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ABSTRACT

The proliferation of often contradictory views on the letter to the Philippians is briefly indicated. It is argued that the letter has not yet been approached adequately from the vantage point of its distinct macro-structure. Where this is attempted, for example by Peter Wick (1994), it not only reveals a careful original structuring by the author, but allows the accommodation and corrective interaction of a multiplicity of valid previous observations, of which some are briefly indicated. It is further suggested that the thematic pattern emerging from such an analysis decisively points to a deictic characterisation of the letter. Christ, Paul and his co-workers, the community itself and even the ‘culprits’ among them are ‘celebrated’ for partaking in the truly Christian attitude whilst the judaising opponents are castigated for not doing so.

1 STUDIES ON PHILIPPIANS—A PERPLEXING SCENE

1.1 To the jubilarian

The magnificent letter Paul wrote to ‘his’ Christian community at Philippi never took a central place in the scholarly attention of Johnnie Roberts. However, his efforts in the field of the corpus Paulinum, ranging from the theological core and central message of the individual letters (1975) to the smallest minutiae of an investigation into formal matters, for example his three essays (1985b, 1986a, 1986b) on transitional techniques to the Pauline letter body, have helped set the standard and inspire the nature of Pauline studies in this country and abroad. His first love, of course, was Ephesians and its lofty view on the church of Christ (1983, 1985a) whilst favouring methods as diverse as letter form and discourse analysis. His masterpiece may remain perhaps his 1992 commentary on Philemon, which Wilhelm Wuellner in a personal remark labelled a gem of interpretation. The brevity of this letter allowed him full application and co-ordination of the methods utilised in this series, resulting in a trend setting example of the exposition of a New Testament letter from the viewpoints of, inter alia, structural, literary, ancient and new rhetorical and (to a degree) sociological analyses. Hopefully the present contribution on Philippians may be worthy of such company!
1.2 The eyes of the beholder(s): the widely divergent results of Philippians' scholarship

It is a striking feature of studies on Paul's letter to the Philippians that so little consensus seems to be achieved on either the major or the minor issues arising from its interpretation. Robert Swift (1984:234) has likened Philippians to 'sort of a "Rubik's cube" of the Pauline literature' which has many times been 'twisted, turned, and rearranged as scholars have attempted to make the best sense they could of it.' He relates these attempts especially to the futile quest for a central theme or a line of argument in the letter.1 Whereas F. C. Baur (1845) originally regarded this as a reason to doubt the authenticity of the letter (cf. Jewett 1970a: 49f), it has since mostly run parallel to the integrity debate, in which proponents of the single, two or three letter partition theories can count on about equal support, though only with great variations within each option.2

Regarding the main aim or central theme of the letter, B. Weiss indicated that even in early Christianity six possibilities were raised, with another six options espoused during the time of the Orthodoxy, Aufklärung and Pietism (1859:2ff). Of these some, like Bengel's 'rejoicing' and the warning against disunity, still figure strongly in recent proposals, whereas a number of new suggestions have found support (I have discussed these in my articles of 1989 and 1995). A notable example is the finding of Geoffrion (1993) that the letter is 'a call to steadfastness'.

Many other instances spring to mind, in which findings are either diametrically opposed or diverge in a motley flock of suggestions.


* The rhetorical genre of the letter is disputed. In this regard, Marshall (1993) opposes Kennedy: 'Contrary to Kennedy's view that Philippians is epideictic, I agree with Watson that the letter is deliberative rhetoric'. He concedes: 'Although these passages may be characterized as epideictic, their ultimate purpose is deliberative' (Marshall 1993:363).

* Approaching the speech character of the letter by means of the criteria of ancient rhetoric, different results are again arrived at. Apart from the purely epistolary categories: the prescript (1:1-2) and the postscript (4:21-
23), rhetorical elements in Philippians are identified in the following way by Watson (1988:60-80), and echoed by Snyman (1993:328):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exordium</th>
<th>1:3-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narratio/Propositio</td>
<td>1:27-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probatio:</td>
<td>2:1-3:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development 1</td>
<td>2:1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development 2</td>
<td>2:12-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development 3</td>
<td>3:1-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peroratio</td>
<td>4:1-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently the scheme of David Black (1995:48) differs significantly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exordium</th>
<th>1:3-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narratio</td>
<td>1:12-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentatio</td>
<td>1:27-3:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositio</td>
<td>1:27-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probatio</td>
<td>2:1-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutatio</td>
<td>3:1-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peroratio</td>
<td>4:1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narratio</td>
<td>4:10-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This underscores the remark of Wick (1994:163): 'Eine rhetorische Analyse des Philippberbriefes ist anscheinend nicht einfach.' The value of the exercise is greatly determined by the way in which the character ascribed to each element is found in different parts of the letter.\(^3\) Noteworthy at this stage is the repetition of a narratio in Black's scheme. Reed remarks that 'proposals for the dispositio of Philippians...are widely divergent' (1997:165). Reed in principle opposes the formal application of ancient rhetoric to Paul's letters (1:156-168, 442-454)\(^4\) and instead utilises (ancient) epistolary features as a heuristic tool.

* The exposition of the central 'Christ hymn' has met with the greatest controversy, encompassing every single aspect of its composition, function and meaning. Contrary to the traditional, seemingly self-evident notion of the exemplary use of Christ's self-sacrifice, a divergent course of interpretation has been initiated by Lohmeyer (1928) and advocated by Käsemann (1968) and Martin (1967), reading 2:6-11 as a poetic rendering of Christ's salvific work and his supreme rule over cosmic powers. Even

---

\(^3\) Still another scheme is devised by Geoffrion (1993:160, 161).

\(^4\) He says: '..I consider it methodologically suspect to read Paul's letters according to the rhetorical handbooks in the light of (i) the evidence from the rhetorical and epistolary theorists themselves and (ii) the absence of formal parallels between Paul's letters and other so-called 'rhetorical' letters.' (1997:157).
the hymnic character of the 'carmen Christi' has been seriously questioned by Riesenfeld (1983) and Schenk (1987:3300–3303), for example.

Likewise, the expositions of crucial terms in the letter have been greatly at variance with one another. Wright (1986:342, 343) for example lists 18 different indications of the meaning of ἀποστεγμός in Philp 2:6b, lamenting that: 'These shades of meaning have become so complex, and the shorthand ways of referring to them so involved, that even the task of describing the different senses on offer has become problematic' (321).

The debate about the opponents in chapter 3 in particular has also taken a sharp turn. Formerly the dispute concerned the character of these adversaries in Philippi and the seriousness of their challenge to Paul (e.g. by Tyson 1976, Grayston 1986, and Mearns 1987). Now a convincing case has been made for a negative exemplary portrayal of these types which, it is argued, may as yet not have materialised in Philippi (see Wick 1994:89–96).

It should not even be expected that the new rhetorical approach as such will be capable of achieving more compatible results. With reference to Swift (1984), Garland (1985), Watson (1988), and Schoon-Janssen (1991), Peter Wick contends: 'Sogar die neue rhetorische Analyse, für sich genommen, macht die Aufsplitterung der Meinungen noch größer' (1994:192).

Finally, the character and general tenor of the letter have been read in completely, and astonishingly different ways. The pendulum has swung in a wide orbit past the prima facie perception of a kind and loving attitude of the apostle, the exemplary character of the Philippians, the hearty relationship between the apostle and 'his' community and the friendly nature (cf. Cornelius 1994) and intention of the letter from which these impressions originate. In the same measure as seemingly positive traits (e.g. the praise of the Philippians and the call to joy) are rendered suspect, the seriousness of the situation in Philippi is seen to take on crisis proportions. The apostle may appear as a theologically self-centred religiomaniac by Fortna (1990), or according to Aspan (1992), as an autocratic spiritual despot, using the cross and exaltation of Christ to attain obedience to himself on a par with the Lord. It is assumed that the pressure of persecution and/or false teachings had brought the Philippian

---


6 Culpepper intimates that ‘[t]hey were dangerously close to embracing a christology...a soteriology...and an eschatology...which Paul viewed as potentially disastrous for the church’ (1980:352–353).
church to the verge of disintegration. Disunity among the members is seen to have been so widespread that the whole letter is understood to be countering it (Peterlin 1995). The financial dealings of the apostle with the Philippians is perceived to have been in dire straits, since he was unable to fulfil his part of the 'contract' they had with him (Capper 1993), etcetera.

It seems incredible that all these differing scenarios could have their basis in the same 'letter to the Philippians'. Certainly this must indicate a pressing need to find some direction regarding priority of themes, real rhetorical thrust, and the relation between communicative issues and situational aspects in the letter.

In the context of his socio-rhetorical approach, Vernon Robbins has indicated the problem inherent in the present research situation: 'The emergence of so many movements and methods in such a short span of time has produced a scientific revolution in biblical studies, and revolutions are times of disunity rather than widespread cooperation'. He indicates the necessity of a much less pretentious scholarly endeavour in this regard: 'The goal is not so much to attain agreement among interpreters as to nurture cooperation in the gathering, analysis and interpretation of data even among people who disagree with one another' (1996:1, 3).

1.3 The quest for a converging scheme: a possible vantage point to gain perspective on the various approaches to Philippians

Even in this post modern age, a measure of mutual understanding and discourse should be strived at. An attempt is launched in this contribution to 'get behind' the overall plan, character and structuring of the letter to the Philippians, enabling a more adequate assessment of its component elements and sub-themes, and facilitating the process of interaction between various methods and seemingly opposite views regarding the image and aspects of the letter. Obviously valid observations must be seen from a wider perspective and benefit from reinterpretation in the light of findings from another angle.

In several instances, claims of progress beyond the unsatisfactory results attained by former, especially form-critical, methods have been made.7 There can be no doubt that form-critical approaches, such as letter form identification and typifying in terms of ancient rhetoric have contributed to an

7 David Black says his textual reading of Philippians 'suggests a corrective to previous interpretive strategies that tend to ignore the letter's overall deliberative function and focus instead on multiple structures and functions that are discernible in the letter' (1995:45). See also Swift (1984), Garland (1985), Watson (1988), Luter & Lee (1995).
elucidation of the fabric of Paul's letters. The significance of these studies may still be enhanced by the growing emphasis on comparative materials from the Greco-Roman world for an understanding of New Testament texts. There is, however, the perception that letter form investigations are limited, firstly by their dissecting, atomistic procedures and secondly by their isolated, self-serving nature, failing to relate meaningfully to the intent and content of the individual letters.8

2 AGAIN: THE STRUCTURE AND CONCEPT OF PHILIPPIANS

The mere procedure of understanding the letter from a text-holistic perspective, in line with the recent ascendancy of linguistic, 'synchronic', text-immanent views9 does not, of course, guarantee a unanimous result as far as the character and theme of the epistle is concerned. Yet recent studies have indicated that there are certain definite advantages in taking the structure and composition of the entire letter as a starting point.10

Among the recent monographs on Philippians, there is one that, to my mind, opens real possibilities of advancing beyond the multiplicity of unrelated and often contradictory efforts in the understanding of the letter. Peter Wick may not be the first German author to employ some kind of structural method to Philippians—this was already done by Schenk (1984). However, Schenk arrived at a threefold partition theory and subjected each of the component letters to a separate linguistic and structural analysis,11 whereas Wick has analysed the text of the present canonical letter and discovered what he regards as a careful original composition of its macro structure.

2.1 The structural proposal of Peter Wick

The contribution of Wick is presented briefly, inevitably with a measure of

8 Roberts already intimated this shortcoming in his contribution to the essays in honour of Bruce Metzger. Referring to the elements distinguished e.g. by Du Toit in the Pauline letter form, he indicated as one of the problems in need of further examination: 'whether this kind of structuring in any way helps us to understand the relationship between the argument of a letter and the parenesis...' (1986b:188).
10 Loubser favours the acceptance of the text of Philippians in its present form and accepts the validity of its unity as a point of departure, assuming that meaning is constituted firstly by the text in its entirety and secondly by the structural binding of its various elements (1986:94-101).
11 Reed critiques the 'compartamentalization' of textlinguistics by Schenk into syntax, semantics and pragmatics, leading to the misconception 'that pragmatic meaning is something other than semantic meaning and, even worse, that syntax can be analyzed apart from semantics' (1997:404).
paraphrasing around intricate edges. It is confronted with some other recent viewpoints, and it is subsequently evaluated. Wick does not arrive at his findings by applying a pre-conceived scheme to the letter, as is often done. His aim, by observing textual features and coherency, is to discover a pattern which may be regarded as the original design of the author and then to substantiate this scheme by further investigation. His point of departure is one of the basic premises of structural analysis: the component parts of the letter must be identified and their formal and thematic relation established to arrive at the concept and rhetoric thrust of the letter (33, 34).

The prescript, proœmium (προεσθίον), and postscript are readily distinguished from the letter body, the latter comprising 1:12-4:20. In the letter body ten thematic blocks are identified. These Glieder, or sections of the letter body, are delimited by Wick in the following way:


The observation of the pattern of structure markers in these ten component parts of the letter body, leads to the inference that, in a unique 'macro-parallelism', the first five blocks (designated α₁-ε₁) may have the second five (α₂-ε₂) running parallel to them, the letter body thus being composed of two almost equal parallel sections:
1. 1:12—2:30
2. 3:1—4:20.

The structure markers figure in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a₁</td>
<td>1:12-26</td>
<td>Joy Opponents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a₂</td>
<td>3:1-16</td>
<td>Joy Opponents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b₁</td>
<td>1:27-30</td>
<td>Opponents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b₂</td>
<td>3:17-21</td>
<td>Opponents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c₁</td>
<td>2:1-11</td>
<td>Joy Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c₂</td>
<td>4:1-3</td>
<td>Joy Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d₁</td>
<td>2:12-18</td>
<td>Joy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d₂</td>
<td>4:4-9</td>
<td>Joy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e₁</td>
<td>2:19-30</td>
<td>Joy Pract. matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e₂</td>
<td>4:10-20</td>
<td>Joy Pract. matters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On closer investigation an astonishing similarity between the respective 'pairs' reveals itself concerning vocabulary, style, subject matter and form—even a word count tallies almost exactly in each case!²

² The word statistics are: a₁:243 - a₂:250; b₁:82 - b₂:90; c₁ proper (2:1-4):58 - c₂:53; d₁:115 - d₂:101; e₁:173 - e₂:169!
The obvious exception is \( c^1 \)—in which the Christ hymn (2:5-11) 'disturbs' the pattern to such an extent, that it is to be regarded as an element on its own. Without the hymn directly incorporated \( c^1 \), consisting of 2:1-4, it is again an exact match to \( c^2 \) (4:1-3). This is a vital insight, suggesting that the hymn is indeed intended to function as an independent element, relating not only to its immediate context, but to all other sections of the letter as well. (Wick 1994:41–57)

In view of the extended parallelism of the ten blocks, they should be interpreted in tandem, thus relating \( a^1 \) to \( a^2 \) as unit A, \( b^1 \) and \( b^2 \) as B, etc. In this way the hymn is positioned between \( c^1 \) proper (2:1-4) and \( c^2 \). Since unit C, comprising the middle pair, \( c^1 \) and \( c^2 \), is the central combination in the letter, the hymn is indeed the centerpiece of the entire letter body, both formally and thematically! In the hymn itself the cross (2:8) can be regarded as the centerpiece, signalling the lowest point in Christ's path of humiliation, in between the high points of 'the form of God' (2:6) and the 'glory of the Father' (2:11).

2.2 The 'breaks': substantiating the proposed macro-structure

The notorious 'breaks' in the present letter and the diversity of themes, according to Wick, coincides with the parallel structure in the letter body.

The first verse of the third chapter has traditionally been regarded as the point of the main breach in the letter, leading to several partition suggestions. But its position exactly at the dividing point between the two great parallel sections indicates a pivotal role in the structure of the letter. It is indeed the indication of another centre which binds together the thematic blocks of the letter. The call to joy in 3:1a appears in the following way in the block sequence:

\[ a^1 + b^1 + c^1 + d^1 + e^1 < 3:1a: \chiαιρετε > a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2 + e^2. \]

The call to 'rejoice' is therefore clearly a complimentary central binding motif echoing throughout the letter and permeating every other theme, as indicated earlier by the structure markers. 13

Verse 3:1b is seen also to function as an important structural signal, introducing as it does the second parallel half of the letter and confirming its 'twofold' composition. Exactly at this point, where the second sequence of parallel themes commences, the author remarks: \( \tauο \ \alphaυτα \ \gammaραφειν \ \ιμιν \ \εμοι \)

---

13 Reed has a different view in this regard. He argues that \( \tauο \ λαοτον \) 'does not introduce the beginning of a new section (nor the absolute conclusion of the previous section), but signals the final imperative in a list of three (2:29 προσδεχοτε...\( \chi\)ετε...3.1 \( \chiαιρετε\)), all of which concern the Philippians' reception of Epaphroditus' (1997:258, 259).
μὲν οὐκ ὀκτυρέων, ὑμῖν δὲ ἁσφαλές, that is, he does not find it 'irksome' to write 'the same things' to them! This has been understood in various ways, for example indicating a previous letter or even oral instruction which is now confirmed in writing. However, it is now proposed that it would most naturally express the intention to dwell on issues related to those that have already been addressed in the letter thus far. It means a return to the same five basic themes, based on the five genuine reasons prompting the writing in the first place, any one of which may on its own be (one-sidedly) regarded as the main theme of the letter, or in the case of a partition theory, of one of the underlying letters.

2.3 Double exposition of five themes.

This provides for the following thematic structure of the letter body, in which '1' indicates blocks in the first part and '2' those in the second part:

2.3.1 First theme

Paul, imitator of Christ:  a 1: 1:12-26,  a 2: 3:1-16

a 1: Paul gives the assurance that his imprisonment has not 'gotten him down' neither did it harm his work. To die would be gain, allowing him to be with Christ. But he is willing to 'stay on' if it can be for the good of the Philippians.

a 2: Paul declines to exploit the 'plus points' which could count in his favour as a devout Jew—as the opponents do. He had to discard all human merit to obtain the free gift of Christ and his resurrection.

2.3.2 Second theme

Living 'in Christ':  b 1: 1:27-30,  b 2: 3:17-21

b 1: The Philippians must behave in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ, that is, they must stand firm in the struggle and not be afraid to suffer.

b 2: Like Paul and other co-workers, they must keep in mind their heavenly citizenship, over the 'enemies of the cross', whose destiny is destruction.

2.3.3 Third theme


c 1: Enjoying the wonderful love and gifts of Christ, they should cultivate a sense of oneness in Christ by considering others better than themselves and by guarding the interests of others.
2.3.4 Fourth theme

Salvation is from God, but man's responsibility: \(d^1: 2:12-18, \ d^2: 4:4-9\)

\(d^1:\) There is a human responsibility to 'work out' the salvation that God worked 'within'. This entails obeying the will of God both in becoming 'blameless and pure' and in 'holding out the word of life, shining like stars in a dark world.'

\(d^2: \) God's peace will fill those who act gently, who request Him to fulfil their needs, who contemplate only what is good and who put into practice the good example of the apostle.

2.3.5 Fifth theme

Giving credit where it is due: \(e^1: 2:19-30, \ e^2: 4:10-20.\)

\(e^1: \) Timothy is recommended for taking a genuine interest in the Philippians, unlike others who have only their own interests at heart 'and not those of Jesus Christ'. Epaphroditus should be honoured 'because he almost died for the work of Christ' (NIV).

\(e^2: \) The Philippians are honoured for the renewal of their support to the cause of the gospel and it is mentioned that they were the only congregation who shared in the apostle's expenses. This is highly recommended as a 'fragrant offering', acceptable to God. They had proved that they knew the self-sacrificial way of Christ. The apostle himself sets the example of not being dependent on luxury—he is satisfied whether or not he is well-stocked with 'consumer goods'.

2.4 Unity around two theological 'centres'

The factor unifying these themes and the letter as a whole does not lie in the subject matter or in any traits of the situation as such, but in the elevated central theological viewpoint from which these varying concerns are approached and by which their rhetorical aim is determined. The leading viewpoint of faith comprises, as indicated above, the two strands running through the entire letter:

(1) the attitude of 'self-emptying' which Christ revealed on the way of the cross as portrayed in the 'Christ hymn' and
the call to joy.

The 'übergeordnete Thema' encompassing both (1) and (2) is the notion of community, or 'unity': 'Die "Koinonia" ist das Grundthema des ganzen Briefes.' (Wick 1994:14).

2.4.1 The attitude of Christ

The association between the 'Christ hymn' and the distinctive double blocks are investigated in detail.

In the hymn, the way that Christ went is portrayed with explicit emphasis on the attitude that motivated him. He willingly left his position as Son and exchanged it for that of a slave. In carrying out his mission, he renounced all privileges and finally submitted to the death of a criminal.

His attitude in doing so was rewarded by God in three ways:
- He was exalted by God as Saviour,
- he stands to receive acknowledgment among all of humanity, and
- he is to achieve the glorification of God by all.

Following him, and taking note of the examples of his servants, Paul, Timothy and Epaphroditus, the Philippian Christians should willingly become 'slaves' of Christ, renouncing what privileges they may rightly have in favour of the needs of their community. In this way they will likewise partake in the exaltation of Christ, the gospel will be spread by their participation and, as a result, God will be honoured.

The association with the example of Christ can be traced in every passage of the letter. Neither Paul nor the Philippians are depicted as trying to equal the status or work of Christ. By following his example they express the wish to follow him and finally to be with him through the resurrection. Again, in the example of self-humiliation the emphasis is not on suffering as such but on service to the cause of the gospel even though Christ did suffer and there seems to be suffering in store for both Paul and the Philippians.

2.4.2 The call to joy

It was indicated above that the prevalent structure marker is the repeated mention of 'joy' or 'rejoicing'. Very often this is regarded as the main theme of the letter, featuring in countless titles on the letter (cf Pretorius 1989:147).

14 Contra Aspan who concludes that as Jesus becomes a 'type' in the hymn, Paul likewise becomes a 'type' for the believers, even the 'type' kurios. 'In short, Paul is their Lord.' And again: 'the rhetorical logic posits him (Timothy) as an authority to be emulated and obeyed, even as a proleptic manifestation of the hoped for visit of their Lord (Paul, not Jesus: 2:24)' (1992:279-281).
However, in the midst of persecution and suffering, joy cannot simply be ‘commanded’. It is noteworthy that ‘joy’ is often associated in the letter particularly with problems such as the opponents and personal distress. This must be explained by the fact that in the central message the readers are given a sound foundation for this kind of joy. The foundation is clearly the example of Christ’s attitude of self-sacrifice and humility and their willingness to put it into practice in their own lives. The overriding frame of mind can indeed be phrased as ‘joy in suffering like and for Christ’. In other words: the five main issues are addressed twice in the letter, firstly *sub specie* attitude of Christ and secondly *sub specie* joy in the Lord, combined into the main theme: *kouvários* (rightly identified by Swift 1984:237ff).

3 CONSEQUENCES: REVISITING PHILIPPIANS’ RESEARCH

The scope and implication of Wick’s structural and thematic observations are briefly spelt out with regard to the main issues.

3.1 A literary masterpiece?

‘Die inhaltliche Systematisierung entspricht einer formalen Struktur, die von beeindruckend schöner und genauer Gestalt ist... Der Brief besitzt eine so hohe literarische Qualität, daß er als Kunstwerk betrachtet werden kann.’ F. C. Baur (1845:464) followed by, inter alia, Clemen (1894:135) was convinced of the conceptual poverty, deficient coherency and monotonous repetition of Philippians. A fair notion of the prevalent scholarly judgment on this matter is given by Roberts (1985:146): ‘This letter displays no strictly designed structure. It has obviously been determined to a large extent by the circumstances of both writer and recipients.’ However, Wick’s endeavour leads to the compelling conclusion that the design and composition of the letter renders it nothing less than a literary masterpiece. This view is anticipated in structural patterns previously discerned by, inter alia, Garland (1985), Loubser (1986), Watson (1988), Aspan (1992), and Luter & Lee (1995).

3.2 The integrity of Philippians

The ‘fissures’ occurring in the canonical letter, notably between 3:1 and 3:2 and around the 4:10–20 passage are rather to be read as structural indicators. This opposes the partition theory of Philippians, originating with J. H. Heinrichs in 1803 (cf Bormann 1995:109 n 1) and propagated since then in endless varieties.

---

15 Severely, and convincingly, criticised by Porter & Reed 1998.
The unity of the present letter has been accepted on methodological grounds by Loubser (1986), Wick (1994:11, 12 n 4), and others, and argued from many angles.\footnote{For instance by Haupt 1902:371; Dibelius 1937:368; Lohmeyer 1956:74; Jewett 1970a:48f. The excellent intensive linguistic investigation of Jeffrey Reed has as its main aim the quest for the unity of Philippians, but in fact leads to a non liquet. It nevertheless represents a remarkable advance in the evaluation of viewpoints on the matter (1997: 401-418).} The structural analysis of Wick provides perhaps the most plausible, consistent and comprehensive explanation for the perceived ‘cracks’ in the letter. Briefly: 3:1a is the pivotal statement of a general theme in the letter (rejoicing) and is not directly incorporated in either the preceding or the following passage, whereas 3:1b is an authorial signal\footnote{Reed finds the epistolary form of a ‘hesitation formula’ in this break in the letter (1997:289).} that themes are revisited and expanded on in the second part of the letter. The so called ‘letter of thanks’ (4:10-20) balances out with its ‘fellow passage’ 2:19-30, dealing with practical matters (the usual ‘correspondence’ materials) and conferring praise where it is due.

3.3 The thematic coherence of the letter

The situation in which the letter was written furnished the author with five basic reasons for writing. These are discussed twice in the same sequence in the two parallel sections of the letter, from the viewpoint of the central theological motif of ἀδελφικός, ‘partnership’ (1:5, 7) which incorporates:

1. the attitude of Christ, displayed in the ‘hymn’ (2:5–11) and
2. the call to joy, interwoven in the fabric of the whole letter and placed prominently at the central verse 3:1a.

This asserts that the thematic coherence of the letter is not constituted by a single overriding topic. Bengel’s summa epistolae: ‘gaudeo gaudet’ and the countless expositions on the ‘joy’ theme (Pretorius 1989:147–153) are placed in proper perspective. Similarly, the hymn eulogising the ‘mind of Christ’, is confirmed as a central binding motif, yet it is not to be regarded as the main theme. Far less may one of the five basic issues, or even aspects of them, be elevated to prime position. Neither the apostle’s situation, nor the call to a ‘walk’ worthy of the gospel, or to steadfastness, or to unity or concord, or to obedience; nor a warning against ‘false teachers’, nor the note of ‘thankless thanks’ can on its own be regarded as the thematic centre of the letter.

On the other hand, the double perspective from which even thematically unrelated issues are approached, provides a sound basis for the literary unity of the letter. Firstly, the marvellous portrayal of the inner attitude of Christ
in the hymn, which Aspan\textsuperscript{18} regards as an instance of ‘tensive language’, must be juxtaposed with all other sections of the letter. Secondly, the spirit of ‘joy in Christ in all circumstances’ is centrally stated and explicitly present throughout the letter, again not in the sense of a logical ‘theme’ but as the pervading triumphant attitude based on the victorious advance of ‘the gospel’ in and through Paul and his Philippian community. These two main perspectives are in turn bound together by the ‘umbrella’ concept of kouvoria.

3.4 Aid to discourse analysis

Although the structural analysis of Wick is primarily concerned with the ‘letter body’, he does indicate how the prescript, prooemium and postscript fit in with his thematic scheme (1994:139–149). Compared to the ‘discourse analysis’ employed in the South African KNT-series of commentaries,\textsuperscript{19} there is a remarkable agreement regarding macro structure and pericope demarcation—both embarking from a holistic view of the text of the present letter. In my structural analysis of Philippians for the above series I arrived at the following statement of the macro structure:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Pericope 1 (1:1–2): Letter heading: Blessing from founder to Christian community.
  \item P2 (1:3–11): Prayer report: Remembering their exemplary acceptance of the Gospel and unfaltering support of its cause. Praying for further growth.
  \item P3 (1:12–26): Paul enduring every tribulation with joy since it profits the Christ-movement.
  \item P4 (1:27–30): Aim: To ensure perseverance in living the disposition of Christ.
  \item P5 (2:1–11): Christ’s self-sacrifice and elevation to power is the key to Christian concord.
  \item P6 (2:12–18): God’s inner work being made manifest in the world.
  \item P7 (2:19–30): The exemplary co-workers Timothy and Epaphroditus and their respective missions.
  \item P8 (3:1–16): Renouncing religious status (and those who falsely pursue it) in order to gain Christ as gift.
  \item P9 (3:17–21): Constantly following good examples, avoiding the obviously malignant, whilst awaiting complete transformation by the coming Lord.
  \item P10 (4:1–3): Affirming the high esteem of co-workers for one another and their bond to one another.
  \item P11 (4:4–9): Rejoicing in the Lord, loving humanity, depending on God, excelling in the whole scope of virtues.
\end{itemize}


\textsuperscript{19} ‘Kommentaar op die Nuwe Testament: Struktuur—Uitleg—Boodskap’. Kaapstad: Lux Verbi.
P12 (4:10-20): Paul lauding the Philippians for the gift of money and displaying what he regards as the correct attitude towards material things.


The surface structure has previously been seen as notoriously ‘unconnected’ and repetitive, rendering a demarcation of some of the pericopes rather subjective, especially where a kind of enumeration or listing is evident, as in P11. As far as the ‘prayer period’ is concerned, it would be quite acceptable to have a division into two or even four distinct pericopes, for example the actual thanksgiving, the motivation, the exclamation of longing, and the petition—which indeed comprises my four colon-clusters. However, with a little help from ancient rhetoric, I have decided to keep the προσευχή (1:3-11) intact as a distinct period. In the second half of the letter, convinced of the parallel pairs in the construction of the two main sections of the letter, certain concessions to Wick’s demarcation have been made.

3.5 Epistolary characteristics

Apart from the most basic elements: prescript, thanksgiving, letter body and postscript, Philippians does not conform to any single type of Hellenistic letter, nor to a preconceived ideal type of ‘Pauline letter’. Epistolary forms may profitably be identified in it (not being elaborated upon here). It does show remarkable similarities with the ‘family letter’, the ‘letter of friendship’ and the epistolary views and customs of Seneca in particular.

Russell (1982:297-305) indicated some added elements in the Pauline letter custom but he ran into difficulties applying it to Philippians, identifying two parenetic passages and two letter body endings! Alexander (1989:90-100) attempts to fit Philippians into the structure of the ‘family letter’ with no clearly defined ‘letter body’ since this type of letter only aims at the strengthening of family ties by exchanging personal news items. He therefore regards Paul’s assessment of his own situation as the main reason for the letter—regarding the false teachers and the disunity in the church as subordinate themes. Had Alexander grasped the twofold structure of the letter the problem he experienced with 3:1-4:20 could have been solved, since it repeats the pattern of the first half and can therefore again be seen as communication about Paul, about the Philippians and about the co-workers!

---

20 The priority of epistolary features and the comparison with Hellenistic letters in determining the structure of the letter is convincingly argued by Reed 1997.

21 This view was already raised by Walter (1977:417): ‘Oder ist es gerade derjenige unter den Paulusbriefen, der nichts anderes sein will als wirkliche Korrespondenz mit den Lesern, Ausdruck herzlicher Verbundenheit des Apostels mit dieser Gemeinde, Niederschlag des Dankes für empfangene Hilfe und Bericht vom eigenen ergehen?’
In any event, the fact that his structure is compatible with the emphasis on communion (κοινωνία) between author and recipients in the προοίμιον gives it a great deal of credibility.

Several aspects of the ‘friendly letter’, however, do warrant it being regarded as a closer parallel to Philippians (see, esp, Cornelius 1994). Its purpose is the upholding of warm, friendly relations between separated persons. An inner self disclosure of the author, revealing his attitude in his circumstances, is required, as Paul does in the two sections of part A. This kind of letter also allows an element of teaching, in the form of a friendly ‘conversation’, as Paul does in his discourses about κοινωνία, the attitude of Christ and the joy in the Lord.

A comparison with Seneca’s ‘Epistulae morales’ is especially illuminating in this regard. Seneca regarded autobiographical materials in the setting of friendship as the ideal means of conveying his philosophic and parentic thought with a view to the inducing of moral conduct (cf Cancik 1967). Seneca freely utilises his own person and life as an example for his moral teaching, although he acknowledges his own failures and honours the example that Socrates in turn set for him. This provides a close parallel to Paul’s call to the Philippians to put into practice what they have seen in him or heard from him (Philp 4:9), although he himself is still striving towards perfection (3:12ff) and is himself imitating Christ, indeed: ‘Paulus macht deutlich, daß er ein Vorbild wird, indem er dem Exemplum von Jesus Christus folgt (3, 17: σωματική).’ Both Paul and Seneca strive at a life that is on a par with their teaching and, moreover, aim at a writing that adequately expresses both. As Seneca regarded death forced upon someone as the highest form of setting an example, so Paul saw his possible execution as setting an example of the attitude of Christ to the Philippians—they even both used the same metaphor of a libation in this matter! Direct influence may not be the explanation of these similarities—they nevertheless indicate a common understanding of the form and teaching possibilities of the ‘friendly’ type of letter (Wick 1994:157–158).

Another tradition has to be taken into account to explain Paul’s prayer period, extending way beyond the simple Hellenistic ‘thanksgiving’ (προσκύνημα). The early Jewish tradition of letters of guidance to communities shows the same tendency to anticipate in the thanksgiving, as in a προοίμιον, the contents of the letter body.

3.6 Language reflecting the social setting.

In several instances the vocabulary of the letter is taken from spheres of the real world surrounding the Philippians.
• The political terms πολιτεύεσθαι (1:27, section b') and πολίτευμα (3:20, section b''), used only once by Paul, at the same time gives substance to their understanding of the Christian lifestyle and completely renews its contents by connecting their citizenship to Christ in heaven. The same happens with the epithets attached to contemporary rulers: κύριος and σωτήρ when applied to Christ.22 '[D]as gesellschaftliche Ideal, ein würdiger Bürger zu sein, erreicht man dort nicht durch Selbsthöhung, sondern durch Selbsterniedrigung, wie es dem Kyrios und Soter dieses Politheuma entspricht' (Wick 1994:170).

The significance of these, and other 'secular' terms is not primarily to carry the thematic argument—they merely 'mirror' the images. They do not belong to the structure and theme of images, but to the 'colour' of it. Geogfrion (1993:23-28) rightly identifies the whole pattern of military/political language in the letter, but he overstates its thematic function in elevating the call to steadfastness to the level of the main theme. He correctly observes that the metaphor of citizenship is used in a spiritual way and that the metaphor primarily stresses co-citizenship. As he puts it: '...rather than describing the Philippians' existence in terms of a colony of heaven, Paul emphasises their identity in terms of their relationship to their fellow citizens of heaven.' This concurs with the idea of κοινωνία in and on behalf of the Gospel and provides the scope of the call to exercise their citizenship (πολιτεύεσθαι) worthily of the Gospel.

• The words relating to athletic competitions (1:27-30; 3:13-14)23 utilises the contemporary ideal of attaining status through victory, and bringing honour to your sponsor. The 'success' of Paul is thus tied up with the 'succeeding' of the Philippians (2:16). But in the Pauline paradox, this victory is attained by self-negation, as is clear from the context of the ἐγγραφή-terminology. Paul presses on toward the goal for the prize (3:14 RSV) by forsaking his former gains while the Philippians who are engaged in the same conflict (1:30) are his 'joy and his crown' (4:1) by living in the same self-forsaking attitude as Christ (Wick 1994:170).

• The language of trade and commerce24 found in Philippians is hardly used by Paul elsewhere. The special purpose it serves here is to explain the spirit of self-negation inherent in the service of Christ. 'Damit spricht er an, daß, wer im Himmelstaat Gewinn machen will, dies paradoxerweise durch Selbsterniedrigung tut' (Wick 1994:170, 171).

22 Perkins (1987:509, 520) may be pressing precision too far in this regard by imposing the situation at Alexandria on the Philippian scene.

23 For instance: αὐξανεῖ (1:27, 4:3), βραβεῖον (3:14), στέφανος (4:1).

24 For example: κέρδος (1:21; 3:7), κερδοφόρον (3:8), βεβαιώσως and ζῆμια (3:7,8) εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήμψεως (4:15), εἰς λόγον ὕμων (4:17), ἀπέχειν (4:18).
Again, taking the financial vocabulary and 'contract' of Paul with the Philippians as the essence of the letter's aim (cf Capper 1993) is being led astray by the use of local terminology in a different context.

* Paul makes use of words that were technical terms in the mystery religions, especially the Isis cult, which had been celebrated in Philippi since 42 B.C. He says he is μυστικός, 'initiated' into the knowledge of how to deal with scarcity as well as with plenty (4:12). And he says that those who have the attitude (scil, of Christ, 2:5) have reached the stage of τέλειος (the perfected, 3:15). Both these expressions are filled with a new content in connection with the self-humiliation of Christ.

* Finally, the use of ethical terms from the Hellenistic Умwel25 is a salient feature of the letter—further attesting to its deictic character. 'Damit zeigt Paulus, daß wer in die Gesinnung Christi lebt, die höchsten sittlichen Ideale der Gesellschaft verwirklicht. Allerdings werden diese Ideale nicht einfach übernommen, sondern von der Selbsterniedrigung Christi her neu interpretiert' (Wick 1994:170–172).

3.7 A heresy among the Philippians?

The notion of a dangerous heresy rampant in the Philippian church is 'carried into' the situation and does not emerge from the letter. βλέπετε with an accusative (3:2) cannot be understood as 'a stern warning against' as has been done traditionally. It must be correctly interpreted as 'look at': 'Die Philipper sollen sich also nicht vor den Hunden, vor den bösen Arbeitern und vor der Zerschneidung in acht nehmen, sondern sie ansehen' (Wick 1994:90). The opponents function in this letter primarily as negative examples (cf Caird 1976:131f). The structure of the letter renders the assumption of, for example, Mearns (1987) that the issue of opposition is the main theme of the letter, untenable. The opponents were judaising Christians26 who propagated circumcision and rejected service and suffering.

The juxtaposition of this 'opponent passage' (a2: 3:1–16) with its counterpart a1 (1:12–26) makes it clear that the brief reference to the false teachers functions in a 'self-disclosure' passage. Paul, imitating the self-denial of Christ, declines to exploit the 'plus points' which could have counted in his favour as a devout Jew—as the opponents shamelessly and mistakenly do.27

25 Arnim (1924) finds Stoic parallels to almost all the moral terms used in the letter (cf Wick 1997:172, esp n 500).
26 Contra Holsten (1875) and Schenk (1987:3294–3299).
27 See above, under the 'first theme', page 555.
3.8 Awkward thanks for financial support?

The position of Paul's 'word of thanks' at the end of the letter has been taken as a sign of discord between Paul and the Philippians, even as a reason to regard it as a separate letter. These are seen to be unnecessary assumptions. Alexander has indicated that it is not strange to find an acknowledgement for gifts in the conclusion of a Hellenistic letter (1989:97). Paul's praise of the Philippians is genuine and abundant (4:18). They are singled out in the same way as Timothy, as Paul had 'nobody else' with the caring attitude of Timothy to send to them (2:20), so 'no other' church showed their caring attitude towards him regarding his physical needs (4:15). Indeed, the whole passage proceeds naturally to a doxology on the basis of the excellent relation between Paul, the Philippian Christians and God (4:20).

Paul's comments on the financial support received from the church at Philippi (4:10–20) are not to be regarded as a separate letter incorporated into the present letter. Designated as ε² it correlates with ε¹ (2:19–30) and deals with matters that could be described as 'normal correspondence' or 'practical arrangements'. However, these matters are also approached from the central vantage point of kouwía, encompassing the elements of 'Christ's attitude' and 'joy'. Thus the information on the missions of Timothy and Epaphroditus becomes an illustration of how they (and Paul!) serve as examples of these virtues of faith e.g. by not contemplating their own interests, but those of Christ and of the Philippians (2:20, 21, 30). Likewise Paul's joy and appreciation for the gift from Philippi comprises genuine praise and elevates the Philippians themselves to a singular model (4:15) and an example, concerning themselves not only with their own interests, but also that of the apostle in the service of Christ, and sharing with him these interests (4:10, 14, 15).

In this passage the letter actually reaches its goal and climax. The theological basis has been laid, the models have been portrayed, the parenetic objectives brought home. Having accomplished all his epistolary objectives the apostle now voices his overwhelming appreciation of the Philippians and their contribution to the mutual gospel effort, already mentioned in the προοιμίων in 1:5, 7, which proved their complicity with the attitude of Christ. Even here, though, he takes the opportunity to present himself as an example—this time in the practical matter of the correct approach towards 'consumer goods'.

3.9 Rhetoric genre: deliberative or epideictic?

There is a remarkable conformity of Philippians with the features Aristotle put forth for the epideictic mode.

* He indicates that the praesens is above all the tense of the epideictic
(1.3.4)—and Watson (1988:59) concedes that it is also the predominating tense in Philippians.

* He names praise or reproach as the substance of this ‘Gattung’, aimed at uncovering that which is honourable or dishonourable (1.3.3). This abounds in Philippians, as indicated above.

* The epideictic speech is concerned with virtues and vices. The greatest virtues are those which are the most beneficial to the affected persons (1.9.1–6). The letter presents a remarkable number of Hellenistic virtues. They are seen from the viewpoint of the ‘attitude of Christ’ which was wholly aimed at the well-being of the other.

* In the prooemium of the epideictic speech, praise (or reproach) should be presented in such a way that the hearer feels himself in some way involved in it (3.14.2 & 11, 205, 208). This happens in the thanksgiving of Philippians (1:3–8). The shorter petitionary prayer (1:9–11) may be regarded as likewise an introduction to the less significant deliberative elements in the letter.

* Not least, Aristotle regarded epideictic speech as closest to the literary form—requiring the highest artistic competence (3.12.2 & 5, 199, 202). This tallies with the careful composition of the Philippian letter pointed out earlier.

Philippians is thus modelled primarily on the ‘epideictic’ or demonstrative speech mode,28 although there are elements of the deliberative mode29 especially in the parenetic sections and specifically in dealing with Euodia and Syntyche.30 The use of examples is usually regarded as typical of the deliberative mode, but here they function in the context of comparison and praise. The Philippians already live basically according to the ‘attitude of Christ’ therefore they can be compared to the role models presented in this regard. Even where a tension between the modes is apparent, Paul takes care not to move onto the level of a purely deliberative discourse. The call to ‘stand firm’ in 4:1 is embedded in a warm expression of solidarity and praise. Even the ‘main culprits’ are honoured by the memory of their partnership with the apostle in the gospel (4:2, 3).

28 J Lambrecht (1989:240) defines it: ‘The epideictic genre evokes assent and affirms communal values. Such a discourse speaks of attitudes in the present; it consists either of praise or blame, encomium or invective; it is often used in amphitheatres and on festivals.’

29 Greek: ‘genos symbouleutikon’.

30 The mixed usage of speech types in antiquity is indicated by Jegher-Bucher (1989:81), whilst Classen (1991:8, 29) pointed out the matter of course combination of letter types.
4 CRITIQUE BY REED

The magnificent 1997 monograph of Jeffrey Reed may be regarded as the textbook on a modern linguistic approach to Philippians, providing inter alia a ‘model of New Testament discourse analysis’ from the perspective of systemic-functional linguistics and a ‘functional grammar of New Testament discourse’, which is then scrupulously and in great detail applied to the letter.

Reed has taken note of Wick’s contribution and at crucial points differs from him, notably on the latter’s understanding of τὰ αὐτά in 3:1 as pertaining to ‘all that follows’ and not only to the call to joy or the warning against adversaries (Reed 1997: 254 n 371, 255 n 372).

He disagrees with the macro-parallelism that Wick finds in the letter mainly on the ground that valid parallels are not to be found in epistolary literature, nor in the Old Testament Psalms to which Wick appeals. Strangely he sometimes labels Wick’s proposal a ‘chiastic outline’, a ‘chiastic approach’, and a ‘chiastic understanding’, though he clearly accepts that it is based on parallelism (:292, 293). He compares it favourably with Luter and Lee’s ‘chiastic analysis of Philippians’, which is ‘far less attentive to the epistolary formulas in the letter which assist in distinguishing its thematic development’ (:292 n 503). However, he does not agree with Wick that, for instance, 2:19–30 and 4:10–20 could be regarded as parallel sections with a ‘correspondence character’ since that would disregard their distinct epistolary functions. He finds that Wick ‘distorts the epistolary function of the disclosure in 2:12–18 by paralleling it with very generic exhortations in 4:4–9’ (:293). His final verdict on the matter is that Wick ‘distorts what can be known about the structure of Philippians in the light of epistolary parallels’ and for that reason ‘faces the same difficulty as that of rhetorical treatments of Philippians’ (:293; cf Porter & Reed 1998:223).

Nevertheless Reed finds a considerable number of points of merit in Wick’s approach. Like Wick he regards the macro-structure (the ‘top-down’ analysis, 1997:47, 48) as the point of departure in the interpretation of the letter. He also does not doubt that Wick ‘has rightly identified some thematic elements (cohesive ties) in the letter’ although the letter consists of ‘many more themes and subthemes’ (:365). He concedes that it contains ‘topoi’ of friendship, although he does not agree to a Gattung of friendship (:172). He does not regard Paul’s letters as ‘merely identical reflections of personal, family letters’ and agrees that they contain argumentation, but only by way of

---

31 In his co-article with Porter dealing with Luter & Lee (1995) the notion of chiasm per se in ancient documents is rejected, apart from ‘instances of reverse parallelism in four-clause sentences...’ (1998:217).
rhetorical microstructures. However, he repeatedly states his view that Paul had his own ideological concerns as well as his own ‘idiolect’ which resulted in modifications of the epistolary conventions (174).

5 CONCLUSION

Wick’s assessment of the Philippians’ macro structure is in itself a remarkable step forward. Although Wick only anticipates a detailed analysis of the letter, he addresses a wide variety of scholarly opinion, indicating extensively what proves to be compatible with his global viewpoint and justifying his rejection of those that run contrary to his perceptions. He acknowledges indebtedness to the French scholar Rolland (1990) who already pointed out the two parallel halves of the letter and identified three of the five corresponding thematic ‘pairs’ in those two parts, interpreting the ‘same things’ of 3:1 accordingly (Wick 1994:61 n 159).

It would not be fair to judge the proposal of Peter Wick solely by that of his work which is utilised in this presentation—he meticulously tries to anticipate and counter any criticism with factual evidence from the text. It may be expected that the ‘giant step’ he takes will open fresh possibilities of making sense of the theme and structure of Philippians and in addition provide latitude for the appreciation of a great deal of what has been done before to unlock the meaning of this letter. What is especially appealing about his scheme is the continuous interpretive interplay between the main theological themes and the main reasons for writing the letter.

This brings out a wealth of meaning that is not ‘read into’ the letter but flows forth from a correct identification of theological motifs involved in the rhetorical thrust and the interplay of thematic elements in the letter. It unmistakably shows features in line with the ‘new paradigm’ of interpretation indicated by Aspan (discussed by Pretorius 1995:277–284), with reference to Wheelwright’s distinction between tensive symbols over steno-symbols—the latter referring to a one to one basis. Aspan quotes Perrin, who ‘suggested that elements of the text must be seen as multivalent and ambiguous symbols, rather than only as bits of data from or clues to an ancient Sitz im Leben’. He also utilises T S Eliot’s description of a poem as a raid on the inarticulate,

32 The ‘bottom-up’ analysis that Reed actually accomplishes in his fifth chapter on the ‘texture’ of Philippians (1997: 296–400).

33 Clarification of the seeming discrepancy between the initial list of five reasons for writing provided by Wick is perhaps needed (1994:14): 1. recognition of gift 2. letter to go with Epaphroditus, 3. Paul’s situation 4. the internal conflict 5. the mission of Timothy, and the eventual five double themes, in which the Epaphroditus/Timothy issue is taken together. See above under 2.3.
defining the character of the text of the New Testament as 'tensive language' because it can be regarded as a raid on the ultimate. In this sense, he says, the term myth has become useful again in a positive way, as an entrée to the (multivalent) text, rather than a husk to be discarded as in the previous use of the term in normal science, by inter alia Strauss and Bultmann (Aspan 1992:110–113).

Peter Wick is aware of the limited scope of his endeavours and in this regard awaits the results of a complete exposition and commentary on Philippians along these lines. I have no doubt that there will be a positive reaction to this incentive and that, amidst a continued variety of opinion, a more accommodating view may be arrived at regarding at least the character and main rhetorical aims of the letter.
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