

The function of the *topos philophronesis* in the letter to the Philippians – a comparison with three ancient letters of friendship

Elma Cornelius
Dept. Classics & Semitics
Potchefstroom University for CHE
POTCHEFSTROOM

Abstract

The objective of this article is to determine the function of the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις in the letter to the Philippians. According to Koskenniemi (1956:35-46) τόπος φιλοφρόνησις means that the ancient letter served the purpose of expressing the friendly relationship between two persons. Koskenniemi also identifies typical philophronetic phrases and formulae. Because it is expected that the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις will be more prominent in letters of friendship (see Dahl, 1976:539), three papyri letters, which were classified by Stowers (1986:58-76) as letters of friendship, are analysed. The letter to the Philippians is compared to the ancient epistolary practice when identifying and determining the function of the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις. It is concluded that the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις serves the function of ἔθος and πάθος and that the relationship between addresser and addressee can be determined by analysing the φιλοφρόνησις.

1. Introduction

The aim of this article is to identify the (possible) presence of the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις in the letter to the Philippians, to determine the function of such a *topos* and the relation between the *topos* and the τύπος of the letter.

The concepts τόπος and τύπος are closely related. Τόπος is a department or heading containing arguments of the same kind. Koskenniemi (1956:35-46) extrapolates three general characteristics of the Greek letter which he takes to be crucial to understanding the uniqueness, purpose and function of the Greek letter:

- * The first and most important is the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις, which expresses the friendly relationship between two persons.

- * The second is the *τόπος παρουσία*, meaning that the letter is intended to revive and sustain the existence of a friendship when the correspondents are physically separated.
- * The third is the *τόπος όμιλία*, known as the epistolary discourse.

A *τύπος* is a type of letter. Ancient epistolary theorists distinguish between *τύποι* of letters according to their style. Cicero (*Ad Familiares* 2.4.1f; 4.13.1, 6.10.4) distinguishes between simple letters with factual information and letters communicating the mood of the writer, the *genus familiare et iocosum* and the *genus severum et grave*. Pseudo Demetrius (*τύποι Έπιστολικοί*) divides letters into twenty-one *τύποι*. Philostratus (*De Epistulis*) mentions certain types of style used in letters, Julius Victor (*Ars Rhetorica* 27) distinguishes between *litterae negotiales* and *familiares* and Pseudo Libanius (*Έπιστολιμαίοι Χαρακτήρες*) divides letters into forty-one *τύποι* according to their style (Malherbe, 1988:12-13).

On the basis of these ancient categories, modern epistolary theorists have developed and refined the possible *τύποι* of ancient letters. Among the letter types discussed are letters of friendship, introduction, blame, reproach, consolation, criticism, censure, praise, interrogation, accusation, apology, gratitude, etc. (Doty, 1983:10; Stowers, 1986:51-174; White, 1986:193-198).

In an attempt to determine the relationship between *τύπος* and *τόπος*, it will be fruitful to notice that, according to Dahl (1976:539), *τόπος φιλοφρόνησις* occurs mainly in the opening and closing segments of a letter and is most elaborate in letters of friendship and diplomatic correspondence. It thus seems possible to infer a close relationship between the *τύπος φιλικός* (friendly type) and the *τόπος φιλοφρόνησις* (friendly relationship).

Stowers (1986:60) classifies the letter to the Philippians as a letter that employs *τύποι* and language from the friendly letter tradition. Does Stowers mean that Philippians employs the *τόπος φιλοφρόνησις*? And if *φιλοφρόνησις* is present in Philippians, how does it function? What is the relationship between the *τόπος φιλοφρόνησις* and the *τύπος* of Philippians? Could the presence of the *τόπος φιλοφρόνησις* mean that Philippians is a friendly letter? In order to answer these kinds of questions, the following will be done:

1. The *τόπος φιλοφρόνησις* is described by applying the following procedure:
 - * Ancient epistolary theorists and rhetoricians are consulted.
 - * Modern theorists are consulted on the ancient epistolary practice.
 - * A practical epistolographical analysis of a sample of ancient letters is attempted.

2. The letter to the Philippians is compared to ancient epistolary practice when identifying and determining the function of the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις.

Because it is probable that the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις will be more prominent in letters of friendship (see Dahl, 1976:539), three papyri letters, classified by Stowers (1986:58-76) as letters of friendship and written between 95 B.C.E. and 58 C.E. are analysed.

The ancient theories and – practice of epistolography and rhetoric date from 200 B.C.E.. Because the letter to the Philippians was possibly written between 52 C.E. and 61 C.E., it seems justified to interpret it in comparison with the three papyri letters from a rhetorical – and epistolographical perspective, since all these letters were written within societies which applied the same rhetorical – and epistolographical rules. These letters as well as the letter to the Philippians are formally analysed according to the theories of White (1972, 1986).

2. The identification of τόπος φιλοφρόνησις in ancient letters

2.1 An identification of τόπος φιλοφρόνησις in ancient epistolary theorists and rhetoricians

Aristotle (Τέχνης Ῥητορικής 5.10) defines ὁ τόπος as "a place to look for a store of something, or the store itself; a heading or department, containing a number of rhetorical arguments of the same kind". Τόποι are of two kinds: κοινοὶ τόποι or simply τόποι, the topics common to any kind of communication (Aristotle, Τέχνης Ῥητορικής ii.26.1) and εἶδη or ἴδια, specific topics, propositions of limited applicability, chiefly derived from ethics and politics (Aristotle, Τέχνης Ῥητορικής i.2.21).

Cicero (*Topica*) defines a τόπος as a residing place of arguments and distinguishes between inherent τόποι (τόποι derived from the whole, the part, meaning and connection) and extrinsic τόποι (arguments not invented by the art of the orator) (Murphy, 1972:146-147).

Quintilian defines the τόποι for arguments as those areas of the mind to which one may go for specific sources of proof (Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 5.10).

Although the ancient rhetoricians do not deal with the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις as such, Aristotle refers to something similar when he deals with ἔντεχνοι. When inventing a speech (or any other vehicle of communication), one uses either ἄτεχνοι or ἔντεχνοι as a means of persuasion (Aristotle, Τέχνης Ῥητορικής i.2.2; 15.1). Ἄτεχνοι are rhetorical strategies which are independent of art, being already in existence and ready for use – rhetorical strategies such as witnesses

and contracts. Ἐντεχνοὶ are rhetorical strategies which have to be invented by the orator himself. The ἔντεχνοὶ that are to one's disposal, are ἔθος, πάθος and λόγος (Aristotle, Τέχνης Ῥητορικής i.2.3-6). The orator persuades by ἔθος (moral character), when the speech is delivered in such a manner as to make the speaker worthy of confidence. When one persuades by πάθος, one persuades by means of the hearers, by addressing their emotions. Lastly, persuasion is produced by the speech itself, called the λόγος.

When the orator chooses, for instance, to persuade by πάθος, he must provide himself with propositions (προτάσεις) needed for his argument (Aristotle, Τέχνης Ῥητορικής i.3.7-9). These propositions or premises are abstracted from the τόποι to his disposal. Premises that are common to all fields, types of speeches and characters of speakers are premises such as the possible and impossible (Aristotle, Τέχνης Ῥητορικής ii.19.1-25), abstracted from κοινοὶ τόποι (topics common to all kinds of rhetoric). Premises abstracted from εἶδη (specific topics) are premises such as friendship (Aristotle, Τέχνης Ῥητορικής ii.4.1-32). Friendship and other εἶδη are discussed by Aristotle as premises for establishing ἔθος and πάθος (Τέχνης Ῥητορικής ii.1-9). From these premises it would seem that ὁ τόπος φιλοφρόνησις (although not indicated as such) was considered by Aristotle as a means for establishing ἔθος and πάθος. Aristotle (Τέχνης Ῥητορικής ii.2-3) is of opinion that it makes a great difference with regard to producing conviction that the speaker should reveal himself to be possessed of certain qualities and that his hearers should think that he is disposed in a certain way towards them; and further that they themselves should be disposed in a certain way towards him. And *philophronetic* elements can be useful in establishing ἔθος and πάθος. A typical example of such a use is: *I know you're worried about our friend Peter's health, but I want to assure you that we all remember him in our prayers.* In this way the writer is convincing his hearers that they have mutual concerns; and where can a better way be found than to say it by an expression of mutual remembrance (see 2.1)?

Since the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις is not specifically dealt with by ancient epistolary theorists and ancient rhetoricians, it will be fruitful to look at the practice of ancient letter writing. This practice is described by modern theorists such as Dahl (1976) and Koskenniemi (1956).

2.2 Φιλοφρόνησις as an ancient epistolary practice

Dahl (1976:539) proposes 'friendly disposition' as a translation for φιλοφρόνησις. He states that *philophronetic* statements often prepare the way for expressions of disappointment, embarrassment, reproach, irony or warnings resulting from the friendship.

Koskenniemi deals with φιλοφρόνησις in detail. According to him Demetrius of Phalerum views a letter as a postulation of friendship, and that is why he considers the *friendly disposition* as the most important essence of the letter and he mentions this function of the letter as being fundamental (Koskenniemi, 1956:35, 37).

Because Koskenniemi (1956:1-214) bases his study on ancient epistolary practice, and does a detailed study of *philophronetic* statements, his research will be summarized here. Koskenniemi (1956:128-154) considers the following as typical *philophronetic* phrases and formulae:

* **General expressions of concern about the recipient's welfare**

For example: ἐχάρη(ν) λαβὼν σου ἐπιστολήν, ὡς ὑγιαίνεις
"I rejoiced at receiving your letter, that you are well".

* **Formula *valetudinis***

For example: εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι –
"If you are well, I would be delighted".

* ***Proskynema* formula**

For example: πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν –
"Above all I pray that you are well".

* **Mutual remembrance**

For example: ἀσπάζου τοὺς φιλοῦντάς σε πάντας –
"Give my regards to everybody who loves you".

* **Greetings**

For example: ἔρρωσο καὶ ὁ θεὸς διαφυλάττει σε –
"Be well and may God be with you".

* **Closing clause/paragraph**

For example: ἀσπάζομαί σε, ἀδελφε, καὶ εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν –
"I salute you, brother, and pray that you are well".

It is thus clear that *τύπος φιλοφρόνησις* is not an unknown concept in the works of modern epistolary theorists – works which are mere descriptions of the ancient epistolary practice. Further details about the *τύπος φιλοφρόνησις* will now be identified by means of an analysis of ancient friendly letters.

2.3 A practical analysis of a sample of ancient letters

In order to see how *φιλοφρόνησις* functions in ancient letters, the following ancient letters will be analysed with the help of information given by Koskenniemi (1956:128-154) on *philophronetic* statements and formulae: PMert (A Descriptive Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of Wilfred Merton) I 12, Ex Hercul (Excavations of Herculaneum) 176, and SelPap (Select Papyri) I.

2.3.1 Papyri Merton I 12: A letter to Dionysios the physician (58 C.E.)

This is a letter of Chairas to his friend Dionysios, a physician. The text and translation are from White (1986:145-146).

1 Χαιρῶς Διονυσίωι τῶι φιλότατῳ
2 πλεῖστα χαίρειν καὶ διὰ πάντο(ς)
3 ὑγιαίνειν κομισάμενός σου
4 ἐπί(στολ(ήν)) οὕτως περιχαρῆς
5 ἐγεγόμεν(ν ὡς εἰ) ὄντως ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ
6 ἐγεγόνειν, ἄ(νευ) γὰρ ταύτης
7 οὐθέν ἐστιν. γράφειν δέ σοι
8 μεγάλας εὐχαριστίας παρετέο(ν)
9 δεῖ γὰρ τοῖς μὴ φίλοις οὖσι διὰ
10 λόγων εὐχαριστεῖν. πείθομαι δέ
11 ὅτι ἐν γαληνεῖα τινὶ ἐνεισχύω, καὶ
12 εἰ μὴ τὰ ἴσα σοι παρασχεῖν,
13 βραχεῖα τινὰ παρέξομαι τῇ εἰς ἐμὲ
14 φιλοστοργίᾳ. ἀντιγράψα καὶ μοι
15 δύο ἔπεμψας, τὸ μὲν τῆς
16 Ἀρχαγαθήου τὸ δὲ τῆς
17 ἐλκωτικῆς. ἡ μὲν Ἀρχαγάθις
18 ὑγιᾶς περιέχει, ἡ δὲ ἐλκωτικὴ
19 ῥητείνης συνσταθμίαν οὐ
20 περιέχει. ἐρωτῶ δέ σε περὶ
21 ἐλκωτικῆς γενναίας δυναμένης
22 ἀκδινδύνως πέλματ(α) ἐλκῶσαι ...
23 γ(άρ) (κ)ατ' ἀνάγκην ἐπείγομαι.
24 περὶ δὲ τῆς σκληρᾶς ἔγραψας δύο
25 γένη εἶναι. τὸ τῆς δια- λυτικῆς
26 μοι γραφῶν πέμψον· ἐστὶν γὰρ
27 καὶ ἡ τετραφάρμακος σκληρᾶ. ἡ δὲ
28 ἐπιστολὴ αὕτη ταύτη σοι
29 ἐσφράγι(στα). ἔρρωσο καὶ
30 μέμνησο τῶν εἰρημ(ένων)
31 ε(ἔτους) Νέρωνος τοῦ κυρίου,
32 μηνὸς Γερμανικοῦ α. Διονυσίωι
33 ἰατρῶι

Chairas to his dearest Dionysios many greetings and continual good health. When I received your letter, I was as exceedingly joyous as if I had actually been in my own native place; for without (the joy of) that there is nothing. And I can disregard writing to you with great gratitude, for it is (only) required that one expresses thankfulness with words to those who are not friends. I am confident that I can persevere with sufficient tranquillity, and if not able to render something equivalent, I will be able to render some humble return for your warm affection towards me. You sent two prescription copies, one of the Archagathian, the other of the caustic plaster. The Archagathian is of the right consistency (rightly compounded), but the caustic does not include the correct amount (relative weight) of resin. I request your advice regarding a suitable caustic that can be used safely to cauterize the soles of the feet; for I am pressed by necessity (for a prescription). Regarding the stiff plaster, you wrote that there are two kinds. Send the prescription of the resolvent type; for the four-drug plaster is also stiff. This letter for you is sealed with this (?). Good-bye and remember what I have said. (Year) 5 of Nero the lord, the month of Germanicus I.

2.3.2 The identification of *philophronetic* elements in PMert I 12

In order to determine the function(s) of φιλοφρόνησις, typical *philophronetic* elements will be identified within the different parts of the letters. The analysis (in each case) is my own, while information provided by White (1986:198-212) was found useful.

* Letter opening

The letter opening (lines 1-3) contains the typical greeting Χαίρωσ Διονυσίωι τῶι φιλάτωι πλεῖστα χαίρειν and the typical health wish καὶ διὰ πάντο(ς) ὑγιαίνειν. According to Koskenniemi (1956:97-100) φιλάτο(ς) is used primarily in private letters. However, it does not concern family relationships or any friendship between the writer and reader. The qualification τῶ φιλάτω indicates a business letter and is generally not taken to express feeling but an objective. This phrase is very seldom used in letters of friendship – the recipient of a friendly letter is seldom addressed as τῶ φίλτω. The greeting in this letter is thus not typical of a *philophronetic* statement. Regarding the health wish, διὰ πάντο(ς) ὑγιαίνειν (line 2-3) is, although a shorter parallel form, a typical health formula, and according to Koskenniemi (1956:128), the health wish and other statements on the welfare of the recipient are common *philophronetic* formulae.

* Letter body

A phrase such as κομισάμενός ... φιλοστοργία (lines 3-14) is a typical exclamation of joy at the receipt of a letter (see White, 1986:201). According to White such an exclamation is more characteristic of the opening of a letter. The opening of the letter seems to be the logic part to contain such a phrase if one takes the possible function of such a phrase into consideration. A possible function of the phrase κομισάμενός ... φιλοστοργία (lines 3-14), could be to express the writer's good attitude towards the recipient and to make sure that the recipient is also positive and ready for the rest of his argument or any innovations. Because lines 3-14 do not, however, only express joy at the receipt of the letter but have an almost philosophical argument about friendship, they may be considered as the opening of the letter body. Although lines 3-14 do not fit into a specific *philophronetic* formula or phrase, they seem to form some kind of *philophronetic* paragraph. Chairas describes his joy at receiving Dionysios' letter (lines 3-4) and explains why he has not written sooner (lines 4-14).

In line 14 another subject is dealt with when the writer turns to what the recipient had written in his letter. This subject serves as the background for the advice Chairas is about to ask. Lines 14-20 thus serve as the middle of the letter body. The closing of the letter body is introduced by a typical request such as ἐρωτῶ (line 20) (see White, 1986:208).

* **Letter closing**

Ἐρωσο ... εἰρημ(ένων) (line 29-30) covers the letter closing. According to Koskenniemi ἔρωσο (line 29) is a typical *philophronetic* formula (1956:151). I would like to add to this μέμνησο (line 30) as another *philophronetic* statement. Although we do not know what Chairas means by εἰρημ(ένων) (line 30) – his request for advice (lines 17-23), or perhaps his explanation why friends do not thank by words – this statement could correspond to the ‘remembrance’ formula as expounded by Koskenniemi (1956:145). Chairas could mean that Dionysios should remember him, and could express both his attitude towards their being friends as well as his current need.

* **Synthesis**

In this letter to Dionysios, the *philophronetic* elements are present in all three parts of the letter. Whereas one would expect a lot of *philophronetic* elements in the opening and closing of the letter body, if one considers the fact that Stowers considers this letter to be of the friendly type, this letter seems to be poor in the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις.

2.3.3 Excavations of Herculaneum 176: Epicurus to a child (3 B.C.E.)

This is a letter from Epicurus (the well-known philosopher) to a child (possibly an orphan of a certain Metrodorus, of whom Epicurus took charge). The text and translation are from Milligan (1927:5-6).

1 ... (ἄ)φείγμεθα εἰς Λάμψακον
2 ὑγιαίνοντες γὰρ αἱ Πυθο-κλήσ καὶ
3 Ἑρμᾶρχος καὶ Κ(τή) -θσιππος,
4 καὶ ἐκεῖ κατελήφα-μεν
5 ὑγ(ι)αίνοντας Θεμῖς-ταν καὶ τοὺς
6 λοιποὺς (φί)λο(υ)ς. ὁ δὲ ποιε(ῖ)ς
7 καὶ σὺ εἰ (ὁ) ὑγι-αίνεις καὶ ἡ
8 μ(ά)μμη (σου), καὶ πάπαι καὶ
9 Μάτρω(ν)ι πάν-τα πε(ί)θη(ι),
10 ὡσπερ καὶ ἔ(μ)-προσθεν. εὐ γὰρ
11 ἴσθι, ἡ αἰτία, ὅτι καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ο(ἱ)
12 λοιποὶ πάντες δε μέγα φιλοῦμεν,
13 ὅτι τούτοις πείθη πάντα ...

We have arrived in health at Lampsacus, myself and Pythocles and Hermarchus and Ctesippus, and there we have found Themistas and the rest of the friends in health. It is good if you also are in health and your grandmother, and obey your grandfather and Matron in all things, as you have done before. For be sure, the reason why both I and all the rest love you so much is that you obey these in all things ...

2.3.3.1 Formal analysis

Because this letter is fragmentary, it is uncertain whether the whole belongs to the letter body or whether one can divide it into letter opening and letter body or even letter closing.

2.3.3.2 The identification of *philophronetic* elements

According to Koskenniemi (1956:133-134) one often finds in the body closing a short ‘warning’ to the recipient to take care of himself or herself. Typical clichés in this formula are *καλῶς ποιήσεις* and *εὐχαριστήσεις μοί*.

Koskenniemi mentions that the degree of intimacy is determined by what is added to the formula. It is surprising that this information from Koskenniemi exactly describes lines 1-10 of the letter of Epicurus. We get a variation on the cliché *καλῶς ποιήσεις* – *εὖ ποιεῖς* (line 6) with *ὑγιαίνεις* (line 7). What is added to this to make it more intimate, is the same health wish for *ἡ μάμμη* – a person near to the recipient and event, a bit of information on the state of health of not only he himself but also of his friends.

This letter from Epicurus contains *philophronetic* elements, but because it is fragmentary, it is not possible to determine to which extent the *philophronetic* elements dominate.

2.3.4 Select Papyri I 103: Petesouchos to his brothers and friends (95 B.C.E.)

This is a letter of Petesouchos to his brothers and friends, consisting of greeting, farewells and assurances of the writer’s welfare. The text and translation (on page 66) are from White (1986:54-55).

2.3.4.1 The identification of *philophronetic* elements

* Letter opening

To the letter opening belong greetings and health wishes (White, 1986:198-202). This means that *Πετοσοῦχος ... ἡμῶν* (lines 1-12) covers the letter opening. In the letter opening we find a health wish – *ἐρρῶσθαι* (line 8) with the assurance that the writer as well as his friends is well (lines 8-12). Koskenniemi (1956: 132) is of opinion that the writer may consider it important to express his interest in things or persons close to the recipient, as part of the health wish. Petesouchos knows his brothers and friends well enough to know exactly what and who are of great importance to them. This enables him to show that they have mutual inte-

rest in these persons. The extensiveness of the health wish in the letter from Petesouchos thus reveals something of the kind of relationship between Petesouchos and his friends.

1 Πετοσοῦχος Πανεβχούνιος
2 Πεταρσεμθεῖ καὶ Παγάνει
3 Πανεβχούνιος καὶ Παθήμει Παρᾶ
4 καὶ Πεταρσεμθεῖ
5 Ἄρσενούφ(ι)ος καὶ
6 Πεταρσεμθεῖ Ψεννήσι(ο)ς καὶ
7 Ὠρωὶ Παρήτῳ χαίρειν καὶ
8 ἔρρωσθαι. ἔρρωμαι δὲ καὶ αὐτός
9 καὶ Ἐσθαύτις καὶ Πατούς καὶ
10 Ἀλμέντις καὶ Φίβις καὶ
11 Ψεννοσίρις καὶ Φάφισ καὶ οἱ παρᾶ
12 ἡμῶν. μὴ λυ-πεῖθε ἐπὶ τοῖς
13 χωρισθεῖσι. ὑπε- λαμβάνουσαν
14 φονευθήσεσθαι. οὐθὲν ἡμῖν κακῶν
15 ἐπύησεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων
16 ἐπιμεμέληται. περὶ ὧν, ἐὰν
17 αἰρήητε, γράψατέ μοι. ἠκούσαμεν
18 τὸν μῦν κατα-βεβρωκένας τὸν
19 σπόρον. καλῶς ἡμῖν ὡδε, ἢ Διὸς
20 πόλει ἐὰν αἰρήησθε, πυρὸν
21 ἀγοράσαι ἤκατε. τὰ δ' ἄλλα
22 χαρίζοισθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐπι-μελόμενοι
23 ἵν' ὑγιαίνητε. ἔρρωται Ὠρος καὶ
24 Πετοσίρις. ἔρρωσθε. (ἔτους)ιθ,
25 Παχῶν η.

Petosouchos, son of Panebchounios, to Peteharsemtheos and Paganis, sons of Panebchounios, and Pathemis, son of Paras, and Peteharsemtheos, son of Harsenouphis, and Peteharsemtheos, son of Psenensis, and Horos, son of Pates, greeting and good health. I myself am also well, along with Esthautis and Patous and Almentis and Phibis and Psenosiris and Phaphis and all our people. Do not be grieved at the departed ones. They were expected to be killed. He did nothing bad to us but, quite to the contrary, he has taken care of us. Concerning this matter, if you want, write to me. We heard that the mice have eaten up the crop. Please come here to us or, if you prefer, to Diospolis to buy grain. For the rest, you would favour us by taking care of yourselves that you stay healthy. Horos and Petosiris are well. Good-bye. (Year) 19, Pachon 8.

Outside address: To Peteharsemtheos the son of Nebchounios. From Petesouchos, the son of Nebchounios.

Verso: παρὰ Πεταρσεμθεῖ Νεβχούνιος
Πετεςούχου τοῦ Νεβχούνιος.

* Letter body

White (1986:208) identifies lines 12-16 (μὴ ... ἐπιμεμέληται) as the opening of the letter body, introduced by non-formulaic instructions. It is, however, remarkable that these instructions also concern consolation and reassurance about mutual matters.

According to White (1986:211), the phrase *περὶ* with the genitive *ὧν* (line 16) is sometimes used in the middle of the letter body but more often at a later point in the body than at the very beginning. In this case it, however, seems that the prepositional phrase *περὶ* with the genitive *ὧν*, introduces the middle of the letter body (*περὶ* ... ἤκατε (lines 16-21)). From this part of the letter body it becomes clear that Petesouchos is worried about the apparent bad circumstances of the

recipients (lines 16-19) and that he would like to share in seeking a solution (lines 19-21).

Concluding the letter body, Petesouchos asks the recipients to take care of themselves (lines 21-24 τὰ ... Πετοσίρις). According to White (1986:205), this is a typical formula for concluding the letter body. Petesouchos, however, extends this health wish by adding χαρίζοισθ' ἑαυτῶν - "you would favour us" (line 22). This extension of the health wish increases the intimacy between parties (Koskenniemi, 1956:134).

* Letter closing

The letter is closed with the typical greeting formula ἔρωσθε (line 24), which is a *philophronetic* element as such (see 2.1).

* Synthesis

In this letter from Petesouchos almost the whole letter consists of *philophronetic* elements. The letter opening as well as the letter closing contains typical *philophronetic* elements (as discussed by Koskenniemi, 1956:128-154). The letter body on the other hand is a complete discussion of mutual interests and care.

2.3.5 Conclusion

The letters from Dionysios (PMert I 12) and Epicurus (Ex Hercul 176) do contain *philophronetic* elements, but only minimally so. In the letter from Petesouchos to his brothers and friends (SelPap I 103), almost the whole letter consists of greetings and statements concerning welfare and love. This can be ascribed to the fact that the purpose of this letter is only to express friendship.

What do all the *philophronetic* statements have in common? I concur with Koskenniemi (1956:132) that the health wishes probably concern matters of importance to the recipient. The analysis above would seem not only to confirm this point, but also to conclude that all *philophronetic* elements serve to make the recipient feel good about himself.

To persuade by means of πάθος means to use statements about those things that are important to the recipient, in order to arouse feelings of pity, sorrow, sympathy or compassion. In the first letter, Chairas writes about his joy when receiving his friend's letter and wishes him health. These statements are used in the letter opening, body opening as well as in the letter closing, to make Dionysios open-minded with regard to the request in the middle of the letter body, namely the request for advice.

In the second letter, Epicurus is most concerned about the child's health and actions. Whatever Epicurus wants to achieve, these statements are still everything the child likes to hear.

In the third letter all the greetings, the farewell and assurances of the writer's welfare serve the function of πάθος.

It thus seems as if *philophronetic* elements serve the function of the ἔντεχνος ἔθος, but primarily πάθος. I would, however, not consider it as merely πάθος. Petersen (1985:53) states the obvious fact that letters are surrogates for the personal presence of the addresser with the addressee. According to Petersen, Koskeniemi has demonstrated that the letter's fundamental structure reflects what happens in the face-to-face meeting of friends. And, Petersen continues, a letter thus functions to establish or maintain a relationship when the parties cannot meet in person.

2.4 The function of τόπος φιλοφρόνησις in ancient epistolary practice

2.4.1 The position of *philophronetic* elements as an indicator of the τύπος φιλικός

According to Koskeniemi (1956:94) one must take into account that the common epistolary style also contains *philophronetic* elements (not only the friendly letter). But is there a difference in the use of *philophronetic* statements in a friendly letter and in a letter of recommendation?

In letter types other than that of friendship, one would expect the *philophronetic* elements to be only part of the letter opening and closing, whereas in friendly letters it is expected to be also part of the letter body. And the more the purpose of a letter is to express friendship, the more *philophronetic* elements will appear in the letter body. If the purpose is simply to express friendship, one would expect *philophronetic* elements also in the middle of the letter body. It is, however, important to keep in mind that other types of letters may also contain *philophronetic* elements in the letter body. This may be an indicator of a mixed type of letter.

Since τόπος φιλοφρόνησις is an essential element of all letters, it is possible to determine on the basis of the position of *philophronetic* elements whether the letter fits into the friendly type or not.

3. An analysis of the letter to the Philippians

3.1 The integrity of Philippians

The problem surrounding the integrity of Philippians handicaps a formal analysis of Philippians. Although we have Philippians as one letter in UBS III, it is important for a study on ancient letters to consider it in its original form.

Kümmel (1965) and Garland (1985) discuss the whole matter. According to some, the transmitted letter to the Philippians has secondarily been compiled by joining two or three originally independent epistles or fragments of letters. Advocates of this view point out that Paul in Philippians, until 3:1, offers the paragon of a clear and precise letter, but that in 3:1 an epistolary conclusion begins which is interrupted in 3:2 by a warning, while 4:4 connects very well with 3:1. On the basis of these considerations some critics suppose that 3:3-4:3 is an interpolation. Other critics find that the thanks for the gift of the Philippians (4:10-20) is also out of place at the end of the letter. Moreover, 3:2-4:3 presupposes no imprisonment of Paul.

As a result, we have the view that Philippians is composed of three letters, each chronologically following upon the previous one (Kümmel, 1965:235). Because of this problem modern theorists also have difficulty in dealing with the letter. In his analysis of the letter, White (1972:73-90) ignores 2:25-4:9.

For Kümmel (1965:237), however, there is no sufficient reason to doubt the original unity of the transmitted Philippians. Garland (1985:143) is of opinion that the arguments against the integrity of the letter are just as plausible as the counter-arguments and he describes this debate as a 'stalemate' in argumentation.

Watson (1988) analyses Philippians rhetorically in order to address the unity question. He (Watson, 1988:88) concludes his article by the following assumptions:

- * If the partition is maintained, one must assume that the host letter and the interpolated letters were redacted so that the rhetoric of the whole has been unified in the present form.
- * Since the present form of Philippians conforms well to the classical rhetorical conventions, the integrity can be assumed.

Although I am of opinion that Watson uses the rhetorical perspective incorrectly to analyse a letter formally, this article is a proof of the fact that the debate on the integrity of Philippians has certainly reached stalemate. It is, however, beyond the limits of this article to survey this discussion in detail. For the purpose of this

article it can be assumed that Philippians as we have it today, is a single unit and can be interpreted as such.

3.2 The identification of *philophronesis* in Philippians

*** Letter opening**

The letter opening consists of a salutation in 1:1-2 and a thanksgiving in 1:3-11. The salutation X to Y, χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη is a typical salutation. The thanksgiving is also introduced by the typical phrase εὐχαριστῶ (1:3).

1:3-11: The conventional *proskynema* formula is something like πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί δε ὑγιαίνειν. Koskenniemi (1956:142) mentions that in the fourth century and later, the *proskynema* formula lost its original form. This coincides with the expansion of Christianity – and as a result 1:3 introduces a typical *proskynema* formula, εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου ... Except for the formula, the whole letter opening contains expressions of love, 1:7 διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ...; 1:8 ὡς ἐπιποθῶ πάντας.

*** Letter body**

The letter body of the letter to the Philippians is introduced by the typical formula γινώσκειν δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι ... (1:12). It can be divided into the following parts:

Body opening: 1:12-26

Body middle: 1:27-4:9

Body closing: 4:10-20

In the middle of the letter body Paul switches from *I* to the *you* (1:27). This can be considered as the transition from the opening of the body to the middle. The middle of the letter body is in 2:19-30, interrupted by the information about Timothy.

*** Letter body: opening:**

1:12-26: Following upon the thanksgiving, this is an autobiographical paragraph concluded by 1:26 - ἵνα τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν περισσεύῃ ... ἐν ἐμοὶ ... This paragraph can be considered as another example of φιλορόνησις in this letter, because such a paragraph tells us something about the nature of the relation between Paul and the Philippians. Paul expresses his concern for their well-being, their growth in faith and joy.

* **Letter body: middle:**

2:17-18: Stowers (1986:60) considers "sharing in one another's feelings" χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσις ὑμῖν ... καὶ ὑμεῖς χαίρετε καὶ συγχαίρετε μοι, α σ α τόπος of the friendly letter tradition.

2:19-30: This whole paragraph I consider as an example of φιλοφρόνησις, because Paul gives some information to the Philippians concerning the mutual friends Timothy and Ephaphrodite. It is clear that both Timothy and Ephaphrodite are known to both parties: 2:22 τὴν δὲ δοκιμὴν αὐτοῦ φινάσκετε; 2:25 Ἐπαφρόδιτον... ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον ... and 2:26 διότι ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἠσθένησεν. This is an indication of their kind of relationship and of their concern for each other. They send mutual friends to each other because of their concern for each other.

* **Letter body: closing:**

4:10 Paul is delighted in God for the Philippians: ἐχάρην ... ὅτι ... ἀνεθάλατε τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν. This is an example of the *proskynema* formula. By using this formula, Paul refers to the good characteristics of the recipients. He actually thanks them for their care-taking. It is evident that the writer and the recipients have a special relation.

* **Letter closing:**

The letter closing is covered by 4:21-23. This part of the letter offers a switch to the *l* again (4:10) and contains the typical secondary greetings (4:21) and blessings (4:23).

4:21-22: Typical of φιλοφρόνησις are the greetings and secondary greetings ἀσπᾶσασθε πάντα ... ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς ... ἡ χάρις ...

* **Synthesis**

From the analysis of Philippians it is clear that Paul uses φιλοφρόνησις in every part of the letter. This, however, does not seem to make of Philippians a τύπος φιλικός, because the *philophronetic* elements in the letter body of Philippians do not dominate when one realizes the extensiveness of the letter body.

The whole opening of the body of the letter to the Philippians is an example of persuading by ἔθος, when Paul tries to increase his trustworthiness. The *proskynema* formulae in the letter opening and closing of the letter body are examples of persuasion by means of πάθος. Another example of πάθος is found in the middle of the letter body, when Paul talks about feelings to be shared. All these exam-

ples arouse the readers' emotions and make them open-minded with regard to the information given in the rest of the letter body.

3.3 The function of the τόπος φιλοφρόνησις in Philippians

It seems as if one may be able to determine from the *philophronetic* elements the nature of the relationship between writer and recipient. With the help of the following fundamental theses illustrated by Petersen (1985:63-64), this relationship will be made clear:

- * Every letter constitutes a new moment or event in the relationship.
- * Every letter implies at least one future stage in the relationship.
- * The persons referred to in the letters are related to one another in some way in terms of role, position or status.
- * The rhetoric, style and tone of a letter correspond to the addresser's perception of his or her status in relation to the addressee.

From this it should be clear that by reading and interpreting the *philophronetic* elements, one will perhaps be in a better position when attempting to read also between the lines. By studying φιλοφρόνησις in Philippians, for example, one can catch a glimpse of what the relationship between Paul and the Philippians might have been. When Paul uses the word γινώσκετε in 2:22, it implies that the relationship between him and the readers is an already existing relationship which he maintains by φιλοφρόνησις. The frequency of *philophronetic* elements in all the parts of the letter is an indicator of a high degree of intimacy between Paul and the Philippians.

4. Conclusions

The following can be concluded:

- * The part of the letter where φιλοφρόνησις appears, as well as the quantity of *philophronetic* elements, depends on the type of letter. Thus the τόπος of a letter and the τόπος are closely related. All τύποι φιλικοί contain τόπος φιλοφρόνησις, but not all letters with τόπος φιλοφρόνησις are τύποι φιλικοί.
- * What is added to the typical *philophronetic* elements increases the degree of intimacy between the addresser and addressee.
- * *Philophronetic* elements serve the function of πάθος and ἔθος.
- * An analysis of *philophronetic* elements can shed light on aspects of the nature of the relationship between addresser and addressee.
- * The letter to the Philippians also employs *philophronetic* elements.

- * The function of the *philophronetic* elements in Philippians function as πάθος and ἔθος and it is no indication of a friendly letter type.

Thus φιλοφρόνησις is a τόπος (present in all letters) that is useful in many ways for the writer of a letter. Studying φιλοφρόνησις in letters also enables one to see something about the writer's means of persuasion, the type of letter and the relationship between addresser and addressee.

Bibliography

- ARISTOTLE. MCMXLVII Τέχνης Ῥητορικῆς (Loeb Classical Library) London : William Heinemann.
- DAHL, N. 1976. Letter. (*In* The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary volume. Nashville : Abingdon p 538-540.)
- DOTY, W.G. 1983. Letters in Primitive Christianity. Philadelphia : Fortress Press.
- GARLAND, D. 1985. The Composition and Unity of Philippians. *Novum Testamentum*, 27: 141-173.
- KOSKENNIEMI, H. 1956. Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des Griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chri. Helsinki : Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Kirjapaino.
- KUMMEL, W.G. 1965. Introduction to the New Testament. London : SCM Press.
- MALHERBE, A.J. 1988. Ancient Epistolary Theorists. Georgia : Scholars Press.
- MILLIGAN, G. 1927. Selections from the Greek Papyri. Cambridge : University Press.
- MURPHY, J.J. 1972. A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric. New York : Random House.
- PETERSEN, N.R. 1985. Rediscovering Paul. Philadelphia : Fortress Press.
- QUINTILIAN. 1947. *Institutio Oratoria* (Loeb Classical Library) London : William Heinemann.
- STOWERS, S.K. 1986. Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity. Philadelphia : The Westminster Press.
- WATSON, D.F. 1988. A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and Its Implications for the Unity Question. *Novum Testamentum*, 30:57-88.
- WHITE, J.L. 1972. The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter in Non-Literary Papyri and in Paul the Apostle. Michigan : Edwards Brothers, Inc.
- WHITE, J.L. 1986. Light from Ancient Letters (Foundations and Facets: New Testament) Philadelphia : Fortress.

