

JULIEN M. OGEREAU

Paul's Koinonia
with the Philippians

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

377

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL) · Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)

J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

377



Julien M. Ogereau

Paul's Koinonia with the Philippians

A Socio-Historical Investigation of a Pauline
Economic Partnership

Mohr Siebeck

JULIEN M. OGEREAU, born 1981; 2010 BTh (Hons 1) in New Testament Studies at the Sydney College of Divinity (Sydney, Australia); 2014 PhD in Ancient History at Macquarie University (Sydney, Australia); currently Research Assistant with the Exzellenzcluster Topoi at Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany, and Honorary Associate at Macquarie University.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-153503-1

ISBN 978-3-16-153488-1

ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2014 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. www.mohr.de

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

τῇ Ἰωάννα Μιρᾷ

προστάτιδι καὶ παρακλήτρια

συμβία κοινωνῆ μου τῶν τε χαρίτων καὶ τῶν μόχθων

Preface

This book would have never been written if, in my undergraduate years, I had not come across the work of E. A. Judge. My encounter with Judge, both in print and in person, radically transformed the way I approach, read, and understand the New Testament and its social world, and ultimately re-oriented my academic path. It led me to the department of Ancient History at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia, where the doctoral dissertation on which this book is based was completed in October 2013. This thesis was written with the secret ambition that Judge might one day cast favourable eyes upon it. It is my sincere hope that he will, and that the *discipulus* will have been found worthy of his much admired *magister*.

Many others have of course contributed to the timely completion of this project. First and foremost, I am indebted to L. L. Welborn for his expert supervision. This book owes much to his intellectual acumen, scholarly rigour, literary finesse, and creativity. The faculty and friends of the department of Ancient History at Macquarie University have also been a constant source of support and inspiration. I am particularly thankful to A. Nobbs, S. Piggin, P. Keegan, C. Forbes, D. Barker, J. R. Harrison, J. T. Fitzgerald, all the members of the New Testament and Early Christianity postgraduate seminar, as well as my parents.

I am also grateful to my former teachers and (then) colleagues at Alphacrucis college, and in particular to S. Fogarty, J. Grey, S. Clifton, D. Parker, M. Hutchinson, P. Oslington, J. Dowton, and A. White, for their encouragement throughout my undergraduate and postgraduate years.

This research has been facilitated by several grants from Macquarie University, the Society for the Study of Early Christianity at Macquarie University, and Tyndale House, Cambridge. Credit is especially due to I. Petersson and M. Lattke who provided the funds for my research leave at Tyndale House in January 2013. Thanks are also due to J. and D. Bröcker who kindly hosted me during my stay in Münster, Germany, in August 2012, as well as to The Australian Archaeological Institute at Athens and to l'École Française d'Athènes for allowing me to use their premises and resources during my stay in the Greek capital in April 2011.

Finally, I would like to thank H. Ziebritzki and J. Frey for accepting with enthusiasm this dissertation for publication in the WUNT II series, as

well as S. Schüz and I. König for their help with the final preparation of the manuscript. Last but not least, I would like to express my appreciation to my examiners, J. M. G. Barclay, J. S. Kloppenborg, and A. H. Cadwalader, for their critical but gracious engagement with the thesis and for their many helpful suggestions.

This book is dedicated to the one who has paid the dearest price of all to make this work possible.

Berlin, August 2014

Julien M. Ogereau

Table of Contents

Preface.....	vii
Abbreviations.....	xiii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 The Vexed Question of the Funding of Paul’s Mission.....	1
1.2 History of Research on Paul’s Economic Partnerships.....	15
1.2.1 Paul’s <i>société de fait</i> (J. Fleury).....	16
1.2.2 Paul’s <i>societas Christi</i> (J. P. Sampley).....	21
1.2.3 Paul’s Paradigm of Social Reciprocity (G. W. Peterman).....	28
1.2.4 Recent Treatises on Paul’s Financial Policy.....	40
1.3 Scope, Significance, and Structure of the Present Study.....	42

Part One: Philological Survey

Chapter 2: Methodological Considerations.....	53
2.1 Brief Overview of New Testament Philology.....	53
2.2 Value of Deissmann’s Methodological Approach.....	59
2.3 Methodological Procedure.....	63
Chapter 3: Paul’s Economic Terminology in the Light of Documentary Sources.....	68
3.1 Introduction.....	68
3.2 Substantives.....	68
3.2.1 τὸ δόμα.....	68
a) Papyrological Evidence.....	71
b) Epigraphic Evidence.....	73
c) Summary.....	74
3.2.2 ὁ καρπός.....	75
3.2.3 ὁ λόγος δόσεως καὶ λήψεως.....	78

a) Documentary Evidence for ὁ λόγος	79
b) Documentary Evidence for ἡ λῆ(μ)ψις.....	82
c) Documentary Evidence for ἡ δόσις.....	84
d) Literary and Documentary Evidence for the Collocation ὁ λόγος δόσεως καὶ λήμψεως	93
e) The Significance of the Phrase εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήμψεως	101
3.3 Verbs	104
3.3.1 ἀπέχω	104
a) Papyrological Evidence	106
b) Epigraphic Evidence.....	110
c) Summary	112
3.3.2 πληρώω.....	112
a) Papyrological Evidence	113
b) Epigraphic Evidence.....	117
c) Summary	118
3.4 Summary.....	119
 Chapter 4: History of Research on Κοινωνία and its Cognates.....	120
4.1 Introduction	120
4.2 Philologically-Oriented Studies.....	121
4.2.1 Κοινωνία and its Cognates in the New Testament (J. Y. Campbell)	121
4.2.2 <i>Der Begriff Κοινωνία im Neuen Testament</i> (H. Seesemann)....	125
4.2.3 <i>Koinoonia en gemeenschap van zaken</i> (P. J. T. Endenburg) ...	130
4.2.4 <i>Koinonein und Metechein</i> (N. Baumert).....	136
4.3 Theologically-Oriented Studies	144
4.4 Summary.....	149
 Chapter 5: Κοινωνία Cognates in Documentary Sources.....	151
5.1 Introduction	151
5.2 Κοινωνία and its Cognates in Inscriptions	152
5.2.1 Κοινωνέω.....	152
5.2.2 Κοινωνός	157
5.2.3 Κοινωνία	169
5.3 Κοινωνία and its Cognates in Papyri	183
5.3.1 Κοινωνέω.....	183
5.3.2 Κοινωνός	188
5.3.3 Κοινωνία	198

5.4 Additional Examples of <i>Κοινωνία</i> as <i>Partnership</i> in Literary Sources	209
5.5 Summary.....	215

Part Two: Exegetical and Socio-Economic Analysis

Chapter 6: Preliminary Questions	223
6.1 The Question of the Literary Unity of Philippians	223
6.2 The Question of the Genre of Philippians	234
Chapter 7: A Socio-Economic Reading of Philippians	244
7.1 Introduction: Purpose, Occasion, and Theme(s) of Philippians	244
7.2 Paul's Gratitude for the Philippians' <i>κοινωνία</i> <i>εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον</i> (1:3–11).....	246
7.2.1 Form and Function of Paul's Opening Thanksgivings	246
7.2.2 Structure and Significance of 1:3–4	247
7.2.3 Structure and Significance of 1:5	251
7.2.4 Connotation of <i>κοινωνία</i> (<i>εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον</i>) in 1:5	252
7.2.5 The Philippians as Paul's <i>συγκοινωνοὶ τῆς χάριτος</i> (1:7)	260
7.2.6 Concluding Remarks on Paul's Ultimate Concern for the <i>προκοπή τοῦ εὐαγγελίου</i> (1:12)	264
7.2.7 Summary	265
7.3 Paul's Acknowledgement of the Philippians' Contribution (4:10–20).....	265
7.3.1 Introduction	265
7.3.2 Paul's Restored Joy (4:10–14)	266
7.3.3 The Significance of the Phrase <i>εἰς λόγον δόσεως</i> <i>καὶ λήμψεως</i> (4:15)	270
a) Selective History of Interpretation	271
b) Paul's Missionary Fund with the Philippians	280
c) Summary	289
7.3.4 Additional Insights into Paul's <i>Κοινωνία</i> with the Philippians (4:16–17)	290
7.3.5 Paul's Formal Acknowledgement of the Philippians' Contribution (4:18)	301
7.4 The Significance of Paul's Economic Discourse.....	308

Chapter 8: A Socio-Economic Analysis of Paul's Κοινωνία with the Philippians	310
8.1 Introduction	310
8.2 Κοινωνία as the Interpretive Crux of Paul's Relationship with the Philippians.....	311
8.3 On the Use, Significance, and Diffusion of Roman Legal Sources.....	316
8.4 Anatomy of Graeco-Roman Partnerships (Κοινωνία/Societas).....	326
8.4.1 The Assimilation of Κοινωνία with Societas	326
8.4.2 Origins and Basic Characteristics of Roman Societas	329
8.5 A History of Paul's Κοινωνία with the Philippians	338
 Chapter 9: Conclusion	 348
 Appendix.....	 351
Appendix A: Κοινων- Cognates in Inscriptions	353
A.1 Κοινωνέω.....	353
A.2 Κοινωνός	367
A.3 Κοινωνία	377
Appendix B: Κοινων- Cognates in Papyri	391
B.1 Κοινωνέω.....	391
B.2 Κοινωνός.....	402
B.3 Κοινωνία.....	461
 Bibliography	 501
 Index of Ancient Sources	 563
Index of Modern Authors	585
Index of Subjects	589

Abbreviations

Primary and secondary sources common to the field of biblical studies have been abbreviated according to *The SBL Handbook of Style* (eds. P. H. Alexander et al.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999), and, when unavailable therein, according to *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (eds. S. Hornblower and A. J. S. Spawforth; 3rd and rev. ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), or according to *A Greek-English Lexicon* (eds. H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie; 9th ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996). Papyrological sources follow the *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets* (eds. J. F. Oates et al.; Online: <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>). Epigraphic sources have been referenced according to the list found in G. H. R. Horsley and J. A. Lee, "A Preliminary Checklist of Abbreviations of Greek Epigraphic Volumes," *Epigraphica* 56 (1994): 129–69. For Latin inscriptions and other Greek inscriptions not referenced in Horsley and Lee's checklist, see F. Bérard et al., *Guide de l'épigraphiste: Bibliographie choisie des épigraphies antiques et médiévales* (3rd ed.; Paris: Presses de l'École normale supérieure, 2000). For all other abbreviations which are referenced neither in Horsley and Lee's checklist nor in the *Guide de l'épigraphiste*, see the list below:

Agora 16	Woodhead, <i>Inscriptions: The Decrees</i>
Bresson, <i>Recueil</i>	Bresson, <i>Recueil des inscriptions</i>
EKM1.Beroia	Gounaropoulou and Hatzopoulos, <i>Epigraphes Beroias</i>
Herrmann-Malay, <i>Lydia</i>	Herrmann and Malay, <i>New Documents from Lydia</i>
IJO 2	Ameling, <i>Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis</i>
IK Heraclea Pont.	Jonnes, <i>Inscriptions of Heraclea Pontica</i>
IKosSegre	Segre, <i>Iscrizioni di Cos</i> (1993)
IKosSegre (EF)	Segre, <i>Iscrizioni di Cos</i> (2007)
ILeukopetra	Petsas et al., <i>Inscriptions de Leukopetra</i>
IMontan	Tabbernee, <i>Montanist Inscriptions</i>
INomima	Van Effenterre and Ruzé, <i>Nomima</i>
IPArk	Thür and Taeuber, <i>Prozessrechtliche Inschriften</i>
ITyana	Berges and Nollé, <i>Tyana</i>
Labarre, <i>Lesbos</i>	Labarre, <i>Les cités de Lesbos</i>
McCabe Kaunos	McCabe, <i>Kaunos Inscriptions</i>
McCabe Theangela	McCabe, <i>Theangela Inscriptions</i>
Mon.fun.Palmyre IF	Gawlikowski, <i>Monuments funéraires de Palmyre IF</i>
Mon.fun.Palmyre IFC	Gawlikowski, <i>Monuments funéraires de Palmyre IFC</i>
Rigsby, <i>Asylia</i>	Rigsby, <i>Asylia: Territorial Inviolability</i>
Ross, <i>IG</i>	Ross, <i>Inscriptiones Graecae ineditae</i>
SGO 1	Merkelbach and Stauber, <i>Steinepigramme Osten 1</i>
SGO 2	Merkelbach and Stauber, <i>Steinepigramme Osten 2</i>

Abbreviations of periodicals and major reference works follow those of *The SBL Handbook of Style*, and if unavailable, those of *L'Année philo-logique*. For all others see below:

ACSS	<i>Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia</i>
ArchMiss	<i>Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires</i>
Berger, EDRL	Berger, <i>Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law</i>
BNP	<i>Brill's New Pauly</i>
Chantraine, DELG	Chantraine, <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque</i>
Deissmann, LAE	Deissmann, <i>Light from the Ancient East</i>
Deissmann, BS	Deissmann, <i>Bible Studies</i>
DGE	<i>Diccionario Griego-Español</i>
EDNT	Horst and Schneider, <i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
<i>Ephemepi</i>	<i>Ephemeris epigraphica</i>
<i>Exp 8th</i>	<i>The Expositor, 8th Series</i>
FilNT	<i>Filologia Neotestamentaria</i>
JEBH	<i>Journal of Economic and Business History</i>
Lewis-Short	Lewis and Short, <i>A Latin Dictionary</i>
LGRE	Taubenschlag, <i>The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt</i>
LTT-A	<i>Library of Latin Texts – Series A</i>
OJRS	<i>Ohio Journal of Religious Studies</i>
OJLS	<i>Oxford Journal of Legal Studies</i>
OED	<i>The Oxford English Dictionary</i>
OLD	<i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i>
Preisigke, WB	Preisigke, <i>Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden</i>
PW[1]	Wissowa et al., <i>Paulys Realencyclopädie, Erste Reihe: A–Q</i>
PW[2]	Wissowa et al., <i>Paulys Realencyclopädie, Zweite Reihe: R–Z</i>
Sherk, RDGE	Sherk, <i>Roman Documents from the Greek East</i>
Smith, DGRA	Smith, <i>Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities</i>
SupJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
Tischendorf, NTG	Tischendorf, <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i>
Wettstein, NTG	Wettstein, <i>Novum Testamentum Graecum</i>
WfKIPh	<i>Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie</i>
ZA	<i>Ziva Antika</i>
ZVR	<i>Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft</i>

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The Vexed Question of the Funding of Paul's Mission¹

Towards the end of his letter to the Romans, the apostle Paul made a remarkable assertion. He claimed that he had preached the gospel from Jerusalem all the way to Illyricum, so that there was no more room left for him to work in these regions (Rom 15:19, 23). However exaggerated one may find this statement to be,² the geographical breadth of Paul's mission remains staggering. It spanned from the confines of Palestine, Syria, and Arabia to the eastern border of the European continent: Macedonia, Greece and the modern-day region of the Balkans (Illyricum). In between these two extremities lay the Roman provinces of Asia, Galatia, Cilicia, Bithynia, in which, Paul boasted, he had fulfilled the ministry that Christ had entrusted to him (Rom 15:19), according to a specifically-delineated *κανὼν*

¹ The term *mission*, which derives from the Latin noun *missio* (which is semantically equivalent to ἀποστολή), has of course come to mean different things to different people. We use it in a general sense to refer to Paul's evangelistic activities in Palestine, Greece, and Asia Minor, regions to which, as a self-proclaimed apostle, Paul thought himself (com)missioned, i.e., *sent out* (ἀποστελλόμενος), to preach the gospel. For a cautionary discussion on the use of modern missionary categories, see John T. Townsend, "Missionary Journeys in Acts and European Missionary Societies," *ATHR* 68 (1986): 99–104. For a brief overview of the use and significance of the term *mission* in western Christian history, see Charles Van Engen, "Essay 1: 'Mission' Defined and Described," in *Global Mission Issues in the Third Millennium* (eds. D. J. Hesselgrave and E. Stetzer; Nashville: B. & H. Academic, 2010), 7–29.

² Paul's role in the expansion of early Christianity may have been over-estimated at times. This is partly due to the preponderant place he and his letters assume in Acts and in later tradition. However, Harnack is probably correct to affirm that the "chief credit for the spread of Christianity is due to those who were *not* regular apostles, and also to the 'teachers'." Indeed, the "most numerous and successful missionaries of the Christian religion were not regular teachers but Christians themselves." Adolf Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (trans. J. Moffatt; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961), 352, 366. Cf. Rodney Stark, *Cities of God: The Real Story of How Christianity Became an Urban Movement and Conquered Rome* (New York: HarperCollins, 2006), 133–36; Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Early Christian Mission: Paul and the Early Church* (vol. 2; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 923.

(2 Cor 10:15).³ As one can easily imagine, this impressive achievement was not accomplished overnight and without the help of others. Paul's mission lasted a good decade, necessitated three long and perilous journeys (according to Acts), and involved several equally dedicated associates (Mark, Timothy, Silas, Priscilla and Aquila, Phoebe, etc.).⁴ The logistics of it all must have been rather complex, while the amount of human and economic resources it required must have been quite substantial. Yet, against all odds, the Pauline mission, as much as the Christian movement in general, enjoyed relative success, perhaps more than anyone had expected. This naturally raises a number of questions, one of which concerns the strategy Paul employed to meet the economic needs of his mission.

Traditionally, scholarship has emphasised Paul's self-sufficiency in his missionary work and his apparent reluctance to have anything to do with money, thereby denying him any intentional and strategic planning in raising financial support. C. H. Dodd, for instance, considered Paul "a well-to-do *bourgeois*" who could not bring himself to ask for, let alone accept, money.⁵ F. W. Beare deemed that financial dependence was always a great source of embarrassment to the apostle.⁶ Similarly, "on the basis of a text like 2 Corinthians 11:8–9," B. Witherington III concluded, without much regard for the obvious rhetorical tone of the passage, that "Paul was never fully comfortable accepting such gifts" (from the Macedonians, here).⁷ As regards the Philippians' show of support, D. Peterlin likewise opined that Paul "gratefully acknowledge[d] the Philippians' gift," but only "with a considerable degree of unease (4:10–20)."⁸ For "there was something about the Philippians' gift that was troubling to the apostle," G. F. Hawthorne suggested.⁹ Indeed, "the whole matter of giving and receiving was a touchy

³ On the likely sense of *κωνών* as the *geographically partitioned* sphere of service and mission in 2 Cor 10:15, see Judge, *NewDocs* 1, 36–45, #9.

⁴ Schnabel numbered thirty-eight of them. Schnabel, *Mission*, 1425–45. Cf. Earle E. Ellis, "Paul and his Co-workers," *NTS* 17 (1970): 437–52.

⁵ C. H. Dodd, *New Testament Studies* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967), 72.

⁶ F. W. Beare, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), 151–52.

⁷ Ben Witherington III, *Friendship and Finances in Philippi: The Letter of Paul to the Philippians* (Valley Forge: Trinity International, 1994), 127. Cf. Ben Witherington III, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 270.

⁸ Davorin Peterlin, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the light of Disunity in the Church* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 226. Peterlin's explanation is not straightforward. Rather than appealing to Paul's scruples vis-à-vis money, he posited that Paul was in fact apprehensive of the reaction of some of his detractors in the church who might have perceived his acceptance of the Philippians' gift as a plea for more (see pp. 209–13).

⁹ Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians* (WBC 43; Waco: Word Books, 1983), 18–19.

subject.”¹⁰ M. Hengel was equally sceptical that Paul could have ever requested material support:

Paul himself had no possessions. During his missionary journeys *he earned his keep by hard manual labour as a tentmaker* (Acts 18.3). *He did not ask the communities to look after him* (1 Cor. 9), but accepted support offered freely with gratitude (Phil. 2.25ff; 4.15ff.). Accustomed to extreme need, he was glad when he was sufficiently cared for (Phil. 4. 11ff.).¹¹

H. Weinel and G. A. Deissmann, who conceived of Paul as “the first artisan missionary,” would have probably approved of Hengel’s comment.¹² R. F. Hock, likewise, might have concurred, as he concluded his portrait of Paul as the working apostle by observing:

Paul’s trade also provided him with his principal means of livelihood, though never with enough to make him anything but a poor man and sometimes not even with that much, so that hunger and thirst and cold were at times his lot.¹³

Despite criticising certain aspects of Hock’s work, T. D. Still would come to a similar conclusion:

Taken together, these passages [1 Thess 2:9; 1 Cor 4:12, 9:6; 2 Cor 11:27] suggest that Paul supported himself in the midst of his ministry by plying a trade. Even if he occasionally received material assistance from given congregations and persons (note 2 Cor 11:9; Phil 4:15–16; Rom 16:1–2, 23), *it was Paul’s stated missionary policy and practice to be fiscally independent* (see esp. 1 Cor 9:12, 15, 18).¹⁴

¹⁰ Hawthorne, *Philippians* (1983), 18–19. Cf. Fred B. Craddock, *Philippians* (Interpretation; Atlanta: John Knox, 1985), 194. Others who share a similar view include Collange, Buchanan, or Alexander. Jean-François Collange, *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians* (trans. A. W. Heathcote; London: Epworth Press, 1979), 8; Colin O. Buchanan, “Epaphroditus’ Sickness and the Letter to the Philippians,” *EvQ* 36 (1964): 161–62; Loveday Alexander, “Hellenistic Letter-Forms and the Structure of Philippians,” *JSNT* 37 (1989): 97.

¹¹ Martin Hengel, *Property and Riches in the Early Church* (London: SCM, 1974), 36 (emphasis added).

¹² Gustav A. Deissmann, *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), 237: “What he needed he earned by his own work as journeyman tent-maker. He was the first artisan missionary, and was proud of his independence ... Only from those who were very near to him did he, making an exception to his rule, receive charitable gifts.” Cf. Heinrich Weinel, *St. Paul, the Man and His Work* (trans. G. A. Bienemann; London: Williams and Norgate, 1906), 178, 351; Dachollom C. Datiri, “Finances in the Pauline Churches: A Socio-Exegetical Study of the Funding of Paul’s Mission and the Financial Administration of his Congregation” (Ph.D. diss., University of Sheffield, 1996), 188–210.

¹³ Ronald F. Hock, *The Social Context of Paul’s Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 67 (emphasis added).

¹⁴ Note the two important terms *policy* and *practice*. Todd D. Still, “Did Paul Loathe Manual Labor? Revisiting the Work of Ronald F. Hock on the Apostle’s Tentmaking and Social Class,” *JBL* 125.4 (2006): 782 (emphasis added).

These opinions appear to be legitimate insofar as Paul himself indicates several times in his letters that he had resolved to work his own trade in order to supply to his needs.¹⁵ For instance, he exhorted the Thessalonians to remember how he and his colleagues toiled night and day as they proclaimed the gospel,¹⁶ so as not to become a burden to anyone (1 Thess 2:7–9).¹⁷ When challenged by the Corinthians, he reminded them of his arduous labour for their own sake (1 Cor 4:12, 9:6; 2 Cor 11:27), words which the author of Acts would also put in his mouth in his farewell speech to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Acts 20:34–35).¹⁸ In a way, as some have argued somewhat anachronistically,¹⁹ it would seem that Paul complied with the traditional Jewish ethos, whereby a rabbi, if he had not inherited the family fortune, provided for his own subsistence by working a trade (cf. *m. Abot* 2:2), since receiving money for teaching the Torah was deemed inap-

¹⁵ For similar views, see for instance Gerald W. Peterman, *Paul's Gift from Philippi: Conventions of Gift-exchange and Christian Giving* (SNTSMS 92; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 7–9; Peter Oakes, *Philippians: From People to Letter* (SNTSMS 110; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 68–69.

¹⁶ On the idiomatic use of the expression *νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας* in papyri, see Andreas Bammer, “An Approach to the Papyrological Understanding of Paul’s Laboring ‘Night and Day’ (1Thess. 2.9),” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor 2007* (ed. T. Gagos; Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Library, 2010), 47–52.

¹⁷ On the contextual connotation of *βάρος* here and in Gal 6:2 (cf. *καταβαρέω*, 2 Cor 12:16; *ἀβαρής*, 2 Cor 11:9; *ἐπιβαρέω*, 2 Thess 3:9, if one is ready to accept it as Pauline), see John G. Strelan, “Burden-Bearing and the Law of Christ: A Re-Examination of Galatians 6:2,” *JBL* 94.2 (1975): 267–70; John P. Dickson, *Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and in the Pauline Communities: The Shape, Extent and Background of Early Christian Mission* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2003), 179–86. Cf. Abraham J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 74–75.

¹⁸ This statement does not necessarily imply that the author of Acts either witnessed the event, reported what Paul had *directly* told him, or made use of Paul’s letters, only that, in this *particular* instance, the way he chose to represent Paul (as he and/or oral tradition *remembered* him) somewhat coincided with Paul’s self-depiction in, for example, 1 Thess 2:7–9, 1 Cor 4:12, 9:6, and 2 Cor 11:27. For a detailed study of these passages, see Steve Walton, *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians* (SNTSMS 108; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). For a case study of a similar literary parallel between Paul’s letters and Acts, and a discussion of the historiographical issues involved, see Mark Harding, “On the Historicity of Acts: Comparing Acts 9.23–5 with 2 Corinthians 11.32–3,” *NTS* 39.4 (1993): 518–38.

¹⁹ Much of the evidence for this rabbinical ethos postdates A.D. I. since it derives from the Mishnaic tradition, although, it could be argued, it may refer to “principles and propositions” from the Pharisaic period. See Jacob Neusner, ed., *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), xxxiii.

propriate (cf. *m. Abot* 4.5).²⁰ Conversely, Hock has suggested that, far from following the Jewish rabbinical model, Paul actually embodied the Cynic ideal of the working philosopher.²¹ Whatever the reason for his attitude may have been,²² it is quite certain that Paul, *in certain circumstances*, felt uneasy about receiving money.

This being said, not every scholar has been reluctant to envisage that Paul could somewhat expect the material assistance of his converts. In his seminal essay on the social pattern of the first Christian groups, the Roman historian E. A. Judge commented for instance:

It was part of his Jewish traditionalism to have practised a manual skill, but it was only exercised in order to establish a point of honour as his advertisement of it admits. *Normally he expected to be supported at the charges of the groups who enjoyed his religious leadership* (1 Cor. ix.4; 2 Cor. xi.8, xii.13; Acts xx.33–35).²³

²⁰ For two opposite positions on the question, see Martin Hengel, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London: SCM, 1991), 15–16; and Ronald F. Hock, “The Working Apostle: An Examination of Paul’s Means of Livelihood” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1974), 12–21. Not every Jewish teacher held this view, however (cf. Sir 38:24–25). Cf. Hans Dieter Betz, *Der Apostel Paulus und die sokratische Tradition: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu seiner ‚Apologie‘ 2 Korinther 10–13* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1972), 106–108; Göran Agrell, *Work, Toil and Sustenance: An Examination of the View of Work in the New Testament, Taking into Consideration Views Found in Old Testament, Intertestamental, and Early Rabbinic Writings* (Stockholm: Verbum, 1976), 63; A. E. Harvey, “‘The Workman is Worthy of His Hire’: Fortunes of a Proverb in the Early Church,” *NovT* 24.3 (1982): 213–14.

²¹ Hock concluded his dissertation as follows: “our analysis has shown, whatever the origin of Paul’s having a trade, the meaning of that trade for Paul’s apostleship is particularly intelligible in light of debates within the Cynic school over the ideal of the working philosopher ... In fact, it might be said that what was only a Cynic ideal was realized in Paul’s working and preaching.” Hock, “Apostle,” 164–65. Cf. Ronald F. Hock, “Simon the Shoemaker as an Ideal Cynic,” *GRBS* 17.1 (1976): 41–53. Theissen also identified a possible connection with Cynic philosophy. See Gerd Theissen, “Legitimation und Lebensunterhalt: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie Urchristlicher Missionare,” *NTS* 21 (1975): 211; repr. in Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982), 27–67.

²² Malherbe somewhat nuances Hock’s position by suggesting that there remain “sufficient differences between Paul and the philosophers to preclude our viewing him as a slavish, unreflective follower of current practice.” Abraham J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 70. Cf. Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 208; David E. Briones, *Paul’s Financial Policy: A Socio-Theological Approach* (LNTS 494; New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 18–19.

²³ Edwin A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century: Some Prolegomena to the Study of New Testament Ideas of Social Obligation* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960), 58 (emphasis added).

B. Holmberg would later concur, affirming quite assertively that “all of Paul’s churches” were “in principle obliged to support their apostle,”²⁴ even though, he conceded, he received such help from the Macedonians “with a measure of embarrassment” (cf. 2 Cor 11:7–9).²⁵ According to D. L. Dungan, this was indeed the right of apostles, or of the *Pneumatiker* for D. Georgi, “which was in general effect in the early Church.”²⁶ Similarly, J. G. Strelan argued that the final injunctions of Galatians 6 placed its recipients under “the obligation to provide for the material support of Paul and his co-workers,”²⁷ a line of thought which W. Pratscher would further develop in his reading of Philippians 4:

Hier geht es ebenso wie Phil. 4.15 um die Abwicklung von Rechtsangelegenheiten. *Die Gabe der Philipper ist* (so sehr sie freiwillig gegeben wurde) grundsätzlich *nicht Sache der Freiwilligkeit, sondern einer rechtlichen Verpflichtung gegenüber Paulus. Paulus hat ein Recht auf diese Unterstützung durch die Philipper bzw. durch alle seine Gemeinden; denn er brachte ihnen eine δόσις, das Evangelium, und hat deshalb das Recht auf eine λήμψις, eine Bezahlung.* Die Gabe der Philipper hat also den Charakter einer ‘pflichtgemäßen Leistung’, gleichsam eines Tributes.²⁸

For Pratscher, Paul never denied his apostolic right to receive support from communities in which he was *not* working (cf. 1 Cor 9), but, in certain circumstances, he was disposed to forfeit the exercise of it.²⁹ In sum, he considered that Paul clung unto his apostolic right in principle only, though not in practice.³⁰ The last sentence of the above citation seems to reveal that Pratscher was, to a certain degree, influenced by E. Lohmeyer in his interpretation. The latter had indeed suggested that Paul, out of practical considerations (“aus praktischen Missionserwägungen und -erfahrungen”), and as a testimony of his close friendship with the Philippians (“ein Zeichen besonderer Nähe”, “als Freundlichkeit”), had granted them what he had denied everyone else, that is, the privilege, indeed the grace

²⁴ Bengt Holmberg, *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 89.

²⁵ Holmberg, *Paul*, 91. Cf. F. F. Bruce, “St. Paul in Macedonia: 3. The Philippian Correspondence,” *BJRL* 63 (1981): 274.

²⁶ David L. Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul: The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 27. Cf. *Ibid.*, 4–26; Dieter Georgi, *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem* (Hamburg-Bergstedt: H. Reich, 1965), 47.

²⁷ Strelan, “Burden-Bearing.”

²⁸ Wilhelm Pratscher, “Der Verzicht des Paulus auf finanziellen Unterhalt durch seine Gemeinden: Ein Aspekt seiner Missionsweise,” *NTS* 25 (1979): 286 (emphasis added).

²⁹ So Dungan, *Sayings*, 32. Cf. John Barnet, “Paul’s Reception of the Gift from Philippi,” *SVTQ* 50.3 (2006): 234–37.

³⁰ Pratscher, “Verzicht,” 286: “Auf dieses Recht verzichtet er nie, wohl aber verzichtet er (unter bestimmten Bedingungen) auf die Inanspruchnahme des Rechts. Am Recht hält er prinzipiell fest, nicht aber am faktischen Unterhalt selbst.”

(“Gnade”), of supporting him in his mission.³¹ This was but a fair repayment, a “Tribut,” that they owed to their community founder, who was himself entitled to such gifts as an apostle (“Als Apostel hat Pls. ein Anrecht auf Gaben”).³² This derogation to the rule (of not accepting financial support) was not his initiative, however, but that of the Philippians themselves.³³ Incidentally, Lohmeyer argued, this explained his apparent lack of gratefulness in 4:10–20: the exercise of their duty (“die Ausübung dieser Pflicht”) made his “Dank an die Gemeinde” unnecessary (“unnötig”).³⁴

While apparently unaware of the works of Pratscher and Lohmeyer, J. P. Dickson propounded a somewhat similar argument, concluding that “Paul believed he was entitled to receive support from those to whom he preached (1 Thess 2:7a; 2 Thess 3:9; 1 Cor 9:5–6)” in the form of “‘maintenance’ or ‘hospitality’ (for both preacher and wife),” though to the exclusion of “‘fees’ or ‘payments of any kind’.”³⁵ As regards the Philippian gift, Dickson then contended that it was “neither a ‘reimbursement’ for representative services, nor a ‘payment’ for services received,” but “an act of love,” “a ‘grace’.”³⁶ Indeed, “the giving of occasional gifts was above and beyond what Paul ‘expected’ of his congregations.”³⁷ Others still have opined that the Philippians’ gift simply represented “an expression of their friendship,” which was meant to cultivate an already positive and fruitful relationship.³⁸

In all fairness, these scholars also have a point inasmuch as there is substantial evidence in Paul’s letters, as well as in Acts,³⁹ that he sometimes

³¹ Ernst Lohmeyer, *Der Brief an die Philipper* (KEK 9.1; 12th ed; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), 185.

³² Lohmeyer, *Philipper*, 185.

³³ Lohmeyer, *Philipper*, 186.

³⁴ Lohmeyer, *Philipper*, 185.

³⁵ Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 193. Dickson however admitted that “in the context of both his Thessalonian and Corinthian missions at least Paul did not make use of his rights” (p. 194). Note: neither Pratscher nor Lohmeyer is referenced in Dickson’s bibliography.

³⁶ Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 204.

³⁷ Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 204.

³⁸ John T. Fitzgerald, “Philippians in the Light of Some Ancient Discussions of Friendship,” in *Friendship, Flattery and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World* (ed. J. T. Fitzgerald; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 153. Cf. Lohmeyer, *Philipper*, 185; Wolfgang Schenk, *Die Philipperbriefe des Paulus* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984), 62–65; Ken L. Berry, “The Function of Friendship Language in Philippians 4:10–20,” in *Friendship, Flattery and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World* (ed. J. T. Fitzgerald; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 107–24; Peterlin, *Philippians*, 180.

³⁹ We are in agreement with scholars who consider Acts as providing secondary evidence on the life of Paul, inasmuch as it offers a *remembered* picture of the apostle, while his letters represent our primary sources. This does not necessarily imply that Acts

received material and/or financial support from some of his disciples, which allowed him to dedicate more time to the work of the ministry. The Philippians, for instance, assisted him on several occasions as he left Macedonia and while he was in Corinth (Phil 4:15–16; cf. 2 Cor 11:7–9). Indeed, as D. L. Dungan has argued, they seem to have supplied him in such “sufficient amount...that it could be termed a salary.”⁴⁰ When in prison, they attended to his needs through Epaphroditus, who may have been bringing him provisions on a regular basis (Phil 2:25, 4:18; cf. Lucian, *Peregr.* 12–13), since prisoners were usually left to rely on the assistance of friends and family (if they were not sustained with meagre rations of food and water).⁴¹

At other times, he freely enjoyed the hospitality of the likes of Gaius (Rom 16:23),⁴² Philemon (Phlm 22), Lydia (according to Acts 16:14–15), and perhaps Phoebe, who is once described as his προστάτις (Rom 16:1–2).⁴³ Such hospitality would have represented a substantial form of material

should be dismissed altogether as unreliable historical material, but only that it should be used critically. We therefore see no particular reason to reject certain accounts of Acts when they corroborate Paul’s letters. Cf. John Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (New York: Abingdon, 1950); Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1959), 78–81; Gerd Lüdemann, *Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1987), 1–18. For a more general discussion on the moot question of the historicity of Acts, see for instance Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London: SCM, 1956); Ernst Haenchen, “The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity,” in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; London: SPCK, 1968), 258–78; Richard N. Longenecker, “The Acts of the Apostles as a Witness to Early Palestinian Christianity,” *Themelios* 5.1 (1968): 15–23; I. Howard Marshall, *Luke, Historian and Theologian* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970); Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); Colin J. Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (ed. C. H. Gempf; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1989), 1–14; Bruce W. Winter, ed., *The Book of Acts in its First-Century Setting* (5 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993–1996); Richard I. Pervo, *A Commentary on the Book of Acts* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009), 14–18.

⁴⁰ Dungan, *Sayings*, 29.

⁴¹ Cf. Craig S. Wansink, *Chained in Christ: The Experience and Rhetoric of Paul’s Imprisonments* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 126–46, 188–98 (*passim*). For a gruesome account of the living conditions in Roman prisons, see *ibid.*, 27–95. Cf. Brian Rapske, *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody* (vol. 3 of *The Book of Acts in its First-Century Setting*; ed. B. W. Winter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 195–225.

⁴² Unless it was Gaius himself, as a guest (ξένος), who enjoyed the hospitality of Paul and of the whole church. On Gaius’ possible role as a host of Paul and of the church in Corinth, see most recently L. L. Welborn, *An End to Enmity: Paul and the “Wrongdoer” of Second Corinthians* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 241–50, 286–87, 321–35, 364–69.

⁴³ What Phoebe’s role entailed is not entirely clear. On the significance of the term, see LSJ, s.v. προστάτις, προστάτης; BDAG, s.v. προστάτις; MM, s.v. προστάτις; Hans Schaeffer, “προστάτης,” *PW[2]* 9:1287–1304. Cf. Edwin A. Judge, “Cultural Conformity

support since it generally included food, lodging, and maybe provisions for travel.⁴⁴ As it has often been noted, the term *προπέμπω*, which Paul employs several times rather expectantly (Rom 15:24; 1 Cor 16:6, 11; 2 Cor 1:16; cf. Titus 3:13; 3 John 1:6), may have sometimes implied supplying to a traveller's practical needs (but see 2 Macc 6:23; Acts 20:38, 21:5).⁴⁵ After all, Paul had a right to claim material assistance from the churches he founded, as he made clear to the Corinthians: *those who proclaim the gospel shall live of the gospel* (1 Cor 9:14; cf. 2 Thess 3:9). Both Moses and Jesus had established that diligent workers ought to be paid the wages they deserve (1 Cor 9: 8–14), a principle which may have in fact been reinforced by an early missionary rule.⁴⁶

Likewise, he instructed the Galatians that those who are taught the word of God ought to share in all things with their instructor (Gal 6:6). However, Paul had laid no such claim upon the Corinthians, thus turning a *direct command* of the Lord into a *discretionary privilege*.⁴⁷ Or, as Theissen argued, he may have preferred to surrender his “apostolic duty ... to practice charismatic poverty” (i.e., to be “dependent [in faith] on other’s generosity”).⁴⁸ For P. Marshall and L. L. Welborn, on the other hand, Paul had

and Innovation in Paul: Some Clues from Contemporary Documents,” *TynB* 35 (1984): 17–22; R. A. Kearsley, “Women in Public Life in the Roman East: Iunia Theodora, Claudia Metrodora and Phoibe, Benefactress of Paul,” *TynB* 50.2 (1999): 189–211 (repr. from *Ancient Society* 15 [1985]); Horsley, *NewDocs* 4, 239–44, #122; Erlend D. MacGillivray, “Romans 16:2, *προστάτις/προστάτης*, and the Application of Reciprocal Relationships to New Testament Texts,” *NovT* 53 (2011): 183–99. For a summary of recent secondary literature on the question, see especially Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 945–48.

⁴⁴ For a socio-theological study of hospitality in antiquity and in the early church, see for instance, John B. Mathews, “Hospitality and the New Testament Church: An Historical and Exegetical Study” (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1965). For a more general treatment, see Abraham J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (rev. and enl. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 92–112; Beate Wagner-Hasel, “Hospitality,” *BNP*. Accessed November 2012. Online: <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-paully/hospitality-e419230>.

⁴⁵ See Mathews, “Hospitality,” 230–34; Abraham J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), 67–68; L. Michael White, “Social Authority in the House Church Setting and Ephesians 4:1–16,” *ResQ* 29 (1987): 217; Holmberg, *Paul*, 86–87; Peterman, *Gift*, 164–65; Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 194–201. Cf. BDAG, s.v. *προπέμπω*; but see LSJ, s.v. *προπέμπω*.

⁴⁶ Dungan, *Sayings*, 40. For a discussion of this instruction in the Synoptic tradition, see Dungan, *Sayings*, 41–75. Cf. Pratscher, “Verzicht,” 291.

⁴⁷ Paul is free to do so, Dungan argued, since following it scrupulously “*would hinder the entry of anyone into the Lord’s salvation*” (italics original). Dungan, *Sayings*, 25. Cf. Datiri, “Finances,” 141.

⁴⁸ Thus, the criticism voiced against Paul could be understood as an accusation of “a lack of trust in the grace of God,” Theissen contended. “Seen this way Paul is dependent

rejected their offer of friendship in the form of a gift (while accepting support from the Philippians, which precipitated the breakdown of his relationship with the Corinthians), *so as not to* become entrapped by the social demands of such unequal *patronal friendships*.⁴⁹ As he confessed in an ironic rhetorical outburst,⁵⁰ he had *plundered* (ἐσύλησα) other churches (ἄλλας ἐκκλησίας)⁵¹ – most likely, the Philippians here – by receiving (λαβών) from them an ὀψώνιον (2 Cor 11:8–9), which, lest the irony of the statement be lost, should be understood as referring to a wage (either in cash or kind), or an allowance.⁵²

Overall, E. E. Ellis' conclusion thus remains rather pertinent: “The right to remuneration is evident not only from such passages as Gal. vi but also

on his work; he is not free and is no real apostle (9:1), for he has offended against the norm of primitive Christian ideal of itinerant charismatics set down by Jesus himself.” Theissen, *Setting*, 43.

⁴⁹ Peter Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relationship with the Corinthians* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987), 233, 257; Welborn, *Enmity*, 368, 398–400. Cf. Judge, “Cultural Conformity,” 15–16, 23; Steve Walton, “Paul, Patronage and Pay: What Do We Know about the Apostle's Financial Support,” in *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology and Practice* (eds. T. J. Burke and B. S. Rosner; London: T. & T. Clark International, 2011), 224.

⁵⁰ Cf. Josef Zmijewski, *Der Stil der paulinischen “Narrenrede”: Analyse der Sprachgestaltung in 2 Kor 11, 1–12, 10 als Beitrag zur Methodik von Stiluntersuchungen neutestamentlicher Texte* (Cologne: P. Hanstein, 1978), 126–27. Zmijewski especially associated Paul's ironical pique with his rhetorical question in v. 7. Cf. Welborn, *Enmity*, 132–35.

⁵¹ The plural form has long puzzled scholars. Given Paul's assertion in Phil 4:15 that no other church had partnered with him, one feels compelled to view the brothers of 2 Cor 11:9 as solely referring to the Philippians (to the exclusion of the Thessalonians and the Bereans), in which case the ἐκκλησίαι mentioned would seem to correspond to house churches in the vicinity of Philippi.

⁵² Caragounis has contended that ὀψώνιον represents *provisions*, rather than *wage* or *salary*, which usually implies, from a modern perspective at least, a contractual employer-employee relationship. However, Cuvigny has observed that in ostraca from Mons Claudianus the word always corresponds to a (waged) allowance, “l'argent qui permet d'acheter de quoi accompagner la ration frumentaire” (thereby differing from μισθός which signifies “louage”). Likewise, Rathbone has noted that in the Heroninos archive, the term can be assimilated to a salary as it designates “a fixed monthly allowance of cash and wheat and sometimes vegetable oil, whereas occasional employees received a *misthos*, that is ‘wages’.” Chrys C. Caragounis, “ΟΨΩΝΙΟΝ: A Reconsideration of its Meaning,” *NovT* 16.1 (1974): 35–57; Cuvigny, O.Claud. III, p. 41; Dominic Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-Century A.D. Egypt: The Heroninos Archive and the Appianus Estate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 91–92. Cf. LSJ, s.v., ὀψώνιον; MM, s.v. ὀψώνιον; Deissmann, *BS*, 266; Horsley, *NewDocs* 2, 93, #65; Sitta von Reden, *Money in Ptolemaic Egypt: From the Macedonian Conquest to the End of the Third Century BC* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 130–32, 138.

from Paul's almost obsessive attention to the question.⁵³ Nevertheless, it seems that, *in certain circumstances*, such as whilst in Corinth, Paul was willing to relinquish his privilege so as to avoid becoming a stumbling block to some (1 Cor 9:12; 2 Cor 11:7, 12:14), and also perhaps to avoid being perceived as an avaricious sophist (cf. Plato, *Gorg.* 520; Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 9.1.5–7; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1:13; Lucian, *Hermot.* 59).⁵⁴ Paul certainly took great pain to explain in words reminiscent of the disputes between the philosophers and the sophists that he was no peddler (*καπηλεύων*) of God's word (2 Cor 2:17; cf. 1 Thess 2:5).⁵⁵ Understandably, this attitude must have placed him under serious constraints, confining him to the workshop for most of the day, and indeed sometimes part of the night, as Hock has persuasively argued.⁵⁶

As can be gathered from this succinct overview, Paul's stance towards financial support is not so easy to comprehend and synthesize. It appears rather inconsistent and incoherent, if not plainly contradictory at times.⁵⁷ For J. P. Sampley, this is the evidence that "Paul did not have a set policy concerning the financing of his preaching mission,"⁵⁸ while for D. Peterlin

⁵³ Ellis, "Co-workers," 443. He pursues: "On the one hand he firmly asserts, on biblical and dominical authority, the right of the 'worker', i.e. preacher, to his wage. On the other hand it is his boast that he does not exercise this right, and he urges certain persons in Thessalonica to 'imitate us' in this matter."

⁵⁴ Cf. Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915), 302; Betz, *Apostel Paulus*, 100–117; Paul Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 517 (n. 32); Bruce W. Winter, *Philo and Paul among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 91–94, 167–69, 228–29. Cf. Dungan, *Sayings*, 15–16; Datiri, "Finances," 141; Walton, "Paul," 224–25.

⁵⁵ Cf. Hans Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (KEK 6; 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924), 100–101; Paul V. Furnish, *II Corinthians* (AB 32A; New York: Doubleday, 1984), 178; Hock, "Apostle," 63.

⁵⁶ Hock, *Context*. Stowers has stressed, on the other hand, that private houses provided the primary platform for Paul's preaching. See Stanley K. Stowers, "Social Status, Public Speaking and Private Teaching: The Circumstances of Paul's Preaching Activity," *NovT* 26.1 (1984): 59–82.

⁵⁷ Cf. Morton Smith, "Pauline Problems: Apropos of J. Munck, 'Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte'," *HTR* 50.2 (1957): 111 (n. 10); John H. Schütz, *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 235 (n. 1); Marshall, *Enmity*, 255–57; Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 178. Baldanza sees no particular contradiction in Paul's attitude: his use of sacrificial language in Phil 4:18–19 suggests to him that Paul considered the Philippians' contribution as an offering comparable to that which the priests were allowed to consume (cf. 1 Cor 9:13–14). Giuseppe Baldanza, "La portata teologica di *ὁσμή ἐνώδιος* in Fil 4, 18," *Laur* 47 (2006): 182–84.

⁵⁸ J. Paul. Sampley, *Pauline Partnership in Christ: Christian Community and Commitment in Light of Roman Law* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 84.

it simply reveals that “Paul’s practice varied from case to case, from church to church and from time to time.”⁵⁹ Yet, what is perhaps most frustrating is that Paul’s actual motives remain somewhat unclear to us. As a resigned H. D. Betz once remarked: “Man kann sich des Eindrucks nicht erwehren, daß wir in 1 Kor 9 die wirklichen Hintergründe, die das Verhalten des Paulus bestimmt haben, nicht erfahren.”⁶⁰

For Holmberg, Paul accepted money for missionary purposes only after he had left a church with which he had established a “full, trusting *κοινωνία*” – whatever Holmberg understands by *κοινωνία* is not clear to us.⁶¹ Pratscher, on the other hand, argued that Paul’s inconsistent attitude was not based on any particular principle or a disparity in affection (viz., because he had “ein wärmeres Liebesverhältnis” with the Macedonians), but could be explained by the differing circumstances affecting the Corinthian and Philippian communities at the time, a view somewhat already held by Theissen.⁶² In Corinth, hostility towards Paul was exacerbated by the *Gegner* and required him to forfeit his right to financial support.⁶³ In contrast, G. W. Peterman has contended that scholars have failed to discern the various types of support which Paul mentions. Thus, he proposed the following resolution:

Paul refers to three types of material aid in his letters: support while present with a congregation (the support due him as an apostle), travel expenses, and mission support. The evidence shows that he rejected the first, asked for the second, and gladly received the third.⁶⁴

To Peterman’s mind, Paul’s acceptance of a gift from Philippi therefore represented “one exception” to his “general practice to be self-supporting,”⁶⁵ a conclusion also reached by G. A. Deissmann, W. Schmithals, J. P. Dickson, and R. S. Ascough, but which B. Holmberg and D. E. Briones (for different reasons) would probably dispute.⁶⁶ Indeed, Holmberg’s view

⁵⁹ Peterlin, *Philippians*, 215.

⁶⁰ Betz, *Apostel Paulus*, 104.

⁶¹ Holmberg, *Paul*, 91. Holmberg is followed by Martin and Reumann. See Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (WBC 40; Waco: Word Books, 1986), 345; John Reumann, “Contributions of the Philippian Community to Paul and to Earliest Christianity,” *NTS* 39 (1993): 441–42.

⁶² Pratscher, “Verzicht,” 293. Cf. Theissen, “Legitimation,” 204: “Außerdem müssen wir annehmen, daß der Unterhaltsverzicht sachlich begründet war, nicht nur ‘kausal’ bedingt, sondern intentional gewollt war. Es handelt sich ja um eine sinnvolle Anpassung tradierter Normen an veränderte Verhältnisse.”

⁶³ Pratscher, “Verzicht,” 294, 298.

⁶⁴ Peterman, *Gift*, 166–67. Cf. Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 179.

⁶⁵ Peterman, *Gift*, 9. Cf. *ibid.*, 119–20.

⁶⁶ Deissmann, *Paul*, 237; Walter Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969), 47; Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 208–12; Rich-

was that “it is not the church in Philippi that proves the exception to Paul’s rule of not accepting money from his churches; on the contrary, it is the church in Corinth that is the exception to Paul’s custom of permitting and gladly accepting financial support from his churches.”⁶⁷ More recently, Briones has proposed to resolve Paul’s seemingly contradictory policy by differentiating two distinct stages in his missionary strategy: 1) Paul enters and preaches the gospel in city A, whilst remaining self-supportive and financially independent (to distinguish himself from sophists, itinerant philosophers, and other teachers, and to draw attention to God as the original source of the gospel); 2) Paul moves to city B where stage 1 is repeated, whilst he receives material assistance from the church in city A.⁶⁸ Briones thus (quite ingeniously) explained Paul’s apparent “double standard” by “an overlapping of the stages.”⁶⁹

Whatever Paul’s real motives and strategy may have been, the difficulties scholars have experienced in reaching a consensus on the matter clearly illustrates that there remain some substantial gaps in our knowledge of Paul’s policy vis-à-vis the funding of his mission. What is also apparent is that, quite often, insufficient attention has been paid to the apologetic tone and rhetorical exigence of passages such as 1 Thessalonians 2:7–9 or 1 Corinthians 9, in which Paul develops a particularly intricate argument which is hemmed by his discussion concerning the consumption of idolmeat in chapters 8 and 10 – his attitude is thus set up as an example of renunciation of a privilege for the sake of the greater good of the community.⁷⁰ In Thessalonica, Paul had to establish an ethical pattern for the church to follow and correct the idleness and meddlesomeness of some who lived at the expense of others (1 Thess 2:7–9, 4:1, 10–12; cf. 2 Thess 3:7–12),⁷¹ while in Corinth he needed to answer reproaches for not accepting their offer of friendship (through a *gift*, presumably) and refute charges of financial misconduct (2 Cor 11:7–9, 12:16–17).⁷²

ard S. Ascough, *Paul’s Macedonian Associations: The Social Context of Philippians and 1 Thessalonians* (WUNT 2.161; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 153.

⁶⁷ Holmberg, *Paul*, 92. Cf. Briones, *Financial Policy*, 224–25; Reumann, “Contributions,” 442.

⁶⁸ Briones, *Financial Policy*, 219–20.

⁶⁹ Briones, *Financial Policy*, 220.

⁷⁰ Cf. Dungan, *Sayings*, 4–6, 33. For a recent, detailed exegesis of the passage, see John Goodrich, *Paul as an Administrator of God in 1 Corinthians: The Graeco-Roman Context of 1 Corinthians* (SNTSMS 152; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 165–97.

⁷¹ This may have been due to their imminent eschatological expectation. Cf. Agrell, *Work*, 95–106; Malherbe, *Paul and Thessalonians*, 98–101.

⁷² Cf. Marshall, *Enmity*, 143–47, 257–58; Welborn, *Enmity*, 132–39, 368, 398–400.

There is thus some truth in Dungan's remark that "his sweeping, categorical repudiations [in 1 Cor 9] should not be taken literally" (and generally).⁷³ Indeed, "[t]hey are all intended to apply only to the Corinthians, and ... exude a certain rhetorical melodrama concerned primarily with making the point regarding idol-meat."⁷⁴ Furthermore, we ought not to overlook the situational differences between the church at Corinth, which was torn by inner divisions and at times in open conflict with Paul, and the church at Philippi, with whom the apostle appears to have enjoyed a more fruitful and harmonious relationship.⁷⁵ Evidently, such contrasts render any attempt to derive a standard Pauline position rather precarious. So we should perhaps refrain from considering any one of these passages as "a general and programmatic treatise" on the question.⁷⁶

It is in any case beyond the purview of this study to attempt to find an innovative and coherent solution to this conundrum (unlike Briones' recent thesis). Rather, our intention is to investigate the socio-economic dimension of one particular relationship which Paul maintained with a number of his converts. As already noted, his letter to the Philippians gives indisputable evidence that he received generous support from them on several occasions (καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δις, 4:16).⁷⁷ This is made very clear right from the onset when he expresses his gratitude to God (εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου) for the Philippians' κοινωνία with respect to the proclamation of the gospel (εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) from the first day onwards (ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν, 1:3–5).⁷⁸ Further down the letter (if we follow the canonical order), he reiterates his acknowledgement of their gracious support:

οἴδατε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς, Φιλιππηῖοι, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας, οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινωνήσεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήμψεως εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνοι, ὅτι καὶ ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δις εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν μοι ἐπέμψατε. (4:15–16)

⁷³ Dungan, *Sayings*, 23.

⁷⁴ Dungan, *Sayings*, 23.

⁷⁵ Peterlin of course refuted any idyllic state of the church in Philippi, but his overall argumentation is rather overstated. See Peterlin, *Philippians*.

⁷⁶ This comment was made in reference to Phil 4:10–20. Peterlin, *Philippians*, 215.

⁷⁷ Cf. a similar use in 1 Thess 2:18. The expression καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δις implies more than two instances of a repeated action (e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 8.56.1; Deut 9:13; 1 Sam 17:39; 1 Macc 3:30). Cf. BDAG, s.v. ἅπαξ; W. Stählin, *TDNT*, 1:381; Leon Morris, "Καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δις," *NovT* 1.3 (1956): 205–208.

⁷⁸ We understand the term εὐαγγέλιον to be referring to the act of proclamation of the good news here, rather than to its theological content. Cf. BDAG, s.v. εὐαγγέλιον 1.; Peter T. O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 62; Dickson, *Mission-Commitment*, 124; James P. Ware, *The Mission of the Church in Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the context of Ancient Judaism* (NovTSup 120; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 165–67.

As we purport to demonstrate, the language of *κοινωνία* here in 4:15–19, a passage which is characterised by an unusual concentration of technical financial terms (e.g., εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήμψεως, 4:15; ἀπέχω, πλήρω, 4:18), and in 1:5–7 (*κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, συγκοινωνός μου τῆς χάριτος*), is neither accidental nor incidental. In context, it is doubtful that the cognates *κοινωνία*, *κοινωνέω*, and *(συγ)κοινωνός*, bear the theological connotations that generations of commentators have ascribed to them. Nor should it be immediately assumed that the surrounding *termini technici* were meant in a metaphorical sense, considering that Paul *had actually received* some kind of material contribution. Rather, we shall argue that Paul employed the term *κοινωνία* in reference to the strategic economic partnership he established with the Philippians, whereby they cooperated in his missionary activities by providing material and human resources, while he performed the work of the ministry. Before going any further, however, we ought to acknowledge that this idea is not entirely original. Indeed, it has already been propounded (in slightly nuanced fashion) by at least two scholars, whose work we shall now review.⁷⁹

1.2 History of Research on Paul's Economic Partnerships

Amid the more general literature acknowledged above, only two scholars, J. P. Sampley and J. Fleury, have articulated detailed hypotheses regarding Paul's potential economic partnerships.⁸⁰ In what follows, we shall offer a succinct review of their seminal contributions, raise some critical questions

⁷⁹ Others have somewhat given assent to the general idea of partnership and have built on the work of Fleury and Sampley (with some adaptation). However, insofar as they did not elaborate their thesis as comprehensively as Fleury and Sampley did, they need not be reviewed in detail. See for instance Paul F. Aspan, "Toward a New Reading of Paul's Letter to the Philippians in Light of a Kuhnian Analysis of New Testament Criticism" (Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1990), 219–20, 255; Brian J. Capper, "Paul's Dispute with Philippi: Understanding Paul's Argument in Phil 1–2 from his Thanks in 4.10–20," *TZ* 49 (1993): 193–214; G. Walter Hansen, "Transformation of Relationships: Partnership, Citizenship, and Friendship in Philippi," in *New Testament Greek and Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Gerald F. Hawthorne* (eds. A. M. Donaldson and T. B. Sailors; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 181–204. We shall also omit P. N. Groves' study since it consists of a missiological application of Sampley's *societas* model to a modern ecclesiastical situation. See Philip N. Groves, "A Model for Partnership: A Model for Partnership Distilled from the Relationship between Paul and the Philippian Church as a Tool to Examine the Partnership Programmes of the Anglican Communion and to Propose New Directions" (Ph.D. diss., The University of Birmingham, 2009).

⁸⁰ Jean Fleury, "Une société de fait dans l'église apostolique (Phil. 4:10 à 22)," in *Mélanges Philippe Meylan* (vol. 2; Lausanne: Université de Lausanne, 1963), 41–59; Sampley, *Partnership*.