul use a commercial term for the collection "and then only because he was dealing with an administrative problem."

<sup>41</sup> Hughes, 1962, p. 283 argues that the change of tone at any point in the epistle is the result of the change of subject matter. See also Barrett, 1973, p.232; and Furnish, 1985, pp. 429-433, who is concerned with the relationship between these two chapters only.

<sup>42</sup> This explanation has some variations. One variation, represented by Héring, 1967, p. 65, is that chapter 9 was written earlier, and as a separate letter, but that it was sent almost at the same time

separate discussions of the collection is a possibility that may not be ruled out completely. However, the position taken here follows Furnish's: that "the redundancy of the two chapters is more apparent than real" and that at least two references in chapter 9 (9: 3 - the reference to the 'brothers'; and 9: 4-5 - the completion of the collection before Paul arrives) "seem to require chapter 8 in order to be understandable."<sup>43</sup> Furnish argues also that 9: 1-5 is "a meaningful extension of 8: 16-24" and that 9: 6-15 "may be readily seen as a general conclusion to the whole discussion since 7: 4, involving several types of reasons for being generous with one's aid for the poor."<sup>44</sup>

### 7.3.1. The Collection as χάρις 8: 1-7.

Paul's discussion of the collection in II Cor. amazingly begins with the "grace of God" (χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ) which he says was given to the Macedonians. The construction, τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δεδομένην ('the grace of God which was given') does seem to have been used to indicate the source of this grace as coming not from the Macedonians themselves, but from God. Their participation in the collection is described as an act of divine grace and not as Paul's achievement or the Macedonians.<sup>45</sup> Betz's literary study draws attention to the fact that χάρις, particularly when used by Paul in the sense of 'the grace of God,' "describes God's salvation in Christ as a whole;" but shows also that "the attributive participle τὴν δεδομένην ('which was given') reminds us of the ordinary meaning of χάρις as 'gift'.<sup>46</sup> This description takes the discussion of the collection beyond the idea of reciprocity and benefaction, as well as partnership. Paul seems to be deliberately using this language to give this discussion a different slant, possibly to stress its difference from Greco-Roman exchange of gifts. Paul shows the proof of this to be the nature of their participation in the collection, which he says was beyond their ability and offered without request (v.3), in fact they even begged urgently to be

---

with chapters 1-8 which were a letter written slightly later. Another variant sees chapter 9 as a different letter addressed to the whole province of Achaia (cf. 1:1), and sent soon after chapter 8, see Martin, 1991, p. 250. Cf. Bornkamm, G. "History of the Origin of the So-Called Second Letter to the Corinthians," *NTS* 8 (1962): 258-64, esp. 260-61.

<sup>43</sup> Furnish, 1985, pp. 429-433.

<sup>44</sup> See also Barrett, 1973, p. 232 who concludes, "it is therefore best to treat it as a continuation of chapter 8 and as belonging to the same letter as chapters 1-7."

<sup>45</sup> Furnish, 1985, p. 413. See also Bultmann, 1985, p. 253.

<sup>46</sup> Betz, H. D. *Second Corinthians 8 and 9*. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1985), p. 42. He comments: "This aspect of the term brings to mind the enormous importance of gift-giving in the ancient world. Today the giving of gifts is a wholly secular affair. In antiquity, however, the giving of gifts not only was a fundamental form of social conduct, but also had deep roots in religious practice."

included in this grace. Paul's testimony here stresses their joyful generosity which was voluntary. Héring's view that Paul had requested the collection in Macedonia does not find support in this passage or anywhere else.<sup>47</sup> In Paul's valuation, this was remarkable in view of their abject poverty and severe testing by affliction (v.2). It is interesting that the poverty of the Macedonians described as ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία ("rock-bottom poverty")<sup>48</sup> produced a wealth of generosity (πλοῦτος τῆς ἀπλότητος). This kind of expression is an 'oxymoron,'<sup>49</sup> and Paul may have used it to stress further the divine nature of this grace.

But is the language εἰς τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς ἀπλότητος (lit. "for the wealth of generosity") a reference to "the size of the collection"?<sup>50</sup> The strength of this argument lies in the language of verse 3: κατὰ δύναμιν ('according to ability') and παρὰ δύναμιν ('beyond ability') which Betz calls "the terminology ... from the area of administration, in particular, financial administration."<sup>51</sup> The secret for this unusual character is given in v. 5: it was because εαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν πρῶτον τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ ("they gave themselves first to the Lord and to us in keeping with God's will," NIV). This verse seems to presuppose v. 8 and is a further proof that their unusual character is the grace of God. Their action is a response to the self-sacrifice of Christ which is the ultimate grace of God.<sup>52</sup> This is the climax of this section that deals with the grace of God among the Macedonians. It is clear that πρῶτον goes with κυρίῳ. Their submission to the apostles results from their submission and obedience to the will of God.<sup>53</sup> This prepares grounds for his request which was his aim: the completion of this act of grace, for which Titus is being sent. This implies that during his earlier visit mentioned in 7: 4, Titus had started the project there.<sup>54</sup> In the next verse Paul presents his request in the imperative,<sup>55</sup> that they excel in this grace as they abound in other virtues. These verses anticipate the next two.

---

<sup>47</sup> So Furnish, 1985, p. 400.

<sup>48</sup> Barrett, 1973, p. 219.

<sup>49</sup> Betz, 1985, p. 44.

<sup>50</sup> As Héring, 1967, p. 58 has understood it.

<sup>51</sup> Betz, 1985, p. 45. As far as I can tell, no one else has made this recognition.

<sup>52</sup> See, Betz, 1985, p. 47.

<sup>53</sup> So Barrett, 1973, p. 221.

<sup>54</sup> So Barrett, 1973, p. 221; Héring, 1967, p.59.

<sup>55</sup> See Furnish, 1985, p. 403, against Georgi, D. *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem* (TF 38, 1965) p. 60.

### 7.3.2. The Ultimate χάρις vv. 8-9.

In v. 8 Paul makes it clear that he is not giving an ἐπιταγή. The phrase οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγήν is used in I Cor. 7: 6 (cf. I Cor. 7: 25) and is most likely a reference to a command from the Lord. The second part of the verse shows what Paul has in mind: he does not want the Corinthians to read what he has said in the previous section as an order. He explains that he does this to test the reality of their love and that he uses the σπουδή ('earnestness') of the Macedonians to do so. Here we see Paul's tact in dealing with the Corinthians whose affection he does not want to lose again after just regaining it.<sup>56</sup> At the same time, he skilfully encourages them to show by the completion of the collection that they are indeed on his side now. Also, Paul wanted the collection to be undertaken willingly and voluntarily and with no compulsion (cf. on vv. 11-12 below).

In v. 9 Paul reaches a climax by bringing in the example of Christ. He speaks of this as "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ" which they already know. This is a verse rich in theological content, but it does not depend on the rest of the discussion for its thought and content. Why then does Paul use it at this point and what is its contribution to this discussion of the collection in Corinth?<sup>57</sup> Craddock argues that the verse is not "a parenthesis or a digression," but "is in fact in full harmony with the discussion of the offering for the saints." He contends further that its appropriateness for this project is beyond doubt.<sup>58</sup> The word ἐπτώχευσε is a reference to the Christ-event, the incarnation, seen as one act; a fact shown by the use of the aorist tense and not the perfect.<sup>59</sup> Paul is saying then that by taking on the form of humanity, Christ became poor and in that way has enriched the Christians in Corinth. Christ's willing self-sacrifice then is what the Corinthians are to emulate. It is interesting that Paul here by implication equates the self-sacrifice of Christ with that of the Corinthians' willingness to share their material resources with their fellow Christians in Judea who were poor. This certainly indicates that for Paul, Christian charity is not to be seen as a mundane exercise, but one that demonstrates appreciation of the grace of God.

<sup>56</sup> So Martin, 1991, p. 262.

<sup>57</sup> These are the questions raised by Craddock, F.B. in his article "The Poverty of Christ: An Investigation of II Cor. 8: 9", in *Interpretation* 22 (1968)158-70.

<sup>58</sup> See Craddock, 1968, p. 160.

<sup>59</sup> So Craddock, 1968, p. 165. See also Martin, 1991, p. 263; Héring, 1967, p.60; and others who argue that this is also a reference to "his pre-existent status." I am however, not going to be drawn into the discussion of the question of Christ's pre-existent status seeing it does not inform this subject. See also Register, 1990, pp. 125f.

### 7.3.3. The Collection as a Voluntary Gift. 8: 10-12.

Paul's concern to ensure a willing and voluntary collection from Corinth is demonstrated once again, and even more forcefully by the hesitancy in his words in v. 10. He states that it is only an opinion he gives (καὶ γνώμην ἐν τούτῳ δίδωμι), and adds that this is for the good of the Corinthians.<sup>60</sup> This is followed by a statement that exalts the decision or intention above its execution. While it is important to ask why he does this, must it be answered with reference to time as most scholars do?<sup>61</sup> When Paul says οἵτινες οὐ μόνον τὸ ποιῆσαι ἀλλὰ καὶ θέλουν προενήρξασθε ἀπὸ πέρυσι ('last year you were the first not only to give but also to have the desire to do so', NIV), was the emphasis of 'not only' on the willingness that was exhibited 'last year'? To be sure the reference to time is important but was Paul not looking ahead to what he goes on to say in the next two verses? The emphasis in vv. 11-12 is clearly on the readiness (προθυμία, occurring in both verses), and the desire (τὸ θέλουν). Paul says the προθυμία is more important than its execution. With a "mild injunction" he calls them to complete this desire and willingness, and adds a disclaimer: ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν (lit. 'out of what you have'), meaning "as your means allow."<sup>62</sup> Paul does not want to let his audience read his emphases in the previous verses in such a way as to rob them of their voluntary sacrifice and make it look like a levy forced on them. These verses speak against the conception of Paul's collection as a levy, or a version of the Temple tax.<sup>63</sup>

Strangely, Paul having argued in v. 10 that he is only giving an opinion goes on in the next verse to give what appears to be a command. ἐπιτελέσατε ('complete') is certainly an imperative. It is however properly understood, a "mild injunction" with which Paul stresses that their willingness shown since last year though obviously the most important thing, is only valid when accompanied by its execution.<sup>64</sup> This same thought is continued in v. 12. A spirit of willingness is what makes the gift acceptable to God and not the size of it. It is interesting that Paul sees the collection not as a gift to the Jerusalem church but to God; and it will be accepted as pleasing to God as long as the willingness is there.<sup>65</sup> The emphasis on willingness and proportionate giving is important. Martin understands it in terms of Paul's pastoral concerns: Paul was sensitive to the delicacy of the situation in Corinth because of the fact that he has just

<sup>60</sup> So Martin, 1991, p. 264.

<sup>61</sup> See e.g. Martin, 1991, pp. 264-5; Lüdemann, 1984, 97-98; Barrett, 1973, p. 225, etc.

<sup>62</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 265.

<sup>63</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, 1991, p. 82.

<sup>64</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 265.

<sup>65</sup> Furnish, 1985, p. 419, citing Prov. 3: 27-28.

recently won them over to his side and does not want to appear to be taking advantage of that.<sup>66</sup> Furnish however finds the background to Paul's reasoning in Jewish teaching on charity giving.<sup>67</sup> Both positions are possible.

#### 7.3.4. A Means of Achieving Equality. 8: 13-15.

Picking up the point on willingness again, Paul emphasises that he is not asking the Corinthians to impoverish themselves to meet the needs of the Jerusalem Christians, but for a sharing that is centred on equality. He then quotes "almost verbatim the Greek version of Exod. 16:18."<sup>68</sup> The term *ἰσότητος* and cognate ('equality' vv. 13, 14) which is central to the argument, denoted "legal equality of all citizens, realised in the democratic order of Greek cities," and was also "closely linked to *δικαιοσύνη*."<sup>69</sup> Did Paul suppose that one day Jerusalem would be contributing to help Corinth and how did the Corinthians accept that? Is the argument here related to that of Rom. 15: 27 regarding spiritual and material abundance? Betz thinks that material blessings are meant in both cases.<sup>70</sup> Barrett thinks it is the same argument as in Rom. 15: 27.<sup>71</sup> For Furnish, this is simply "a formal statement of the principle of equality, with no special thought for what its operation might involve in the future."<sup>72</sup> The beginning of v. 14, "in the present time" (*ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ*) does appear to lend support to the argument of Barrett and Nickle. I shall have more to say on this below on Rom. 15: 27. Suffice to say here that social reciprocity was surely being employed.

Does the reference to their *περίσσευμα* ('abundance') have any bearing on their social status and the wealth of members of this church? Martin thinks not<sup>73</sup> arguing that this is not alluding to I Cor. 1: 26 and Rom. 16: 23 where there is evidence that there were at least a few wealthy members in this church. This however, is precisely the point which Theissen builds his thesis on.<sup>74</sup> Surely abundance here has a material

---

<sup>66</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 265

<sup>67</sup> Furnish, 1985, p. 419, citing Prov. 3: 27-28; and Job 4: 8 as evidence

<sup>68</sup> Furnish, 1985, p. 421.

<sup>69</sup> Georgi, 1992, pp. 84-91. He discusses the term in the light of Philo's understanding, identifying about "six points of interest in the tradition Philo was working with" (p. 85). These include its personification which sees it as a divine force; as well as an understanding that identifies it with grace granted from above in the Wisdom of Solomon. The reference in Philo is *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres* 141-206.

<sup>70</sup> Betz, 1985, p. 68.

<sup>71</sup> Barrett, 1973, p. 226. See also Nickle, 1966, p. 21.

<sup>72</sup> Furnish, 1985, p. 420. See also Héring, 1967, p. 62.

<sup>73</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 267.

<sup>74</sup> Theissen, 1982, 99-110.

implication. I shall argue below that there were at least some among the Corinthians who were rich (see 8.3).

### 7.3.5. Commendation of Delegates for the Collection, vv. 16-24.

These verses have led some scholars to conclude that this chapter (and possibly chapter 9) was a letter of recommendation, and that its beginning which was cut off by the redactor possibly had the names of these delegates.<sup>75</sup> Without being drawn into the ensuing debate which to me does not inform this subject, it is clear that these verses are a recommendation of the brethren who will oversee the organisation of the collection and ensure its success. Verses 16-17 are Paul's testimony of Titus' zeal for Corinth which corresponds to his own zeal. In these two verses, Paul tells the Corinthians that Titus like himself is concerned about them, has agreed to return to Corinth to complete the collection and that the decision to send him corresponded with Titus' own initiative to return. This whole episode led Paul to begin this testimony with a "verbless ejaculation" of thanksgiving to God.<sup>76</sup> It is interesting that Titus' zeal for Corinth is expressed by the word σπουδῆ and cognate, a word used before of the Macedonians' earnestness in v. 8. This word "is commonly found in Hellenistic administrative letters as the most important qualification of administrators."<sup>77</sup> Titus' administrative quality is here attested then. Paul also says that Titus' zeal was not just ordinary zeal (σπουδαιότερος, v. 17 is the comparative adjective of the noun) and that he was doing that all on his own.<sup>78</sup> By directing his thanks to God, Paul shows that Titus' great quality was a divine gift, and thus erases any doubt about his ability.

The recommendation of the other two (vv. 18-24) is equally interesting. These unnamed persons both have attractive credentials. The first is called a 'brother' (ἀδελφὸν - a word for fellow Christian), one who is renowned in the gospel throughout all the churches (i.e. praised for his preaching of the gospel), and one who was chosen and appointed by the churches. Χειροτονηθεὶς is aorist participle passive and refers to a selection by the raising of hands. Paul adds that his

<sup>75</sup> See Betz, 1985, p. 73 where he discusses this whole question giving the various trends of thought among advocates of this conception as well as the strengths and weaknesses of it. See also Barrett, 1973, p. 228.

<sup>76</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 273. See also Barrett, C.K. "Titus" in *Essays on Paul* (SPCK: London, 1982) pp. 118-31, esp. 126 where he argues that Titus returned to Corinth not as a desire to complete the collection but "to retrace his steps."

<sup>77</sup> Betz, 1985, pp. 70, 58 where he gives a list of some references.

<sup>78</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 274.



appointment was done for the purpose of honouring God through this collection which was what he was eager to do, an objective he will achieve through their *προθυμία* ('eagerness' or 'readiness to help'). The second delegate is also called 'our brother.' Betz is probably right in thinking that Paul might have nominated him.<sup>79</sup> He has been tested in several occasions and proved to be eager in many matters, an eagerness that is presently evident in the confidence he has on the Corinthians. Martin's guess that the tests were presumably on the handling of funds<sup>80</sup> sounds reasonable, given the fact that we are dealing with the issue of money here. In vv. 20-21 Paul says that the appointment of the brothers was a precautionary measure against any charge of mismanagement, and that he aims at what is honourable not just before God, but also before men. These men, says Paul, can be trusted. Titus is a fellow worker well known to the Corinthians and the two brothers are "representatives of the churches and an honour to Christ" (v. 23 NIV). They are not to be doubted, and neither is the whole project. Rather the men should be shown love and the collection completed so that the churches can know that Paul's pride in Corinth is reasonable (v. 24). But who are the churches responsible for this delegation? This question has been answered differently.<sup>81</sup> Nickle thinks the churches of Judea are being referred to here.<sup>82</sup> But there is no evidence for this view in the context. Also, Gal. 1: 22 and I Thess. 2:14 where there is reference to Judean churches leave no doubt about which churches are intended.<sup>83</sup> The thesis that Jerusalem directed the collection project has no evidence in Paul's letters. It seems forced to impose on this discussion the idea that Jerusalem initiated or directed the collection. It is better to understand 'all the churches' here to refer to Achaia and Macedonia.

### 7.3.6. The Delegates' Task. II Cor, 9: 1-5.

The commendation of the delegates and the exhortation to complete the collection continues. Paul explains using the term *καυχῶμαι* in v. 2 that the delegates had to be sent in advance to complete the collection. The word means 'to boast' and here it is a verbal form in present tense indicating that it was not a past action, but one that is still in progress.<sup>84</sup> This means that Paul has been boasting to the Macedonians about the

<sup>79</sup> Betz, 1985, p. 78.

<sup>80</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 277.

<sup>81</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, 1983, p. 158 thinks it is a reference to several house churches in one area.

Most commentators think it is a reference to Paul's whole mission field, which would include Galatia as well as Asia, in addition to Macedonia and Achaia. See e.g. Hughes, 1962, pp. 311-12.

<sup>82</sup> See Nickle, 1966, pp. 18-22.

<sup>83</sup> Furnish, 1985, p. 434.

<sup>84</sup> Hughes, 1962, p. 323.

eagerness of the Achaians and does not want that boasting to be met with embarrassment in the event that this eagerness did not lead to the completion of the collection. Also, in protecting his reputation, Paul shows that he was at the same time protecting the reputation of the Achaians who would be put to shame if the Macedonians discovered that their eagerness did not produce results. In this understanding *περὶ μὲν γὰρ*, "need not express an emphatic contrast" to what was said in chapter 8. "It may - and more probably does - introduce a sub-heading within the major theme."<sup>85</sup> The sub-heading here then would be the reason for the sending of the delegation. His administrative qualities and his ability to plan ahead against eventualities are very evidently displayed here. In short, Paul shows himself a leader with vision. As he says, he does all to honour God and be seen without reproach by men (8: 21). But this letter presents nothing new to the Achaians who have already heard a lot about the project. Yet he implies that this explanation is necessary and hopes that his readers will bear with him. His aim in all this is the completion of the collection "as a generous gift" in Achaia.

But why the sudden mention of Achaia? Why the change from Corinth to Achaia in this chapter? Is this not support for the view that this chapter was a separate letter meant for Achaia?<sup>86</sup> The answer to this may be seen in the fact that Paul uses Achaia because of the mention of the sister province of Macedonia, and that Paul certainly had Corinth in mind at least as the biggest audience of this letter.<sup>87</sup> It is to be noted also that here and in Rom. 15: 26, Achaia has not got the usual article that accompanies it when it is mentioned in the NT.<sup>88</sup> Also, it is a known Pauline practice to use regional names for the principal cities in such regions.<sup>89</sup> In fact, Alexander contends that "Paul prefers to identify regional names."<sup>90</sup>

The final reason Paul gives for sending the delegation is fascinating: to ensure 'a generous gift' rather than a 'an extortion'. *Εὐλογία* which here has the sense of 'bounty' or generosity, might be an intentional wordplay on the word *λογεία*, or more likely used because the two words are semantically linked. With it Paul makes it

<sup>85</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 282 against Betz, 1985, p. 90, who concludes from this that chapter 9 most likely begins a new letter.

<sup>86</sup> As Martin, 1991, pp. 249-50, 281 argues

<sup>87</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, 1991, p.88.

<sup>88</sup> So Furnish, 1985, p. 426.

<sup>89</sup> It is not known from any where that Paul accepted support from Thessalonica. Yet when talking about the support he accepted from Philippi (II Cor. 11: 9), he uses the name Macedonia.

<sup>90</sup> Alexander, L. "Narrative Maps: Reflections on the Toponymy of Acts" in M. Daniel Carroll R., David J.A. Clines and Philip R. Davies (ed.) *The Bible in Human Society: Essays in Honour of John Rogerson* JSOT Supplement Series 200 (1995), p. 21.

clear that he expected a substantial amount collected at Corinth - this is what will confirm his boast. The other word, *πλεονεξίαν* "occurs frequently in vice lists with reference to 'covetousness' or 'greed'."<sup>91</sup> The sense is clear. Paul wants a good sum, but at the same time insists that it is collected willingly and under no pressure. Paul then reports how he has used the enthusiasm of Achaia to arouse the eagerness of the Macedonians. Given the fact that Paul was boasting to the Corinthians about the eagerness of the Macedonians as an example for the Corinthians to follow, would it therefore be right to suppose as some do that this was "a ploy that had evidently worked well" for Paul?<sup>92</sup> Hughes thinks it is unfair to Paul's character evident in the letters and Acts to do that.<sup>93</sup> While there is certainly a great deal of force in Hughe's argument, the problem it has is twofold. In the first place, he does not define what character of Paul he has in mind, nor the references in Paul and the Acts. Secondly, his argument makes no reference to the context and what Paul says in this passage. Nevertheless, if Paul was dishonest and crafty, it would have been unwise for him to write and tell the Corinthians about his craftiness. The fact that Paul saw no problem in 'admitting' this indicates that it cannot have been taken very seriously. Given the fact that Corinth had expressed its desire to contribute to the collection (see above under 7.2), it makes sense to conclude that Paul here genuinely wants to avoid a situation where he and the Corinthians would be ashamed that such enthusiasm was not followed through. We could say then that this displays Paul's competent managerial ability.

### 7.3.7. A Theological Motivation for the Collection. II Cor. 9: 6-15.

This section is rich in agricultural imagery and motifs clearly meant to strengthen Paul's argument. Most scholars have appealed to Prov. 22: 8 and 11: 25 as the source of the thought in v. 6 which "combines, as Paul does, the agricultural motif and moral axiom."<sup>94</sup> Murphy-O'Connor's so-called awkward paraphrase: "The more blessings you give, the more you will receive,"<sup>95</sup> sums up this verse, and the whole of the section that runs from v. 6 through to v. 11. The emphasis is on generous giving as Furnish correctly remarks: "here the issue is not 'what' one should sow, as

<sup>91</sup> See Furnish, 1985, p. 428.

<sup>92</sup> So Betz, 1985, p. 91.

<sup>93</sup> Hughes, 1862, p. 324, "To suggest, as some have done, that the Apostle was craftily and without regard to the requirements of strict honesty, playing the Macedonians and the Corinthians against each other in order to increase the size of the collection, is to show an astonishing insensitiveness to the character of Paul as it is plainly revealed in his own letters and in the Acts of the Apostles."

<sup>94</sup> See Martin, 1991, p. 289.

<sup>95</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, 1991, p. 90.

it is in Gal. 6: 7-8, but 'how much' one should sow - that is 'contribute' to the collection for Jerusalem.<sup>96</sup> Paul demonstrates that "giving as εὐλογία established a circle in which εὐλογία was received in order to be given out again."<sup>97</sup> Paul's hopes for a generous collection in Achaia might have lifted high when he wrote this verse. Such a proverb which existed though in various different forms in the Greco-Roman world of Paul's day in this exhortation, must have appealed to the Corinthians, at least Paul thought so.

Paul does not allow himself to be drawn away from what he believes to be the secret of Christian generosity. Verse 8 therefore takes him back to where he started in 8: 1 - the grace of God. The Corinthians will be able to give because God who gives both the grace to give and the resources to be given 'is able' (δυνατεῖ). The subject of verse 8 is therefore definitely God, so also of vv. 9-10.<sup>98</sup> So, the generosity Paul expects from them is an act of grace, which he believes is sufficient for all who believe. With this, the stress on the giver's attitude in v. 7 makes more sense. Appropriating God's grace enables them to give with a cheerful heart. The grace of God is not forced on the recipients, but is accepted by faith (cf. Ephes. 2: 8). In the same way, the giver has to decide personally and joyfully in her/his heart the amount to give.<sup>99</sup> The notion of personal decision on what to give recalls an earlier discussion which established that such decisions were opposed to Roman *patria potestas* but possible here because Paul was dealing with Greeks whose ownership of property was not strictly under the head of the family (see above under 1.2). The opposite of this, the giving 'with sorrow or out of necessity' (ἐκ λύπης ἢ ἐξ ἀνάγκης), recalls the trait of avarice (v. 5) and an unwillingness to part with money.<sup>100</sup> Using a thought that is "thoroughly Old Testament and Jewish,"<sup>101</sup> Paul makes the point that his

<sup>96</sup> Furnish, 1985, p. 447.

<sup>97</sup> Verse 6: 'He who sows sparingly will also reap sparingly, and he who sows bountifully (ἐπ' εὐλογίαις) will also reap bountifully.' See Register, 1990, pp. 131f who notes that this idea of the nature of sowing affecting the nature of harvest is common to a whole range of works: Aristotle's *Rhetorica*, Cicero's *De Orators*, the gospels, Greek Apocalypse of Baruch, and especially Prov. 11: 24; cf. Betz, 1985, p. 102.

<sup>98</sup> Georgi, 1992, p. 98.

<sup>99</sup> Dahl, N.A. "Paul and Possessions," in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. (Augsburg Publishing House: Minneapolis, 1977) 22-38; esp. 31. He writes: "Paul concentrates on the joy and love which the gifts express, on the relationship to one another and on the community in Christ which the distribution of material goods realises. Money becomes more than just money within the Christian church; it attains an almost sacramental significance: 'A visible sign of an invisible grace.'"

<sup>100</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 289.

<sup>101</sup> See Barrett, 1973, p. 236; Martin, 1991, p. 290.

friends should be able under God's grace to give joyfully, and adds, 'for God loves a cheerful giver.'

In vv. 9-10 Paul continues to dwell on the thought of divine providence as he continues his exhortation on the right motivation for the collection. The thought runs as follows: God who gives allows the giver to have enough so that she/he may abound in 'good works.' This has support from Scripture (see Ps. 111 [112]: 9). Divine providence has the poor in mind and God's righteousness is the controlling factor in its distribution. Thus, "those who give generously to the needy should know that their charitable act is part of that larger righteousness of God by which they themselves live and in which they shall remain forever."<sup>102</sup> Righteousness here denotes "religious, moral, and compassionate activity in general."<sup>103</sup> This parallels Matt. 6: 1-4 where *tsedakah* as charity is the subject. I have discussed this passage elsewhere (see 2.4.1. above) and noted that charitable giving was one of the major means of financial support in the Synagogue. Davies discusses it in terms of a 'section on worship,' which he says is 'triadic' and "treated under almsgiving, prayer and fasting" with almsgiving taking special prominence.<sup>104</sup> Guelich similarly discusses it in terms of "the first example of religious devotion" which, he says, "stems from a whole relationship with God and comes in response to God and the need of others."<sup>105</sup> This indicates that Paul's emphases on grace includes a practical outworking as well.

But what does 'fruit of your righteousness' signify? The choice is between reading it eschatologically<sup>106</sup> or as a simple reference to the charitable giving of one who shares in God's righteousness to provide for the needy? An eschatological reading removes it from its context. Paul is clearly talking in concrete terms of what he desires to see done by his readers now. His concern is a generous charitable giving to help the Christians in Jerusalem. Again, there seems to be a lot of 'reciprocity' in this passage. Therefore, I think it makes sense to suggest that Paul is here transposing 'social reciprocity' to a theological sphere. I shall say more about this below.

---

<sup>102</sup> Furnish, 1985, p. 449.

<sup>103</sup> Martin, 1991, p. 291.

<sup>104</sup> Davies, W.D. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (The University Press: Cambridge, 1964), pp. 307ff. The reason for the prominence of charity is the fact that the setting of the Sermon on the Mount was the post-war Jamnian period; and as a counter emphases of a misrepresented Pauline emphases on grace to the detriment of charity (p. 316). For an exegetical discussion of these verses, see Davies, W.D. and Allison, D.C. Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* in 3 volumes. Here vol. 1 (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1988); pp. 575-84.

<sup>105</sup> Guelich, R.A. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding*. (Word Books: Waco Texas, 1983), pp. 302f.

The thought that divine grace is given for generosity is emphasised in v. 11, where Paul says it 'results in thanksgiving to God.' The Christians in Corinth and Achaia will be made rich so that they can share in God's righteousness, and to bring praise to God. This idea is developed further in the next couple of verses or so.<sup>107</sup> Munck sees here "an ecumenical aim of the collection among the Gentile Christians for the church in Jerusalem."<sup>108</sup> The collection is aimed at meeting the needs of the saints in Jerusalem, as well as a demonstration of the 'obedience' of the Gentiles which accompanies their 'confession of Christ.' The Jerusalem church in turn will engage in prayer for the Gentile church. This is a strong point in support of the view that the unity of the two wings of the church was at least one of the important reasons for the collection by Paul. But how significant was this reason for the apostle? What implications does this reading have on the whole question of Paul's relationship with Jerusalem? What exactly did Paul mean by 'obedience' here, especially when it is not 'a command' (ἐπιταγή)?

The fact that Paul devoted a lot of time and energy to the organisation of this project is an indication of its importance to him; but it does not necessarily imply dependence on Jerusalem. There is nothing in the passage to indicate that he was passing on some directives he had received from Jerusalem. He is speaking to them as his children and expects their obedience. In doing so, he seems to be assuming a great deal.<sup>109</sup> But why? The answer lies in his confidence in the Corinthians, which is in fact a confidence in 'the grace of God.' In v. 14 he says the Jerusalem Christians will see and be united in heart to them as a result. He had started this whole discussion with reference to 'the grace of God' (8: 1) and here ends with it. Such grace is a gift that is beyond human description (v. 15), and it is the source of his confidence (8: 10; 9: 2). Rom. 15: 25-33 shows that Paul's confidence was not hollow or unfounded, and that the collection was definitely completed in Macedonia and Achaia.

---

<sup>106</sup> As does among others Martin, 1991, p. 292.

<sup>107</sup> So Héring, 1967, p. 68. Cf. Munck, 1959, pp. 289-90.

<sup>108</sup> Munck, 1959, p. 290.

<sup>109</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, 1991, p. 93 makes this point nicely: "Paul is assuming that the believers are authentic, and not merely nominal, Christians. He also takes for granted that God's gifts are given through human channels. Finally, he presumes that each local community is a genuine community and the various communities are united by bonds of love."

#### 7.4. The Collection As An Obligation. Rom. 15: 25-33.

Paul had just told the Christians in Rome about his ministry (vv. 14-22), followed by his plans to visit them on his way to Spain with the hope of enjoying their assistance (vv. 23-24). He expected to enjoy their company for a while before proceeding. It was a visit he was confident would be 'in the full measure of the blessing of Christ' (v. 29). He anticipated that his coming to them would be in joy, God willing, and of mutual benefit (v.32). It was in this context that Paul told them about the collection project. Here, he makes clear that the project has been completed. There remains only its conveyance to Jerusalem which he was set to do. It will be recalled that in I Cor. 16: 4, Paul was unsure about accompanying the collection to Jerusalem. Now, it seems clear that Paul feels it is necessary for him to go. In using the present tense πορεύομαι Paul "indicates that he is actually about to go."<sup>110</sup> Paul's mind was now set and determined on the conveyance of the collection to Jerusalem, even though he had reason to be afraid (vv. 30-31). It can be inferred from I Cor. 16: 3 and II Cor. 8: 19 that a sizeable party of representatives of at least some of the churches, was responsible for taking the collection to Jerusalem.<sup>111</sup> Why then was Paul determined to go despite his fears? This, among other things, is what has led to the conclusion that Paul was responsible to Jerusalem, organising the collection on its behalf. But in that case why did he earlier believe he would not have to go? Those delegates could have easily represented him and the churches of his mission. I suggest that the reason lies in the fact that the unity of the two wings of the church was very significant for Paul.

This contribution was made freely and voluntarily. The verb εὐδόκησαν repeated in vv. 26 and 27 does mean 'to decide' and carries with it the connotation 'deciding happily,' hence RSV 'have been pleased' and NAB 'kindly decided.'<sup>112</sup> The contributors are named as Macedonia and Achaia (Roman provinces as habitually in Paul).<sup>113</sup> The question however is: why are Galatia and Asia not mentioned? Was the collection in Galatia (I Cor. 16:1) a failure, or was it already delivered to Jerusalem? Can we conclude from this silence that there was no collection in these two regions? Several explanations have been given for this scenario: 1) that these regions were last

<sup>110</sup> So Cranfield, C.E.B. *Romans* ICC, Vol. II (T&T Clark Ltd: Edinburgh, 1979), p. 770. Dunn, 1991, p. 873 says the present tense of the verb is here used loosely with a future meaning "presumably implying imminent departure."

<sup>111</sup> See, Ziesler, 1990, p. 345

<sup>112</sup> See Newman, B.A & Nida, E.A. *A Translation Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans: Helps for Translators*. V. XIV (United Bible Society: London, 1973), p.285. See also Dunn, 1991, p.875.

<sup>113</sup> Morris, 1988, p. 520.

to complete the collection,<sup>114</sup> 2) that they had taken their contribution to Jerusalem earlier,<sup>115</sup> 3) that Paul was hiding the fact that it was a levy on the churches of the Pauline mission,<sup>116</sup> and 4) that the collection project in Galatia was a failure.<sup>117</sup> Morris says simply that "it is not clear why he singles them out for mention here;" but contends that other areas were certainly included as I Cor. 16:1-2 at least shows.<sup>118</sup> Morris may be right in suggesting that we may never know Paul's reasons for this incomplete listing of the participating regions, but would it be wrong to see a clue to resolving this dilemma in what Paul says in I Cor. 16: 3-4? There he presents the possibility that a church can send a delegation with their collection unaccompanied by Paul. Surely this is a possibility for Galatia, and Asia Minor. It is a possibility that Galatia and Asia had their collection ready at a different time, either before or after Achaia and Macedonia, and Paul saw no need in mentioning the stage in which they were at when he wrote to the Romans. Moreover, it certainly would not have made sense for Asia and Galatia to send their contribution via Corinth - it was more sensible to go direct.

In v. 26, Paul talks about this collection in terms of *κοινωνίαν τινα ποιήσασθαι* replacing the juridical terms *ἀδρότης* (II Cor. 8: 20), *λογεία* (I Cor. 16: 1), and *λειτουργία* (II Cor. 9: 12). This is understood by most scholars "not just in the sense of partnership, but also in that of sharing and participating."<sup>119</sup> Peterman has demonstrated, with the help of arguments from the semantic range of *κοινωνία*, the Greco-Roman social convention, the purpose of the collection, the context of the verse, partnership in Philippians, and the significance of *τινά*, that the phrase should be understood as 'establish fellowship.'<sup>120</sup> He concludes that in the Greco Roman social convention this 'fellowship' comes from the giving and receiving of gifts. Here the Jerusalem church gave the gift of the gospel which Paul preached and which was received by the Pauline churches. The collection expresses their material gratitude, whose acceptance will establish the fellowship.

<sup>114</sup> Bruce, F.F. *Romans*. TNTC (Inter Varsity Press: Leicester, 1983), p. 264. See also Dunn, 1991, p. 875 who says that it is because Paul was writing from Achaia and these two regions were closest proximity.

<sup>115</sup> Munck, 1959, p.293. Certainly there was no reason why Paul should have been conveying it - a long detour via Achaia.

<sup>116</sup> Käsemann, 1980, p. 399, cf. Cranfield, 1977, p. 772 who rejects the suggestion that Paul was concealing the fact that it was a levy on his churches, but gives no alternative suggestion.

<sup>117</sup> Lüdemann, 1984, p. 86.

<sup>118</sup> Morris, 1988, p. 520.

<sup>119</sup> So Käsemann, 1980, p. 319; Cranfield, 1979, p. 772; Dunn, 1991, p. 875; etc.

<sup>120</sup> Peterman, G.W. "Romans 15: 26: Make a Contribution or Establish Fellowship?" *NTS*. 40 (1994): 457-463.



The fact that Paul describes the giving of Gentile churches as an obligation (ὀφειλέται and cognate) in v. 27 is interesting and curious. This is the language of patronage and recalls the discussion above.<sup>121</sup> Such obligations, it will be recalled follow the acceptance of a benefit. The receiver is obliged to reciprocate the benefit by some service, and the giver stands in a position of advantage over the receiver. It was an unequal relationship with the giver being the superior party. I have shown above that this appears at least at first sight as a contradiction to the voluntary nature of the collection in v. 26 (cf. II Cor. 8 & 9). Moreover, it is strange that the benefactor is here seen as the one under obligation rather than the beneficiary. What was the nature of this debt that is owed? Does this mean that Paul, who brought the gospel to the Gentile churches, was inferior and responsible to the Jerusalem leaders and by preaching to the Gentiles was acting on the delegation of these Jerusalem leaders? Did the Jerusalem church control the Pauline mission, and if so, how can we explain Paul's words in Gal. 2: 10 that his apostolic calling and mission were independent of Jerusalem? How would the Gentile Christians have understood this idea of indebtedness? Morris attempts at resolving this by saying that the obligation was moral - an obligation of charity and therefore involving no compulsion.<sup>122</sup> This is however not quite satisfactory. Moreover, he does not explain what he means by 'obligation of charity.' Peterman argues that the social convention of giving and receiving carries with it the obligation to reciprocate and that this may be fulfilled in an expression of verbal gratitude, but material gratitude is most appropriate as what establishes friendship.<sup>123</sup> So Paul understood the contributions of the Gentile Christians as an expression of gratitude from beneficiaries to their benefactors. In this instance Paul sees himself primarily as a Jewish Christian sharing the faith originating from the Jerusalem church to the Gentiles;<sup>124</sup> though definitely not as its representative. It is interesting that the contribution of the Gentiles is here given a religious connotation. Although this service is in 'material things' (τοῖς σαρκικοῖς), Paul implies that the λειτουργεῖν of the Gentiles is not less spiritual than the sharing of the Jewish Christians which is in 'spiritual things' (τοῖς πνευματικοῖς). The

<sup>121</sup> See 1.5 above.

<sup>122</sup> So Morris, 1988, pp. 520-21. He says, quoting Murray that "charity is an obligation but it is not a tax."

<sup>123</sup> Mott, S.C. "The Power of Giving and Receiving: Reciprocity in Hellenistic Benevolence" in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honour of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by his Former Students.* (ed.) Hawthorne G.F. (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1975): 60-72. He brings into the discussion the arguments of classical authors especially Seneca in his *De Beneficiis*.

<sup>124</sup> Cranfield, 1979, p. 773.

word group with the root λειτουρ- refers to public service that ranges from religious to civic duty,<sup>125</sup> but the context here requires the religious connotation.

The collection is described as εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ (NIV "for the poor among the saints in Jerusalem"). It is interesting and controversial that Paul uses different phrases to describe the recipients of this collection. It will be recalled that in Gal. 2: 10 they are referred to as simply τῶν πτωχῶν ('the poor').<sup>126</sup> In I Cor. 16: 1 the designation is τοὺς ἁγίους ('the saints') as also in II Cor. 8: 4 and 9: 1. Here, v. 25 refers to them in the dative as τοῖς ἁγίοις ('to the saints'). Who exactly then were they? Is the genitive τῶν ἁγίων partitive or is it epexegetic and therefore a self-designation of the Jewish pious taken by the Christians in Jerusalem? Cranfield opts for the first understanding arguing that the latter though possible can not be the case here unless forced exegesis is employed.<sup>127</sup> Dunn strongly supports this argument.<sup>128</sup> He however, does not dismiss completely the possibility that Paul here reflects at least to some extent the self-understanding of the first Jerusalem Christians as 'the poor.' He also traces the source of this poverty to the "over-enthusiastic resourcing of the common fund by means of realising capital in the earliest days of the NT movement."<sup>129</sup>

Keck, in his two articles<sup>130</sup> argues extensively against the hypothesis that the church at Jerusalem designated itself as 'the poor.' He presents several reasons why this hypothesis can not be right. Keck's conclusion is that Palestinian Christianity can be

<sup>125</sup> See LSJ, s. v.

<sup>126</sup> But the rest of the description may be implied by the context, in that the speakers are representatives of the Jerusalem church.

<sup>127</sup> Cranfield, 1979, p. 772.

<sup>128</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 875. "Despite substantial support for the view that the genitive is epexegetic ('the poor who are the saints'), Paul could hardly have expected or intended his readers to take the phrase in other than its most natural sense in the Greek (partitive genitive..)"

<sup>129</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 876.

<sup>130</sup> Keck, L.E. "The Poor Among the Saints in the NT" *ZNW* 56 (1965) 100-29, and "The Poor Among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran", *ZNW* 57 (1966) 54-78. These two articles were essentially against Holl, K. "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in Seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde." *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie* (1921) 920-47, reprinted in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* II, (Tübingen, 1928) 44-67. His reasons are: a) it is unknown to Acts which is supposed to be favourable to it. (b) Matt., and the Jewish Christian milieu with which it is associated also knows nothing of this self-designation and its presuppositions. (c) James views the problem of rich and poor differently and so can not be used in this argument even if it is true that James represents early Palestinian Christianity. (d) Paul's discussion of this offering in Gal. 2: 10; Rom. 15: 25-33; I Cor. 16: 1-4; and II Cor. 8 & 9 stand against it. (e) the Ebionite literature, as far as is recoverable, does not give sufficient reason for this hypothesis. (f) even the evidence from the Qumran material is insufficiently strong to support this hypothesis - they "do not establish the accuracy of Acts, nor do they allow us to fill in details omitted from the narrative."

rightly assessed only if this hypothesis or any other writing on 'the Poor' is thrown overboard. He does not however give any alternative understanding. This leaves the question unanswered. Would it be right to argue with Morris that the construction here indicates that not all the Jerusalem Christians were poor, but that there were many poor among them, enough to necessitate the organisation of the gifts from elsewhere?<sup>131</sup> This, I think, is a possibility we must allow.

Paul in v. 28 repeats that his intention is to convey this gift to Jerusalem (cf. v. 25). His language however, is not very clear, presenting some puzzlement particularly "over the precise significance of *σφραγίζω*"<sup>132</sup> On this, Newman and Nida remark:

The use of the verb 'to seal' in this context is admittedly difficult. Perhaps it is best understood from the practice of sealing sacks of grain. If a sack of grain were sealed, the recipient was assured that the grain he received was the full amount that had been placed in the sack. For that reason, the TEV renders this verb as "have turned over to them the full amount."<sup>133</sup>

Cranfield reviews various explanations of this word including: (a) the formal handing over of the collection (b) the final delivery of the collection into safe custody (c) the guarantee that the collection was intact and thereby proving wrong the insinuation that have been made in II Cor. 8: 20f and 12: 16-18 (d) the confirmation of the significance of the collection as a token of love by the Gentile churches or a token of their gratitude or as the fruit of Jerusalem's spiritual blessings to the Gentiles or a justification of Paul's mission to the Gentiles, and (e) the completing of the whole matter. He rightly concludes: "maybe the first or second of the three possibilities mentioned under (d) above should be regarded as most probable."<sup>134</sup> 'Fruit' quite clearly refers to the collection as the context makes clear.

Paul indicates that he was not sure of the acceptance of the collection in Jerusalem. This is expressed in his plea to the Roman church, made in Christ's authority and the love among Christians which is the outworking of the Holy Spirit, to support him in prayer (v. 30). The verb *συναγωνίσασθαι* is aorist infinitive and means 'to strive in company with me.' This verb appears only here in the NT. Its cognate without the compound appears in Col. 4: 12 and is also used in connection with prayer.<sup>135</sup> Morris rightly remarks that Paul does not underrate the opposition and that the appeal is for a

<sup>131</sup> Morris, 1988, p. 520.

<sup>132</sup> See Dunn, 1991, p. 877; so also Cranfield, 1979, p. 774.

<sup>133</sup> Newman and Nida, 1973, pp. 286-7; cf. Deissmann, 1923, pp. 238-39.

<sup>134</sup> Cranfield, 1979, pp. 774-5.

<sup>135</sup> Cranfield, 1979, p. 776.

serious prayer.<sup>136</sup> But as Pfitzner<sup>137</sup> shows, Paul was not saying that his friends in Rome should join him in contending with God, and that the 'Agon' of Paul here should not be "limited to an 'Agon' of prayer." He shows further that this word always signifies "participation and assistance in the 'Agon' of someone," whether in "a military context" or in "a legal context," and concludes that the 'Agon' of Paul here refers to his "missionary Agon" as a whole. The strength of this argument is that otherwise, God is to be seen as the opponent being contested in prayer.<sup>138</sup> The understanding then is that Paul is calling on the Christians to join him in his missionary struggle and that what he now fears is its immediate aspect. This agrees with what Paul goes on to say. The content of the prayer he requests is ἵνα ῥυσθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ ἡ διακονία μου ἢ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ εὐπρόσδεκτος τοῖς ἀγίοις γένηται, ('that I may be rescued from the unbelievers in Judea and that my service in Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints there' NIV. v. 31). It is interesting that there is no ἵνα introducing the second fear. Thus, Dunn, agreeing with Schmithals, argues that there was only one fear rather than two, namely, the opposition of the unbelievers which will in turn force a rejection of the collection by the church, which "would be forced to reaffirm its solidarity with the ancestral faith in preference to its unity with the Diaspora churches."<sup>139</sup> Dunn argues that "Paul's fears strengthen the probability" that Paul's 'law-free' mission was seriously opposed in the Jerusalem church, and "that this opposition was probably strongly nationalistic in character."<sup>140</sup>

### 7.5. Conclusion.

It is clear then, that Paul talks about the collection as an act of benefaction, as χάρις, as κοινωνία, and as ὀφειλή. Contemporary readers and Paul himself would have had no problem with the idea of benefaction as it was common in the institutions of the associations, the schools, the synagogue and the family. He seems to have used this in Galatians to stress his independence from Jerusalem, and thus the independence of his mission. By describing the collection as benefaction, he

<sup>136</sup> Morris, 1988, p. 523. He writes: "a formal and tepid prayer, but for a wholehearted involvement, which he describes in terms of a conflict ... There is a very real struggle going on between the forces of good and evil, and a most significant part of that struggle is prayer".

<sup>137</sup> Pfitzner, V.C. *Paul and the Agon Motif* NovTSup. 16 (Brill: Leiden, 1967) 120-127.

<sup>138</sup> Although this idea is not unknown in the Bible, as in Jacob's story, the context indicates that this idea was not in the forefront of Paul's thinking now.

<sup>139</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 879 whose view here is based on the presupposition that Paul's chief aim in organising the collection was the unity of the two wings of the church.

<sup>140</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 879.

dismisses any suggestion of Jerusalem's authority and association with the Temple tax. This implies that the Pauline mission is patron to the Jerusalem church. *χάρις* as charitable act is not far removed from the idea of benefaction, but with it Paul takes the discussion to a completely different sphere, a theological understanding. He might well have used this in Corinth because experience has taught him that this church can be very boastful, and he wanted them to know that God is the source of this act. This idea is foreign to the models of schools, family, and associations; but one that was at home in the synagogue. With *χάρις*, the collection is voluntary. α δ

*κοινωνία* as establishing fellowship excludes the idea of patronage and thus any suggestion of an unequal relationship. As a social ideal, it was very much desired in associations, the schools, the synagogue, and the family. With it Paul underscores how important the unity of the two wings of the church was to him. *ὀφειλή* as a debt has an opposite idea to that given by benefaction and *χάρις*. As a social concept, it was at home in the four models. With it, the Gentile mission is not seen as the benefactor but as the client who is under obligation to the patron, and the idea of voluntary action is removed. These contradictory ideas reveal the extreme sensitivity Paul shows in discussing this subject. It is not difficult to see that this may well be because the question of the unity with the Jerusalem wing of the church was potentially, at least, in tension with his zeal to preserve the independence of the Gentile mission.

The language Paul employs in discussing the collection in Corinth contrasts interestingly with that of his personal support. On the collection, Paul uses strongly emotional and religious language, while on his personal support he uses strong rhetoric involving sarcasm and irony. Both indicate how sensitive these issues were at Corinth, though for different reasons.

The discussion in this chapter shows that Paul was at home using ideas and concepts from his social milieu and that such ideas and concepts were not at odds with his conception of the gospel. That he uses these interchangeably confirms the usefulness of the models.

## Chapter 8. FINANCES OF THE HOUSE CHURCHES.

### 8.1. Introduction.

Filson has contended forcefully that the early church existed as house churches.<sup>1</sup> He argued that the early church met in small groups in houses of its members which had rooms big enough to accommodate such meetings. This, he said, was true for the Jerusalem church, and more so for the churches of the Pauline mission.<sup>2</sup> With the support of archaeological evidence, Filson's thesis drew out an interesting conclusion which I here quote in full.

It thus appears that the house church was a vital factor in the church's development during the first century, and even in later generations. It provided the setting in which the primitive Christians achieved a mental separation from Judaism before the actual open break occurred. It gave added importance to the effort to Christianise family relationships. It explains in part the proneness of the apostolic church to divide. It helps us gain a true understanding of the influential place of families of means in what has sometimes been regarded as a church of the dispossessed. It points us to the situation in which were developed leaders to succeed apostolic workers. Obviously the apostolic church can never be properly understood without constantly bearing in mind the contribution of the house churches.<sup>3</sup>

The position from which I argue in this chapter assumes the first point, and more importantly the point about the influential place of the families of means that hosted the churches in each location. Without getting involved in the discussion of whether or not his other conclusions are valid, I am operating from the basis as he did, which sees the significant contribution of the house churches in the development of the church, in this case, its financial development. My specific concerns are: the responsibility of each believer to his fellows, and to leaders, the social status (and its financial implications) of the Christians, special privileges for leaders, and the nature and importance of the services of wealthy and influential members. I shall seek to answer these questions with material from the text of Paul's letters, our only source. Again, the four social models will be consulted for possible readings of the situation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Filson, F.V. "The Significance of the Early House Churches," *JBL* 58 (1939), 105-112, esp. 106: "The assembly of Christians in hospitable homes goes back to the first days of the church."

<sup>2</sup> Filson, 1939, p. 106 writes "Paul gives examples. Prisca and Aquila made their home a centre of Christian fellowship and teaching (I Cor. 16: 19, Rom. 16: 5). Romans 16 mentions Christians by groups, with the clear implication that each group had its own meeting place. At Laodicea, Nympha (or was it Nymphas?) was hostess to a group of believers (Col. 4: 15). In Colosse Philemon made available a home for a band of disciples."

<sup>3</sup> Filson, 1939, p. 112.

## 8.2. Responsibility: Especially To Instructors. Gal. 6: 1-10

These verses conclude the general moral exhortations in this epistle (as often at the end of an epistle) which began in 5: 13. Barclay calls it 'the paraenetic material' of the epistle and raises questions to do with its function, and the relation to the rest of Galatians.<sup>4</sup> Betz, in a detailed literary work on Galatians, calls this section the 'exhortatio,' and refers to the section 5: 26-6: 10 "exhortatio: Recommendations in Form of *sententiae*."<sup>5</sup> Duncan designates the overall context as "practical implications of the gospel."<sup>6</sup> Similarly, Guthrie refers to it as "Christian life in its responsibility to others."<sup>7</sup> The image that emerges from these remarks, and which is evident in the text itself, is that Paul is here concerned with moral ethics as it affects life in a community, a community morality which is to be expected of a community founded under the authority of the gospel. Thus, 6: 1-10 is understood within the overall context of 5: 1-6: 10. This is a community formed by the working of the gospel through the Spirit whom Paul calls on the Galatians to allow His influence direct their lives (5: 16-26). So, a life directed by the Spirit says Paul, should find its expression in a community spirit which values highly community life. This informs our subject. In verse 2 Paul says:

Ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Carry each other's burdens, and in this way you will fulfil the law of Christ (NIV).

Strelan has rejected the traditional understanding which interprets verses 1 and 2 as a 'unit of thought.'<sup>8</sup> In an extensive article on v. 2, Strelan argues that this understanding "is open to question on at least two counts." Firstly, he draws attention to the fact that there is no article connecting these verses, as verses 2 and 3 have and thus providing a "logical relationship." Secondly, he notes that little "attention has been given to the fact that the two halves of Gal. 6: 2 are linked by the words καὶ οὕτως."<sup>9</sup> His thesis is that this "is an exhortation to each Christian to shoulder his

<sup>4</sup> Barclay, John M.G. *Obeying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1988), pp. 1ff; 106ff.

<sup>5</sup> Betz, 1979, 291.

<sup>6</sup> Duncan, G.S. *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*. (Hodder and Stoughton: London, 1947) pp. 152, 178. He describes the verses in question which he reckons as actually starting with 5: 26, with the words "under the leadership of the Spirit we must find practical ways of helping one another."

<sup>7</sup> Guthrie, D. *Galatians: The New Century Bible, New Series Based on the Revised Standard Version* (Nelson & Sons Ltd: Ontario, 1969) 151.

<sup>8</sup> Strelan, J.G. "Burden-bearing and the Law of Christ: A Re-examination of Galatians 6: 2" *JBL* 94 (1975) 266-276.

<sup>9</sup> Strelan, 1975, p. 266.

share of a common financial obligation."<sup>10</sup> In his conclusion, he suggests three possibilities of what this 'common financial obligation' might have been:

It is the obligation to provide for the material support of Paul and his co-workers. This seems the most likely answer. Less likely, perhaps, but more provocative, is to understand the phrase "Bear each other's burdens" as an exhortation to each Christian to share in the common task of contributing to the collection for the poor in Jerusalem. A third possibility lies in the combination of the two previous suggestions. Perhaps the "poor of the saints in Jerusalem" (Rom. 15: 26) are the Jerusalem leaders who labour in the Word. They were following in the footsteps of Jesus, the poor man. Hence, Gal. 6: 2 is an admonition to contribute to the support of the Jerusalem apostles by participating in the collection organised by Paul.<sup>11</sup>

The problem with Strelan's position is that he does not make any reference to the context of this verse. His second and third suggestions remove the verse from its context. Regarding the first, it is to be noted that Paul was speaking to the Galatians about responsibility to one another and not about himself and his team. Strelan's conclusion must therefore be rejected on all three counts. However, it must be allowed that τὰ βάρη here includes every kind of burden, financial burdens not excluded. Paul argues that being responsible for the general welfare of one another fulfils this command of love. This parallels charitable giving in ancient Judaism (see 2.2.3, and 2.3.3).

Betz's position which has a different focus adds two interesting points to this discussion. First, that the verse is two lines of a 'maxim,' the first being "the maxim proper," and the second "its Christian (Pauline) interpretation." Secondly, that Paul borrowed the first part of this maxim "from the Hellenistic philosophical tradition" which he found useful as summary of "his teaching in Gal. 5: 13-14 and is also related to 6: 1." He adds further that "the language is metaphorical: τὰ βάρη refers to the 'burdens' of human life; βαστάζετε is more than 'tolerate' and includes effective assistance and relief."<sup>12</sup> For Betz, it is apparent that the emphasis is on mutual help which draws on the social practice of reciprocity, and which Paul happily uses to talk about his gospel message. So, Paul was happy to call on Christians to reciprocate God's love by loving their fellows.

But what does the 'law of Christ' refer to? Is this a reference to specific commandments or precepts? Strelan thinks it refers to "the dominical saying quoted,

---

<sup>10</sup> Strelan, 1975, p. 267.

<sup>11</sup> Strelan, 1975, pp. 275-76. In his footnote, n.50, Strelan has detailed the arguments for and against the suggestion that here we have a reference to the collection for the 'poor' in Jerusalem. There is however no point in restating the points Strelan has made. For a discussion on this subject, see under 'the collection.'



paraphrased, or alluded to in various forms.”<sup>13</sup> He however does not present any grounds for this assertion. Duncan argues that it refers to the commandment of love.<sup>14</sup> Betz similarly identifies the phrase with the ‘new commandment’ of Jesus in John 13: 34. The problem with these possibilities is that they raise the question what these precepts or commandments are, and remove the phrase from its context. Guthrie, on the other hand, thinks it refers to the law of relationship to the person of Christ.<sup>15</sup> This is probably the proper understanding as it certainly fits the context. But this does imply that the ‘law of Christ’ is a synonym for ‘life in the Spirit.’ Is this a legitimate assertion? In 5: 13-14 Paul refers to the command of love, and this is immediately followed by a description of the life by the Spirit (5: 16-26). Thus it seems Paul is here describing the practical outworking of this life by the Spirit.

If the above assertion is correct, then the burdens in question can include any burden and thus, connecting v. 2 either with what precedes it or with what follows. Thus, Paul was calling on the Galatians to show their love to the brother who has been overtaken by sin as much as through love, they would not be arrogant (vv. 3-4). Similarly, it is part of the life of the spirit to be responsible individuals.<sup>16</sup> So as part of his exhortation on community morals, a morality governed by life in the Spirit, Paul includes this section on charity that is primarily financial, but incorporates everything else. This last point strengthens the contention that this is not a discussion of the collection for Jerusalem in Galatians. There is nothing in the text about the collection project, and so it is better to understand it in terms of general moral exhortations as often at the end of the letters. This parallels the moral obligation that was upon the benefactors in Judaism. It will be recalled that in discussing ‘the Synagogue’ (see 2.4.1 above) it was noted that such benefactors donated freely to meet all kinds of needs, and that such benefaction was the backbone of that

---

<sup>12</sup> Betz, 1979, pp. 298-299.

<sup>13</sup> Strelan, 1975, p. 276, referring to I Cor. 9: 14; Matt. 10: 10; I Tim. 5: 18; Did. 13: 2; and probably Gal. 6: 6.

<sup>14</sup> Duncan, 1947, p. 181, alluding to Matt. 22: 37-40; John 13: 34, cf. Gal. 5: 14.

<sup>15</sup> Guthrie, 1969, p. 153: “Undoubtedly the expression ‘law of Christ’ is meant to contrast with the system of legalism as a religious principle. It involves submission to a Person rather than to a code. It seems better to take it in this sense than to suggest that ‘law’ here refers to any specific commandments or precepts of Jesus. All that Christ has become to the believer incurs a new kind of obligation upon him. As Christ bore the burdens of others, so the believer must do the same. This is the ‘law’ of true Christian relationships.”

<sup>16</sup> Bligh, J. *Galatians: A Discussion of St Paul's Epistle*. Householder Commentaries, No. 1 (, St Paul Publications: London, 1970), p. 483. He remarks, “Charity consists in bearing the burdens of others - being patient with their defects, assisting them in their repentance, aiding them in their needs - but it is not a part of charity to provide burdens for other Christians to carry. On the contrary, a Christian should lighten the burdens of others by *not* being a burden to them, financially or otherwise, if he can help it.” Italics are his.

institution. Similarly patrons and benefactors played a key role in the survival of contemporary associations (see 3.4.2.1.viii above).

Verse 6 is most important for our purpose here. Paul says, *κοινωνεῖτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχοῦντι ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς* ('Anyone who receives instruction in the word must share all good things with his instructor', NIV). This as Betz notes is "the last maxim" and, "certainly one of the most puzzling in the whole letter."<sup>17</sup> The connection between this verse and v. 5 is the fact that Paul does seem to be clarifying that his statement that each person should 'carry his own load,' does not remove responsibility.<sup>18</sup> Grammatically, "the δὲ ('but') provides a loose connection with the preceding, simply indicating that this saying follows v. 5."<sup>19</sup> The verse raises a number of questions. Should the verse be taken as a commendation to students to share material goods of life with their teachers, or does it include 'spiritual' goods? Is Bruce right in taking it as "another way of stating the principle that 'the labourer deserves his wages' (Lk. 10: 7; I Tim. 5: 18; cf. Matt. 10: 10)" and therefore a paraphrase of I Cor. 9: 14?<sup>20</sup> In other words, "does it deal primarily, as the translation might suggest, with the duty of ministerial maintenance?"<sup>21</sup> The term *ἀγαθά* can have one of four meanings: good things in the general sense, possessions or treasures, possessions of a higher order (good qualities), and good deeds.<sup>22</sup> It is, however, not clear whether Paul is here referring to only material things or he was implying both material and spiritual things. The context demands the second meaning but does not seem to exclude the third.

The verse is clearly an injunction which fits into the context and provides "an instance of the mutual help inculcated in v. 2a."<sup>23</sup> It is mutual help between teacher and the students. We do not know if Paul refused support at Galatia as he did at Corinth and at Thessalonica (I Thes. 2: 9). Nevertheless, what he says here indicates that he did not expect 'teachers' of 'the word' to act as he did, nor did he allow his churches to refuse them support.<sup>24</sup> This agrees with his argument in I Cor. 9 where such help is seen as a duty. Paul's injunction here raises the whole question of teachers' pay in the contemporary period which I discussed above (see 5.2.2, 5.2.3; cf. 4.4.3). There, it

<sup>17</sup> Betz, 1979, p. 304.

<sup>18</sup> Guthrie, 1969, p.154. He contends that this fits the context.

<sup>19</sup> Betz, 1979, p. 304. See also Guthrie, 1969, p. 154.

<sup>20</sup> Bruce, 1982, p. 263.

<sup>21</sup> Duncan, 1947, p.183. The 'translation' that he refers to is his own translation of the verse.

<sup>22</sup> This is attested in the major lexicons. See e.g. Bauer, LSJ, and Lampe, s.v.

<sup>23</sup> Bruce, 1982, p. 263.

will be recalled, I established that Paul discusses this question in terms of freedom and independence. The issue here is slightly different because it is not Paul's support that is in question, but that of the local leaders. Paul seems to be avoiding a situation in which the congregations would be arguing that such local leaders should do what their apostle was doing. This whole discussion recalls what we noted on the 'Hippocratic oath' discussed above (see 4.3.2) where we saw how apprentice doctors were under obligation to share everything with their teachers. There is a very close parallel with what Paul encourages here. The student taking the oath promised to make his teacher a partner in his livelihood (βίου κοινωνεσθαι). This clearly parallels κοινωνεῖτω in Gal. 6: 6. So Paul insists that the Galatians should 'share all good things' with their teachers, who, it is reasonably logical to conclude, are included in those 'who follow this rule' (6: 16), where 'this rule' refers to Paul's gospel of freedom from the law of circumcision (6: 13-15).<sup>24</sup> This means also that 'the word' here refers to the Christian message of salvation. But whether or not this means that the teaching of the Christian message had become "full-time - or at least a heavily time-consuming - occupation," is not guaranteed by this text.<sup>25</sup> Similarly, whether or not this is a version of the saying of Jesus that 'the labourer deserves his wage,' as well as another version of Paul's statement in I Cor. 9: 14, is not certain. Again, our sources are not helpful in this regard. However, given the fact that Paul is concerned about the instructor in the community, who obviously is labouring to morally build it up, the possibility must be allowed that this verse relates to I Cor. 9: 14. In that case, Paul did not want to let his decision not to use his rights be the rule for community leaders in the churches.

The fact that Paul refers to teachers with the class name τῷ κατηχοῦντι ('with the one who teaches'), a substantival participle, supports the claim that there were teachers in the churches of the Pauline mission, or at least in this church. But whether or not such teachers are to be distinguished from missionaries like Paul, is a question that is given very little attention. Duncan does not see any distinction between the two, arguing that teachers, apostles and prophets 'did not necessarily differ.'<sup>27</sup> It is

<sup>24</sup> Bruce, 1982, p. 263.

<sup>25</sup> Longenecker, R.N. *Galatians: WBC*. Vol. 41. (Word Books, Publisher: Dallas, Texas, 1990), p. 278.

<sup>26</sup> Longenecker, 1990, p. 279.

<sup>27</sup> Duncan, 1947, p. 184, comments: "God, who gave the Word and the Spirit, gave to the church also apostles and prophets and teachers (cf. I Cor. 12: 28). Teachers did not necessarily differ from apostles and prophets as a separate 'order'; the different terms denote rather different aspects of ministerial work, and in so far as a man was a teacher his work would be to train inquirers and catechumens, and to give to the brethren who had been baptised further instruction in the fundamentals of the faith."

hard to see how Duncan comes to this conclusion. The context of I Cor. 12 shows that Paul was discussing the different forms in which the Spirit is manifested to different individuals. Paul emphasises here that like a body with different parts, the different roles, whether apostles or teachers or whatever, are contributing to the welfare of the 'body of Christ.' However, the parts themselves are distinct and so are their functions: εἰ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ὀφθαλμός, ποῦ ἡ ἀκοή; εἰ ὅλον ἀκοή, ποῦ ἡ ὀσφρησις;<sup>28</sup> This argument is continued in the verses that follow. We could ask, If the whole church was comprised of teachers, where would the apostle be? If the whole church were apostles, where would the prophets be? Clearly, Duncan did not consider this verse. So these were distinct functions in the church, belonging together in the body of Christ, the church (vv. 12f). The next three verses (7-9) do certainly continue the thought and argument of the last verse. They contain a warning that is explicated by Paul's "'flesh-spirit' antinomy," followed by an appeal to his readers to continue to do good because that will result in reaping eternal life.<sup>29</sup> The fact is undoubted that these verses have close affinities with II Cor. 9: 6-7, though the language, and in fact the message, are not exactly the same. It is however wrong to conclude from this a "conjecture that St Paul had asked the Galatians to contribute to the fund for the relief of the poor in Jerusalem and they had shown themselves unresponsive."<sup>30</sup> A better explanation sees this affinity between the two references as a reflection of "the extent to which Paul's involvement in his collection project moulded the vocabulary he used to refer to sharing of sustenance for any purpose."<sup>31</sup> As the context shows, the concern here is the sharing of goods between Paul's readers and their teachers. This, better fits the context of community morality and not the collection project.

V. 10 interestingly states that Christians have obligations to all people, but that the obligation to πρὸς τοὺς οἰκέλους τῆς πίστεως is special. It concludes the exhortations to live a life in the spirit began in 5: 13. The appeal to apply the command of Jesus to "Love your neighbour as yourself" in 5: 14 which served to introduce the whole section now finds its perfect conclusion. But what did Paul mean

<sup>28</sup> "If the whole body were an eye, where would the sense of hearing be? If the whole body were an ear, where would the sense of smell be?" (v. 17, NIV translation).

<sup>29</sup> Longenecker, 1990, p. 278. See also Betz, 1979, p. 306, who refers to these verses as "an eschatological warning" that has the addition of Paul's own interpretation and an appeal.

<sup>30</sup> So Bligh, 1969, p. 484. See also Bruce, 1982, p. 127 who is unwilling to rule out the possibility that these verses "could cover such a fund." Hurtado, L. W. "The Jerusalem Collection and the Book of Galatians." *JSNT*, Issue 5 (1979), 53 is another author who argues strongly that Gal. 6: 6-10 and the fact of its affinity with the language of the collection elsewhere, "are specific in intent, and form an exhortation to participate in the Jerusalem collection."

<sup>31</sup> Nickle, 1966, p. 59 n. 55.

by τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως ('the family of believers,' or 'the household of faith')? The general consensus is that it refers to Christians. However, Duncan discusses three other possibilities.<sup>32</sup> First, he notes that when Paul says 'especially those who belong to the household of faith,' it does seem as if Paul is "untrue to the fundamental universalism of his gospel," and secondly that in so doing Paul limits "his reference to merely physical needs, on the principle that, 'if a Christian were left in distress this would be even more to the discredit of the new religion than if a non-Christian went hungry.'" These two suggestions are unnecessary as they try to explain away the text, and limit it. However, Duncan went on to contend that by making this statement, Paul was "not qualifying what he has just said, but enforcing a specific application." In this case, the application is in the area of relationship to one another. Paul goes on to say that this should be done 'while we have time.' It "assumes that the opportunity is present."<sup>33</sup> It also strikes home the note of urgency. Paul wanted the Galatians to actively and urgently apply this community morality in their fellowship, and especially to consider their teachers. The discussion here recalls our earlier study (see 2.4.1.) where it was noted that the moral exhortation to give is strengthened by the promise of material blessings. In verse 7, he talks about it in terms of sowing and reaping, and verses 9-10 leave no doubt about the fact that acting charitably is the sowing he talks about which will yield the harvest. This, together with what was noted on verses 2 and 6 and its parallel in 'philosophical schools' indicates the usefulness of these models.

### **8.3. Social Status and Finances. (1 Cor. 1: 26-31).**

The question of the social status of the early Christians first received serious attention in the works of Deissmann whose view was that they came from the "lower class."<sup>34</sup> The merit of Deissmann's work is that it pioneered this discussion. More recent discussions of the subject are represented in the works of Judge and Theissen. Judge's position was the complete opposite of Deissmann's:

<sup>32</sup> Duncan, 1947, p. 187. See also, Guthrie, 1969, p. 158 who stresses that "a specific application of the principle" is meant here.

<sup>33</sup> Guthrie, 1969, p. 157.

<sup>34</sup> Deissmann, 1927, p. 144, remarked: "The New Testament was not a product of the colourless refinement of an upper class ... On the contrary, it was, humanly speaking, a product of the force that came, unimpaired and strengthened by the Divine presence, from the lower class (Matt. 11: 25ff.; 1 Cor. 1: 26-31). This reason alone enabled it to become the Book of all mankind." This is a passage being quoted by virtually all scholars that have considered this subject.

Far from being a socially depressed group, then, if the Corinthians are at all typical, the Christians were dominated by a socially pretentious section of the population.<sup>35</sup>

He views the higher classes of the social strata dominating the composition of the early Christians, though not denying the fact that these would have been accompanied by the retinue of followers, and servants. Theissen acknowledges the fact that these positions can appeal to sociological analysis for confirmation, but strikes a middle course stressing the "internal stratification" of these churches as their characteristic mark. His study includes a review of statements about the community as a whole as well as those about individual members which include references to offices, houses, services rendered, travel and divisions within Corinth. Also included is the sociological analysis of the theological quarrel in this congregation, looking specifically at socio-cultural and socio-economic factors; and a look at the issue of social integration in the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. He then concludes:

In conclusion it can be said that Hellenistic primitive Christianity was neither a proletarian movement among the lower classes nor an affair of the upper class. On the contrary, what is characteristic for its social structure is the fact that it encompassed various strata - and thus various interests, customs, and assumptions.<sup>36</sup>

Meeks acknowledged the position of Judge and Theissen as approaching a consensus that still needs to clarify the characteristics of the Pauline groups.<sup>37</sup> This is a good starting point from which I shall go on to seek to determine its bearing on the question of finances of the Pauline Mission. In other words, if Deissmann is right, the question would be: How did the poor Christians finance their movement? Or, if Judge or Theissen are right, would it be right to say that the rich members of the congregations funded the movement? If so, what implication did that have for the individual churches, and for its rich and poor members?

First, a definition of terms is in place. Scholars employ terms such as 'lower class,' 'lower-middle class,' and 'proletarian' or 'proletariat' to discuss these issues. These terms can be understood with reference to Roman law. 'Lower class' was used for the 'plebeians' who were the lowest in the society. They were the commoners, low-born, working-class, who were often uncultured. The term 'proletarian' is often used for this group of citizens. The 'lower-middle class' then stood between these lowest

---

<sup>35</sup> Judge, 1960a, p. 60. Judge was probably overreacting to Deissmann's view but it seems to be, if in fact it was an overreaction, one which was not unfounded.

<sup>36</sup> Theissen, 1982, p.106.

<sup>37</sup> Meeks, 1983, pp. 51-110, esp. 53. For him, clarification needs to be made over mixture of classes in the light of 'the social structures of the society as a whole.'

members of the society and the middle class, which is often referred to as the 'bourgeois.' In terms of modern class analysis, these terms are loosely used.<sup>38</sup>

The overall context of these verses is Paul's response to the problem of divisions in the Corinthian church, divisions that were internal and against him (I Cor. 1: 10-4: 20). Such divisions were undertaken in the name of wisdom (1: 10-17). However, God has chosen to reveal His power through what is considered foolishness, the cross (1: 18-25). These verses (1: 26-31), therefore demonstrate how God's foolishness operates, and how the power of God is demonstrated in the lives of the Christians in Corinth. Paul begins by appealing to the fact of their calling. The term τὴν κλήσιν ('vocation', 'call') has two basic connotations: a) vocation with the connotation of a station in life,<sup>39</sup> and b) the act of God in calling them (this seems the correct interpretation). Paul was concerned with getting the Corinthians to consider the important fact that God called them regardless of their present values of "worldly wisdom or merit."<sup>40</sup> Paul goes on to say:

ὅτι οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, οὐ πολλοὶ δυνατοί, οὐ πολλοὶ εὐγενεῖς.

Not many of you were wise by human standards; not many of you were influential; not many of you were of noble birth (v. 26, NIV).

The key word in this verse, and which affects its translation, is οὐ πολλοί ('not many'). It would seem that Deissmann's position understood this to mean something like 'not any.' The other positions however understand it as meaning 'there were some,' with the number unspecified, but which certainly allows that there were those who fitted these categories. Barrett<sup>41</sup> brings in here an interesting discussion of this issue which first of all recognises the fact that from I Cor. 7: 21, this church certainly included slaves. He notes however, that persons like Erastus in Rom. 16: 23 "can hardly have been poor," and so dismisses the often quoted pejorative statement of Celsus who speaking about the Christians says:

<sup>38</sup> Fox, R.L. *Pagans and Christians*. (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.: New York, 1987), pp. 27-63, demonstrates that the modern social scientist does not find it easy to appreciate the social divisions of antiquity. Writing about the upper class, he says: "A class which could exert such economic and political dominance is not prone to receive tributes from modern social historians" (p. 55). De Ste Croix, 1981, pp. 31-111 defines them in terms of degree of ownership or control. Kyrtatas, 1987, pp. 21-24 describes the 'oppressed-class' theory of early Christianity as "a very crude picture of Roman society" (see esp. p. 23). Meeks, 1983, p. 55 cautions against a hasty assigning of Pauline groups "to some general level."

<sup>39</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 78, notes that "despite BAGD there is no evidence that it ever referred to vocation or station in life."

<sup>40</sup> Fee, 1987, p.78.

<sup>41</sup> Barrett, 1971, p. 57

Their injunctions are like this. 'Let no one educated, no one wise, no one sensible draw near. For these abilities are thought by us to be evils. But as for anyone ignorant, anyone stupid, anyone uneducated, anyone who is a child, let him come boldly.' By the fact that they themselves admit that these people are worthy of their God, they show that they want and are able to convince only the foolish, dishonourable and stupid, and only slaves, women, and little children.<sup>42</sup>

But if the above is an exaggerated statement which was pejorative, the statement of the second century "Christian apologist Minucius Felix in reply to his pagan interlocutor: 'That many of us are called poor is not disgrace, but our glory,'"<sup>43</sup> is not improving the picture. If Celsus' statement was the evaluation/criticism of an outsider, Minucius' statement does seem to be defending Paul's statement in these verses. To be sure, Paul clearly could not have meant what Celsus here describes, and I do not think there is any passage in the New Testament that can be called upon in support of this allegation. Also, the church Celsus and Minucius describe is not the Corinthian church of the mid first century CE, which includes people like Gaius and Erastus. Nevertheless, Gager's comment that "Christian communities of the first two centuries derived adherents from the lower classes of the Roman Empire - slaves, freedmen, freeborn Roman citizens of low rank, and non-Romans (*peregrini*) of various nationalities,"<sup>44</sup> cannot be hastily ruled out. But his point that "a consensus has emerged ... that for more than two hundred years Christianity was essentially a movement among the lower and lower-middle classes of the empire,"<sup>45</sup> no longer stands.<sup>46</sup>

Wuellner, in his short study on this passage, rejects on grammatical grounds the "allegations of Christianity's proletarian origins" arguing that there is in this passage no "trace of any evidence that the Corinthians belonged to proletarian circles."<sup>47</sup> His position is basically that which is elaborated in Theissen's work quoted above. There is certainly a sufficiently strong reason for accepting the correctness of this

---

<sup>42</sup> Origen, *Contra Celsum* III. 44. The translation is as in Barrett, 1971, p. 57, quoted also by Gager, J.G. "Religion and Social Class in the Early Roman Empire" in *Early Church History: The Roman Empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity*. (eds.) Stephen Benko and John J. O'Rourke (Oliphants: London, 1980) 99-120, esp. 99.

<sup>43</sup> Gager, 1980, p. 99.

<sup>44</sup> Gager, 1980, p. 99.

<sup>45</sup> Gager, 1980, p. 113.

<sup>46</sup> See a critique of this position in Scroggs, 1980, 164-78. See also the work of scholars like Judge and Theissen already quoted.

<sup>47</sup> Wuellner, W.H. "The Sociological Implications of I Corinthians 1: 26-28 Reconsidered" in *SEv.* 4, Vol. 112 of *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Berlin (1973), 666-72, esp. p. 672. He concludes, "I would rather suspect that, inferences drawn from archaeological sources notwithstanding, the Corinthian Christians came by and large from fairly well-to-do bourgeois circles with a fair percentage also from upper class people as well as the very poor."



conclusion. 'Not many' cannot mean all or none, unless Paul's words are disregarded. On the basis of this verse therefore, Theissen's position is confirmed. Paul shows here that God demonstrates that His wisdom which is foolishness to the wise of this world has resulted in their salvation, contrary to the norm of the day, in which case only the strong, powerful, and those of noble birth, would have been saved. In vv. 27-29, continuing the language of v. 26, he describes what God has chosen as τὰ μὴ ὄντα ('things that are not'). Paul seems to reflect the social gap that existed between the rich members and the poor lower classes of the society. An example of this kind of picture is seen in Lucian's description of the plight of the philosopher who enslaves himself by going into the house of the rich. Lucian writes:

Just now, you think the rich man is lucky on account of his gold and ivory and his so much luxury. And now you pity yourself for thinking that you are alive when in fact being a mere nothing.<sup>48</sup>

The philosopher here is seen to have degraded himself to the lowest that one can go in life. By enslaving himself he had become extremely poor and helpless.

It is noteworthy that Paul does not use the word that means 'rich' to describe what the Corinthians were not when God called them. Surely, they were not of noble birth<sup>49</sup> or the wise and influential as Paul himself says, but must these terms be equated with wealth? Was it not possible for freedmen, who by nature of their birth, would have been uneducated and therefore not wise and influential, to rise to be rich? Were some of them not likely to have progressed into positions of honour in the society of the Greco-Roman world? Surely this was a real possibility. Downing says:

Paul's triad of terms reminds us to look wider than simply to wealth; 'noble birth' could be acknowledged in a family come on hard times, and influence could be exerted by impoverished philosophers. But the fact remains that even in Corinth there were few with any kind of accepted status.<sup>50</sup>

Downing<sup>51</sup> also brings into this discussion the interesting point that "there were very few with the birth and wealth to qualify as Roman senators or even 'knights,' *equites*." He notes also that even with the provincial aristocracy, it was not an easy thing to qualify as a suitable candidate because of the amount of money as well as

---

<sup>48</sup> See Lucian *Merc. Cond.* 16. καὶ ἄρτι μὲν εὐδαιμονίζεις τὸν πλούσιον τοῦ χρυσοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἐλέφαντος καὶ τῆς τοσαύτης τρυφῆς, ἄρτι δὲ οἰκτεῖρεις σεαυτὸν, ὡς τὸ μηδὲν ὦν εἶτα ζῆν ὑπολαμβάνεις. (my translation).

<sup>49</sup> Robertson and Plummer, 1911, p. 25, note that the names known to us from 16: 17; and Rom. 16 are "suggestive of slaves or freedmen." This is important as they could be well off but still not 'noble.' See also Kyrtatas, 1987, pp. 76-78.

<sup>50</sup> Downing, 1992, p. 91.

<sup>51</sup> Downing, 1992, p. 88.

land one needs.<sup>52</sup> Fox shows that this was true also for election into local magistracy where councillors had to pay heavily to qualify, not only for getting elected but all through the period of office.<sup>53</sup> He notes how this practice gave prominence to donors and benefactors to the exclusion of the poor, and demonstrates also how freedmen could not participate. This, says Downing, and the fact that there was “no ‘middle class’ in anything like the modern western sense,” asks for a reconsideration of what Paul says here about noble birth and influence. If Paul could say ‘not many,’ surely it signifies that there were at least a few who were of noble birth, influential, and wise. The implications of this for the finances of the Pauline churches in general is that the few members of this church who were influential and of noble birth (and we may include ‘fairly rich’), took care of the needs of the church as benefactors whom Paul insists should be given honour.

#### **8.4. Men Deserving Honour. I Cor. 16: 15-18**

In these concluding remarks of this epistle which begin at v. 13 and run through to the end of the chapter in v. 24, Paul exhorts the church at Corinth to honour this man identified as Stephanas, and others like him<sup>54</sup> because of two reasons. First Paul says his household ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας (‘were the first converts in Achaia’ NIV). This man was the first Christian in Achaia, and his household might have served as the foundation members of the church in this region.<sup>55</sup> This is probably why he is one of the few persons Paul baptised here. The second reason for the appeal is given as the fact of their service to the saints. Grosheide suggests that they had been of assistance to the church probably in the provision of hospitality; and that the word διακονίαν here “cannot be taken of an official ministry in the church, because the subject of the verb is *they*, which refers to the whole family.”<sup>56</sup> This is a reasonable argument. It is very unlikely that the household of this man did all become officers in the church at Corinth.

<sup>52</sup> Downing, 1992, p. 88 also notes that “Pliny quotes the figure of one thousand *sesterces* as the property qualification in land for a *decurion*, a ‘town councillor’ in his Italian town of Cuma, one quarter of the qualification for an *eques*.”

<sup>53</sup> Fox, 1987, pp. 50ff. During the period of office they were required to perform.

<sup>54</sup> See Fee, 1987, who notes that the precedent of this exhortation, is I Thess. 5: 12-14, and which, like vv. 13-14, should not be “explained simply on formal grounds.”

<sup>55</sup> Robertson and Plummer, 1911, p. 395. There is a parallel for this in Rom. 16: 5 where Epænetus is identified as ὃς ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς εἰς Χριστόν (‘the first converts in Asia’). Fee, 1987, notes that this phrase means more than just ‘first converts’ but as ‘firstfruits’, giving it the “promise of more to come,” appealing to II Thess. 2: 13 and Rom. 16: 15 as further examples of this usage.

<sup>56</sup> Grosheide, 1954, p. 402.

Two points require explanation here. First, what does ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς ('they devoted themselves' or 'they appointed themselves') mean? Moffatt<sup>57</sup> points out that this phrase "is a trade metaphor which Plato happens to use, in the *Republic* (ii. 371), about tradesmen who 'set themselves to the business of serving the public' by retailing farm produce, since they 'saw the need of this.'" Plato puts these words in the mouth of a certain Adeimantus who said:

ἀλλ' εἰσὶν οἱ τοῦτο ὀρώντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν διακονίαν τάττουσι ταύτην.

but there are men who see this need and appoint themselves for this service.<sup>58</sup>

Moffatt notes that in this case "the household of Stephanas had recognised that something had to be done for the good of the community and had addressed themselves to the business of voluntary, unofficial service." Conzelmann<sup>59</sup> notes that here, and for the fact that the word used for this service is διακονίαν, "lies the roots of the office of the διακονός, 'deacons'" but contends that "for Paul there are indeed as yet no 'offices' (as there is also no real organisation), but functions, services; cf. v. 16: help in the work, labour." This seems a fair conclusion. It would seem then that this household had decided on their own to serve the church as its benefactors.

The second issue follows on from the first. What was the nature of this service? Are there grounds for identifying this service with II Cor. 8: 4; and 9: 1, the collection for the saints in Jerusalem? Because the word διακονία is used for the collection in II Cor. 8 and 9, this does appear an easy answer. However, as Fee points out,<sup>60</sup> there are two reasons militating against that understanding. First, the verb ἔταξαν is aorist, indicating that the service in question here was already long in progress, while the collection was only starting.<sup>61</sup> Secondly, both the content of the next verse (v.16) and the context of the whole section show that "the saints here are the Corinthians themselves, as in 1: 2." This discussion is taken even further by Filson<sup>62</sup> who sees the service of Stephanas and his household here as the provision of accommodation for the meetings of the church in their house. This means that this man must have been a man of means to own a house large enough to host the Christians that meet in it. In fact, Filson sees the conversion of families of means as Paul's missionary strategy - "one of his first objectives" when he embarked on the missionary work

<sup>57</sup> Moffatt, 1947, p. 278.

<sup>58</sup> LCL translation.

<sup>59</sup> Conzelmann, 1975, p. 298.

<sup>60</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 829, n. 23.

<sup>61</sup> See also, Barrett, 1971, p. 394.

<sup>62</sup> Filson, 1939, p. 111.

among the Gentiles. In other words, "the practical way to obtain" a meeting place and a base in any new station "was to win a household with a home large enough to serve as a centre for Christian activity." Theissen discusses this name under the categories of the references to houses, travel and services rendered.<sup>63</sup>

When Paul exhorts that the household of Stephanas be honoured or submitted to (v. 16), or that they 'deserve recognition' (v. 18b), what did he mean? It is interesting that Paul says this kind of recognition should be given to others as well: 'to everyone who joins in the work and labours at it.' Appealing to Eph. 5: 21, Fee's position is typical of the way this verse is read.<sup>64</sup> But in Phil. 2: 3-4, the voluntary yielding in love, which should concern itself with the interest of the other person, is meant to be an injunction for all to follow. Here however, there is no doubt that the recognition demanded for people like Stephanas was to be special. It was meant for people τοῖς τοιοῦτοις (such as these). Barrett explains this as simply an injunction to value, respect and follow the lead of the men.<sup>65</sup> This seems to me an oversimplification of the point Paul makes here. If this were the case, why the special mention of Stephanas and people like him? For Moffatt, it was an appeal that these persons be given "moral support and recognition, especially in the absence of any apostolic authority."<sup>66</sup> This position raises the question of how this was meant to be done, a question Moffatt does not address. The problem we have here is that Paul seems to be intentionally ambiguous in the way he presents this injunction. The difficulty is heightened by the lack of any clue as to how the Corinthians understood it, and the fact that we are far removed from Paul and his audience by many centuries of history. The fact that the above mentioned suggestions are surrounded with difficulties as indicated demands that a solution be sought elsewhere. Here it is appropriate to recall the discussion on voluntary associations which revealed the fact that leaders of such clubs and associations received preferential treatment at meals and celebrations as well as exemptions from certain duties (see 3.4.3 ). In the case of the churches however, it would seem that their leaders did not receive any recognition, and Paul would have probably seen that as a bad sign on their part. It would seem then that Paul here seeks

^ ese

<sup>63</sup> See the full discussion in Theissen, 1982, pp. 73-96. This man travelled, owned a house, and served the church, says Theissen, because he was a man of means.

<sup>64</sup> Fee, 1987, p. 830, says "Although this could possibly mean to be in submission to them in some form of obedience, both the context and the similar passage in I Thess. 5: 12-13 suggest rather that it means 'submission in the sense of voluntary yielding in love.'" See also Conzelmann, 1975, p. 298, who remarks: "there is no organisation, but voluntary subordination."

<sup>65</sup> Barrett, 1971, p.394.

<sup>66</sup> Moffatt, 1947, p. 278.

to correct that tendency, upholding the practice we have seen in the associations, and therefore gives here a mild rebuke to this church.

In verse 17, Paul adds two further information to what he had said in the last two verses. First, he gives the indication that he was probably thinking of Fortunatus and Achaicus alongside Stephanas in verses 15-16. Secondly, he makes the problematic statement that these individuals 'have supplied what was lacking' from the Corinthians (cf. Phil. 2: 30).<sup>67</sup> Their visit has given Paul joy as well as refreshed his spirit (v. 18). But what did Paul mean by this? Grosheide thinks it is a reference to Paul's inability to see the Corinthians which has resulted in his sorrow, but now removed by the arrival of these men.<sup>68</sup> The problem with this however, is that Paul refers to the Corinthians being refreshed by these men as well as himself. How can Paul say that they have refreshed the Corinthians too if he was thinking primarily of their visit to him? Robertson and Plummer's suggestion that it was a reference to the good news brought by these men, similarly does not fully answer this question, despite their attempt that 'it will be a consolation to the Corinthians to learn what comfort their delegates have been to Paul.'<sup>69</sup> Barrett's suggestion that it is a reference to their Christian fellowship and the services they rendered,<sup>70</sup> makes the most sense. These three men who have been of service to the church at Corinth, have now rendered a similar service to Paul. However, the question remains: what was the nature of this 'service'? Could their service to Paul have been material/financial? Was their service to the church in material/financial support, including the provision of accommodation for meetings? These are possibilities, but that would make Paul a client of these men, a position Paul avoided. This recalls the discussion of the services of Phoebe to Paul in Rom. 16: 1-2 (see 5.3.1.1.1). We noted there, it will be recalled, that Paul understood the whole thing in terms of mutual patronage. Here too there is indication that Paul accepted their services while at the same time offering his to them. His appeal to the Corinthians to recognise them makes him patron of these men, not to mention the fact that they became Christians through him. So Paul accepted whatever services these men rendered because he regarded these men as mutual patrons, his friends.

---

<sup>67</sup> For the meaning of this phrase see elsewhere on the discussion of the passage in Phil. 2: 30.

<sup>68</sup> Grosheide, 1954, p. 403.

<sup>69</sup> Robertson and Plummer, 1911, p. 397.

<sup>70</sup> Barrett, 1971, p. 395.

### 8.5. Influential Members. Rom. 16: 1-15, 23; Phil. 2.

Romans 16 has generated many questions, both literary and historical which have engaged NT scholarship.<sup>71</sup> The concern here is with the specific issue of the nature of the services of the individuals mentioned, especially on any financial implications for the Pauline mission. The passage begins with the commendation of Phoebe already discussed (see 5.3.1.1.1.). That the service of Phoebe was not the hosting of church meetings is not in doubt here. To be sure, it most likely included hospitality, but what Paul says in the rest of this passage shows that the hosting of church meetings is not included. Paul nowhere else used the words *διάκονος* and *προστάτις* to describe any host of a meeting venue. The probable references to this service in this chapter (vv. 5, 10, 11, 23), similarly employ a different vocabulary. But this eliminates the hosting of church meetings as a possible service this woman rendered. The word *διάκονον* unfortunately does not provide any helpful clues to this question because it can be used for any service; spiritual, philanthropic, and secular. Ellis's comments on people who are called 'diaconoi' by Paul identifies them as "a special class of co-workers... active in preaching the gospel."<sup>72</sup> Similarly, the word *προστάτις* provides no clear clues to the nature of this service. Sanday and Headlam contend that she acted "as patroness of a small and struggling community."<sup>73</sup> But was Paul simply referring to her role as patron of this church and of himself or did it include something else? Whelan's point that Phoebe was a woman of influence who was able to move among the high social class, with "connections in certain spheres" for Paul as Paul was for her in certain spheres,<sup>74</sup> seems quite appealing. But again, it explains only the services to Paul, but not to the church. All the evidence considered then fails to provide clear clues to the nature this service, allowing only for a guess. My guess, is that this woman probably served the church by her giving in cash and kind to pay for its expenses.

<sup>71</sup> McDonald, 1969-70, 369-72, on questions such as: Is the chapter part of the letter or the result of a compilation? Historical questions are discussed in Whelan, 1993, 67-85, who attempts a solution by suggesting that the letter was a letter written to Ephesus. Manson, T.W. "St Paul's Letter to the Romans - and Others" in *Studies in the Gospel and Epistles* (University Press: Manchester, 1962) 225-41, links this with the question of the purpose of Romans which he sees as a "manifesto setting forth his deepest convictions on central issues, a manifesto calling for the widest publicity."

<sup>72</sup> Ellis, E.E. "Paul and His Co - Workers" *NTS* 17, (1970-71), pp. 437-52, esp. pp. 442-443. He continues "They appear in Paul's circle not only as itinerant workers (Georgi) but also as workers in local congregations, such as Phoebe (Rom. 16: 1) and the ministers in the church at Philippi (Phil. 1: 1). For the essential factor seems to have been ministry not movement, the charismatic function without any peripatetic implications. Their teaching function is of special interest, for it is this type of Christian worker (*κατηχούντι*) that in Gal. 6: 6 is specifically singled out as deserving pay."

<sup>73</sup> Sanday and Headlam, 1895, p. 418. See recently, Dunn, 1991, p. 889, who clearly sees here a reference to the wealth and influence of this woman.

<sup>74</sup> Whelan, 1993, p. 82. She notes also that this was mutual because she depended on Paul also for connections in certain spheres. Also see 5.3.1.1.1 above.

Next, Paul mentions the services of a couple, Priscilla and Aquila (vv. 3-5a).<sup>75</sup> Again, I have discussed this in section 5.3.1.1.2 and noted that he calls them *συνεργούς* ('fellow workers in Christ') - a term Paul uses for all his co-workers. There is clear reference here to 'the church that meets in their house.' Here we come to another reference to the house churches.<sup>76</sup> It seems very clear then that "the local structure of the early Christian groups was thus linked with what was commonly regarded as the basic unit of society."<sup>77</sup> There is reason to believe that this couple opened their house for the meetings of the churches wherever they went. In I Cor. 16: 19, Paul talks about the church that meets in the house of this couple while they were at Ephesus. The evidence from Acts (18: 2, 18, 26) is that this couple was once at Corinth. If this is accepted, and there is no reason why it should not be, a church met at their house there too. Here, on the assumption that this was the concluding chapter of the letter written to Rome, there was a church in Rome meeting in their house. The picture that emerges is that this couple was wealthy enough to buy or rent a house large enough to accommodate a number of people wherever they went. Could there be a link between this last point and the fact that the churches of the Gentiles owe them a debt of gratitude? Or was the debt of gratitude simply due to the fact that they risked their lives for Paul, and the churches owe them thanks for rescuing him? I think that both positions should be granted as possibilities.

There is also reference here to two other households (the household of Aristobulus in v. 10, and that of Narcissus in v. 11). The question is whether these are simply references to households in terms of members of the families or whether they are house churches. Also, what was the social status of these two persons? The expressions used are *ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου* ('greet those who belong to the household of Aristobulus,' NIV) in verse 10; and *ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου τοὺς ὄντας ἐν κυρίῳ* ('greet those in the household of Narcissus who are in the Lord,' NIV) in verse 11. Käsemann<sup>78</sup> doubts that the persons named here were even Christians arguing that "the formulation simply shows that there is a Christian group" in each of these families. He contends further that the "obviously restrictive clause" in verse 11 referring to the household of Narcissus is

<sup>75</sup> The question of the contact Paul had with this couple, and their movements around the different parts of the Empire have been discussed by most commentators and topical writers. For details, see for instance Sanday and Headlam, 1895, pp. 418-20; and most recently, Dunn, 1991, pp. 891-2.

<sup>76</sup> Most scholars who emphasise the existence of the house churches appeal to this verse. See for instance Filson, 1939, p.106; Theissen, 1982, pp. 83-7, 94-5.

<sup>77</sup> Meeks, 1983, p. 75.

<sup>78</sup> Käsemann, 1980, p. 414.

strong evidence for his argument.<sup>79</sup> In other words, the persons Paul sends greetings to are members of these families 'who are Christians,' with the implication that there were other members of these households who do not necessarily have to be Christians. For Dunn, this Aristobulus is most likely the grandson of Herod the Great, and that those being referred to are Christians among his "household slaves and freedmen."<sup>80</sup> He contends that although the name Aristobulus was a common name, the possibility that Herod's grandson is the one referred to is "certainly a strong" one. The argument is that this is a genitive of "proper names;"<sup>81</sup> translated, 'those belonging to the household of Aristobulus.' The same argument is presented for the household of Narcissus who was most likely an influential freedman of the early fifties who was killed after the accession of Nero, and his family absorbed into the house of the Emperor.<sup>82</sup> This however, does not rule out the fact that house churches existed among the Emperor's household slaves. The problem with this is that slaves could not meet in their master's house.<sup>83</sup> If they were freedmen, and in the imperial household, they would have been at the lower end of the social ladder, but not necessarily poor or uninfluential. In fact there is reason to believe that imperial slaves were wealthier than many provincial middle class people.

If we are not sure that those belonging to the households of Aristobulus and Narcissus were house churches, it is unquestionably clear that the references in verse 14 and 15 are to house churches. In v. 14, Paul sends greetings to Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas and Hermas; and then adds: καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφούς ('and the brothers with them'). Similarly, in v. 15 he greets Philologus, Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas; and concludes: καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίους ('and all the saints with them'). Dunn writes about v. 14: "The brothers with them' is best understood as a reference to a house church among whom Paul knew only five members by name, not including the host(ess)," and on v. 15, he writes "All the saints with them' presumably refers to another house church, of whom Paul knew only five. Perhaps the whole group consisted of members of the imperial household, who met in 'off-hours.'"<sup>84</sup> Commenting on this, Sanday and Headlam remark: "This and the similar expression in the next verse seem to imply that

<sup>79</sup> Käsemann is here thinking of τοὺς ὄντας ἐν κυρίῳ (lit. 'those being in the Lord').

<sup>80</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 896. The argument is that Aristobulus ended up as a private person in Rome, and by this time he probably had died and his family passed to the Emperor. See Morris, 1988, p. 535.

<sup>81</sup> So Morris, 1988, p. 535, n. 38.

<sup>82</sup> See, Sanday and Headlam, 1895, pp. 425- 426. See also most recently, Dunn, 1991, p. 896.

<sup>83</sup> What Paul says in Phil. 4. 22 indicates that the Christian slaves in Caesar's household found a way of meeting there.

<sup>84</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 898.



these persons formed a small Christian community by themselves."<sup>85</sup> This is the general consensus among scholars.<sup>86</sup> We are not told how these financed themselves. Presumably the leader of the each house church provided the meeting place. How funds were obtained for whatever project or need is open to conjecture. It seems reasonable to conclude, as the discussion above allows, that the well-off members served as benefactors.

Of interest is the reference to working hard. Paul refers in v. 6 to *πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν* ('laboured hard'); and in v. 12 to *κοπιώσας* ('work hard') and *πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν* ('worked hard') with reference to Tryphaena and Tryphosa on the one hand, and the 'dear friend' Persis on the other. Morris calls attention to the present tense used in the case of the two similar sounding names in this verse as opposed to the past tense used of Mary in v. 6 and of Persis in v. 12. He concludes that the present tense signifies continuity in this service while the past tense signifies that the other two women were probably old, but had worked hard when they were young.<sup>87</sup> These were most likely freedwomen with a great degree of independence. What did their working hard consist of? This is a difficult question to answer because of the paucity of information. That their service is valued by Paul indicates that it was no ordinary service. However, its nature may only have to be conjectured. They could have been woman who served the church in several acts of kindness, such as serving tables or setting the meeting venues, or something different.

While it cannot be ruled out completely, the rest of the designations in this chapter up to verse 13 use phrases that do not necessarily entail some service of a significant nature. In vv. 5b, 8, 9b, and 12b, Paul uses the phrases *τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου* ('dear friend'), and *τὸν ἀγαπητόν ἐν κυρίῳ* ('whom I love in the Lord'). Dunn notes that *τὸν ἀγαπητόν* "simply denotes a warm personal relationship, but not necessarily anything more specific."<sup>88</sup> For Watson, this indicates that they are well known to the apostle, a fact that is true also of Rufus and his mother whom Paul calls 'his mother and mine.'<sup>89</sup> It is however interesting that Epænetus is mentioned right after Priscilla and Aquila, and called *ὃς ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς Χριστόν* ('first convert

<sup>85</sup> Sanday and Headlam, 1895, p. 427. See also Morris, 1988, p. 537.

<sup>86</sup> See in addition, Murray, 1965, pp. 231-32; and Käsemann, 1973, p. 415, who says, "The lists in vv. 14 and 15 mention representative members of two house churches which include an unnamed number of other Christians."

<sup>87</sup> Morris, 1988, pp. 533 and 536 respectively.

<sup>88</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 893.

<sup>89</sup> Watson, F. *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles*. SNTSMS 56. (The University Press: Cambridge, 1986) p. 99.

in Asia'). Morris who translates this word as 'firstfruit' contends that the fact that this man was also called beloved means that he was dear to the apostle.<sup>90</sup> This however does not give any clue to the nature of the service this man rendered. In any case, the fact that he is now at Rome is an indication that he had enough funds to enable him to travel. In other words, although wealth was not the only condition for travel, he would fit neatly Theissen's category of references to travel.<sup>91</sup>

Paul uses συγγενεῖς ('relation, fellow-countryman') for Ἀνδρόνικον and Ἰουλιᾶν in v. 7a, and for Herodian in v. 11a. This is most likely a simple reference to their Jewish nationality. Andronicus and Junia (most probably husband and wife),<sup>92</sup> called συναιχμαλώτους μου ('fellow-prisoners'), is a reference Dunn contends "will hardly be metaphorical," though he admits that it is unclear "which of Paul's several imprisonments is in view."<sup>93</sup> More interesting is the fact that Paul says of them ἄτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ('who are outstanding among the apostles, and they were in Christ before I was'). This requires a bit of interpreting. For Paul, apostles comprise a wider circle than the twelve to include all those who witnessed the risen Lord, a criterion which included Paul because of his untimely birth (I Cor. 15: 8). So, the five hundred there mentioned in I Cor. 15: 7 are in Paul's reckoning apostles. But the fact that these persons are called 'outstanding' rates them higher than the rest. The immediate question however, is what accounts for this? Again, because of the paucity of information, this is a difficult question to answer. Dunn's comments on this are the best of the attempts at an answer:

---

<sup>90</sup> Morris, 1988, p. 533.

<sup>91</sup> For Theissen, travel was difficult in the Greco-Roman world and thus, the fact that one travelled is an indication of one's position and wealth. He does not mention this man in his analysis of references to travel in Theissen, 1982, pp. 91-94 because he was dealing primarily with the Corinthian church.

<sup>92</sup> The discussion of the name Ἰουλιᾶν has engaged scholarship from the patristic period involving scholars like Chrysostom who understood it as a feminine name. Modern scholars are however divided as to whether it is referring to a man or woman. Those who follow the patristic commentators in reading a feminine name appeal to the fact that there is no evidence for the masculine form of the name while 250 examples of the accusative form of the name referring to women are found. See for instance Dunn, 1988, p. 894; Cranfield, 1979, p. 788; Brooten, B.J. "Junia ... Outstanding Among the Apostles' (Rom. 16: 7)." In *Women Priests*, ed. L. and A. Swidler, (Paulist: New York, 1977): 141-144; and Lampe, P. "Iunia/Iunias: Sklavenherkunft im Kreise der vorpaulinischen Apostel (Röm 16: 7)." *ZNW* 76 (1985): 132-34. Those who argue for a feminine name find support in the fact that the accentuation of the name as in Nestle, Ἰουλιᾶν is masculine and possibly a contraction of 'Junianus' as in Patrobas, Hermas and Olumpas (See for instance Sanday and Headlam, 1988, p. 423; which Dunn, (1988, p. 894) thinks is "a striking indictment of male presumption regarding the character and structure of earliest Christianity." Other scholars simply think it is impossible to decide between the male and female readings of the name. See for instance Black, M. *Romans*. NCBC, Based on the Revised Standard Version. Second Edition (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids; Marshall, Morgan and Scott: London, 1973): 208; and Bruce, 1969, p. 271.

<sup>93</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 894

Whether they had played any role in founding one or more of the Roman (house) churches (cf. I Cor. 9: 1-2) and thus were apostles of (the body of Christ in) Rome (cf. I Cor. 12: 27-28) is left unclear by the text... We may firmly conclude, however, that one of the foundation apostles of Christianity was a woman and wife.<sup>94</sup>

This makes sense given the fact that Paul was not here reporting about the existence of woman apostles in early Christianity. He was therefore under no obligation to write more than what he writes here. This indicates that we know only very little about the early church - only what these sources which addressed specific issues reveal to us.

Urbanus is called *συνεργὸν ἡμῶν* ('our fellow-worker') in v. 9a, a designation that is similar to that of Priscilla and Aquila in v. 3, the difference being that here Paul says 'our' instead of 'my.' Murray understands this as meaning that he "was not therefore a companion of the apostle."<sup>95</sup> This does not inform our subject. So also are the designations *τὸν δόκιμον* ('tested and approved in Christ,' v. 10) and *τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν κυρίῳ* ('chosen in the Lord,' v. 13). Verse 23 is most interesting. It contains the greetings of one Gaius, a Corinthian, whose hospitality is being referred to. Paul says *ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Γάιος ὁ ξένος μου καὶ ὅλης ἐκκλησίας* ('Gaius, whose hospitality I and the whole church enjoy sends you his greetings'). This Gaius is almost certainly the Gaius mention in I Cor. 1: 14, whom Paul baptised.<sup>96</sup> The controversial question however, is whether the hospitality referred to here entails the provision of a place for the meetings of the whole church, or simply the provision of hospitality in terms of lodging for members of the universal church visiting Corinth. Käsemann contends that the latter of these views is meant here.<sup>97</sup> A more popular view is that which sees here the provision of a meeting place for the whole church in Corinth.<sup>98</sup> I Cor. 14: 26 clearly refers to the assembly of the whole church. There is no reason why this should not be the case here. This speaks for the fact that this man was wealthy enough to own a large house to accommodate the whole church in Corinth.<sup>99</sup> This in turn speaks against the conception which sees the early Christians as comprising only members of the lower social class.

---

<sup>94</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 895. See also Morris, 1988, p. 534.

<sup>95</sup> Murray, 1965, p. 230.

<sup>96</sup> See, Dunn, 1991, p. 910; Käsemann, 1980, p. 421; Morris, 1988, p. 544. Sanday and Headlam, 1895, p. 432; etc.

<sup>97</sup> Käsemann, 1980, p. 421.

<sup>98</sup> See typically, Dunn, 1991, p. 910; Theissen, 1982, p. 94; etc. That Paul was writing from Corinth is supported by the fact that 16: 1 refers to Phoebe from Cenchreae, and 15: 25-33 indicate that Paul was getting ready to go to Jerusalem with the collection now completed.

<sup>99</sup> This is the whole argument of Theissen, 1982, pp. 83-87.

The reference to Erastus here among the few persons from Corinth sending greetings to the church at Rome is an indication of his importance. He is described as ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως ('city treasurer'). However the argument is not so simple. Dunn notes that ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως could be a description of a one highly ranked in the 'administrative hierarchy,' "but also a role fulfilled by slaves and freedmen."<sup>100</sup> Theissen has argued convincingly that even though a freedman, this man had climbed high on the ladder of the hierarchy to a rank that may have been an equivalent of a quaestor, to the rank of an aedile.<sup>101</sup> He discusses the issue in three levels: evaluating all NT statements, consulting parallels outside the NT, and analysing inscriptional evidence on the Corinthian offices. On the NT statements, he notes two other occurrences of this name (2 Tim. 4: 20 and Acts 19: 22), all linked with Corinth. He concludes that the qualifying phrase here distinguishes this man from the other 'Erastoi' who would have been known to the Corinthians. On the negative side, he notes that the Vulgate translation uses *arcarius civitatis* to describe this man, and that it "means a low-level financial bureaucrat, usually a slave;" but also points out that this translation could have been influenced by I Cor. 1: 26ff. On the evidence from outside the NT, Theissen discusses the general linguistic usage of the word οἰκονόμος as well as the inscriptional evidence which is ample for the Roman period. He notes however that there is evidence of some officers with this description who were slaves, and that the office can be of a "less significant person employed in financial administration, possibly even a slave to be regarded as the city's property." The evidence about offices in Corinth includes an inscription referring to an Erastus which reads: [*praenomen nomen*] *Erastus pro aedilit[at]e s[ua] p[ro] pecunia stravit* ("Erastus laid [the pavement] at his own expense in return for his aedileship").<sup>102</sup> The question is whether the Corinthian aedile is the same as the οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως in Romans 16: 23. Theissen thinks this possibility must be allowed even though it cannot be satisfactorily proven. Another possibility, he says is that οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως might have been an office Erastus held before he became aedile. But did Paul mention him here simply because he wanted to distinguish him from the other 'Erastoi'? This is possible, but it is possible also that he mentions this man for his outstanding contributions to the church in Corinth. Such contributions could have been financial or material.

<sup>100</sup> Dunn, 1991, p. 911.

<sup>101</sup> Theissen, 1982, p. 75-83.

<sup>102</sup> I am here using Kent's reconstruction in Kent, J. H. *Corinth, Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens VIII, 3. The Inscriptions 1926-1950* (The American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Princeton N.J., 1966), no. 232 cited and discussed by Theissen, 1982, p. 80.

Philemon 2 is another passage that similarly refers to a house church in another location, Colossae. Here, Philemon, whom Paul calls fellow-worker, together with Apphia (probably his wife), and Archippus (probably his son) opened their house for the meetings of the church there. This man was a man of "love" and "faith" which is expressed concretely in the opening of his house for the worship of the church. The reference in v. 22 is to a different kind of hospitality - the opening of his house for the accommodation of travelling missionaries, here Paul himself included. This speaks for the wealth of this individual who could provide room for the meetings of the church as well as for the travelling missionary.

### **8.6. Conclusion.**

The evidence from the study of these passages therefore show that the existence of house churches in the Pauline mission and in Rome is an established fact. The provision of houses by well-off members of the churches was almost the norm. Paul valued this kind of service from the individuals in the progress of his mission. Paul also enjoyed from his converts other services the nature of which we may never know. Because this employed the social convention of benefaction which was the bedrock of most, if not all institutions of the day, the four social models prove very helpful in enhancing the understanding of this subject.

## CONCLUSION.

The first point that stands out conspicuously from this study is the fact that our texts provide very little direct evidence. The Pauline epistles were written to meet specific needs. This means that issues which did not arise as specific problems needing to be solved, or exceptional performances demanding commendation, were left out of the records that have come down to us. The use of models has helped us 'flesh out' an understanding of what is going on behind the hints in the text.<sup>1</sup> Without models, this task is left to the imagination of the scholar, a procedure that cannot be tested. Models on the other hand allow testing and validation to take place.

Our study has confirmed the assumptions with which we started. What comes out forcefully is that Paul was a man of his culture. Closely related to that is the fact that he responded well, and showed remarkable understanding of Jewish as well as Greco-Roman culture. This means that the hellenistic Paul blended well with the Jewish Paul, more than we are prepared to accept, may be!<sup>2</sup> This also confirms Meeks' conclusion that all four models have something to offer. Also, as Meeks emphasises, no one model tells the whole story. All four models taken together, however, provide an impressive picture of which the Pauline texts give only clues.

First, it is confirmed that Greco-Roman patronage, benefaction, and the convention on friendship, greatly influenced Paul's acceptance and rejection of support from the churches. Quite definitely, Paul shows remarkable sensitivity to the ongoing debate on teachers' pay which was a subject current in the schools of his day. Here the model of hellenistic schools provides a distinct perspective for the understanding of this aspect of the church's finances, showing that Paul acted within the confines of his culture and responded to those conceptions which were current when he wrote these texts. Paul shows this sensitivity in his discussion of the issue of apostolic support, as well

---

<sup>1</sup> So Carney, 1975, p. 17 who uses the phrase 'patch out', and goes on to comment about what models can enable us do: "So we may be able to patch over a gap in our data with a probable hypothesis which will enable us to proceed with our analysis."

<sup>2</sup> See Engberg-Pedersen, 1994, pp. xviii-xix who writing an introduction to a collection of essays he edited comments: "Since it is determined not to let any given theological interest colour its comparison of Paul with phenomena in his cultural context, whether (originally) Jewish or (originally) Greek, it is entirely open to seeing Paul as a confluence of ideas, motifs, and practices of almost any provenance. Thus if a scholar succeeds in establishing important points of contact between Pauline Christianity and other Jewish religious groups, this is not to be taken as an argument for a specifically Jewish Paul, nor does it exclude the possibility that there may be equally important points of contact with non-Jewish, specifically Hellenistic groups, and vice versa. Paul was neither *specifically* Jewish nor *specifically* Hellenistic. Any one- or two-word categorisation of him should be avoided."

as his acceptance and non-acceptance of support from the churches. His emphases on freedom and independence, as we have seen, leaves no doubt about this, and is best understood in light of this ongoing debate. Closely related to this is the fact that Paul shows remarkable awareness to the issues involved in the convention on exchange of goods and services. He shows how he was concerned about the aspect of reciprocity, as well as the fact that acceptance places the receiver in a position of indebtedness to the giver. As a general rule, he was not going to allow himself to become bound to someone; rather he insists on his independence. This was however not the only influence on Paul's decision on this issue. As stressed in our discussion of the texts, Paul appealed to the scriptures to support his arguments on apostolic support. This appeals to the model of the synagogue in which we explored the OT ideal of support of priests. We must conclude therefore that on the question of support from the churches, the models of the Hellenistic schools and the synagogue are most useful in providing an enhanced understanding of the Pauline texts. In addition, the model of the family aids our understanding of Paul's use of hospitality, and his imageries of parent-child or nurse-child relationship.

Secondly, it is confirmed that Paul's choice to work for a living rather than depending on the support of the churches, as well as the choice of the particular trade he adopted, is best understood in the light of the contemporary perception. Paul shows a remarkable awareness, not only of the rabbinic attitude to work, but also of the philosophical discussion on the subject. By working on a trade, he accepts the rabbinic ideal of combining the study of the Torah with working on a trade. But also in his paraenesis on work he shows how conversant he was with 'quietism' as a philosophical *topos*. Thus we may conclude that the models of the synagogue and the philosophical schools enable us to 'flesh out' the details on this subject. He chose to work in order to maintain his independence. It is not very clear why he chose the particular trade he adopted, but the sentiments he expressed were those any upper class citizen would have expressed towards manual labour. This has implications for the understanding of Paul's personal status.

Thirdly, it is confirmed that the convention on exchange of goods and services influenced Paul's discussion of trans-local finances represented in the collection project. The language he uses shows that he understood it as a kind of benefaction. Benefaction being the bedrock of all Greco-Roman institutions was central in the running of all four institutions represented in the models, making their study a very useful exercise. With ὀφειλή, Paul shows that he viewed the gifts of the churches of his mission for Jerusalem in the light of the convention on exchange of goods and services. Again, this is best understood in the light of the particular aspect of the

convention which obligates reciprocity for any service or gift received. Similarly, *κοινωνία* falls under this category, and was an ideal desired by all four institutions.

Next, it is confirmed that Paul's discussion of the local finances of the churches reflects the practice in all four models. The models of the associations and the synagogue provide at least a partial analogy to Paul's insistence that the members of the churches support one another by bearing each other's burdens. For instance, charitable giving was central in ancient Judaism, and Paul seems to be appealing to this here. In addition, the synagogue and especially the associations depended heavily on the donations of rich benefactors which amounted to large sums of money. In fact, as we have seen, the wealthy were morally obliged to give in ancient Judaism. The Hippocratic oath provides a remarkable parallel to the filial relationship Paul advocates for the churches as well as the responsibility that went with it. Also, hospitality which sustained the house churches, was very much central in the family model as it is in all the other models.

Finally, it is confirmed that although Paul was quite happy to appeal to the practices in these contemporary institutions, which he borrowed and adopted, he equally felt free to rework and reshape such practices to suit his liking. In this respect, his motivation and guiding principle was his perception of the gospel message and especially his understanding of his calling as an apostle. For instance, we can recall the discussion of apostolic rights (see 5.2.2.), where we saw that this determined his decision not to allow himself to be supported by the church even though that was his right (*ἐξουσία*). His perception of the gospel and the effect it had on his life seems clearly the overriding principle that guided the way he reworked and reshaped the practices he borrowed from his social milieu. This confirms also that Paul's perception of the gospel message is best understood within his social context, which in turn supports our interest in the social and cultural world of early Christianity. Surely, the gospel is to be understood within a social and cultural context. We can only appropriate and receive it in our social and cultural contexts if we first of all understand its early beginnings within its social setting. The fact that Paul adopted some of the practices of his social milieu is significant. It indicates that the gospel is not totally opposed to the cultural practices in society, but only to those aspects that are against its message.

So, the usefulness of these 'models from the environment' is confirmed. They provide the tools with which data can be gathered and evaluated. As emphasised in the introduction, these models have enabled us choose a selective perception of the Pauline situation, have served as cognitive filters, have enabled us handle data well, and have provided new perception. More importantly, they have helped us avoid a



misreading of NT texts in light of our unconscious assumptions about church life, and about giving and receiving in general. Jewett's humorous reading of works on the Thessalonian correspondence brings out clearly the fact that these unconscious assumptions can greatly influence our reading of biblical texts without us knowing.<sup>3</sup>

To return to the Nigerian situation which called for this study, the discoveries we have made have proved most useful in answering the questions the average church leader confronts on a daily basis. Paul's insistence to maintain his freedom and independence and not to put a hindrance in the way of the gospel should answer questions that relate to 'corrupt' benefactors and attitudes to bribery. The church should be able to dispense with such benefaction, and thus not come into disrepute. Similarly, Paul's choice to work on a trade as a means of achieving his freedom and independence is probably worth emulating by church leaders and missionaries whose circumstances allow for such a step to be taken. The avoidance of a charge of avarice or greed should be paramount in the valuation of such church leaders and missionaries. Also very useful is Paul's discussion in answering questions that relate to the running of local and trans-local finances. Paul's key theological point, namely, that Christian charity is an act of grace (χάρις) which finds its perfect demonstration in what Christ did, should prove useful in answering those questions. Similarly, Paul's discussion of such acts of charity in terms of sowing and reaping should provide the motivation needed.

---

<sup>3</sup> Jewett, 1986, pp. 135-142 discusses three traditional models scholars have unconsciously brought into discussions of the Thessalonian situation: (a) the model of the revivalistic congregation which equates the situation in Thessalonica with a present day Protestant church in England and North America experiencing a revival with emphasis on a 'vital and enthusiastic religious life', 'spontaneity', and 'intense expressions of the spirit'; (b) the model of a decent but impractical congregation with an overly literal eschatology which paints the picture of 'an ideal European Protestant congregation of the nineteenth century - sturdy, attentive to duties, and loyal to the proper theological principles of faith and hope' (p. 138); and (c) the model of an average congregation facing minor confusions and outside pressures in which Best paints a picture of 'the typical British, Continental or North American congregation of the twentieth century, generally marked by low spiritual intensity, an amorphous doctrinal and moral legacy, and exhibiting no serious internal problems while standards of decency are being resolutely maintained and outside pressures resisted' (p. 140).

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.

### Reference Works

- Bowker, J.** *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1969).
- Charles, R.H.** *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, vol. 1 (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1965).
- *et al.* *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English: With Introduction and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books.* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1979).
- Charlesworth, J.H. ed.** *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 2. (Darton, Longman and Todd: London, 1985).
- Coggins, R.J. and Houlden, J.L. (ed.)** *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (SCM Press: London, 1990).
- Cross, F. L. and Livingstone, E. A. eds.** *ODCC* second Edition (Oxford University Press: London, 1974).
- Danby, H.** *The Mishna: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes.* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1964).
- Fredman, D. N. ed.** *ABD* vol., 2 D-G (Doubleday: New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland, 1992):
- Hawthorne, G.F. et al eds.** *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Inter-varsity Press: Leicester, 1993).
- Horbury, W. and Noy, D.** *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt: With an Index of the Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrenaica.* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1992).
- Lewis, N. and Reinhold, M. eds.** *Roman Civilization Sourcebook II: The Empire.* (Harper and Row: New York, 1966).
- Lifshitz, B.** *Donateurs et Fondateurs dans les Synagogues Juives: Répertoire des dédicaces grecques relatives à la construction et à la réfection des synagogues.* (J. Gabalda et cie: Paris, 1967).
- Malherbe, A.J.** *The Cynic Epistles.* (Scholars Press: Missoula, Montana, 1977a).

### General.

- Adkins, A. W. H.** "Polupragmosune and 'Minding One's Own Business': A Study in Greek Social and Political Values", *CPh* 71 (1976): 301-27.

- Atkins Jr., Robert R.** *Egalitarian Community: Ethnography and Exegesis*. (The University of Alabama Press: Tuscaloosa and London, 1991).
- Alexander, L.C.A.** "Hellenistic Schools and the New Testament", (A Short Paper delivered at the British New Testament Conference, Wills Hall, Bristol, Unpublished, Sept. 14th 1989).
- . "Hellenistic Letter-forms and the Structure of Philippians" *JSNT* 37 (1989): 87-101.
- . "Schools, Hellenistic" in *ABD*. Vol. 5 (Doubleday: New York, London, 1992): 1005-1011
- . "Chronology of Paul" in eds. Hawthorne *et al.* *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Inter-varsity Press: Illinois and Leicester, 1993).
- . "Paul and the Hellenistic Schools: the Evidence of Galen" in Troels Engberg-Pedersen, ed., *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*. (T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1994) 60-83.
- . "Narrative Maps: Reflections on the Toponymy of Acts" in M. Daniel Carroll R., David J.A. Clines and Philip R. Davies (edited) *The Bible in Human Society: Essays in Honour of John Rogerson* JSOT Supplement Series 200 (1995).
- Alexander, P.S.** "Midrash" in Coggins, R.J. and Houlden, J.L. (ed.) *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (SCM Press: London, 1990).
- Appelbaum, S.** "The Social and Economic Status of the Jews in the Diaspora" in Safrai, S. and Stern, M. et al. *CRINT*. in 2 volumes (Van Gorcum & Comp. B.V. - Assen: 1974)
- Astin, A.E.** "Literary Patronage", *OCD* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1970) 790-791.
- Aune, D.E.** "Human Nature and Ethics in Hellenistic Philosophical Traditions and Paul: Some Issues and Problems" in Engberg-Pedersen, T. ed. *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*, (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1994): 291-312.
- Attalides, M.** "Forms of Peasant Incorporation in Cyprus During the Last Century", in eds. Gellner, E. and Waterbury, J. *Patrons and Clients* (Duckworth: London, 1977).
- Barclay, John M.G.** *Obedying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1988),
- Barnett, P.W.** "Opposition in Corinth", *JSNT* 22 (1984) 3-17.
- Barrett, C.K.** *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Harper and Row: New York and A & C Black: London, 1968).
- . *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* ((Harper and Row: New York and Adam & Charles Black: London, 1973).

- . "Christianity at Corinth", *BJRL*. Vol. 46 (Aberdeen University Press: Aberdeen, 1964): 269-97.
- . "Titus", in *Essays on Paul* (SPCK: London and Westminster Press: Philadelphia, 1982) 118-131.
- Beare, F. W.** *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (Adam & Charles Black: London, 1959).
- . *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary*. (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1981).
- Beet, J. A.** "The Christian Secret", *Expositor*, 3rd Series, Vol. 10 (1889) 174-189.
- Benko, S.** "Pagan Criticism of Christianity During the First Two Centuries CE" in *ANRW II* (Walter de Gruyter: Berlin, New York, 1980): 1056-1118.
- Best, E.** *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistle to the Thessalonians* (A&C Black: London, 1972).
- . *Second Corinthians: Interpretation* (J.Knox Press: Atlanta Georgia, 1987).
- Betz, H.D.** *Der Apostle Paulus und die Sokratische Tradition*. (J. C. B. Mohr: Tübingen, 1972).
- . *A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Church in Galatia* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1979).
- . *Second Corinthians 8 and 9* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1985).
- Black, M.** *Romans*. NCBC, Based on the Revised Standard Version. Second Edition (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids; Marshall, Morgan and Scott: London, 1973).
- Block, A.** "Variations in Patronage", *Sociological Gids* 16 (1968) 365-378. d c
- Blue, B.** "Acts and the House Church" in Winter, B.W. (series editor) *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan; and The Paternoster Press: Carlisle, 1994).
- Boissevain, J.** *Friends of Friends: Networks, Manipulators and Coalitions* (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, , 1974).
- Bolchazy, L.J.** *Hospitality in Early Rome: Livy's Concept of its Humanising Force*. (Ares Publishing Inc.: Chicago, 1977).
- Bormann, L.** *Philippi: Stadt und Christengemeinde zur Zeit des Paulus*. NovTSup. Vol. LXXVII (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995);
- Bornkamm, G.** "History of the Origin of the So-Called Second Letter to the Corinthians", *NTS* 8, (1962) 258-264.

- . "The Missionary Stance of Paul in I Cor. 9 and in Acts", in *Studies in Luke-Acts* . Keck, L.E and Martyn, J.L. eds. (Abingdon: Nashville, 1966).
- . *Paul*. Tr. Stalker, M.G. (Hodder and Stoughton: London, Sydney, Auckland, and Toronto, 1969).
- Bowersock, G.W.** *The Sophists in the Roman Empire*. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1969).
- . *Approaches to the Second Sophistic: Papers Presented at the 105th Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association*. (University Park: Pennsylvania, 1974).
- Braund, D.** "Function and Dysfunction: Personal Patronage in Roman Imperialism", in ed. Wallace-Hadrill, *A Patronage in Ancient Society* (Routledge: London, 1989), 171-185.
- Brickhouse, T.C. & Smith, N.D.** *Socrates on Trial*. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1989),
- Brooten, Bernadette J.** *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues*. Brown Judaic Studies, (Scholars Press: Chico, California, 1982).
- . "Junia ... Outstanding Among the Apostles' (Rom. 16: 7)." In *Women Priests*, ed. L. and A. Swidler, (Paulist: New York, 1977): 141-144.
- Bruce, F.F.** *I and II Corinthians* NCB (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, and Marshall, Morgan & Scott: London, 1971).
- . *Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free*. (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids. UK title *Paul, Apostle of the Heart Set Free*. Paternoster: Exeter, 1977).
- . *First and Second Thessalonians*, Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 45 (Waco Books: Waco Texas, 1982).
- . *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Testament*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (The Paternoster Press: Exeter, 1982).
- . *Romans*. Tyndale NTC (Inter Varsity Press, Leicester, 1983).
- . *The Book of the Acts* Revised Edition. (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1989).
- Brunt, P. A.** *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1988).
- Buchanan, C.O.** "Epaphroditus' Sickness and the Letter to the Philippians" *EvQ* 36 (1964) 157-166.
- Bultmann, R.** *The Second Letter to the Corinthians* (Augsburg Publishing House: Minneapolis, 1985).

- Burford, A.** *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society*, (Thames and Hudson Ltd.: London, 1972).
- Campbell, J. Y.** "Κοινωνία and its Cognates in the New Testament." *JBL* 51 (1932): 352-80, repr. in *Three New Testament Studies* (Brill: Leiden, 1965) 1-28.
- Caragounis, C. C.** "Οψωνιοις: A Reconstruction of its Meaning" *NovT.* 16 (1974) 36-57.
- Carney, T. F.** *The Shape of the Past: Models and Antiquity*. (Coronado Press: Lawrence, Kansas, 1975).
- Carson, H. M.** *The Epistle of Paul to Colossians and Philemon*, TNTC, (Tyndale Press: London, 1966).
- Casson, L.** *Travel in the Ancient World*. (Allen and Unwin: London, 1974).
- Chadwick, H.** "All Things to All Men", *NTS* 1 (1954-55): 261-75.
- Clark, G.** *Iamblichus: On the Pythagorean Life* (University Press: Liverpool, 1989).
- Clarke, A. D.** *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of I Corinthians 1-6*. (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln, 1993).
- Clayton N. Jefford** edited, *The Didache in Context*. *NovTSup.*, vol. 77 (E.J. Brill: Leiden, New York, and Köln, 1995):
- Collange, J. F.** *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians* Translated from the First French Edition by A.W. Heathcote (Epworth Press: London, 1979).
- Connolly, A. L.** "The Dangers of Sea Travel" in Horsley, G.H.R. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. vol. 4 (The Ancient History Documentary Research Centre: Macquarie University, 1987): document 26, pp. 113-117.
- Conzelmann, H. A.** *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1975).
- Craddock, F. B.** "The Poverty of Christ: An Investigation of II Corinthians 8: 9" in *Interpretation* 22 (1968): 258-70.
- Cranfield, C. E. B.** *Romans* ICC Vol. II (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1979).
- Creed, J. M.** *The Gospel According to St. Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. (MacMillan: London, 1950).
- Crook, J. A.** "Patria Potestas" *CQ* 17 (1967): 113-122
- Culpepper, R. A.** *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools*. (Scholars Press: Missoula, 1975).

- . "Co-workers in Suffering, Phil. 2: 19-30", *RevExp.* 77 (1980) 349-358.
- Dahl, N. A.** "Paul and the Church at Corinth According to I Cor. 1:10 - 4: 21" in *Christian History and Interpretation*. Farmer, W.R., Moule, C.F.D; and Neibuhr, R.R. eds. (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1967).
- . "Paul and Possessions", in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Augsburg Publishing House: Minneapolis, 1977).
- Daube, D.** *Roman Law: Linguistic, Social and Philosophical Aspects* (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 1969).
- Davies, J.L.** "Saint Paul's *χαρίς*" *Expositor 4th Series*, 5 (1892) 343-346.
- Davies, W.D.** *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (The University Press: Cambridge, 1964).
- Davies, W.D. and Allison, D.C. Jr.** *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 volumes. (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1988).
- de Ste Croix, G.E.M.** *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, (Duckworth: London, 1981).
- De Witt, N. W.** "Organisation and Procedure in Epicurean Groups", in *CPh* 31 (1936): 205-211.
- . *Epicurus and his Philosophy*. (University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 1954).
- Deissmann, A.** *Light From the Ancient East* ET. 2nd edition (Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1927).
- . *Bible Studies* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1923).
- Diels, Hermann and Kranz, Walther.** *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 3. *de* vols.; (Weidmann: Dublin, 1966).
- Dixon, S.** "Family Finances: Terentia and Tullia" in Rawson, B. (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome*. (Croom Helm Ltd., London, 1986).
- Dodd, C.H.** "Εὐνομος Χριστοῦ", in *More New Testament Studies* (Manchester University Press: Manchester, 1968): 38-46.
- Downing, F.G.** *Cynics and Christian Origins*. (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1992).
- Dudley, D.R.** *A History of Cynicism*, (Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung: Hildesheim, 1967).
- Dungan, D.L.** *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul: The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of the Early Church* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1971).
- Dunn, J.D.D.** *Romans 9-16* WBC, Vol. 38b, (Word [UK] Ltd: Milton Keynes, 1991).

- Düring, I.** *Chion of Heraclea: A Novel in Letters* (Wettergren & Kerbers: Gothenburg, 1951).
- Edwards, O.C.** "Sociology as a Tool for Interpreting the New Testament" *ATR* 65 (1983): 431-448.
- Ehrenberg, V.** "Polypragmosyne: A Study in Greek Politics" *JHS* 67 (1947): 46-67.
- Elliott, John H.** *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of I Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1982).
- . "Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: Review Essay*." *RSR* II No. 4 (1985): 329-335.
- Ellis, E.E.** "Paul and His Co - Workers" *NTS* 17, (1970-71), pp. 437-52
- Ellison, H.L.** "Paul and the Law - All Things to All Men", in *Apostolic History and the Gospel, Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. f. Bruce on His 60th Birthday* Edited by Gasque, W. and Martin, R.P. (Paternoster Press: Exeter, 1970).
- Engberg-Pedersen, T.** ed. *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*, (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1994).
- Esler, Philip F.** *The First Christians in their Social Worlds: Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. (Routledge: London and New York, 1994).
- . (ed.) *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*. (Routledge: London and New York, 1995).
- Fee, G.D.** "Χαρις in II Corinthians 1: 15: Apostolic Parousia and Paul-Corinth Chronology", *NTS* 24 (1977-78) 533-538.
- . *The New International Commentary on the New Testament: The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (W. B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1987).
- Findlay, G.G.** *Christian Doctrine and Morals* (Chas. H. Kelly: London, 1894).
- . *Saint Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthian*. (W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1961).
- Finley, M.I.** *The World of Odysseus*. Second Edition (Chatto & Windus: London, 1977).
- . *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* edited with introduction by Shaw, B.D. and Saller, R.P. (Chatto & Windus: London, 1981)
- . *The Ancient Economy* . Second Edition (The Hogarth Press: London, 1985).
- Florenza, E.S.** *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. (Crossroad: New York, 1983).



- Fitzmyer, J. A.** *The Anchor Bible. The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes.* (Doubleday & Company, Inc.: Garden City, New York, 1981).
- Forbes, C. A.** *Teachers' Pay in Ancient Greece,* (University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, (1942).
- , "Comparison, Self Praise, and Irony: Paul's Boasting and the Conventions of Hellenistic Rhetoric", *NTS* (1986) 1-30.
- Fox, R. L.** *Pagans and Christians.* (Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.: New York, 1987).
- Frame, J. E.** *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1946).
- Fraser, P. M.** *Ptolemaic Alexandria* Vol. 1. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1972).
- Furnish, V. P.** *The Anchor Bible, II Corinthians.* Vol. 32A, Translated With Notes and Commentary. (Doubleday: Garden City, New York, 1985).
- Gager, John G.** *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity.* (Prentice-Hall, Inc.: New Jersey, 1975).
- , "Shall We Marry Our Enemies?" *Interpretation* 36 (1982): 256-265.
- Gale, H. M.** *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul* (Westminster Press: Philadelphia, 1964).
- Garland, D. E.** "Philippians 1: 1-26: The Defence and Confirmation of the Gospel", *RevExp.* 77 (1980): 327-36.
- Gardner, J. F. and Wiedemann, T.** *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook* (Routledge: London, , 1991).
- Gellner, E.** "Patrons and Clients" in *Patrons and Clients*, ed. Gellner, E. and Waterbury, J., (Duckworth: London, 1977).
- Georgi, D.** *Remembering the Poor: A History of Paul's Collection for Jerusalem* English Translation, (Abingdon Press: Nashville, 1992).
- Gill, D. W. J.** "Acts and the Urban Élites" in Winter, B. W. (series editor) *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting* vol. 2. (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan; and The Paternoster Press: Carlisle, 1994).
- Glad, Clarence E.** *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy* NovTSup. (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995).
- Goodman, M.** *The Ruling Class of Judea.* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1987).
- Goodspeed, E. J.** "Gaius Titus Justus", *JBL* 69 (1950): 382-383.
- Gould, J. B.** *The Philosophy of Chrysippus.* (State University of New York Press: Albany, 1970).

- Grabbe, L.L.** *Judaism From Cyrus to Hadrian*. 2 vols. (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1992).
- Griffin, M.T.** *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1976).
- Grosheide, F.W.** *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London, 1954).
- Guelich, R.A.** *The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding*. (Word Books: Waco Texas, 1983).
- Gundry, R.H.** *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. (William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan 1982).
- Guthrie, W.K.C.** *History of Greek Philosophy* 3. vols. (University Press: Cambridge, 1962).
- The Sophists*, (University Press: Cambridge, 1971).
- Gutmann, J.** *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture*, (Ktav Publishing House, Inc.: New York, 1975).
- Haenchen, E.** *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1982).
- Hagner, D.A.** *Matthew 1-3* WBC, (Word Books Publisher: Dallas, Texas, 1993).
- Hall, D.R.** "Paul and Famine Relief: A Study in Galatians 2: 10", *ExpTim.* 82 (1970- 71): 309-311.
- Harris, O.G.** "The Social World of Early Christianity" *LTQ* 19,3 (1984): 102-114.
- Harrington, Daniel J., S.J.** ed. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra Pagina Series, (The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1991) .
- Harvey, F.D.** "Dona Ferentes: Some Aspects of Bribery in Greek Politics", in *Crux, Essays Presented to G.E.M. de Ste Croix on His Seventy-fifth Birthday*, eds. Cartledge, P.A. and Harvey, F.D. (Imprint Academic: Exeter, 1985).
- Hatch, E.** *The Organisation of the Early Churches: Eight Lectures Delivered Before the University of Oxford, in the Year 1880* (Rivingtons: London, 1881).
- Hawthorne, G.F.** *Philippians* WBC, (Word [UK] Ltd: Milton Keynes, 1991).
- Heinrici, C.F.G.** "Die Christengemeinde Korinths und die religiösen Genossenschaften der Griechen." *ZWT.* (1876): 465-526.
- Hengel, M.** "Die Synagogeninschrift von Stobi", *ZNW* (1966): 145-183.
- "Proseuche und Synagoge" in Gutmann, J. *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture*, (Ktav Publishing House: New York, 1975).
- *The Pre-Christian Paul*. (SCM Press: London; Trinity Press International: Philadelphia, 1991).

- Héring, J.** *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (Epworth Publishing Company: London, 1962).
- *The Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*. Originally CNT, Tr. Heathcote, A.W. and Allcock, P.J. (Epworth Publishing Company: London, 1967).
- Hermann, P. et al.** "Genessenschaft" in *RAC* 4 (Hiersemann: Stuttgart, 1959), cols. 94ff.
- Hock, R. F.** "Simon the Shoemaker as an Ideal Cynic", *GRBS* 17 (1976): 41-53.
- *The Working Apostle: An Examination of Paul's Means of Livelihood* (PhD. Yale, 1974; Ann Arbor University Microfilms Inc., 1978).
- "Paul's Tentmaking and the Problem of His Social Class", *JBL* 97 (1979) 558-61.
- "The Workshop as a Social Setting for Paul's Missionary Preaching", *CBQ* 41 (1979): 438-50.
- *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1983).
- Hodge, C.** *An Exposition of the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (Banner of Truth Trust: London, 1958).
- Holl, K.** "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in Seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde", in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte II* (J.C.B Mohr: Tübingen, 1928): 2: 44-67.
- Holmberg, B.** *Paul and Power*. (Part 1) *Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament*, 11 (Gleerup: Lund, 1978).
- *Sociology of the NT: An Appraisal*. (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1990).
- Hopwood, K.** "Bandits and Rural Order", in *Patronage in Ancient Society*, Edited by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, (Routledge: London, 1989).
- Horsley, G.H.R.** *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* vol. 4 (The Ancient History documentary Research Centre: Macquarie University, 1987).
- "Sophia, 'The Second Phoebe'" in *New Documents* (SNTS, August, 1988): 239-244.
- Hughes, P.E.** *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott: London, 1962).
- Hurd, J.C.** *The Origins of I Corinthians* (Mercer University Press: Macon G.A.; 1983).
- Hurtado, L.W.** "The Jerusalem Collection and the Book of Galatians," *JSNT* 5 (1979) 46-62.
- Jaeger, W.** *Aristotle: Fundamentals of the History of his Development* Second Edition (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1962).

- Jeremias, J.** *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into the Economic and Social Conditions During the NT Period.* (SCM Press: London, 1969).
- Jervell, J. and Meeks, W.A. eds.** *God's Christ and His People: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl.* (Universitetsforlaget: Oslo, Bergen, and Tromsø, 1977b).
- Jewett, R.** "The Epistolary Thanksgiving and the Integrity of Philippians", *NovT.* 12 (1970) 40-53.
- *Dating Paul's Life.* (SCM Press Ltd: London, 1979).
- *Jewett, R. The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety.* Foundations and facets. New Testament. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1986).
- Johnson, T and Dandeker, C.** "Patronage: Relation and System." in Ed. Wallace-Hadrill, A. *Patronage in Ancient Society* (Routledge: London, 1989).
- Jones, C.P.** *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 1978).
- Judge, E.A.** *The Social Patterns of Christian Groups in the First Century* (Tyndale Press: London, 1960a).
- "The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community: Part II" in *JRH* 1 (1960b): 125-137.
- "Cultural Conformity and Innovations in Paul: some Clues from Contemporary Documents", *TynB* (1984) 15-23.
- Käsemann, E.** "A Pauline Version of the 'Amor Fati'" in *New Testament Questions Today* ET. (SCM Press: London, 1969).
- *Commentary on Romans* (SCM Press: London, 1980).
- Keck, L.E.** "The Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament", *ZNW* 56 (1965) 100-129.
- "The Poor Among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran", *ZNW* 57 (1966) 54-78.
- Kee, Howard C.** *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspectives.* (SCM Press Ltd.: London, 1980).
- *Knowing the Truth: A Sociological Approach to NT Interpretation* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1989).
- Kent, J. H.** *Corinth, Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* VIII, 3. The Inscriptions 1926-1950 (The American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Princeton N.J., 1966).
- Kerferd, G. B.** *The Sophistic Movement.* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1981).

- Kindler, A.** "Donations and Taxes in the Society of the Jewish Villages in Eretz Israel During the Third to the Sixth Centuries CE" in *Ancient Synagogues in Israel, the Third-Seventh Centuries CE: Proceedings of Symposium, University of Haifa, May 1987*. ed. Rachel hachlili, (B. A. R.: Oxford, 1989).
- Kindstrand, J.F.** "Demetrius the Cynic" in *Philologus* 124 (1980): 83-98.
- Kraabel, A.T.** "The Diaspora Synagogue: Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence since Sukenik", in *ANRW*, II.19.1 (1979): 477-510.
- Kramm, T.** "Amt" in *RAC* (1981): 351-401.
- Kruse, C.G.** *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary* (Inter-Varsity: Leicester, 1987).
- Kyrtatas, D.J.** *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities* (Verso: New York, and Methuen & Co.: London, 1987).
- Lacey, W.K.** *The Family in Classical Greece*. (Thames and Hudson: London, 1968).
- La Piana, G.** "Foreign in Rome During the First Centuries of the Empire" in *HTR* 20, No. 4 (1927) 225-281.
- Lampe, P.** "Iunia/Iunias: Sklavenherkunft im Kreise der vorpaulinischen Apostel (Röm 6:7)." *ZNW* 76 (1985): 132-34
- Lees, H.C.** "Epaphroditus, God's Gambler", *ExpTim.* 37 (1925) 46.
- Lentz, J.C.** *Luke's Portrait of Paul* (University Press: Cambridge, 1993).
- Lietzmann, H.** "Zur Altchristlichen Verfassungsgeschichte" in *ZWT* 55 (1914): 98-153. A t
- Lieu, J., North, J. and Rajak, T.** (eds.) *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*. (Routledge: London and New York, 1992).
- Lieu, J.** *The Second and Third Epistles of John: History and Background* T&T Clark: Edinburgh (1986).
- "History and Theology in Christian views of Judaism", in Lieu, J., North, J. and Rajak, T. (eds.) *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*. (Routledge: London and New York, 1992): 79-96.
- Lightfoot, J.B.** *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (Macmillan: London, 1878).
- Lohse, E.** *Colossians and Philemon* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1971).
- Lüdemann, G.** *Paul Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology*. Tr. F. Stanley Jones (Fortress: Philadelphia, and SCM Ltd: London, 1984).
- Lyons, G.** *Pauline Autobiography: Towards a New Understanding*, SBLDS 72, (Scholars Press: Atlanta, 1985).

- Lynch, J.P.** *Aristotle's School: A Study of a Greek Educational Institution*.  
(University of California Press: Los Angeles and Berkeley; London,  
1972).
- Mackay, B.S.** "Further Thoughts on Philippians", *NTS* 7 (1961) 161-170.
- Macmullen, R.** *Enemies of the Roman Order*, (Oxford University Press: London,  
1967).
- Malherbe, A.J.** "'Gentle as a Nurse': The Cynic Background to I Thessalonians  
2", *NovT.* 12 (1970): 203-217.
- "The Inhospitability of Diotrophes", in *God's Christ and His People:  
Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl*. Eds. Jacob Jervell and Wayne A.  
Meeks (Universitetsforlaget : Oslo, 1977b) 222-232.
- *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. Second Edition, Enlarged,  
(Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1983).
- *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophical Tradition of Pastoral  
Care* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1987).
- *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis,  
1989),
- Malina, B. J. and Neyrey, J. H.** "Honour and Shame in Luke-acts: Pivotal  
Values of the Mediterranean World" in Neyrey, J.H. (ed.) *The Social World  
of Luke-Acts* (Hendrickson: Peabody, Massachusetts, 1991):25-65.
- Malina, B.J.** *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*.  
(John Knox Press: Atlanta, 1981).
- "The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation" *Interpretation.* 36.  
No. 3 (1982): 229-242.
- "Why Interpret the Bible with the Social Sciences?" *ABQ* 2 (1983):  
119-133.
- "Review: *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle  
Paul*, by Wayne A. Meeks" in *JBL* 104/4 (1985)
- Malinowski, F.X.** "The Brave Women of Philippi", *BTB* 15 (1985): 60-64.
- Manson, T.W.** *Studies in the Gospel and Epistles* (Manchester University Press:  
Manchester, 1962).
- Marrou, H.I.** *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Tr. by Lamb, G (Sheed and  
Ward: London, 1956)
- Marshall, I.H.** *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (The  
Paternoster Press: Exeter, 1978).
- *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (Inter-  
Varsity Press: Leicester, 1980).
- Marshall, P.** *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the  
Corinthians* (J.B. Mohr: Tübingen, 1987).

- Martin, R.P.** *Philippians*. NCB. (Oliphants: London, 1976)  
 ----- *II Corinthians*, WBC, (Word [UK] Ltd.: Milton Keynes, 1991).
- Mathews, J. B.** *Hospitality and the New Testament Church: An Historical and Exegetical Study* (Unpublished ThD Dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1965).
- Mcdermott, S.J.** "Biblical Doctrine of Κοινωνία", *BZ* 19 (1975) 60-64.
- Mcdonald, J.I.H.** "Was Romans 16 a Separate Letter", *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 369-72.
- Mckay, H.A.** *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism*. (E.J.Brill: Leiden, New York. Köln, 1994).
- Mealand, D.L.** "Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts II-IV" *JTS New Series*, Vol. 28 (1977): 96-99
- Meeks, W.A.** *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 1983).
- Merlan, P.** "The Successor of Speusippus," *TAPA* 77 (1946) pp. 103-105.
- Meyers, E.M.** "Synagogue" in *ABD* vol. 6. (Doubleday: New York, 1992):
- Michael, J.H.** "The First and Second Epistle to the Philippians", *ExpTim.* (Dec. 1922) 106-109.  
 ----- *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians* (Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1946).
- Millar, F.** *The Emperor in the Roman World* (Duckworth: London, 1977).
- Millet, P.** "Patronage and its Avoidance in Classical Athens", in ed. Wallace-Hadrill, A. *Patronage in Ancient Society* (Routledge: London, 1989) 16.
- Mitchell, M.M.** "Concerning περί δὲ in I Corinthians", *NovT.* xxxi, 3 (1989): 229-256.
- Moffatt, J.** "Philippians 2: 26 and II Tim. 4. 13", *JTS* 18 (1917) 311-312.  
 ----- *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1940).
- Moles, J.L.** "'Honestius quam ambitiosius'? An exploration of the Cynic's Attitude to Moral Corruption in His Fellow Men" in *JHS* Vol. 103 (1983): 103-123.
- Momigliano, A.** "Clients", in *OCD* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1970): 152-153.
- Morris, L.** "Καὶ ἀπαξ καὶ δις", *NovT* 1 (1956) 205-208.  
 ----- *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* TNTC, (Tyndale Press: London, 1958).  
 ----- *The Epistle to the Romans* (Inter-Varsity Press: Leicester, 1988).  
 ----- *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. TNTC, Revised Edition (Inter-Varsity Press: Leicester, 1984).

- The First and Second Epistle to the Thessalonians* (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1991).
- Mott, S. C.** "The Power of Giving and Receiving: Reciprocity in Hellenistic Benevolence" in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honour of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by his Former Students*. Edited by Hawthorne G.F. (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1975): 60-72.
- Moule, C.F.D.** *An Idiom-Book of the New Testament Greek* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1953).
- Moule, H. C. G.** *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Translation, Paraphrase and Exposition* (Pickering & Inglis: London, 1963).
- Moxnes, H.** "Honour, Shame, and the Outside World in Paul's Letter to the Romans." In ed. Jacob Neusner et al. *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1988).
- , "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts" in *The Social World of Luke-Acts*. Neyrey, J.H. ed., (Hendrickson Publishers: Massachusetts, 1991).
- Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind** (SCM Press: London, 1959).
- Muller, J.J.** *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians and to Philemon* (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1955).
- Murray, O. and Price, S. eds.** *The Greek City From Homer to Alexander* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1990)
- Murphy-O'Connor, J.** *Saint Paul's Corinth* (Glazier: Wilmington, 1983).
- The Theology of the Second Letter to the Corinthians* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1991).
- Murray, J.** *The Epistle to the Romans*, Vol. II (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1965).
- Newman, B.A. & Nida, E.A.** *A Translation Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans: Helps for Translators* V. XIV (United Bible Society, London, 1973).
- Neyrey, J.H. ed.,** *The Social World of Luke-Acts*. (Hendrickson Publishers: Massachusetts, 1991).
- Nickle, K.F.** *The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy* (SCM Press, London, 1966).
- Nuesner, J., and Frerichs, E.S. eds.** *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*. (Scholars Press: Chico, California, 1985).
- O'Brien, P.T.** *Introductory Thanksgiving in the Letters of Paul*, NovT. Supl 49 (Brill: Leiden, 1977).



- "The Fellowship Theme in Philippians", *RTR* 37 (1978) 9-18.
- *The Epistle to the Philippians* (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1991).
- Omanson, R.L.** "A Note on the Translation of Philippians 1: 3-5", *BT* (1978): 244-5.
- Orr, D.G.** "The Roman Domestic Religion: The Evidence of the Household Shrines" in *ANRW* II, 16.2 (Walter de Gruyter: Berlin, 1978) 1557-1591.
- Orr, W.F. and Walther, J.A.** *Anchor Bible I Corinthians* Vol. 32 (Doubleday: Garden City, New York, 1976).
- Otto Kern, ed.** *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*. (Berlin, 1900).
- Panikulam, G.** *Koinonia in the New Testament: A Dynamic Expression of Christian Life* (Pontifical Biblical Institute: Rome, 1979).
- Patterson, S.J.** "Didache 11-13: The Legacy of Radical Itinerancy in Early Christianity" in Clayton N. Jefford edited, *The Didache in Context*. NovTSup., Vol. 77 (E.J. Brill: Leiden, New York, and Köln, 1995): 313-329.
- Pattison, S.E.** *A Study of the Apologetic Function of the Summaries of Acts* (U.M.I. Dissertation Information Service: Michigan, 1992).
- Peterlin, D.** *Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Light of Disunity in the Church* NovTSupl. Vol. LXXIX (E.J. Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995).
- Peterman, G.W.** *Giving and Receiving in Paul's Epistles: Greco-Roman Social Conventions in Philippians 4 and in Selected Texts* (Kings College, PhD Dissertation submitted to the University of London, Sept., 1992).
- "Romans 15: 26: Make a Contribution or Establish Fellowship" *NTS*. 40 (1994): 457-463.
- Pfifzner, V.C.** *Paul and the Agon Motif*. NovTSup. 16 (Brill: Leiden, 1967).
- Plummer, A.** *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1914).
- Poland, F.** *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Preisschriften ... der fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft, 38 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1909).
- Rahtjan, B.D.** "The Three Letters of Paul to the Philippians", *NTS* 6 (1959-60) 167- 173.
- Rajak, T.** *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*. (Duckworth: London, 1983).
- Rajak, T. and Noy, T.** "Archisynagogoi : Office, Title and Social Status in the Greco-Jewish Synagogue" in *JRS* (1993): 75-93.
- Ramsay, W.M.** *St Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1935).

- Rawson, B. ed.**, *The Family in Ancient Rome*. (Croom Helm Ltd., London, 1986).
- Rawson, E.** "Roman Rulers and the Philosophic Adviser" in *Philosophia Togata*. eds. Griffin, M. and Barnes, J. (Clarendon Press Oxford, 1989): 233-257.
- Register, D. R.** *Concerning Giving and Receiving. Charitable Giving and Poor Relief in Paul's Epistles in Comparison with Greco-Roman and Jewish Attitudes and Practices*. (MPhil. Thesis, University of Sheffield, Feb. 1990).
- Richter, Philip J.** "Recent Sociological Approaches to the Study of the New Testament" in *Religion* 14 (1984): 77-90.
- Robertis, F.M.** *Storia delle corporazioni e del regime associativo nel mondo romano*. 2 vols. (Adriatica editrice: Bari, 1973).
- Robertson and Plummer, A. A.** *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1911).
- Rostovtzeff, M.** *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1926).
- *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. Vol. 2 (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1972).
- Safrai, S.** "The Synagogue" in Safrai, S. and Stern, M. et al. *CRINT*. in 2 volumes (Van Gorcum & Comp.: B.V. - Assen, 1974)
- Safrai, S. and Stern, M. et al.** *CRINT*. in 2 volumes (Van Gorcum & Comp.: B.V. - Assen, 1974)
- Saller, R. P.** *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982).
- "Patria Potestas and the Stereotype of the Roman Family" in *Continuity and Change* 1 (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1986) 7-22.
- Sanders, E.P.** *Judaism, Practice and Belief: 63 BCE - 66 CE*. (SCM Press: London, 1992).
- Sayari, S.** "Political Patronage in Turkey", in *Patrons and Clients* (Duckworth: London, 1977): 103-113.
- Schmithals, W.** *Paul and James: Studies in Biblical Theology* 46 (SCM Press: London, 1963)
- Schubert, P.** "Forms and Functions of the Pauline Thanksgiving", *ZNW* 20 (1939) 7-82.
- Scott, E. F.** *The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians*, The Moffatt NT Commentaries, (Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1948).

- . "The Epistle to the Philippians", *The Interpreters Bible*, eds. Buttrick et. al. (New York, 1955).
- Scott, J.** "Patronage or Exploitation", in *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies* (Duckworth: London, 1977): 21-39.
- Scroggs, R.** "The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament: The Present State of Research" *NTS* 26 (1980): 164-179.
- Sedley, D.** "The end of the Academy" in *Phronesis* XXVI (1980): 67-75.
- . Sedley, D. "Philosophical Allegiance in the Greco-Roman World" in *Philosophia Togata* eds. Griffin, M. and Barnes, J. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1989)
- Shürer, E.M.** *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (175 BC - 135 CE)*. Revised Edition, 3 vols. (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1987).
- Silva, M.** *Philippians*, WEC. (Moody Press: Chicago, 1988).
- Smallwood, E.M.** *The Jews Under Roman Rule From Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations* (Brill: Leiden, 1981 reprint).
- Sonne, I.** "Synagogue" in *IDB* vol. 4. (Abingdon Press: New York, 1962): 476-491.
- Stevenson, J.** *The Catacombs: Rediscovered Monuments of Early Christianity*. (Thames and Hudson: London, 1978).
- Stone, I.F.** *The Trial of Socrates*. (Little Brown and Co.: Boston, Toronto, 1988).
- Strachan, R.H.** *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* MNTC, (Hodder and Stoughton: London, 1948).
- Strack, H.L. and Stebenger, G.** *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1992).
- Strelan, J.G.** "Burden Bearing and the Law of Christ: A Re-examination of Galatians 6: 2" *JBL* 94 (1974) 266-276.
- Sumney, J.L.** *Identifying Paul's Opponents in Corinth: The Question of Method* (JSOT: Sheffield, 1990).
- Talbert, C.H.** *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on I and II Corinthians* (Crosswood: New York, 1987).
- Tasker, R.V.G.** *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (Tyndale Press: London, 1968).
- Thrall, M.E.** *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies* (Brill: Leiden, 1962).
- Theissen, G.** *The First Followers of Jesus*. (SCM Press: London, 1978).
- . *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1982).
- Tidball, D.J.** *An Introduction to the Sociology of the NT* (Paternoster Press: Exeter, 1983).

- Tod, M.N.** *Sidelights on Greek History* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1932).
- Trombley, F.R.** *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529*. Vol. 1. (E.J. Brill: Leiden, New York, Koln, 1993).
- Urman, D. and Fleisher, P.V.M.** eds. *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery*. (Brill: Leiden, 1995).
- Vincent, M.R.** *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians and to Philemon*, ICC (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1902).
- Von Michael McDermott, S.J.** "The Biblical Doctrine of  $\kappa\omicron\lambda\nu\omega\nu\iota\alpha$ ", *BZ* 19 (1975) 64-77, 219-233.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A.** (ed.) *Patronage in Ancient Society* (Routledge: London, 1989).
- Walzing, J.** *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains* 4 vols. (Peeters: Louvain, 1895-1900).
- Wanamaker, C.A.** *The Epistle to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (W.B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan; and Paternoster: Exeter, 1990).
- Watson, A.** *Society and Legal Change* (Scottish Academic Press: Edinburgh, 1977).
- Watson, F.** *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles*. SNTSMS 56. (The University Press: Cambridge, 1986).
- White, L.M.** *Domus Ecclesiae: Domus Dei*. (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1982).
- Wilken, R.L.** *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them*. (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 1984).
- "Collegia, Philosophical Schools, and Theology" in *The Catacombs and the Colosseum*. ed. Stephen Benko and John J. O'Rourke (Judson: Valley Forge, 1971).
- Winter, B.W.** (series ed.) *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting* vol. 2. (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan, and Paternoster Press: Carlisle, 1994).
- Yamsat, P.** *The Ekklesia as Partnership: Paul and Threats to Koinonia in I Corinthians*, (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Sheffield, 1992).
- Ziesler, J.** *Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SCM Press: London, 1990).