

Chapter IV Christology (Phil 2:6-11) as motivation for the ethical exhortations in Philippians (Phil 1:27-30, 2:1-5, and 2:12-18)

4.1 Introduction

Paul's ethics is founded in his theology, which means that faith and behaviour cannot be separated (Hooker 1985:3). This thesis particularly enquires into the relation between ethics and Christology. This chapter considers both elements: Christology as presented in 2:6-11, in relation to the sections on ethical exhortation (Phil 1:27-30, 2:1-5, and 2:12-18). There are more passages dealing with Christology as such, like Phil 3:7-11, *et cetera*. Some passages do not render a clear distinction between the Christology and the ethical exhortation. They integrate Christology and ethical exhortation, like in Phil 3:7-11, 3:12-14, 4:4-7, and 4:10-13, which will be dealt with in chapter 5.

Paul begins and ends this section of the letter (1:27-2:18) on the theme of unity for the sake of witness in suffering (1:27-30 and 2:14-18). The believers have certain opponents (1:28), causing them to suffer because of their faith in and obedience towards Christ (1:29). It is circumstances like these that provide Paul with an opportunity for exhortation, as outlined in one of the governing metaphors: he calls upon his readers to live their life as citizens in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ, i.e. the same gospel that will be rehearsed in 2:6-11. For a follower of Christ to be worthy of citizenship, implies to bring honour rather than shame to the city, its rulers, as well as towards its traditions (Gorman 2004:429-430).

In Phil 2:6-11, Paul gives the supreme example of Christ's willing obedience to the point of the death on the cross and his exaltation to be Lord. He uses it to exhort his readers and to explain to them what selfless giving and humble service to others means, as well as how to cope with undeserved sufferings (Watson 1988:69). This chapter will prove how the Christology of Phil 2:6-11 is interconnected with the ethical exhortations in Phil 1:27-30, 2:1-5, and 2:12-18. Christology as the foundation of the exhortations is investigated. The three exhortations are: 1:27-30, an appeal to unity and fearlessness in the situation of suffering, 2:1-5, an appeal to unity and a humble mind among the believers of the congregation, and 2:12-18, a final exhortation for the readers to work out their own salvation (Wong 1992:294). Christology does fulfil a certain function in the ethical exhortation, by its linkage to the ethical exhortations.

4.2 The humiliation and exaltation of Christ (Phil 2:6-11: units 1-12)

4.2.1 Introduction

Phil 2:6-11 can be divided into two parts: Christ's self-humiliation (vv 6-8) and Christ's exaltation (vv 9-11). Units 1 to 8 (vv 6-8) can be divided into two aspects of Christ's life namely his *pre-existence* (units 1 to 2; v 6) and his *suffering* (units 3 to 8; vv 7-8). According to units 3 to 6 (v 7), the self-humiliation of Christ takes place in terms of three different progressions: *taking the form of slave, being born in human likeness* and *being found in appearance as a man*. Units 7 to 8 point to his death as the climax of his self-humiliation.

In vv 9-11 God acts. V 9 introduces a new stage with the conjunction *therefore* (διό v 9), which introduces God's reaction to Christ's self-humiliation and his obedience (Marshall 1991b:55; O' Brien 1991:232). In 'the sharp shift of the subject of the main action from Christ to God, Christ now becomes the passive recipient and object of God's own acts' (Nagata 1981:264). Units 9 to 12 (vv 9-11) form one sentence, constituted by two closely combined main verbs *exalt* and *bestow* (ὑπερυψώω, χαρίζομαι v 9) with God as subject, and by the ἵνα clause to indicate purpose expressed with two subjunctive verbs *bow* and *confess* (κάμψῃ, ἔξομολογήσεται vv 10-11; Silva 1992:127).

Kreitzer (1998:113) doubts whether this part is a continuation of the ethical exhortation about suffering that leads to exaltation, because there is no immediately obvious connection between the exaltation theme contained in these verses and the exhortation based upon the ethical example of Jesus, which is clearly underlined in 2:6-8. However, the exaltation of Christ is relevant for Paul's readers who were suffering, to give them hope that they would also be exalted as Christ has been exalted from his suffering. This exaltative part (2:9-11) is a continuation of the ethical exhortation to the suffering readers. It is a significant part of the exemplary model for the readers (Fowl 1990:95).

It is evident that Christ's exaltation was the result of his self-humiliation (vv 6-8). Therefore the exaltative response by God is indicated by *therefore also* (διὸ καὶ v 9), just as the antithetical theme of humiliation and exaltation elsewhere indicates that the integrity of both motifs can be sustained only by means of the exaltation (Nagata 1981:265). Marshall (1993:125-126) combines the exaltation of Christ with that of believers:

[T]his part of the reason for stressing the exaltation of Jesus Christ as Lord in 2:6-11, is to prepare the way for emphasising that Christians must conform to the pattern of his humility and suffering and set their hope on resurrection, which they will meet at his coming as the Lord Jesus Christ and experience the transformation of their fleshly bodies into glorious ones.

4.2.2 The self-humiliation of Christ (2:6-8)

4.2.2.1 The pre-existent Christ (v 6)

Init 1 (v 6) ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, *the one who is in the form of God*, the relative pronoun *who* (ὃς) is an introductory formula of early Christological hymns (see 1 Tim 3:16). It identifies the historical Christ (2:5) as the subject of the section that follows, which speaks of him as the one that existed *in the form of God and equal with God* (2:6; Bockmuehl 1997a:126; Hawthorne 1998:97; Silva 1992:123). As the way of exhorting his readers who were suffering and in conflict, Paul, first of all, started his argument by drawing the attention to Christ's previous status, which was *in the form of God* (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων v 6) to provide them with a pattern, how to solve the problem of suffering (1:27-30), to unify the congregation (2:1-5) and to work on their salvation (2:12-18). Paul indicates the high status that Christ occupied. Paul uses the present participle rather than the finite verb to point to Christ's constant *being* (Fee 1995:203). The language *being* (ὑπάρχων) functions as a presupposition to what the rest of the sentence assumes; it points to the *pre-existent one*, who *made himself empty* at one point in our history (Hawthorne 1998:97). There are differences of opinion among scholars about the concept of *pre-existence*.

The word *form* (μορφή), which widely embraces ideas such as stature, form, condition, feature, countenance, external appearance (Hawthorne 1998:98), does not simply mean that the external appearance changed, although there could be a possibility of emphasising both the internal and external form with reference to the *nature* or *character* of something (Louw and Nida 1989:58.2). Matera (1999:128) elucidates that the term *form* (μορφή) in Greek refers *to the specific form on which identity and status depend*, and the term might better be interpreted as *nature* or *status*. Therefore, when it was used in relation to Jesus Christ, the *form* (μορφή) essentially never alters, that is to say, the unchangeable being of *Jesus* in terms of divine status (Knapp 1997:88). However, scholars differ about the meaning of the term *form* (μορφή).

Käsemann (Fowl 1990:52) defines the meaning of the term *form* (μορφή) as a *mode of being* in that Jesus is in the *form* (μορφή) of God, asserts that Jesus was in the realm determined by God, since Käsemann convinces that Paul's use of the preposition *in* (ἐν) is to 'designate the realm in which one stands and by which one is determined, as in a field of force'. He bases his interpretation upon parallels extracted from Gnostic dualistic literature of the 'heavenly man' (e.g. *Sib. Or.* 8.458; *Corp. Herm.* 1.13-14; Fowl 1990:52; Hawthorne 1998:99). However, it seems quite difficult to follow it, since as Fowl (1990:53) correctly indicates, the term *form* (μορφή) does not denote a mode of existence. There is no essential reason to read into the preposition *in* (ἐν) a designation of the realm in which one stands (Fowl 1990:53). According to Hawthorne (1983:83), there is also a certain reason why it seems difficult to follow the usage *being of mode*. Although this meaning is reasonable in this context, as well

as in v 7, one should not easily take it for granted owing to its strong reliance on the *heavenly man-myth* from gnostic dualism.

Martin (1959:184; 1997:115-116), by citing Brockington's observation about the use of *glory* (δόξα) in the LXX, connects *form* (μορφή) and *image* (εἰκὼν) to the usage of *glory* (δόξα) and opens the way for a fruitful contemplation of the meaning of the participle clause *being in the form of God* (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων). Likewise some scholars (Behm 1967a:751; Bockmuehl 1997b:23; Fowl 1990:53-54; O' Brien 1991:209) argue that the term *form* (μορφή) could be described in relation to the visible form of God in the LXX, which frequently explained God's glory (δόξα) with his majesty. The *form* (μορφή) then pictures pre-existent Christ as clothed in the garments of divinity and splendor in correspondence to Jn 17:5. However, it seems unreasonable to equally apply it to the parallel phrase *form of slave* (μορφή δούλου; Hawthorne 1983:82). Collange (1979:97) contends that the equivalence of *form* (μορφή) and *glory* (δόξα) never occurs prominently. Paul does not focus on the *glory* and *majesty* of Christ, but emphasises the character of the humble Christ.

Likewise, Dunn (1998a:284-288), Hooker (1975:160) and Martin (1959:183; 1997:115-116) state that the term *form* (μορφή) is synonymous with *image* (εἰκὼν Gen 1:26), and can be used interchangeably. Collange (1979:97) based his thinking on the idea that Christ is considered to be the 'second Adam' (cf. Rm 5), while the first Adam is considered to be in the 'image of God' according to Gen 1:26. Talbert (1967:151) also contends that the phrase *being in the form of God* indicates a part of the Adam/Christ-typology as the second Adam reversed the decision of the first Adam. However, Wallace (1966:22) contends that to equate *form* (μορφή) and *image* (εἰκὼν) contains a big problem, since it equates the image of God with the form of God. This exegesis leaves the meaning of *form of slave* (μορφήν δούλου v 7) indeterminate. To be consistent it should be rendered *image of servant*, a less powerful expression than *form of a servant*, i.e. participation in essential human nature (Wallace 1966:22). O' Brien (1991:209) likewise draws attention to the doubt whether Paul's intention was to draw on the Adam/Christ parallel at all, and that different views have been subjected to linguistic, exegetical, and theological investigations without giving a satisfactory answer. Wanamaker (1987:181) disagrees that the Adamic Christology in the Pauline tradition reflects a similar understanding to Philo's Logos as the image of God. Wherever Paul speaks of Christ as the Last Adam it takes place in the light of discussing the resurrection in which he wants to force the heavenly or divine character of Jesus' existence, not his humanity as such. It is done to contrast the fleshly Adam of creation with the eschatological Adam who became a life-giving spirit (1 Cor 15:45). Hurst (1986:454) argues that the purpose of 2:5-11 is exhortative. It is to exhort believers in Philippi to have the same attitude as Christ, not to develop Christ's function as the second-Adam.

The term *form* (μορφή) refers to the character of Christ, and can be understood as *form*, *status*, and *essence in the form of God*, which points to the attributes of God. The importance to understand the word *form* (μορφή), together with Paul's reason why he selected it, should in turn be placed with what transpires in the sentence itself

(Fee 1995:204). As a result, although some scholars (Dunn 1998a:284-288; Hooker 1975:160; Talbert (1967:149-153) strongly reject the pre-existence of Christ, Martin (1997:120) evinces that the description of the pre-existent Christ as *in the form of God*, is quite characteristic.

To exhort his readers Paul had to draw attention to the pre-existent Christ, to say something about Christ's 'mind' as God and as man. Paul's prior concern in the transition from Christ's *being God* to his *taking the form of a human being* is to indicate by means of *metaphor* the essential quality of that humanity: he *had taken the form of slave* (μορφὴν δούλου λαβών 2:7; Fee 1995:204). It has to do with the process of humiliation from very high to very low, on which the process of exaltation follows, where Jesus Christ was glorified to a higher position. Marshall (1991b:50) points out that Jesus had taken the form of a slave and the likeness of a human being at some later point, after *being in the form of God*, which suggests most importantly that *the form of God* is primarily to be identified with having the status of God, that is, sovereignty exchanged for the status of a slave. McClain (1998:89) argues that Paul's prior purpose is a strong argument for the reference to his pre-existent status. Christ's existence in the divine substance and power in the past clearly speaks of his pre-existence before the incarnation, (Braumann 1986b:706). For Paul the use of the expression *form of God* (μορφὴ θεοῦ 2:6) confirms his emphasis on Christ's pre-existence (Bockmuehl 1997a:129), which is his high status in the light of his divine honour. However, according to unit 2, he did not think of being equal to God as something to take advantage of. Rather, unit 2 draws attention to the first step of his humiliation.

4.2.2.3 Motivation through Jesus Christ's self-humiliation (v 6)

Unit 2 (v 6) οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, *he did not think of being equal with God as something to take advantage of*, describes Jesus' willingness not to grasp what might have been expected of him (Marshall 1991b:51). The infinitive clause *to be equal with God* (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ 2:6) could be the second description of Jesus Christ's pre-existence.

Gnilka, cited by Nagata (1981:213), contends that the term ἴσα refers to the quality of the position of the divine dignity, rather than to the quality of divinity. Vincent (1979:58-59) also contends that the term ἴσα, used as an adverb, means *in a manner of equality*. He evinces that the infinitive clause does imply the *equality with God*, but as *existence in the way of equality with God* (Vincent 1979:58-59). However, it is not wise to follow Vincent, since his argument seems to emphasise a *mode of divine existence* rather than supporting *equality*. According to Nagata (1981:216-217), although the adverbial nuance may be reinforced, there is no certain expression in the hymn itself that the speculative differentiation between the equality in position or rank and the equality in nature has led to the choice of ἴσα instead of ἴσος (Nagata 1981:216-217). Therefore, Loh and Nida's (1977:56) statement that 'the *equality with God*, is not a reference to equality of attributes or powers, nor is it alluding to a higher dignity which Christ could achieve in the future; it is an honoured status

Christ already had' is also not enough in this context, since their argument seems to point to a *mode of divine existence* as well. According to Murphy-O'Connor (1976:30), there is a clear tendency to derive the value attached to the infinitive clause *to be equal with God* (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ 2:6) from the rendering given to the participial phrase *being in the form of God* (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων 2:6). He further describes that the phrase can contain an allusion to divinity, but in itself does not convey this idea (1976:30). In the end, he rejects thinking either of pre-existence or divinity (1976:30). However, Murphy-O'Connor's argument does not seem likely, since as Hawthorne (1983:84) argues, the infinitive clause *to be equal with God* (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ 2:6) could be understood to refer to *equality with God* of which he has just spoken equivalently by describing *being in the form of God* (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων 2:6). Wanamaker (1987:187) states that after describing that grammatically the word ἴσα is 'a predicate adverb used as an adjective', it should be understood that *being equal with God* does not signify an equality of persons, but as the exercise of an office, the office of Lord.

To the contrary, it seems unclear what kind of office Christ had to exercise in his pre-existence. Wright (1986:344) convinces: if there is to be any supreme distinction of meaning between Christ's being in the form of God and Christ having *being equal with God* (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ), such a distinction does not, at least, mean that either phrase is speaking of something less than divinity and/ or the honours involving that state. He evinces that both descriptions express Christ Jesus in his pre-existent state, as one who is real, and fully *capax humanitatis*, but at the same time different from all other human beings in nature and origin (1986:344). Matera (1999:128) and O'Brien (1991:215-216) also demonstrates that the infinitive clause *being equal with God* (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ) clearly point to the *equality with God*. According to Hawthorne (1983:84), the definite article (τὸ) implies that this second expression is closely linked to the first, because here its function is to refer back to something previously mentioned. Nagata (1981:215) states that it is obvious that the term *equal* (ἴσα) elucidates an equality in position or condition of divine dignity and power. In the context of Phil 2:6, the relation of the phrase *in the form of God* (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ 2:6) to the infinitive clause *to be equal with God* (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ 2:6), would point out that *status* or *position* is the respect in which Christ and God are equal (Fowl 1990:56). This idea suggests that Christ was on the same level with God and therefore has the same sovereign might, as he (Christ Jesus) is able to act independently of him (God; Marshall 1991b:51). Therefore, we can conclude that the infinitive clause *being equal with God* (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ 2:6) exegetically explains the first participial phrase *being in the form of God* (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων 2:6), and might even suppose the stronger interpretation *this divine equality* (Wright 1986:344). Next we follow the account of his voluntary self-emptying and self-humiliation: he did not think of being equal with God as something to take advantage of, but he rather deprived himself of all previous advantages and took the form of a slave (Hawthorne 1996:173-174).

In the negative clause *he did not consider it as something to take advantage of* (οὐχ ἀπαγγμὸν ἠγήσατο v 6), Hooker (1975:151) reports that Carmignac thought the

negative particle *not* (οὐ) to belong to the noun (ἀρπαγμός), rather than to the verb (ἠγγήσατο). However, Foerster (1964a:474) states that the negative formulation is easily comprehensive, since it is a great gain to be equal with God and ‘everyone’ would make use of it. Nagata (1981:237) convinces that the negative *not* (οὐ) indicates a quite sharp contrast with the adversative particle *but* (ἀλλά), which points to the difference between the pre-existent Christ and the incarnate Christ, rather than to a complementary negative and positive characterization of the kind of divinity Christ possessed. I disagree with Hooker (1975:162) who suggests that the ‘negative *not* (οὐ) is a deliberate contrast between Christ and Adam’. Above I have given the reason why the Adamic Christology is very unlikely in the context of Phil 2:6-11 and we should not think of the fall of Adam, or the fall of the devil (Foerster 1964:474). It seems natural to place the negative particle in front of the verb *think* or *regard* (ἠγγέομαι), which describes the act of Christ in terms of the noun (ἀρπαγμός).

The term ἀρπαγμός is rare in secular Greek, and is a *hapax legomenon*, in the LXX and New Testament (Nagata 1981:217). Louw and Nida (1989:57.236) indicate that the term ἀρπαγμός can be rendered in the two possible ways: firstly, *to grasp something which one does not have forcefully*, secondly, *to retain by force what one possesses*. In this context, the latter seems more feasible, since it indicates the status of Jesus Christ before his incarnation, indicating Christ’s voluntary self-abnegation, which runs through the whole life of Jesus (Foerster 1964:474).

According to Dunn (1998a:285), the term ἀρπαγμός can be taken as *a matter of seizing, something to be grasped*, since there is no certain evidence to claim that the sense *retaining* is contained in the word itself. Since Gen 3:6 clearly alludes to the object of this action, *the being like God*, the contrast with Adam’s attempt to be like God, would not be missed by many who were familiar with Paul’s Adam theology (Dunn 1998a:285). Hooker (1975:162) evinces that Adam, who was created in the form and likeness of God came to think that the divine likeness was something that he needed to seize by misunderstanding his position; his tragedy was that in grasping it, he lost it. On the other hand, according to her, Christ as the true Adam understood that his likeness was already his, by means of his relationship with God (Hooker 1975:162). Nevertheless, he emptied himself (Hooker 1975:162). However, as I have already argued against the contrast of Adam to Christ, Paul’s intention in Phil 2:6-11 is not to contrast Adam with Christ, but rather to exhort his readers by drawing attention to both the self-humiliation and exaltation of Christ. Furthermore, Foerster’s (1964:474) argument against Dunn and Hooker seems quite reasonable to convince that ‘nor is there any suggestion of a pre-temporal temptation of Christ, since the reference is not so much to temptation as to a free act and in this connection we are not to link the term ἀρπαγμός with any thought of robbery or seizure by force’.

Hammerlich, a Danish philologist, suggests that the term ἀρπαγμός could be understood as *mystical rapture* in the use of the corresponding verb ἀρπάζειν (i.e. a *being snatched*, rather than in an active sense, *a snatching*; Robinson 1968-9:253). If so, the meaning might be *to be caught up* in a mystical rapture, *a-being-taken-away-into-the-presence-of-God*, as Trudinger (1967-8:279) demonstrates. According to

Trudinger (1967-8:279), his insight in terms of the meaning of the term ἀρπαγμὸν, has some significant implications concerning the importance of the ascension or exaltation of Jesus as understood by at least some sections of the primitive Christian community. However, it does not seem too early to get to the point of Christ's exaltation at this current context, since the subject of exaltation is not Christ himself, but God, as certainly indicated at v 9. It is thus difficult to agree with Hammerlich and Trudinger.

Moule (1970:271) evinces that the term ἀρπαγμός as an abstract noun signifies neither something not yet possessed, but desirable (to be snatched at, *res rapienda*), nor something already possessed (*res rapta*) and to be clung to (*retinenda*), but rather the act of snatching (*raptus*). He convinces that the point of the passage is that in place of imagining that equality with God meant *getting*, Jesus, on the contrary, *gave* – gave until he was *empty* in that he thought of equality with God not as *completion* (πληρώσις), but as *emptiness* (κένωσις), not as ἀρπαγμός, but as open handed spending – even to death (Moule 1970:272). However, as O' Brien (1991:214) rightly points out, if the term ἀρπαγμός had an active sense, it would be natural to have an object. Moule replied that it misses the point, since an abstract noun like *snatching* or *grasping* does not necessarily take an object (Wright 1986:349). Used intransitively, it elucidates a particular way of life, which characterised pagan rulers and the fetishes that the believers at Philippi may well have worshipped in their pre-Christian time (O' Brien 1991:213-214). Brown (1986a:604) and O' Brien (1991:214) pose the problem that Moule seems not to give enough weight to the sharp contrast between v 6 and v 7 introduced by an adversary particle *but* (ἀλλά).

Lightfoot (1963:132, 134) indicates that there are two possible interpretations for the term ἀρπαγμός. On the one hand, if the term ἀρπαγμὸν is chosen to signify *robbery* or *usurpation*, it implies that the equality with God was the natural possession, the inherit status, of the Lord. On the other hand, if the clause ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο is regarded as equivalent to the idiomatic expression ἄρπαγμα ἠγεῖσθαι, the term ἀρπαγμός will imply *a prize, a treasure*. He further applies these two opposite concepts to both the Latin fathers and the Greek fathers. In comparison with these two interpretations, Lightfoot (1963:136) elucidates that while the Latin fathers use the clause οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο (v 6) as a continuation and expansion of the idea already entailed in ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων (2:6), *he existed in the form of God* and so *did not regard his divine equality with God as usurpation (res rapta)*, the Greek fathers treat the clause οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο (v 6) as containing a contrast to this idea, *he existed in the form of God* but nevertheless *did not eagerly assert his equality (res retinenda)*. In the end, he followed the latter as the only viable alternative, ruling out the former (Wright 1986:323). Therefore, O' Brien's (1991:214) argument that the participial clause should be interpreted not as a *concessive* clause (who *although* he was in the form of God), but as a *causal* (precisely *because* he was in the form of God, he regarded equality with God not as a matter of getting, but of giving), since his argument seems to make the sharp contrast weak in the context. Martin (1997:149) supposes that the term ἀρπαγμός should be understood as a passive concrete sense (*prize* or *gain*) in the light of the mediating

position including both *res rapta* and *res rapienda*, which can be called *res retinenda*.

The term ἀρπαγμός in connection with τὸ ν 7 (ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν), indicates a sharp contrast. It seems best to say that it means *something to take advantage of*, as Hoover (1971:118), Wright (1986:345), and O' Brien (1991:216) explain that the sense of the negative clause οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο highlights that Jesus Christ willingly declined to use his divine equality that he had from the beginning for himself. Bruce (1989:69) also demonstrates that Christ's self-humiliation was clearly not motivated by self-assertion or self-aggrandizement. He abandoned every advantage or privilege of his equality with God in self-abnegation and unreserved self-humiliation. The contrast here takes place between man and God, pertaining to the godliness of Jesus, as well as in his becoming a man. A sharp contrast indeed exists between who and what God is and who and what man is. In Jesus crossing this border, from being God to becoming man, he indeed loses a lot. What Jesus Christ has indeed sacrificed and finally completely lost, was thus much more serious and severe than the hardship Paul endured at a later stage in chapter 3 of Philippians, when he stated that he counted everything to be a loss, in order to gain Christ and to be found in him and to know Christ Jesus, as well as the power of his resurrection, together with the participative sharing in his suffering, up to the stage of his death (Phil 3:8-10). According to Bockmuehl (1997a:131), Christ's refusal to take advantage of his divine status, proved himself entirely different to human nature, as he refused to use his divinely authorised status to his personal advantage. Through his rejection to use his privilege as a divine being, it was possible to *make himself empty* (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν 2:7), as well as to challenge the believers to consider other people better than themselves (Phil 2:3; Bockmuehl 1997a:130-131). Christ's humbleness within himself to divest himself of his divine status provides the foundation and the pattern for the believers (Brown 1986a:605).

4.2.2.4 Christ empties himself

Unit 3 (ν7) ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, *but he emptied himself*. The three participial clauses in units 4-6 describe the retrogressive action of how Christ emptied himself in unit 3 (ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν), *but he emptied himself: taking the form of slave* (μορφὴν δούλου λαβών), *becoming in the likeness of human beings* (ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος) and *being found in the human form* (καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος). Since these participles point to actions simultaneous to the verb ἐκένωσεν, they show how the action of the verb *empty* (ἐκένωσεν) was effected (Hawthorne 1983:86). As a result it is difficult to agree with O' Brien (1991:226) and Martin ([1959] 1993:106) that the last phrase should be connected to ν 8, since, as Hawthorne (1983:87-88) contends, the noun *form* (σχῆμα) in hymnic fashion combines with *form* (μορφή) and *likeness* (ὁμοίωμα) to establish a threefold repetition of the one basically significant idea, that Christ in his incarnation fully associated himself with the genuineness and completeness of his humanity.

In unit 3, the adversative conjunction *but* (ἀλλά ν 7) contrasts with *not* (οὐ ν 6) to lead the readers to look back to units 1 to 2 to remind them that Christ, *being in the*

form of God and *being equal with God* voluntarily chose the way of suffering that led to its climax, the death on the cross (2:8; O' Brien 1991:216). Although the unit does not explain of what Christ emptied himself, it is clear that both the subject and object of the verb *empty* (ἐκένωσεν) is Christ himself (Nagata 1981:238). Talbert (1967:152) contends that the clause *emptied himself* (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν v 6) most probably refers to Jesus as the servant who surrendered his life to God. Griffiths (1957-1958:239) agrees with Robinson that with reference to Isa 53:12, the clause *emptied himself* (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν v 6) signifies the surrender of life, not the *kenosis* of the incarnation. However, it is not feasible to see in *to empty* an allusion to Isa 53 to refer to the death of Christ, which is referred to later in v 8 (Loh and Nida 1977:58). Silva (1992:125) describes this Christ hymn primarily as an attribution of the servant of the Lord to Jesus. It seems to be an overstatement. It is none the less reasonable 'he emptied himself' actually means 'he suffered the death of the servant of the Lord'. Wilson (1983:48) convinces that the phrase does not point to a surrender of his deity. The clause *emptied himself* (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν v 6) clearly speaks of the incarnation of the son of God (Wanamaker 1987:188).

According to Vincent (1979:59), this clause is rather used, not as indicating a metaphysical sense to signify the limitations of Christ's incarnate state, but as a strong and graphic expression of the completeness of his self-humiliation. That is, Jesus declined to use his status of equality with God for his own ends, but was ready to say NO to himself (Marshall 1991b:53). In addition, Fee (1999:95) demonstrates that it stands here in direct antithesis to the 'empty glory' (v 3) and functions in the same way as the metaphorical 'he became poor' (2 Cor 8:9). He further states that 'thus, as in the 'not' side of this clause (6b), we still deal with the character of God as revealed in the mindset and resulting activity of the Son of God' (Fee 1995:95). He furthermore concludes that Paul's prior concern is with divine selflessness. God is not an acquisitive being, grasping and seizing, but self-giving for the sake of others (Fee 1995:95). Hooker (1978:162) states that

[E]lsewhere in Paul the verb is used metaphorically, meaning to make null and void. If we take it in the same sense here, we may translate: 'he made himself powerless'. This suits the context, since it offers a contrast with what went before: Christ, who was in the form of God and knew that equality with God was his, nevertheless made himself nothing.

According to Caird (1976:121), there is no clear justification for what in modern times has appeared to be as manifest as kenotic Christology, the idea that Christ could not have become man without stripping himself of the attributes of deity, in particular those of omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence. He clearly states that Paul in this context does not talk about it, but about Christ's self-humiliation of rank, privilege and rights (Caird 1976:121). Collange (1979:101) demonstrates that what is said in the clause *emptied himself* (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν v 6) is that Christ remains God, but that he abandoned the exercise of the power of God; he emptied himself of the fullness of the power. However, Hawthorne (1983:86) argues that it is not necessary to insist that the clause *emptied himself* (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν v 6) requires

some genitive of content be provided from the context – e.g. ‘Christ emptied himself *of something*, since Christ who was in very nature God, but who did not regard that this nature was characterized by acquisitiveness ‘effaced all thought of self and poured out his fullness to enrich others’. Although I have so far examined different meanings, I have not been able to come to satisfactory conclusion, but can agree with the following:

[T]hat what it does not mention explicitly is of what he emptied himself. The contrast between unit 2 and unit 3 is very suggestive; that is, Christ set aside his rightful divine prerogatives or status. This does not mean he set aside his divine nature, but it does indicate some sort of self-limitation, some sort of setting aside of divine rights or privileges (Witherington 1994a:66).

Furthermore, in order to understand this unit better, as Hawthorne (1983:86) supposes, we should define it more precisely by the participial phrases that follow – *taking* (λαβών) *the form of a slave*, *becoming* (γενόμενος) *in the likeness of human beings* and *being found* (εὑρεθείς) *in human form*. Christ’s emptiness thus has certainly taken place in *taking the form of a slave* as a first step of his emptiness not by a subtraction, but by an *addition* (Wilson 1983:48). Prior to dealing with these aspects, it seems better here to deal with the emptiness of Christ Jesus in comparison with the loss of Paul (3:7-11) in brief. What Paul here intends by means of using three participial clauses, is to absolutely highlight that Christ Jesus’s emptiness came from *his divine status* to *his humanity*, which indicates *nothing* in comparison with the divine status, which is *everything*. Paul himself also describes that he did regard everything as *loss* for the sake of Christ (3:7-11). However, we can easily recognise that there is a sharp difference between Christ Jesus and Paul in that in spite of the fact that Paul himself did regard everything as loss, as Christ emptied himself, his loss is completely different from Christ’s, since on the one hand, he lost everything of himself to have righteousness not from keeping the law, but from faith in Jesus Christ. On the other hand, Christ fundamentally emptied himself for sinners. Christ’s emptiness is his willful act of becoming nothing, to be an example others could follow to please God.

4.2.2.4.1 *The form of a slave*

In unit 4 (v 7) μορφήν δούλου λαβών, *taking the form of a slave*, the participle *taking* (λαβών) has a syntactical relationship to explain the main verb in unit 3 (Vincent 1979:59). The object *form* (μορφήν) of the verb λαμβάνω is also used in unit 1. There is no idea that Christ contained the outer appearance of a slave, or that he disguised himself as a slave (Hawthorne 1983:86). Rather, it denotes that he took the nature, ‘the characteristic attributes’ of a slave. In other words, he became a slave (Hawthorne 1983:86). The nature of a slave obviously expresses a sharp contrast to the *nature of God* (Loh and Nida 1977:58). That is, he surrendered his divine status *by taking* the nature of a slave. Furthermore, Christ did not disguise himself as a

servant: he became a servant, expressing in his deeds entire and absolute submission to the will of God (Loh and 1977:58). The heart of the matter is to show that Christ surrendered the highest possible status and took on the lowest possible role (Loh and Nida 1977:58). He did not merely exist in a servant's condition. He rather lived in humble service (Loh and Nida 1977:58). Therefore, expressing the nature of a slave in a sharp contrast to that of God could mean that the two expressions parallel in form indicate that if having the nature of God is interpreted as *was just like God*, one may then render taking the nature of a servant as *he was just like a servant* (Loh and Nida 1977:58). In emptying himself and taking the form of slave, Christ changed his honorable status in the light of his equality with God to the shameful status of a slave, which should be obedient to the will of another (Fowl 1990:58). To whom was Christ, as a slave, obedient? To people or God? It must be that he was obedient to God (Marshall 1991b:53). In adopting the role of a slave towards others, he was acting and obeying the will of God (Hawthorne 1983:87).

Gibbs (1970:281) states that Christ, who was essentially equal to God (v 6), took the form of a servant led away to death (Isa 53:8), but later God would 'exalt' and glorify him exceedingly (Isa 52:13) by means of identifying the Messiah with the suffering servant of Deutero-Isaiah, as Phil 2:5 is dependent on Isa 52:13-53:12. Martin (1997:191-194) follows Schweizer's interpretation that *he became the righteous sufferer*. According to O' Brien (1991:221), Schweizer states that the term *slave* (δοῦλος) is applicable to the righteous man suffering for his loyalty to God, and that the early church saw in Jesus the manifest example of this type of faithful one. However, as Nagata (1981:247-248) highlights, the act of Christ's humiliation in the current context is clearly demonstrated in terms of a sharp contrast between the divine majesty and might of the pre-existent one and the self-humiliating slave. According to Moule (1970:268), the term *slave* (δοῦλος) is taken not primarily of the suffering servant of Isaiah or even of the righteous sufferer generally, but mainly because slavery meant, in contemporary society, the extreme in respect of deprivation of rights. O' Brien (1991:223) likewise states that it seems much better to comprehend the expression *taking the form of a slave* (μορφήν δούλου λαβών) against the background of slavery in contemporary society.

If so, in order to understand this expression, it seems reasonable to deal with the term *a slave* (δοῦλος) in contemporary society in brief, since I have already dealt with it in detail in 1 Pet 2:18. At the Mediterranean society, slaves were known to be inferior or mediocre persons (Malina and Neyrey 1996:103). Furthermore, according to Harrill (2000:1125), slavery is rendered as a dynamic process of alienation and dishonour, termed *social death*, which signifies denying a person all dignity (as understood in that particular culture). He more specifically states that 'although they are not biologically dead, slaves in effect are socially dead to the free population' (Harrill 2000:1125). Therefore, a slave, as a property belonging not to himself, but to another, would be denied the right and the privilege to anything – even to his life and person (Moule 1970:268). When Jesus emptied himself in terms of the divine calling by becoming incarnate he became a slave, without any claim on his rights whatever (O' Brien 1991:223). 'He did not exchange the nature or form of God for that of a slave; instead, he displayed the nature or form of God in the nature or form

of a slave, thereby showing clearly not only what his character was like, but also what it meant to be God' (O' Brien 1991:223-224).

The phrase *the form of a slave* (μορφὴν δούλου) could be thus understood as signifying his slave condition, a condition of service as contrasted with the condition of equality with God (Vincent 1979:59). Bruce (1989:70) convinces that Christ's divine character was prominent, and most worthily displayed in the act of his humble service to wash his disciples' feet at the last supper (Jn 13:3-5). Jesus' ultimate act of humble service became the example of true servanthood, and it is comprehensive how Christian vocabulary would then get to reflect this (O' Brien 1991:224). The act of Jesus serves as the example, and accounts for the servant language (O' Brien 1991:224). Therefore, Christ's taking the form of a slave is best understood as his voluntary humiliation from the highest status, 'equality with God', to the lowest, that of a slave, giving up all his rights and privileges in order to serve (Bockmuehl 1997a:136).

4.2.2.4.2 *In the likeness of human beings*

For unit 5 (v 7) ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, *becoming in the likeness of human beings*, the second participial phrase elucidates significantly the expression of the finite verb *empty* (κένωω; Hawthorne 1983:87; O' Brien 1991:224). O' Brien (1991:224) states that the modal phrase describes the manner in which Christ *emptied himself*, rather than pointing to the manner of his *taking the form of a slave*. However, it seems to be better to connect this clause with what precedes units 3-4, as Fee (1995:213), Silva (1992:125-126), Vincent (1979:59) and Wanamaker (1987:188) demonstrate, since it more specifically describes the steps of Christ's emptying in terms of his impoverishment. According to Fee (1995:213), the phrase *taking the form of a slave* (μορφὴν δούλου λαβών v 7) appears first, on account of rhetorical reasons, to make the contrast with the phrase *in the form of God* (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ 2:6) much sharper and to elaborate on the real nature of his incarnation. The second phrase points to its factual side, which reflects the *quality* of his incarnation. That is to say, Christ appeared *in the form of a slave by his becoming in the likeness of human beings* (Fee 1995:213). Paul uses the plural genitive noun *of human beings* (ἀνθρώπων) to reinforce the fact that Christ became a human being in all respects, not like any particular individual (Loh and Nida 1977:59; O' Brien 1991:225). The aorist participle *becoming* (γενόμενος) does not have the sense *was born* because of its parallelism with the same participle *become* (γενόμενος) in v 8 (Collange 1979:103). It would be possible. Loh and Nida (1977:59) are convinced that *becoming* can also be taken in its so-called *etymological* sense of *being born*. Fowl (1990:60) rather suggests the alternative:

[T]he first phrase ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος may well be a reflection on the birth of Jesus. It is not unknown for γενόμενος to be used in this way in the New Testament (cf. Rm 1:3; Jn 8:3). Alternatively, one might point to the use of ὁμοίωμα in Rm 8:3 and view this verse as a parallel. In this case,

then the phrase would convey the notion of Christ's entrance into the earthly realm in a human body. Christ would have been subject to those things to which all humanity is subject. Yet there is no specific indication that when Christ took on a human body it was for the purpose of ultimately freeing humanity from its subjection.

O' Brien (1991:224) convinced me that

[T]he aorist participle *become* (γενόμενος derived from γίνομαι), together with the preposition *in* (ἐν), stresses the notion of 'beginning' or 'becoming', in the sense of 'coming into a position, or a state', and stands in sharp contrast to the present participle ὑπάρχων (2:6). In fact, two *static* verbs ὑπάρχων and εἶναι are found in v 6, but elsewhere the hymn uses the verbs that connote action (e.g. ἐκένωσεν, λαβών, and γενόμενος in v 7; ἐταπείνωσεν, γενόμενος in v 8). Earlier it was said that Christ *always existed* (ὑπάρχων) *in the form of God*. Here it is claimed that he *came into existence* (γενόμενος) *in the likeness of man*.

O' Brien (1991:224) concludes that although Collange rejects the rendering of the participle by *was born*, there is no doubt that Jesus's entrance into an existence like that of human beings was surely brought about by human *birth*, while the same participle signifies *born* at Gal 4:4 and Rm 1:3 (cf. Jn 8:58).

The term ὁμοίωμα is rare in secular Greek, but appeared frequently in the LXX (e.g. Ex 20:4; Deut 4:12, 16; Isa 40:18-19; Ezek 1:5, 16, 22, 26; 2:1; 8:2; 10:1, etc.) combined with words such as μορφή, εἰκών, ἰδέα, and σῆμα (Beyreuther and Finkenrath 1986a:501-502; Schneider 1967:191; O' Brien 1991:224). However, Beyreuther and Finkenrath (1986a:501-502) and Schneider (1967:191) agree that the two words εἰκών and ὁμοίωμα are used not only as synonyms, but also as possibly distinctive. What distinguishes them is that the term εἰκών is regarded as the object, an entity in itself, whereas the term ὁμοίωμα emphasises the element of comparison, what is similar or like, a copy (Beyreuther and Finkenrath 1986a:501; Schneider 1967:191). Therefore, the dative noun ὁμοιώματι can be rendered as *appearing in likeness of human beings* or *coming to be like a person*, as well as *becoming in the likeness of human beings*, which also implies *birth* (Nida and Louw 1989:64.3). In addition, it can denote *equivalence*, *identity* (Rom 6:5; cf. 5:14) to stress the sense of an original duplicate of the original, and thus refers to Christ's essential identity with human beings (O' Brien 1991:225). The text implies both the divinity of the pre-existent One and the humanity of the incarnate One (Beyreuther and Finkenrath 1986a:503-504). Phil 2:7 differs from Rom 8:3 in that Paul does not deal with the problem of sin in the hymn. There is no comparison between Christ and sinful, disobedient human beings (O' Brien 1991:225).

According to Lightfoot (1953:112), we cannot prove that the term ὁμοίωμα denotes the reality of the Lord's humanity. He states that it stands midway between μορφή and σχῆμα without explaining its meaning (1953:112). Beyreuther and Finkenrath (1986a:504) say the problem is that there are still those who try to render this likeness as not real, but merely apparent. According to them (1986a:504), that is about Schneider's (1967:197) position, when he says that 'even as man he remained at the core of his being what he had been before'. O' Brien (1991:225) points out that 'interpretations that tend in this direction can hardly avoid the danger of some form of Docetism, even when the contrary is asserted'. Denying real humanity to Christ should be taken as meaningless in this context, as Walvoord (1971:55) strongly argues: the term ὁμοίωμα surely signifies that Christ was like human beings, had the essential attributes of humanity, and manifested these in staying among human beings as a real man. Loh and Nida (1977:59) assert that Christ's likeness to human beings is a real likeness: *He came as man in the world and lived as a man*. Moreover, as Bruce (1989:70) and Bockmuehl (1997a:137) admittedly state, Jesus was a man truly born of woman (Gal 4:4) and died a terribly real death as ὁ γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ, shows. I concur with O' Brien's (1991:225) statement that

[C]hrist fully participated in our human experience, while at the same time recognising that 'even the self-emptying and humiliation have not destroyed or violated the secret of the pre-existent One'. Jesus is 'truly man, but he is not merely man'. Nevertheless, here the term ὁμοίωμα and the other paraphrastic formulas such as ὁμοίωμα, μορφή, and σχῆμα draw attention to the action of Christ, namely, that as the pre-existent one he became a real human being and took the form of a servant, becoming obedient to death (v 8). The expressions do not point to what is mystical and extraordinary in the nature or essence of the incarnate One.

4.2.2.4.3 *Being found in human form*

Unit 6 (v 7) καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθείς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, *being found in the appearance as a human being*, is the final participial phrase to stress the meaning of ὁμοίωμα elaborating on the clause *he emptied himself* (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν v 7; Hawthorne 1983:87). O' Brien (1991:226) does not support it that this current participial phrase modifies the preceding. He, however, admits that there is a real relationship between the participial clauses in the progression of thought. In this unit, the participle *being found* (εὐρεθείς) is used as an aorist passive to view not a quality of a thing in itself, but a quality as recognised by others (Fowl 1990:61; Martin 1997:208; Vincent 1979:60). According to Martin (1997:208), Lohmeyer says that the phrase *as human being* (ὡς ἄνθρωπος) should be understood as *like a Son of Man* (ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου) in the light of the original Semitic concept in the Aramaic of Dan 7:13. However, some commentators (Collange 1979:104; Hawthorne 1983:88; O' Brien 1991:227) point out that it is incorrect to interpret it in terms of an allusion to Daniel's heavenly

Son, since it does not precisely account for how the phrase *as a human being* (ὡς ἄνθρωπος) is equivalent to the Aramaic *barnasha*, when the LXX quite relevantly interprets the phrase by *as a Son of Man* (ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου; O' Brien 1991:227). Rather, it is a lessening of its emphasis on the final element in an emphatically unequivocal, repetitive affirmation of the realness of Christ's humanness (Hawthorne 1983:88). Martin (1997:207) says its meaning is *he was found to be a man* as a good parallel to Gal 2:17 *we were found to be sinners* (εὐρέθημεν ... ἁμαρτωλοὶ).

The term *appearance* (σχῆματι) as an element of outward form appears once in the LXX (Isa 3:17), and twice in the New Testament. In classical Greek it constantly refers to 'the outward form or structure perceptible to the senses' (Schneider 1971:954). Walvoord (1971:55) suggests that the term σχῆμα means *fashion* referring to the outer manifestation and more transient characteristics of humanity. According to Vincent (1979:60) the term σχῆμα denotes something changeable, as well as external. The term σχῆμα used with the verb *find* (εὐρίσκω) speaks of the *way* in which Jesus appeared as a human being (O' Brien 1991:226). According to Martin (1997:207), this unit entails an unequivocal witness to his personal humanity in this declaration that, in the eyes of those seeing his incarnate life, he was *as a man*. 'Christ Jesus who became in the *likeness* of human beings, was found in the *appearance*, as a man that was precisely recognisable as human' (Fee 1999:97). Together the two phrases emphasise his real humanity, just as the first two phrases in v 6 emphasise his divine attribute (Fee 1999:97). Therefore, Christ's real humanity is reaffirmed in this unit. The statement simultaneously takes the point toward the direction of his humiliation (O' Brien 1991:226).

Silva (1992:126) distinguishes each of these three nouns, which describe Christ's emptiness step by step in the following way:

[N]o doubt μορφή was chosen first to provide an explicit contrast with μορφή θεοῦ in v 6; ὁμοίωμα (a close synonym to ἴσος, cf. ἴσα in v 6) serves to delimit more precisely the range of μορφή (that is, although μορφή covers a very wide semantic range, only that area that overlaps with ὁμοίωμα is in view); finally σχῆμα, which has an even greater range than μορφή, is perhaps the most useful term available to provide a general summary of what the two previous clauses have stated.

The three Greek words *form* (μορφή v 7), *likeness* (ὁμοίωμα v 7), and *appearance* (σχῆμα) certainly describe on the one hand that Christ was still all that God is after he became incarnate; but that, on the other hand, he had a real humanity, manifested in being in the *form* of a slave *like* other men, apart from the fact that he was no sinner in the *appearance* as a man, who acted like a human being (Walvoord 1971:56). Therefore, who can deny that in a word, 'Christ was genuinely and truly man, who had to live the same kind of life as any other man had to live' (Hawthorne 1983:88). We can once again ask why Christology is so important to Paul? Paul surely had intended to use his Christology to motivate his ethical exhortation for his readers. It

provided the ground and pattern for Christian conduct. Paul appeals to the suffering people not to be shaken in their faith, while exhorting the church members in conflict to restore unity among themselves.

4.2.2.5 Christ's humbleness

Unit 7 (v 8) ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν, *he humbled himself*, closely associates with the vocabulary and behaviour exhorted in 2:3-4, and is parallel to the preceding main sentence *he emptied himself* (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν v 6) as the final downward step of self-humiliation (Bockmuehl 1997a:138). It is important to note that the verb *humble* (ἐταπείνωσεν) is not in the passive, but in the active aorist tense, with a reflexive pronoun *himself* (ἑαυτόν), indicating a voluntary historical act of self-humbling (Bockmuehl 1997a:138). Moreover, it should be dealt together with the following participle clause *becoming obedient to death, even the death of cross* (unit 8 γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ v 8). It qualifies the ultimate action of Christ's humbleness. The aorist active verb *humble* (ἐταπείνωσεν) is not synonymous with the first main aorist active verb *empty* (ἐκένωσεν), but takes the thought further (Vincent 1979:60).

The verb *humble* (ἐταπείνωσεν) is used with the reflexive pronoun *himself* (ἑαυτόν), which points out that the action was free and voluntary (O' Brien 1991:228). The emphasis in this clause is thus clearly not on the subject, but on the act of Christ (Vincent 1979:60). The clause *he humbled himself* (ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν) speaks of the entire life of Christ on earth in its devotion to the Father and the acceptance of the human fate (Martin [1959] 1987:106). As a human being Christ did not work for himself to get to some pinnacle of human achievement (Hawthorne 1983:89). Christ's whole life was completely opposite to the believers in Philippi where they were in conflict with each other. Thekkekara (1992:313-314) points out that Christ's self-humiliation is presented as an attitude diametrically opposed to every self-conceit and arrogant conduct, opposed to every ambition, vainglory and self-exaltation.

According to Nagata (1981:255), the verb *humble* (ἐταπείνωσεν) should not be interpreted in the ethical category, as it is used in the Jewish prominent sayings, for the fact that the hymn fails to speak of whose *slave* (δοῦλος) is meant in v 7, and to whom the incarnate one become obedient in v 8, cannot be explained if the intended purpose of the employment of the scheme of humiliation and exaltation were basically ethical. Moreover, Martin (1997:215) rejects the possibility of relating Christology to the ethical exhortation in that the text of the hymn must be taken on its own, irrespective of the application made in the immediate verses, since once this is done, it becomes increasingly hard to follow the *ethical interpretation*.

However, it seems to me that Nagata possibly made a mistake by taking away a possible ethical implication in the work of Christ by just looking at a single paragraph 2:6-11 rather than dealing with the immediate textual contexts from 1:30-2:5 including 2:12-18. Martin's seems to ignore the immediate passage to come to a

better conclusion. Paul displayed his Christology in between two ethical exhortative parts (1:27-2:5 and 2:12-18) in his pastoral concern for the Philippian church. Oakes (2001:126) sees that Paul shapes his story and exhorts his readers at Philippi by means of the story of Christ. Christ is the example to confirm the Phillipian congregation's faith and to lead them to be humble. For this Christ is the best example in Paul's pastoral work. The historical foundation of Christ's humanity and self-humbling is significant for the ethical point to which Paul was leading his readers to love and unity amidst real adversity (1:30). Paul leads his readers to Christ's lowest and most degrading humiliation, to his obedience unto death on a cross, which is the climax of his humiliation.

4.2.2.5.1 *The obedience unto death*

Unit 8 (v 8) γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ, *becoming obedient unto death, even the death of cross*, defines more specifically the second main clause *he humbled himself* (ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν v 8); Vincent 1979:60). The explanatory aorist participle *become* (γενόμενος) describes the actual action of self-humbling, of becoming obedient unto the death (O' Brien 1991:228). According to Acts 7:39, the same adjective *obedient* (ὑπήκοος) is used with the dative case denoting to whom the obedience is due (O' Brien 1991:228). However, in Phil 2:8 there is no indication to whom Christ became obedient. Martin (1997: 216) states with reference to Barth, that the hymn is not concerned with to *whom* Christ obeyed in his self-humiliation as a human being. Paul is rather interested in the fact that he obeys in subjection and dependence (Martin 1997:216). Martin (1997:216) says that this unit does not describe anything about the inner relationships between the Father and the Son in the Godhead. His becoming obedient is simply noted as a fact (Martin 1997:216). However, although the text does not clearly indicate the reference *to whom*, it can be inferred *to whom* he was obedient, since it would be helpful to see Christ's strong dependence on God the Father. As Fowl (1990:63) and Marshall (1993:133-134) state, the fact that God was the only one who exalted Christ in v 9, it grants credence to the concept that his obedience was obedience to God. Christ's obedience was actually unconditioned and unlimited, which means that it went up to the end of his life as far as his death (Bockmuehl 1997a:139).

According to Hurtado (1984:124) the obedience in Phil 2:8 is not an indication of obeying *of* death, as if death were one of the cosmic powers, but obedience to the *extent* of death (μέχρι θανάτου not θανάτου), since it emphasised the quality of Jesus' action. The action is not limited to the experience of death, but includes a larger obedience that remains steadfast even to the point of death. Caird (1976:122), Dahl (1995:11-12) and Fowl (1990:63) explain that Christ's obedience got to the point willingly to accept death, which was more specifically on a cross. The phrase *unto death* (μέχρι θανάτου) indicates the reality of Jesus' death. Hawthorne (1983:89) evinces that the precise phrase *unto death* (μέχρι θανάτου) measures the magnitude of Christ's humility and conveys the idea that he was obedient to God to the full length of accepting death on *a cross*. A *cross* indicates that Christ's death was not a natural death, but that he was killed by the worldly powers, which did not understand

the work of Christ according to the will of God. ‘The intensive or explicative conjunction *even* (ὅτι) that introduces this phrase calls special attention to this most striking element in the humiliation of Christ’ (Hawthorne 1983:89).

Crucifixion, borrowed from the Persians and perfected by the Romans, was an unusually cruel and humiliating way of capital punishment (Hawthorne 1983:89). Crucifixion was generally held as the typical punishment for slaves (Hengel 1977:51). Moreover, crucifixion also had the purpose to protect the people against dangerous criminals and violent men, which accordingly brought contempt on those who suffered it (Hengel 1977:50). According to Cicero, cited by Knabb (1997:91-92), it is a crime ‘to bind a Roman citizen; to flog him is an abomination; to slay is almost an act of murder; to crucify him is – what? There is not fitting word that can possibly describe so horrible a deed’. The Jews also abhorred crucifixion not only because of its pain and shame, but because anyone thus hanged was regarded as accursed by God (Deut 21:23, 23; 1 Cor 1:23; Gal 3:13; cf. Heb 12:2; Hawthorne 1983:90). ‘By the standards of the first century, no experience could be more lonesomely degrading than *death on a cross*’ (Knapp 1997:92). The fact that this death took place on a cross, reinforced the ultimate extent of his self-humiliation (Fowl 1990:63-64).

His crucifixion was Christ’s supreme act in human degradation. In this phrase the lowest and most degrading status in the descent-theme of the first section of the hymn is reached – he was in the form of God, was equal with God, emptied himself, humbled himself, renounced himself to a criminal’s and a slave’s death (Hawthorne 1983:90). The story of Christ reaches to its first climax at this point. These units 1-8 (vv 6-8) lead in one great sweep, from the highest status to the lowest and most degrading status, from the light of God to the darkness of death (Martin [1959] 1987:108). Marshall (1991:54) points out that in this way Paul brings out the strong reality of what *humbling* oneself denotes – and thus gives an active commentary on how he understood *humbly* in v 3. Therefore, as Brown (1996:14) states, Christ’s lowest and degrading humiliation suits Paul’s ethical exhortation for his readers as well as himself, with martyrdom and the possibility of sharing a shameful and painful death like Christ (cf. Phil 1:1:12-24, 27-30; 2:17; 3:17-21). Oakes (2001:200) points out that in this context, Paul’s readers are required to apply Christ’s action to their situation of suffering and conflict.

4.2.3 The exaltation of Christ (vv 9-11)

4.2.3.1 Exalted Lord

In unit 9 (v 9) διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν, *therefore also God raised him to the highest place*, with the inferential *therefore also* (διὸ καὶ v 9), Paul draws the previous narrative to its relevant conclusion (Fee 1995:220). The conjunction *therefore* (διό) definitely refers to the exaltation and as such we can conclude that there is consequently no space for any coincidence (Peterson 2004:179).

God vindicated the self-emptying and self-humbling of Christ (2:6-8) by way of his exaltation, which confirmed God's approval of Christ, being 'equal with God', which can consequently be considered to be a certain reverse of issues pertaining to his personal status of humiliation (Hendriksen 1962:113-114; Peterson 2004:179).

While Christ's death on a cross was socially most shameful, it was regarded as most honorable in the eyes of God, since Christ had done all his work according to the will of God. Unit 9 presents God as intervening and acting on behalf of his Son (O' Brien 1991:232-233). According to Beasley-Murray (2000:224), the additional prepositional prefix (ὑπέρ) to the verb *raised to the highest place* (ὑπερύψωσεν v 9) points out that God did not merely restore Jesus to the place of exaltation that has always been his. By raising him from the dead, he lofted him to a yet higher status than he had ever had before.

However, according to Moule (1970:269) and O' Brien (1991:236), both contextual and linguistic investigations propose that the verb has a superlative or, more emphatically, an elative strength, implying Jesus's exaltation to a status over the whole of creation (rather than a comparative force in relation to his pre-existence). Nagata (1981:227-228) likewise supports the idea that the main verb *raised to the highest place* (ὑπερύψώω v 9) is superlative, not contrasting the pre-existent Christ to the exalted Christ, but between the exalted Christ and the whole of creation over which Christ reigns (v 10). When this verb (ὑπερύψώω v 9) is used in the LXX, the Old Testament describes Yahweh as the one, who is 'exalted far above all gods' (Ps 96 [97]:9; cf. Dan 3:52, 54, 57-88; Hawthorne 1983:91). The use of the aorist tense (God *raised him to the highest place*, ὑπερύψωσεν v 9) implicitly speaks of that moment in history marked by the resurrection-ascension of Christ. Jesus Christ, who emptied himself and humbled himself in obedience to God up to accepting death in its most cruel form, was resurrected from the dead by God and raised to the highest place (cf. Acts 2:32, 33; 5:30, 31; Eph 1:20, 21; Hawthorne 1983:91). God vindicated his own honour and that of his crucified son by raising him from the dead and installing him as the Lord of Glory. Christ has been bestowed this very high and valuable honour by God, of setting an perfect example for believers to pursue (Rom 6:4; 2 Cor 2:8; Harrison 2003:221).

His status was raised from the lowest and most degrading and shameful humiliation in society. He acquired the status of honour and majesty to be 'seated at the right hand of God's throne' (Mk 16:19; Acts 2:33; 5:31; Rom 8:34; Heb 1:3; 12:2), 'far above all rule and authority and power and dominion and every name that is named not only in the current age, but also in the coming age' (Eph 1:20-21; Hendriksen 1962:114). He was *raised to* the kind of exaltation that befits his divine status (Bockmuehl 1997a:141; Hendriksen 1962:114). To the believers under suffering and in conflict, the suffering and exaltation of Christ appeal to be patient in their suffering, and to unify themselves through the same mind of Christ in their conflicts. The Christology in Phil 2:6-11 indeed functions as motivation in Paul's ethical exhortation. The main sentence, *God raised him to the highest place* (ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν v 9), is followed by the statement that God *bestowed on him the name that is above all names* (ἔχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα v 9). This

second phrase parallels the first, but functions both to emphasise the fact of Christ's resurrection-exaltation and at the same time to measure its extent (Hawthorne 1983:91).

4.2.3.2 His superior name

Unit 10 (v 9) καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα, *also bestowed him the name that is above all names*, is clearly parallel to unit 9, expands its meaning and points to its nature (O' Brien 1991:237). The aorist verb *bestowed* (ἐχαρίσατο) has the sense of *granted as an act of grace* (Loh and Nida 1977:61). 'The term *name* (τὸ ὄνομα) is virtually equivalent to a person or being' (Luter, Jr 1993:626). According to Malina (1993:38), the term *name* (τὸ ὄνομα), in the ancient Mediterranean society, indicates one's good name, one's reputation, upholds the extreme concern of people in every circumstance of public behaviour and provides purpose and meaning to their lives, like money which bestows power in the modern society.

A good name and family reputation are central, since families in that time were not completely self-sufficient and independent in the economic environment as in modern society (Malina 1993:38). Social life requires a degree of interdependence, co-operation, and shared enterprise (Malina 1993:38). The name is virtual equivalent to the person himself. The concept of the *name* (τὸ ὄνομα v 9) represents nature and power (Eph 1:21, Heb 1:4). It represents the name of Christ as both divine quality and power (Nagata 1981:267). Although there are various meanings for the *name*, basically two are relevant: Jesus and Lord (Fee 1995:221). The phrase *the name that is above all names* (τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα v 9) implies the name, which stands for the highest authority and power above all rival beings: the Lord Jesus Christ (Luter, Jr 1993:626; Nagata 1981:267).

According to Hawthorne (1983:91), *the name that is above every name* (τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα v 9) expresses that God not only graciously provided him a designation, which make him distinct from all other beings, a title which outranked all other titles, but also that he bestowed on him a nature which coincided with that title, giving substance and meaning to it. That God bestowed on him the designation *Lord* expresses the great honour ascribed to Christ. In the ancient Mediterranean society it was bestowed by a notable person of power, such as a king or governor (Malina and Neyrey 1991:28). As creator of all creatures, God who has the absolute power and rank to do so ascribed it to Jesus (Malina and Neyrey 1991:28). In v 11 Christ is named the Lord of the universe, the position of God *vis-à-vis* the world (Marshall 1991:56; Martin [1983] 1997:238). I agree with Witherington (1994b:104) that *the name that is above all names, is surely the name of God and in this hymn the name that Jesus was given when he was raised and exalted beyond death was not Jesus, – he had that name since human birth – but the name of God in the Old Testament – that is, Lord, which is the LXX equivalent to Yahweh.*

If that title (name) is *Lord* (κύριος v 11), as the context points (v 11), it signifies that

Christ has recovered the character of Lord, ruling over the entire universe (Hawthorne 1983:91). All authority in heaven and earth is subordinate to him. It is God's gift and his own nature (Mtt 28:18; cf. Eph 1:20-21). This is the result of Christ's exaltation – raised by God to the position of supreme authority in the cosmic structure of things (Hawthorne 1983:91-92). He has been exalted to the point of the universal Lord. The suffering (Phil 2:6-8) and exaltation of Christ (Phil 2:9-11) exhort believers under undeserved suffering and conflict. Their suffering will be reversed to exaltation at the time of Christ's coming, as Christ has been exalted by God.

4.2.3.3 Universal Lord

The conjunction *in order that* (ὡς να v 11) implies purpose (Bockmuehl 1997a:146; Hawthorne 1983:92; O' Brien 1991:238-239) rather than result (Fee 1995:223). Bockmuehl (1997a:145) indicates three possible translations for the phrase *in the name of Jesus* (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ v10): 1) *in his name*, 2) *whenever his name 'Jesus' is pronounced*, 3) *in honour of his name*. Bockmuehl (1997a:145) and O' Brien (1991:240) prefer 3 to 1 and 2. According to Marshall (1991:56), 2 is relevant in this context. When the simple name of Jesus is pronounced, the result is that every body present bows in worship and homage. However, Beasley-Murray (2000:225) and O' Brien (1991:240) state that the English translation *at the name* may be misleading, since it might imply that *whenever* the name of the Lord is pronounced every one would bow the knee in adoration. Furthermore, Beasley-Murray (2000:225) states that in the LXX to do something *in the name of the Lord* constantly implies to do something 'by invoking the name of the Lord', that is, calling upon the name of the Lord, accompanies the action. However, his argument is not supported by Nagata (1981:273) and O' Brien (1991:239). Both of them argue that the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ in this context is not the technical formula of invocation and worship, although such a use is often found in the New Testament (Acts 2:38; Eph 5:20; Col 3:17; in exorcism and healing, Mk 9:38; Lk 9:49; Acts 3:6; Jas 5:14).

O' Brien's (1991:240) concludes that the worship is in honour of the exalted Christ, as the parallel words of v 11 explicitly state that the act of reverence is paid to the son and *to the glory of God the Father*. Therefore, Jesus is the one that is worshipped. O' Brien (1991:240) argues that the word *of Jesus* (Ἰησοῦ v 10) is neither in the dative case nor is it an explicative genitive, but rather a possessive genitive, since it is not *the name Jesus*, but *the name which belongs to Jesus* that is .

In such context, the use of the concrete name *Jesus* (Ἰησοῦ v 10) serves to reinforce the reality of his humanity: it is the real human being whom the first part of the hymn has mentioned (vv 7-8) who has been exalted (O' Brien 1991:240). God exalted Christ, who emptied himself and humbled himself, to be the Lord of the universe through raising him to the highest place in public. The day will come when all will acknowledge this (O' Brien 1991:240).

The essence of the worship, which will be offered to the exalted Lord by all creatures is pictured as genuflection: *every knee should bow in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth* (πᾶν γόνυ κάμψη ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων v 10; Beasley-Murray 2000:226). The main clause *every knee should bow* (πᾶν γόνυ κάμψη v 10) is a common expression for doing reverence, but constantly in recognition of the authority of the God or the person to whom one is offering such reverence (Fee 1995:223-224). In the Old Testament the bending of the knee is expressed as implying great reverence and subordination, marking the humble approach of the worshipper who felt his need so deeply that he could not stand straight in front of God (O' Brien 1991:241). Isa 45:22-25 proclaims God's uniqueness and hails his universal triumph (O' Brien 1991:241). According to Hawthorne (1983:92), the name *Lord* granted to Jesus is the Old Testament name for God (YHWH) as in Isa 45:18. God's word in Isa 45:23 *before me every knee will bow; by me every tongue will swear* (NIV) is here interwoven in the structure of vv 10-11 and applied to Jesus (Hawthorne 1983:92). Hawthorne (1983:92-93) picks up the significance of the quotation

[I]t is significant that this quotation is taken from one of the Old Testament passages that most strongly emphasise the sole authority of God – *I am God and there is none else* (Isa 45:22). Hence, although the grammatical construction ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κάμπτειν is unique (but cf. Ps 62 [63]:5; 43 [44]:10; 104[105]:3; 1 Kgs 8:44), and the idea astonishing, it is nonetheless necessary to understand that the writer is here asserting that homage is indeed to be paid *to* Jesus as Lord, not *through* Jesus to God. Therefore, the expression ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, *at the name* or *before the name*, meaning that all must bring their homage to Jesus, all must fall on their knees before him to show honor to him.

The universal adoration now becomes clear by a series of three adjectives: *in heaven and on earth and under the earth* (ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων v 10) (Hawthorne 1983:93). Fee (1995:224-225) describes the characters of the three adjectives:

[I]n keeping with the Isaianic oracle, especially that 'the Lord' is the Creator of the heaven and the earth (Isa 45:18), Paul is purposely throwing the net of Christ's sovereignty over the whole of created beings. Those 'of heaven' refer to all heavenly beings, angels and demons; those of earth refer to all those who are living on earth at his Parousia, including those who are currently causing suffering in Philippi, and those 'under the earth' probably refer to 'the dead', who also shall be raised to acknowledge his lordship over all.

However, it is not important to identify the specific referents of these adjectives, but to emphasise the universal Lordship of Christ. These adjectives as masculine, rather than neuter, speak not only of rational beings in explicit relation to *all* (πᾶν v 10), but

also of the universal character of the acclamation offered to the exalted Lord (Hawthorne 1983:93; O' Brien 1991:243; Silva 1992:133). Even though a few scholars have recently argued that the hymn has only the spirit world in mind in terms of the cosmic principalities and powers alone, Beasley-Murray (2000:226) states that it cannot exclude human beings. All principalities and all people should bow their knees in front of Jesus and do reverence to him in worship and awe (cf. Eph 1:10; Beasley-Murray 2000:226; Hawthorne 1983:93).

4.2.3.4 The highest exaltation

In unit 12 (v 11) καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς. *and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is the Lord to the glory of God the father*, the conjunction *and* (καὶ v 11) points out that God's second purpose in exalting Christ and graciously giving him the name above all others, is that *every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is the Lord to the glory of God the Father* (v 11; O' Brien 1991:2450246). The compound verb *confess* (ἐξομολογήσεται v 11) necessarily points to either public praise or a confession of sin (Collange 1979:107). In this context, it indicates the public and liturgical character of the confession, which should acclaim Jesus in the same manner as the multitude of earthly monarchs (Collange 1979:107). The verb deals with an action which is in course of development, demonstrated for the present by the confession of believers, but to be entirely manifested at the end of time (Collange 1979:107). As the bowing of the knee basically signified a respectful submission to Jesus, the confession of every tongue acknowledges that Jesus Christ is Lord (Beasley-Murray (2000:226).

The confession that *Jesus Christ is Lord* (ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς v 11) expresses the exaltation to the highest position, the heavenly throne of God (Bauckam 1998a:58). In the Old Testament, self-humiliation by God's servant often leads to God's exaltation for the servant (cf. Isa 53:10b-12; Kurz 1985:112). Following the LXX of Isa 45:23, it is significant that *Lord* (κύριος) stands for the divine name *YHWH* to be confessed not just by the church, but by *every tongue* (πᾶσα γλῶσσα v 11; Bockmuehl 1997a:147).

The term 'Lord' within the Hellenistic world, may sometimes refer to God, but may at some other times also be used in a different way. In the Hellenistic context, many terms, such as lords, principalities, powers, thrones and dominions were used as synonyms, referring to beings who were less than God, but more powerful than people and who ruled over the spheres of power (Allen 2007:73). While it is a great honour to Christ, that the creator and absolute king of God's kingdom named him Lord, the public acclamation will be made by all, at least by 'all rational beings, ... everyone who is able to intelligently acknowledge the Lordship of Jesus Christ (Malina and Neyrey 1991:41; O' Brien 1991:249).

This acknowledgement of Jesus as Lord, in no way deprived God of glory – it was in fact the center of God's self-revelation. To acknowledge Jesus as Lord, as well as to give glory to God the father, are synonymous (Hooker 1978:159). God's unique

reign acquires universal acknowledgement when it is exercised by the one who humiliated himself in the way of obeying God up to death on the cross and was therefore exalted to the divine throne (Bauckam 1998b:136). Therefore, the fact that Jesus Christ is now called *Lord* (κύριος) strongly signifies that his action of self-humiliation and obedience has not just exemplary, but also completely authoritative importance (Hurtado 1984:125). Hurtado (1984:125) demonstrates that Paul asks obedience (2:12), as Christ became obedient (2:8), and the authority of his summoning to obedience (as ὥστε of 2:12 indicates) depends on the fact that the one to whom his readers are called to conform to is now the *Lord* (κύριος). The name given to Jesus is that of Lord (Κυρίος), and the gift of it implies that Christ is now exalted in the place of office and power, exercising the sovereignty properly belonging to God (Marshall 1968:112).

The phrase *to the glory of God the Father* (εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς v 11) emphasises that God is the actor who has initiated the activities of v 9 and that the acclamation of Christ by all of the powers, ultimately directs to the glory of God (Fowl 1990:68-69). Respecting Jesus is a way of glorifying God, because the position held by Jesus was offered to him by God. Honouring God entails honouring him whom God has placed in this position of honour. Honouring him is to honour a person, whose status has been assigned to him by God, in light of the implicit honour of God himself (Marshall 1991:58). That every knee bows in front of him and all tongues confess him to be Lord, is *to the glory of God the Father* (Bauckam 1998:134). Christ's Lordship indicates the praise of God as Father (O'Brien 1991:251). Hurtado (1984:125) says that the exaltation of Christ (vv 9-11) describes a certain reversal to his suffering (vv 6-8), which means that his actions (vv 6-8) were vindicated and approved by God, and that his previous status as slave, becoming human, obedient unto the death on a cross, has been changed to the honourable status of Lord, ascribed by God and recognised by the whole of all creation, including human beings.

4.2.4 Conclusion

Phil 2:6-11 expands the Christological theme: Christ's suffering and exaltation. The character of Christ in terms of four features can be illustrated: his pre-existence, his self-emptying, his humbleness, and his exaltation. The character of his pre-existence was *in the form of God* and *in equality to God*. However, he did not take advantage of it. He willingly emptied himself by *taking the form of a slave, in human likeness, and in appearance as a man*. He voluntarily humbled himself to the extent of *becoming obedient to death, that is, the death on a cross*. In the process of the steps of Christ's suffering Paul's intention is not only to describe his Christology in this section. This section should be considered in relation to the adjacent parts of ethical exhortation in order to exhort his readers to follow the way of Christ, not to shrink from their current circumstances, but to solve the conflicts among them. As they encounter suffering because of their faith in Christ, and from conflicts in the congregation, they have to remember that Christ also suffered by giving up his admirable status as God, emptied himself and humbled himself to the death on a cross. For Paul Christology here exhorts his readers under their unstable

circumstances by drawing attention to Christ's change in status from his highest status to the lowest. Christ is the *actor* in his self humiliation to death on a cross. Paul challenges his readers to commit themselves.

God however, bestowed a great honour on Christ that is above every honour, which means that all people, as well as all spiritual beings in heaven, in earth, and under the earth will bow their knees before him and confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the father. Christ's willing suffering satisfied God completely. As a result, God exalted him to the highest status. God is the *actor* in Christ's exaltation.

If believers suffer in the name of Christ, they should not be afraid, since God will exalt them to complete their salvation. If believers suffer conflicts among themselves, they should follow the lifestyle of Christ.

Therefore, this section can be summarised in the following way: Paul exhorts his readers to work out their salvation with fear and trembling, since God works in them, as he acted as the initiator who exalted Christ from the lowest and most degrading place to the highest place. The hymn does not occur in the context of a theological argumentation, but is placed in the midst of the ethical exhortations of the apostle. The life of Christ, especially his suffering and exaltation, is the paradigm and pattern for the life of the believers in various ways, even though there are ways in which Christ was unique and his experience cannot be imitated (Witherington 1994a:58).

Paul composed his letter with a deliberate ethical intention, to be applied to the believers' life, rather than as a statement of soteriology (Hengel 1995:380; Marshall 1993:136-137). Paul does not regard it as ridiculous idealism to appeal to the example of Christ for the ethical exhortation of his readers. Paul's intention seems to emphasize the Gospel principle in this hymn that those who humble themselves and suffer on behalf of their faith for the sake of Christ (an action, not an inferiority complex) will be exalted, as God has exalted Christ to the loftiest position (suffered by means of self-emptying and self-humbling; Witherington 1994b:104).

Bockmuehl (1997a:148) states that the whole purpose, in keeping with 1:27-30, 2:1-4, and 2:12-18, was to commend to the Philippians the Lord's example as the ultimate ethical exhortation for the steadfastness of the believers in adversity, as well as to facilitate a harmonious unity amongst each other. The ethical exhortative part (1:27-30, 2:1-5, and 2:12-18) will be analysed to prove that Christology has and still functions to motivate ethical exhortation.

4.3 The calling to unity, humility and obedience in Phil 1:27-30, 2:1-5, and 2:12-18

4.3.1 Introduction

The analysis of the ethical part will prove the hypothesis that Christology of Phil 2:6-11 functions as the motivation for the ethical exhortation of 1:27-30, 2:1-5 and 2:12-18: how to conduct oneself in hostile circumstances (1:27-30), how to solve inner conflicts (2:1-5), and how to work for their salvation (2:12-18). Fowl (1990:77) indicates that Phil 2:6-11 is used to support the ethical demands of 1:27ff, designed to direct the readers as to what kind of conduct to have amidst a hostile environment; that Phil 2:6-11 is used to support Paul's argument against his opponents in 3:1ff (Fowl 1990:77). However, it is difficult to follow Fowl's argument that Phil 2:6-11 is linked to both 2:17 and 3:1. Craddock (1985:35), O' Brien (1991:143) and Hawthorne (1983:55) indicates that Phil 2:6-11 is related to 2:1-5 and 2:12-18, as well as inseparably to 1:27-30. Craddock (1985:35) tried to prove in which way Phil 2:6-11 is connected with both 1:27-30 and 2:1-5. The conjunction *therefore* (οὖν 2:1) linked this passage with the preceding section (1:27-30; Craddock 1985:35). The words *in one spirit* (ἐνὶ πνεύματι 1:27) and *in one soul* (μὴ ψυχῇ 1:27) are the necessary qualities to stand firm in, and to struggle together in the midst of a hostile environment (Craddock 1985:35). This chapter investigates and focuses on the three different issues, which were simultaneously present in the Philippian church whose members encountered suffering from their opponents (1:27-30), as well as with the internal conflicts among themselves (2:1-5), how to work for their salvation (2:12-18).

4.3.2 Do not be afraid of the opponents (Phil. 1:27-30: units 1-8)

4.3.2.1 Introduction

After Paul has written about his personal circumstances and has disclosed his own innermost feelings (1:12-26), he moves to instruct the congregation in the imperative (Hawthorne 1983:54). He provides his readers at Philippi with practical exhortations to hold fast to one common purpose and to work together for the gospel (Loh and Nida (1977:38). With the focus on v 27, he gives only one comprehensive exhortation, covering every aspect of the readers' lives (O' Brien 1991:143). Paul relates his concern for them to his concern for the gospel in the Philippians church (Fee 1995:161). The purpose of their suffering is to advance the gospel of Christ, which contains suffering and hardness (v 29). It moves man's central concern from himself to Christ, to other people, and to the future (v 28; Collange 1979:73). It is also a gospel of faith, of grace, and of the gift of God as the active power, which demands unity and solidarity (v 27), the initiative of which is the Spirit (v 27; Collange 1979:73).

4.3.2.2 A life worthy of the gospel of Christ

Unit 1 (v 27) Μόνον ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύεσθε, *Only live in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ*. Paul uses the introductory adverb, *only* (μόνον v 27). This adverb shifted Paul's direct concern from his readers' progress and joy in their faith, to the current situation in the Philippian church (Fee 1995:161). It implies that the clause *to live in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ* (ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύεσθε v 27) is the most significant imperative in the letter (Davis 1999:111). Fee (1995:161) points out that Paul's common word for conduct is the general Jewish metaphor of *walking* (Phil 3:17-18). Paul's choice of πολιτεύεσθε, a word found only here in Paul and one other time in the New Testament, caught the readers's attention and made the command memorable (Davis 1999:112). Bockmuehl (1997:97) is convinced that Paul consciously selected this term (cf. πολίτευμα 3:20; πολιτεία Eph 2:12), which carried more punch at Philippi than his more general words for *walk* or *conduct*. The verb *to live* (πολιτεύομαι v 27) has the dual sense of exercising your rights, and public duties of free and full citizenship. Collange (1979:73) says that there is no mention of the relationships with the city or the state, nor of individual conduct, but rather of the community life.

According to Tellbe (1994:110), we cannot ignore that the verb πολιτεύεσθε and πολίτευμα (3:20) have political connotations related to Philippi as a Roman colony. Clarke (2000:196) and Winter (1994:98) suggest that the verb πολιτεύεσθε can be rendered as *to live as citizens*. Although Paul views his readers as alien residents in the cities of the world, they belong to a heavenly common-wealth (Tellbe 1994:110). Clarke (2000:196) declares that Paul exhorts his readers to be responsible citizens in the public sphere of the *city* (πόλις) by living consistent with the gospel. Bruce (1983:56) thinks that Paul used this verb, which means *to live as citizens*, because he later addressed them as *citizens of heaven* (3:20). The verb has this dual sense: the citizens of the city, as well as that of heaven. Collange's argument seems one sided. As citizens as well as believers they should live *in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ* (Marshall 1991:35). As obedience, humble mindedness, together with mutuality, are the virtues that established a community, the verb πολιτεύεσθε points to the practical exercise of these virtues (Roberts 1937-8:326). Hawthorne (1983:56) claims that *to live in a manner worthy of the Gospel of Christ*, implies to live as a good citizen of an earthly state, fulfilling one's duties and responsibilities to the state (Hawthorne 1983:56). It also signifies that the lives of believers, as good citizens of heaven, should be controlled by the laws of this unique term *citizenship* (πολίτευμα 3:20; Hawthorne 1983:56).

Paul uses the adverb *worthily* (ἀξίως) in phrases generally by way of exhortation and commonly with the verb *walk* (περιπατέω, 1 Thess 2:12; Col 1:10; Eph 4:1). Here he exhorts his readers to live worthy of the gospel of Christ (O' Brien 1991:147). Philippi as a colony enjoys the personal imperial patronage of the Lord Caesar, but the Philippian church is a personal colony of Christ the Lord above all (2:10-11). The practice of their normal citizenship thus must be thus *worthy* of his gospel (Bockmuehl 1997a:98). Fee (1995:163) states that the phrase *in a manner worthy of*

the gospel of Christ (ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ v 27) denotes that ‘the gospel had a known ethical element and that *selfish ambition, vain conceit, grumbling, and disputing* were not in accordance to their heavenly citizenship, since they did reflect the ethical character of the gospel’. The phrase *of Christ* (τοῦ Χριστοῦ v 27) is an objective genitive, meaning *the good news about Christ* (Loh and Nida 1977:38; Vincent 1979:32). In view of vv 27, 29 and 2:5-11, it qualifies the gospel with a *glory* attributable not to itself, but to Christ and by that very fact is effective, through struggles, sufferings, in the stable achievement of real progress, especially in brotherly community life (Collange 1979:73-74). Therefore, what this phrase means is that *to live in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ* is above all to live by the *example* of Christ as illustrated in 2:6-11 (Bockmuehl 1997a:98).

4.3.2.2.1 Paul’s concern for his readers

For unit 2 (v 27) ἵνα εἴτε ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ὑμᾶς εἴτε ἀπὼν ἀκούω τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν, *whether coming and seeing you or being absent, I hear the things about you*. According to Fee (1995:163) Paul uses a purpose clause to appeal to his and their relationship. The clause functions as the object of *I hear* (ἀκούω v 27), the object being *the things about them* (τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν v 27). The words *whether coming and seeing you ... or being absent* (εἴτε ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ὑμᾶς εἴτε ἀπὼν) could be considered as a short parenthesis in apposition to Paul, the personal subject of the verb *to hear* (ἀκούω; O’ Brien 1991:148). The outcome of living in a manner worthy of the gospel, will find its value within the corporate existence of the believers that stands firm and united, and which is completely independent of Paul’s absence or presence with them (Bockmuehl 1997a:99). As Paul’s salvation and the progress of the gospel are not influenced by his situation, likewise a gospel centered lifestyle in Philippi can stand firm on its own two feet – without regarding whether Paul lives or dies (Bockmuehl 1997a:99). Holloway (2001:117) concurs that Paul exhorts his readers, distressed by suffering, to live in a manner worthy of their status as Christians, not to be shaken in their faith. Paul accordingly emphasises that amidst the struggle of the ambivalence, to die for his faith, or to be exalted as a consequence of the faith, he prefers Christ to be near to him (Schreiber 2003:359). As Christ’s suffering (2:6-8) was reversed to exaltation (2:9-11), God would surely reverse their suffering to exaltation for the sake of Christ.

The phrase *the things about you* (τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν v 27) indicates the equivalence of their’s to *Pauls’ situation* in 1:12. Paul expects to *hear* about the Philippian circumstances when Timothy returns from his imminent mission (2:19; Bockmuehl 1997a:99). The kind of things Paul expected to hear, Fee (1995:163) surmises to be (1) ‘that by standing firm in the one spirit (2) they are contending together as one person for the faith of the gospel; and (3) that in so doing they are not themselves intimidated in any way by the opposition that is responsible for their present suffering’ (1:27b-28a).

4.3.2.2.1.1 Stand firm in one spirit

Unit 3 (v 27) ὅτι στήκετε ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, *that you stand firm in one spirit* defines

unit 2, arising out of Paul's affective concern for his readers (O' Brien 1991:149). For the first two of these injunctions, the main verb *stand firm in one spirit* (στήκετε ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ν 27) was to describe what kind of attitude the Philippian church members had to have. According to Loh and Nida (1977:39), the basic meaning of the verb *stand firm* (στήκετε) is simply *to stand* (Mk 3:31; 11:25), but in Paul's case he usually uses the added component of firmness (2 Thes 2:15; 1 Cor 16:13). Lightfoot (1953:106) describes that this verb *stand firm* (στήκετε) has the metaphorical sense, either of soldiers standing firm in battles, or of condemned Christians fighting for their lives in a Roman amphitheater (Eph 6:13; 1 Cor 4:9; Loh and Nida 1977:39). The phrase *in one spirit* (ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι) qualifies the verb *stand firm* (στήκετε). To stand firm in fighting they should be of one spirit.

Fee (1999:78) contends that the phrase *in one spirit* (ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ν 27) means to have a common mind about something, but that Paul himself uses it elsewhere to speak of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 12:9, 13; Eph 2:18), since such a phrase with the word *spirit* is unknown in all of Greek literature. Martin ([1959] 1987:87-88) sees the possibility of both the Holy Spirit and the one spirit in that

[T]he Holy Spirit strengthens the human spirit under trial, so the two interpretations are not mutually exclusive. 1 Cor 12:13 and Eph 2:18, however, seem to show that the person of the Holy Spirit is the primary meaning here. He whose office it is to unify believers in the body of Christ is the *sphere* in which the Philippians are to maintain as a courageous witness even as Paul himself leans heavily upon the same strengthening grace in his prison experience (1:19). On the other hand, if, as it may be thought, the rivalry in the church was over the matter of superior spiritual gifts, the *ta pneumatika* of 1 Cor 12:1, the call might be a corrective reminder that it is the *one spirit* who is the author of these gifts of his grace, *ta charismata* (1 Cor 12:4), and that he gives them in his sovereign wisdom to whosoever he pleases (1 Cor 12:11). Therefore, there is no room for jealousy because they are *gifts* (cf. 1 Cor 4:7) and also because the divine Spirit retains the right to give and to withhold.

However, Bockmuehl (1997a:99), O' Brien (1991:150) and Silva (1992:94) argue that the view of Martin on the Holy Spirit is unacceptable in the light of its parallelism with *soul* (ψυχή). According to Lightfoot (1953:106) there is a general distinction between *spirit* (πνεῦμα) as the principle of the higher life and *soul* (ψυχή) as the seat of the affections, passions. However, in this context, the rhetorical effect of using two terms comes to overrule sharp semantic distinctions (Silva 1992:94). Silva (192:94) warns that one should not be misled to consider that standing firm is the particular function of the spirit while the soul specialises in struggling. Paul is here not concerned with ontology or human psychology, but with mental harmony, singleness of purpose, harmonious attitudes (Silva 1992:94). The two parallel phrases, *in spirit* and *in soul* (πνεύματι, ψυχῇ), function strictly to emphasise the idea that believers' harmony, which believers themselves must contend for, was

absolutely necessary if the church in Philippi was to sustain a courageous witness against any hostile opposition (Hawthorne 1983:57).

According to Witherington (1994a:53), Paul exhorts his readers not to stand alone against the world, but as part of the community of faith, bolstering, reinforcing and strengthening one another. In the eyes of Paul, morality is a community event, something his readers strive for together, since they are called to stand not as severed members of the body of Christ, but as the body of Christ (Witherington 1994a:53). For Paul suffering for the cause of Christ is seen not as a shameful thing, but as a high honour, something one should view as positive in spite of its painful character (Witherington 1994a:53). Therefore, ‘they must stand firm and be ready’ (Witherington 1994a:53). The general principle of *standing firm in one spirit* (στήκετε ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι v 27) has two aspects, which have been expanded by two participles, one active, *contending* (συναθλοῦντες v 27) and the other passive, *not frightened* (μὴ πτυρόμενοι v 28; Collange 1979:74).

4.3.2.2.1.1 Contending for the faith of the gospel

Unit 4 (v 27) μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, *contending in one soul for the faith of the gospel*, is the first qualification of unit 3. As Marshall (1991:36) explains that while unit 3 was about standing one’s ground, unit 4 is active participation in a struggle or contest, which means that the mood has shifted from defence to attack and from maintaining a position to making an advance. The compound verb *contend* (συναθλοῦντες v 27) is quite rare in classical Greek and is only found again in 4:3. The simple verb *contend* (ἀθλέω 2 Tim 2:5), from which the word *athletics* is extracted, appears in the sense of *contesting in the games* (Loh and Nida 1977:40). Loh and Nida (1977:40) claim that although the metaphor is derived from athletic games or from war, in the current context the latter seems more possible. However, Hawthorne (1983:57) objects against Loh and Nida by saying that Paul rapidly changes the picture from soldiers at battle stations to athletes as a team, side by side, playing the game not as several individuals, but together as one person with one mind (μιᾷ ψυχῇ), for one purpose. He further explains that the purpose here is to preserve the faith brought into existence by the gospel (τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου v 27), which is subjective genitive (Hawthorne 1983:57).

Bockmuehl (1997:99) disagrees with Hawthorne. Although the dative τῇ πίστει could function as instrument (*by means of*), it is more likely a dative of advantage. O’ Brien (1991:152) likewise demonstrates that the genitive *of the gospel* (τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) is a genitive of origin (*the faith which is based on the gospel*) rather than an appositional genitive (*the faith which is the gospel*) or an objective one (*the faith in the gospel*). Vincent (1979:34) convinces that what is meant is to *contend together for the rule of life* (called *the faith*) which distinctively characterises the gospel, as Silva (1992:95) and Witherington (1994a:53) agree. Witherington (1994a:53) points out that ‘the issue is here orthopraxy, a way of living, rather than orthodoxy’. Therefore, the Philippian church members were requested to stand firm in their suffering for the cause of the faith – its spread and growth, the same purpose that was set before all of Paul’s work without being frightened in any way by the enemy in terms of the fact that gospel governs the life of both Paul and his readers (Marshall

1993:127; O' Brien 1997:152).

4.3.2.2.1.1.2 Unaffraid of the opponents

Unit 5 (v 28) καὶ μὴ πτυρόμενοι ἐν μηδενὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντικειμένων, *and not being frightened in any way by those who oppose you*, is the second qualification of unit 3. It functions as the foundation of his appeal for unity in the face of opposition and suffering (vv 29-30), which together serve as the primary 'historical context' of the letter (Fee 1995:167). The believers encountered by opponents were thrown into a panic, which stroke terror into their hearts (O' Brien 1991:152-153). Therefore, Paul urgently exhorted them not to be shaken in their faith despite the fact that he was currently under pressure in prison (1:12, 17). The opponents of the Philippians could either be outsiders or Judaizers. Collange (1979:75) and Hawthorne (1983:58) prefer Judaizers to outsiders while these opponents would be the same as those Paul sharply warned against in 3:2. Bruce (1989:57) prefers outsiders to Judaizers, because in the current context the Philippians encountered the same kind of opposition from their pagan neighbours as from the authorities.

Tellbe (1994:105-106)⁵⁴ likewise argues that the opponents are represented as an *external* threat rather than constituting an internal threat for the church, because in the literary unit 1:27-2:18 opponents are the same as the depraved and crooked generation of 2:15. From Acts 16 it seems as if there were not enough Jews in Philippi to start a synagogue, Acts 16:20 hints at a certain antipathy towards the Jews. The Philippian believers encounter the same kind of opposition that Paul himself experienced when he was with them, which was thus from gentile neighbours (O' Brien 1991:153). Therefore, it seems more likely that the opponents were gentiles outside the church. The second participial qualification can be linked to vv 28, 29, and 30, since these verses support them in their sufferings under the enemy, not as something negative, but with a positive intention. According to Holloway (2001:116), Paul supported the last of the injunctions with three arguments:

- (1) [T]hat 'their equanimity in the face of opposition signals a victorious outcome to their current ordeal, that is, the destruction of their opponents, and their own salvation (1:28); (2) that their suffering has been ordained by God (1:29), and (3) that he himself has suffered and continues to suffer similar opposition in his service to Christ (1:30).

4.3.2.2.1.1.2.1 God beings the judge who destroys the opponents, while he saves his people

Unit 6 (v 28) ἥτις ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἔνδειξις ἀπωλείας, ὑμῶν δὲ σωτηρίας, καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ θεοῦ, *this is a sign of destruction to them, but a sign of your salvation, and this is from God*, shows two different outcomes from the opposition. The opponents will be destroyed (*which was a sign of destruction to them ἥτις ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἔνδειξις*

⁵⁴ There is a certain chiasmic structure: a. 1:27-30 (external environment), b. 2:1-5 (internal environment), c. 2:6-11 (the example of Christ), b'. 2:12-13 (internal environment), a'. 2:14-18 (external environment) (Tellbe 1994:106).

ἀπωλείας v 28). The Philippian church under suffering would be saved (*but which was a sign of your salvation* v 29 ὑμῶν δὲ σωτηρίας v 28). In the light of the confirmation *and this is from God* (καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ θεοῦ v 28) the neuter antecedent *this* (τοῦτο) refers back to the whole account of opposition in its double effect, which leads the opponents to destruction and the believers to salvation (O' Brien 1991:157).

Hawthorne (1983:58) thinks that the singular feminine relative pronoun *which* (ἥτις v 28) refers to the singular and feminine noun *faith* (πίστει v 27). Bockmuehl (1997:101) and Vincent (1979: 35) however accordingly argue that *which* (ἥτις v 28) is an explanatory pronoun, which takes its gender from the predicative *a sign* (ἔνδειξις) and refers back to the exhortation about spiritual unity, contending for the faith of gospel, and their fearlessness in the situation of opposition. The demonstrative pronoun *to them* (αὐτοῖς v 28) indicates the opponents who are the enemies of the gospel.

The noun *a sign* (ἔνδειξις) is connected to two contrasting genitive nouns *destruction* (ἀπώλεια v 28) and *salvation* (σωτηρία v 28; O' Brien 1991:155), which refer to the eschatological and eternal destruction and salvation respectively (O' Brien 1991:156). The noun *destruction* (ἀπώλεια v 28) as the opposite of salvation, entails not only exclusion from eternal life, but also destruction and loss of life as the result of the final judgement (Marshall 1991:38; O' Brien 1991:156). The failure of the opponents to frighten the believers, the latter's fearlessness, was a *sign* that God was performing his plan (Hendriksen 1962:89). Those opponents rather should recognise that the believers' endurance under suffering for the sake of faith will lead to their exaltation by God (Marshall 1991:38). The undaunted courage was a sign of salvation and of invincibility, because it did not have its origin in human beings, but indeed in God (Hendriksen 1962:89). It is important in this section to realise that the ultimate fate between the opponents and the believers will be reversed, the opponents will be destroyed by God, and on the other hand, the believers will be exalted by God.

The phrase *and this is from God* (καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ θεοῦ v 28) indicates that God is the judge, not only to destroy the opponents, but also to save the believers. Therefore, their suffering could be considered, not as negative, but as positive. The suffering signals the doom of the opponents as enemies of the gospel, it makes sure the eternal salvation of the faithful who will endure patiently to the end (Martin [1959] 1987:91). That is why they can stand firm in a manner worthy of the gospel, without being frightened by their enemies, although they may encounter suffering for Christ.

4.3.2.2.1.1.2.1.1 Suffering

The last clause in the long sentence (from v 27) provides a theological description of their suffering (Fee 1995:170). The description is divided into two parts: v 29 the readers's current suffering on account of their relationship with Christ; and v 30 their relationship with him (Fee 1995:170). Bockmuehl (1997a:102) says that these verses explain the surprising fact as to why Paul considered the steadfastness of the

believers in their opposition to be the proof of God's salvation. The suffering of the believers was inherently connected with that of Christ, as indicated in 2:6-8.

4.3.2.2.1.1.2.1.1.1 *Suffering for Christ*

In unit 7 (v 29) ὅτι ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν, *because to you it has been granted for the sake of Christ, not only to believe in him but also to suffer on his behalf*, the causal conjunction *because* (ὅτι v 29) was used to introduce this emphatic clause about *salvation from God* (σωτηρία ἀπὸ Θεοῦ v 28; Vincent 1979:35). Whatever is happening to the believers, whether good or bad, should be regarded as evidence of God's design to save them! *Due to the fact that this is the way to exaltation, which is God's gift of salvation to his children* (Silva 1992:96), the believers are standing firm in the faith of the gospel, while they can expect suffering as believers (Hawthorne 1983:60). It is lexically unique to describe suffering as a gift (*to you it has been granted* ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσθη v 29; Silva 1992:96).

Paul's use of the passive *it had been granted* (ἐχαρίσθη v 29) points to his trust that God governs all events. As a result, Paul exhorts his readers not to be astonished by their suffering as if God had forgotten them or was angry with them (Hawthorne 1983:61). On the contrary the verb is used to encourage and exhort the believers under undeserved suffering that 'God rewards and endorses believers with the gift of suffering', as God exalted the suffering Christ to the most honourable place, to be called Lord (2:6-11; Martin [1959] 1987:92; Vincent 1985:36). Bockmuehl (1997a:102) says that the passive verb *it has been granted* (ἐχαρίσθη) suggests that both *to believe in him* (τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν) and *to suffer on his behalf* (τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν) are actually gifts of God's *grace* (χάρις) – the same grace in which Paul and his readers were said to be partners in 1:6-7.

It is clear that the suffering of the believers is *for Christ* (τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ v 29). The prepositional phrase *for Christ* (τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ v 29) might mean that the believers are suffering because they are on Christ's side (Hawthorne 1983:60). Carson (1996:56) states that the believers' suffering for Christ is not precisely the same as Christ's suffering for them, since the believers' suffering for Christ cannot add to the redeeming significance of his suffering. It is however a sign of being involved on the side of Christ. Peterlin (1995:54) is convinced that that is why suffering is mentioned as a gift or grace from God. The believers should regard it as their privilege to suffer for Christ. That does not mean that suffering is considered a good thing or an enjoyable experience.

The interpretation *not only ... but also* (οὐ μόνον ... ἀλλὰ καὶ v 29) indicates that it is quite significant to avoid the directly negation. It expresses addition rather than an adversative (Loh and Nida 1977:44). Therefore, Paul exhorts his readers that God enabled them *not only to believe in Christ* (οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν v 29), *but also to suffer on his behalf* (ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν v 29; Marshall 1991:39). Paul uses the same language to describe the believers' suffering for Christ

(2 Cor 12:10; cf. Col 1:24; Acts 9:16) as of Christ's suffering for us (e.g. Rom 5:8; 8:32; 2 Cor 5:21; Gal 3:13; 1 Thess 5:10; Bockmuehl 1997a:102). Therefore, the suffering of the believers in this context is not suffering that leads to destruction, but suffering for the advancement of the gospel of Christ (Loh and Nida 1979:44). The emphasis on *on behalf of Christ* likewise accounts for the reason why Paul continued (v 30) to connect their current suffering with his suffering (Fee 1995:172).

4.3.2.2.1.1.2.1.1.2 The same struggle

In unit 8 (30) τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχοντες, οἷον εἶδετε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ νῦν ἀκούετε ἐν ἐμοί, *having the same struggle you saw in me and now you hear of it in me*, the participle *having* (ἔχοντες) refers to *you* (ὑμῖν) in the previous verse 29. *You* (ὑμῖν) is the logical subject of the participle as well as of the the entire clause (Loh and Nida 1977:44; Vincent 1979:36). According to Fee (1995:172) and Silva (1992:298), Paul concludes this exhortation-turned-theological explanation of the believers' suffering by calling attention to the correspondence between his readers' experience and his own suffering (v 30). The phrase *the same struggle* (τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα v 30) indicates that the believers, like Paul, were truly suffering for the sake of *Christ* (Koperski 1996:98). The word *struggle* (ἀγών v 30) implies any inward or outward struggle (Col 2:1; 1 Thess 2:2; cf. 1 Tim 6:12; 2 Tim 4:7; Heb 12:1; Hawthorne 1983:62).

As the aorist verb *you saw* (εἶδετε) speaks of his struggle in the past, the present verb *hear* (ἀκούετε) indicates a reference to his personal and current imprisonment as he suffers (Loh and Nida 1977:44-45). Bockmuehl (1997a:102) says that Paul regarded the suffering of his readers and of himself for Christ as a privilege. As in 3:10 he refers to his longing to participate in Christ's sufferings. That is why Paul was able to remind his readers that they are in the same struggle. They struggle for the defence of the gospel, whether against Jewish opposition, as in his case, or against Roman pressure as in the case of the Philippians, as well as of Paul (Brewer 1954:82). Their participation in the gospel (1:5), that is, their active fellowship in the spreading of the gospel from the time of their conversion up to the present, signified that they were entailed in the same conflict as Paul (O' Brien 1991:162). Paul considered his experience during his first visit to Philippi and his current imprisonment with its struggles as various aspects of one and the same struggle (O' Brien 1991:162). Paul has been at pains to indicate that the environments around him have led astonishingly to the advancement of the gospel.

Therefore, he exhorts his readers in their suffering for Christ's sake (O' Brien 1991:162). Since the current sufferings of Paul and his readers are likely to have a common source in distinctly Roman religious and political opposition, the nature of their suffering is quite specifically the same as a struggle for the same gospel (Bockmuehl 1997:103).

4.3.2.5 Conclusion

As we have seen in the first part with its three ethical themes in 1:27-2:5, 2:1-5 and 2:12-18, the believers encountered opposition from outsiders. When someone living in a group oriented society decides to believe in Jesus Christ, he will suffer estrangement from that society. The prisoner Paul wrote his letter to encourage those suffering people. Like Paul in prison, as a result of serving Christ, his readers are also suffering for the sake of Christ. Therefore, he emphasises that their suffering is the same as his.

The believers as belonging to a heavenly commonwealth, live as alien residents in the cities of the world. Their lives have a dual sense: physically as citizens of the city and spiritually of heaven. In the world they should live, not according to its social norm, but worthy of the gospel of Christ. When they are willingly eager to live according to Paul's instruction, it generally causes them to encounter suffering from their pagan society.

Paul's concern is to exhort them to stand firm in faith and in harmony. Without trembling before their opponents, they should contend for the faith of the gospel by following the example of Christ, as described in 2:6-11. With the certainty that God exalted Christ to the highest status, they need not be frightened by their opponents. Their suffering is a sign that they are on Christ's side. In the end God will destroy the opponents. On the other hand, they will be saved, since they are privileged to participate in Christ's suffering.

Therefore, Paul's concern with the Christology in 2:6-11 is to exhort his readers to live in a way worthy of the gospel of Christ, while suffering undeservedly.

4.3.3 The same mind as Christ (Phil 2:1-5: units 1-6)

4.3.3.1 Introduction

This second part of the ethical exhortations, which started in 1:27, can be considered as a strong exhortative summoning them to unity and mutual consideration (O' Brien 1991:164). The conjunction *therefore* (οὖν v 1) refers to what they have been exhorted to in 1:27-30, i.e. to *one in spirit and soul* (1:27). It is the condition for standing firm amidst the struggling together in suffering. It receives increased attention in Paul's exhortation of the church in 2:1-5 (Craddock1985:35). In making his claim to his readers in Philippi for unity and active concern for one another (2:1-4), Paul summoned them to cultivate the habit of mind 'which [was] also in Christ Jesus' (2:5; Dunn 1998a:281).

Paul gave the believers certain missiological instructions about caring for their community, i.e. to love and care for everyone within the local community (2:1-13; Rom 12:9-13; Barram 2006:149). In summoning them as a spiritual newly formed community, Paul used quite a bit of the key words from chapter 1: joy, fellowship,

love, partnership, affection, unity and mindset or attitude (1:4, 5, 8, 13, 27; Craddock 1985:35). In 2:1-4, Paul summons the believers to humility and compassion for others with Christ Jesus ‘the Lordly example’ of self-humiliation and humbleness (O’ Brien 1991:166).

4.3.3.2 Four characteristics of the Christian life

Unit 1 (v 1) Εἴ τις οὖν παράκλησις ἐν Χριστῷ, εἴ τι παραμύθιον ἀγάπης, εἴ τις κοινωνία πνεύματος, εἴ τις σπλάγγνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί, *therefore if there is any encouragement in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of spirit, if any affection and mercy.* Barclay (1958:40) says that ‘his appeal was not that of master to servant; it was not even that of teacher to pupil; it was that of father to child’. When he heard the reports of the internal dissensions in the Philippian church, his mind was so upset that he could not but appeal to them (Vincent 1979:53). His appeal in love is based upon four grounds: the first and third upon objective principles of the Christian life; the second and fourth upon subjective principles (Vincent 1979:53). According to Vincent (1979:53), what Paul appealed to was not to what was required by the readers’ personal relationship to Paul. Rather, he reminds them of their relationship to Christ with the phrase *in Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ). For Paul the fourfold use of *if* (εἴ v 1) was, according to Marshall (1991:41), intended to let his readers realise that *if* certain things are true in their lives, *then* the logical outcome was that they should behave in a certain way.

4.3.3.2.1 Exhortation in Christ

In the first of Paul’s four appeals *therefore if there is any encouragement in Christ* (Εἴ τις οὖν παράκλησις ἐν Χριστῷ v 1), the term *encouragement* (παράκλησις) have two different meanings: *comfort* and *consolation*, on the one hand, and *exhortation* and *encouragement*, on the other hand (Hawthorne 1983:65). Barclay (1958:40) says it should be rendered as *consolation* in that it frequently has to do with that which gives a man the capacity triumphantly to face a difficult, dangerous, or distressing situation. Collange (1979:77) and O’ Brien (1991:171) also prefer consolation to encouragement or exhortation. Collange (1979:77) prefers consolation to exhortation because Paul is careful not to appear as if he is giving orders. The main verb leading to *so that* (ὅνα) in v 2 is not even indicated. To O’ Brien (1991:171), the expression is almost equivalent to ‘salvation’ known and experienced in the sphere of Christ Jesus, and Paul is concisely referring to what had taken place in the lives of his Philippian church members when he preached the Gospel to them.

Although O’ Brien does not explain what happened, he seems to be close to Barclay’s understanding. Schmits (1967:794-795) says that the verb *encourage* (παρακαλέω) from which this noun derives is used especially by Paul for the exhortation he himself gives, based on the word of God. It seems best to understand it as meaning *encouragement* (Nida and Louw 1989:25.150), since it clearly explains

what exhortation means. Moreover, Paul's *exhortation* (παράκλησις v 1) was not a command, but an appeal to the believers (those *in Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ v 1) by a fellow believer (one who is himself *in Christ* ἐν Χριστῷ) – an ethical strengthening by one who is strong in faith (Hawthorne 1983:65). The phrase *in Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ v 1) reminds them of their new identity as Christians. Phil 2:6-11 describe the identity of Christ. The readers had to equip themselves with the mind of Christ who suffered and was exhorted. Their suffering referred to in 2:1-5 was not under outsiders as in 1:27-30. It happened inside their congregation. Without recovering the mind of Christ among them there is no way of solving it at all.

Paul uses the phrase *in Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ v 1) to appeal for the spirit and conduct that correspond to being *in Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ; Stagg 1980:339). Paul earnestly appeals to them to remember that they really are *in Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ; Stagg 1980:339). Vincent (1979:53) declares that their being *in Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ) strongly exhorts them to brotherly love and mutual unity in the church, the body of Christ (Stagg 1980:339). Because the readers are *in Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ v 1), Christ is their Lord, who exhorts and urges them to do what is right. Their union or personal relationship with the suffering and exaltation of Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ) opens up a treasury of exhortation and strength to brotherly love and mutual unity (Bockmuehl 1997a:106).

4.3.3.2.2 *The consolation of love*

In the second appeal, *if any comfort of love* (εἴ τι παραμύθιον ἀγάπης), the noun παραμύθιον basically means *to speak to someone*, or *coming close to his side in the expression of a friendly way* (cf. 1 Cor 14:3). Its meaning has developed along two main lines: with reference to what ought to be done, *to admonish*, as well as reference to what has already happened, *to console* (Stählin 1967:817). παράκλησις and παραμύθιον cannot sharply be distinguished (Hawthorne 1983:65), but the word παραμύθιον in this context can better be understood as meaning *consolation* qualified by *love* (ἀγάπης; Louw and Nida [1988] 1989:25.154), since it implies an appeal to their experience of *consolation*, which the divine *love* has brought them in their suffering (Beare [1959] 1973:71; Bockmuehl 1997a:106).

The noun *of love* (ἀγάπης) as a subjective genitive is a spiritual reality, which binds the believers as members of the household of faith together (Martin [1959] 1987:94). According to Hawthorne (1983:65), in this context where Paul's affection for his readers seemed so clear and so much in the foreground, and because of the fact that the verb παραμύθεσθαι was never considered to imply God's comfort, it seemed natural to suppose that it was Paul's love that offered the consolation for his readers in Philippi. Martin ([1959] 1987:94) indicates that it can be Paul's love for his readers, or their fraternal regard for one another, or Christ's love for his church (cf. Eph 5:25). He prefers the latter meaning, because the phrase refers to the phrase *in Christ*. Most of the commentators (Bockmuehl 1997a:106; Fee 1995:181; Marshall 1991:41; O' Brien 1991:172) understand it as *divine love*, based on Christ's

redemptive work, rather than as *Paul's love*. Stählin (1967:817) explains that the consolation of love is the consolation obtained in Christ through God's love. Mutual consolation is one of the outstanding characteristics of the community life of early Christianity. When they restore love based on Christ's love, they would attain unity among themselves.

4.3.3.2.3 Fellowship of the spirit

The third of Paul's appeals is, *if any fellowship of spirit* (εἴ τις κοινωνία πνεύματος v 1). The word *fellowship* (κοινωνία) derived from κοινωνός and κοινωνέω implies *participation, fellowship* along with a close bond, which denotes an association involving familiar mutual relations and involvement (Hauck 1965:798; Louw and Nida 1989:34.5). A great word for Christian fellowship, in common Greek it can refer to partnership of any kind (e.g. partnership in a business; Barclay 1958:40). The word *fellowship* (κοινωνία) is qualified by the subjective genitive *of spirit* (πνεύματος). It refers to *the partnership and fellowship, which only the Holy Spirit can give* (Barclay 1958:40). However, Caird (1976:116) sees it as a subjective genitive in that it is not possible to experience *participation in the spirit* except through the fellowship, which is the Spirit's distinctive creation. Loh and Nida (1977:49) contend that the genitive construction *fellowship of spirit* (κοινωνία πνεύματος v 1) should not be rendered in the subjective sense of *fellowship made possible by the Spirit*, but rather in the objective sense of *participation in the spirit* or *fellowship with the Spirit*, since there does not seem to be any parallel for the use of a *fellowship of x* to denote a *fellowship created by x* (Marshall 1991:42). As the phrase *fellowship of (with) the Spirit* (κοινωνία πνεύματος v 1) appeals to the realities of the believers' experience, the genitive noun *of the Spirit* (πνεύματος v 1), refers to the Holy Spirit, who is the agent to empower all believers ((Beare [1959] 1973:71); Fee 1995:182). The Spirit as the source of spiritual life, love and power thus empowers the believers participating in the Spirit, to have the power at their disposal to live as God wants them to do (Marshall 1991:42). Only the Spirit of God and of Christ (cf. Rom 8:9) could bring the believers at Philippi into the unity of the spiritual life in which Paul also shared (Beare [1959] 1973:71).

4.3.3.2.4 Affection and compassion

The last of the four appeals, *if any affection and mercy*, (εἴ τις σπλάγχνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί) is based on deep feelings without a genitive qualifier (Fee 1995:182). The word *affection* (σπλάγχνον) has appeared in 1:8, and the word *compassion* (οἰκτιρμός) is expressly mentioned to belong to God in Rom 12:1 and 2 Cor 1:3 (Fee 1995:182). According to Vincent (1979:54), σπλάγχνον is the seat or the organ of compassionate emotion. Οἰκτιρμός is the emotion itself. According to Lightfoot (1953:108) the word *affection* (σπλάγχνον) signifies the abode of the tender feelings, and *compassion* (οἰκτιρμός) signifies the manifestation of these in compassionate yearnings and actions.

Silva (1992:103) rejects Bultmann's (1967:161) explanation that these two words form a hendiadys, 'heartfelt sympathy'. Silva (1992:103) points out that the word *affection* (σπλάγχχνον) is used in 1:8 of the affection itself, rather than of the seat of the affection (the heart). He renders this phrase as *affection* and *compassion* (Silva 1992:103). Köster (1971:557) states that the word *affection* (σπλάγχχνον) is especially used of God in relation to *affection* in eschatological salvation. Marshall (1991:42) states that what appeared in 1:8 speaks of the kind of love shown by Jesus himself and displayed by Paul towards the readers (Collange 1979:78).

According to Bultmann (1967:161), οἰκτιρισμός (v 1) refers to human sympathy (Col 3:12). However, Barclay (1958:41) states that three of its four occurrences in the New Testament refer to God (Rom 12:1; 2 Cor 1:3; Col 3:12) and of its 27 occurrences in the LXX, refer to the compassion of God (Barclay 1958:41). Therefore, the word *compassion* (οἰκτιρισμός v 1) characteristically speaks of the *compassion* of God. Therefore Paul's appeals to his readers are based on the *compassion* of God through Christ (O' Brien 1991:176).

According to Stagg (1980:339) Paul bases his exhortation to a better quality of Christian lifestyle in the midst of conflict on their being *in Christ*, in his love, in the fellowship of the Spirit, and in God's compassion and mercy. Stowers (1991:118-119) says that the way of Paul's exhortation to his readers to find unity and a brotherly and mutual love among them is based on the phrase *in Christ*, since 'in Christ' there is encouragement, the consolation of love, the sharing of the spirit, affection and compassion (2:1).

4.3.3.3 Paul's threefold exhortation (vv 2-4)

Unit 2 (v 2) πληρώσατέ μου τὴν χαρὰν, *make my joy complete*, seems to be the peak toward which the rhetorical expressions of unit 1 (v 1) is constructed (Hawthorne 1983:67). The verb (πληρώω) as the only main verb in vv 2-4 in its original sense means to *make full* (Loh and Nida 1977:50). Paul's joy (μου τὴν χαρὰν) is the object to be made full (Vincent 1979:54). The readers are a unique source of joy to him (1:4-5, cf.4:1; Loh and Nida 1977:50). Paul tactfully exhorts them in a threefold way (Hendriksen 1962:99; O' Brien 1991:176). Paul's chief and deep concern for the Philippian church was to further their spiritual progress in humbleness and mutual respect. His joy is made *full* when it takes hold in the lives of his readers and the bond between them is strengthened (Geoffrion 1993:188). Paul's main appeal to his readers is that they strive for unity coupled with humility on the model of Christ (2:6-11).

4.3.3.3.1 To think alike

Unit 3 (v 2) ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε, τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ἔχοντες, σύμφυχοι, τὸ ἓν φρονοῦντες, *that you would have the same mind, having the same love, the same spirit, and one purpose*. Without making a choice Hawthorne (1983:67) points to

three possible ways of rendering *so that* (ὅνα): 1) as the direct object of a verb to be supplied; 2) as the substitute for the imperative and 3) as the description of what Paul meant by having his joy fulfilled. According to Silva (1992:103), the ὅνα -clause introduced an implicit exhortation for the readers as mentioned in the third option, since Paul appealed to his readers with the exhortation in the ὅνα clause, to fulfill his joy (Kent Jr *et al.* 1996:34). It indicates the purpose of the exhortation.

The way to make Paul's joy full is to be *thinking the same thing* (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε v 2). The two participle clauses *having the same love* (τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ἔχοντες v 2) and *being united in one spirit* defines their *thinking the one thing* (σύμψυχοι, τὸ ἓν φρονοῦντες v 2; Stagg 1980:339). While the verb to *think* is used primarily in the intellectual and spiritual sense (Bertram 1974:220), it equally entails one's emotion, attitudes, will and orientation (Osiek 2000:53). Therefore, as Barclay (1958:5) says it denotes a man's entire attitude and disposition of mind, that is, the attitude of mind behind all of man's thinking. The clause *to think the same thing* (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε v 2) appeals to them to have the same attitude. The demonstrative pronoun (αὐτο), with the neuter article (τὸ) indicates to be oriented toward one and the same thing (Osiek 2000:53). Therefore, Bertram (1974:233) says that Paul's fundamental appeal is to have a uniform direction, a common mind, with unity of thought and will (Bertram 1974:233). *To think the same thing* (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε v 2) signifies not only that they should agree and live in harmony with each other, but also that they ought to have the same concern in mind (Dahl 1995:6).

The participial clause *having the same love* (τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ἔχοντες v 2) defines the main clause *think the same thing* (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε v 2). It reinforces the theme of unity and brotherly love in the midst of conflict among the believers of the Philippian church. This clause has the same structure as the main clause *think the same thing* (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε), emphasising the *same* love (τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην). The *sameness* of mind is spelled out in 2:6-11, where the *mind* of Christ (v 5) is expounded. The *same love* (τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην v 2) has the same source (*encouragement in Christ* v 1), and the same motivation and object (2:6-11). The *love*, which is *in Christ*, will be attuned to the paradigm of *the mind of Christ* (Bockmuehl 1997:109). The believers' love is essentially the exercise of their entire personality (Barclay 1958:5). Paul exhorts his readers to *love* one another with the love God demonstrated through his son Christ. When they practise the *love* in Christ, they will be able to overcome every kind of difficulty, infidelity, and conflicts among them (Günther and Link [1976] 1986:547). Therefore, Paul stresses that his readers's love should be the reciprocal love for one another in relation to Christ's love for them (v 1; O' Brien 1991:178). The goal of love is not to pursue your own interest, but to place your life freely in the service of others, as Christ gave himself for others (2:6-11; Stauffer 1964:50).

The last participial clause *united in one spirit, think the one thing* (σύμψυχοι, τὸ ἓν φρονοῦντες v 2) also emphasises the theme of unity among the believers in Philippi. However, the plural adjective *one in spirit* (σύμψυχοι) can be considered as an independent item in the series of the phrases or as accompanying the phrase

immediately following (Kent Jr *et al.* 1996:34). Marshall (1991:44), Martin (1959) 1987:96 and O' Brien (1991:178) claim that the former seems more probable as an independent description. Fee (1995:185), Loh and Nida (1977:51), Silva (1992:103), Vincent (1979:54-55) and Wilson (1983:41) prefer the latter. Bockmuehl (1997a:109) points out that the phrase σύμψυχοι, τὸ ἕν φρονούντες (v 2) can either be considered as a hendiadis or as separate phrase, since the meaning is the same.

The term *united in one spirit* (σύμψυχοι v 2), found only here in the New Testament, relates to *one soul* (μία ψυχῆ) in 1:27. Bockmuehl (1997a:109) sees it to be identical, although here 'it is concerned with internal unity and there, with an external threat'. It emphasises the idea that the Paul's readers should have one soul, a common affection, desire, passion, and sentiment for living together in harmony (Hawthorne 1983:68). Paul's intention by means of this adjective *united in one spirit* (σύμψυχοι v 2) with the adjacent participial clause *think the same thing* (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε), which harks back to the main clause *think the same thing* (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε) is to exhort his readers to get to an inner harmony in stead of conflict and self-interest (O' Brien 1991:179). Bertram (1974:233) points out that Paul urgently exhorts his readers to seek the same goal with a like mind, to establish the given unity and to maintain a Christian disposition in all things. Its emphasis is on a certain unity and mutual love within the community of faith (Fee 1995:186).

4.3.3.3.1.1 Humility

Unit 4 (v 3) μηδὲν κατ' ἐριθείαν μηδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν ἀλλὰ τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους ἠγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν, *neither according to strife, nor according to vainglory, but with humility considering others better than yourselves*. The double negative *nothing ... nor* (μηδὲν ... μηδὲ v 3) and the omission of a verb in the prohibition, call attention to its absoluteness. *Do nothing according to strife or according to conceit* bind all believers at all times (O' Brien 1991:179). Apart from the double negative this unit also contains a positive argument introduced by *but* (ἀλλὰ v 3) with an verb such as *do* (Collange 1979:79). While the negatives refer to elements, which endanger the community's peace and unity, the positive one is absolutely essential to keep the community peaceful and harmonious.

The preposition *according to* (κατὰ with accusative v 3) marks the rule or principle to which someone conforms one's behaviour, not its source (Fee 1995:186; Vincent 1979:55). It indicates that the believers in the Philippian church had not behaved according to the will of God as Paul instructed, but according to their own will. The word *strife* (ἐριθεία v 3) which appeared in 1:17 implies the imputing of ill will (Osiek 2000:40). It denotes the attitude of self-seekers busy and active in their own interests and seeking their own gain or benefit (Büchsel 1964:661). Therefore, it seems best to consider it as meaning *fighting for oneself*, based on selfish-ambition (Peterlin 1995:36).

The word κενοδοξία (v 3) is used only here in the New Testament and has at its root of the idea *empty opinion, error* (Hawthorne 1983:69). A person motivated by κενοδοξία is a person who assertively, even arrogantly, claims to have the right

opinion (δόξα), but who is actually in error (κένος; Hawthorne 1983:69). Therefore, as Lightfoot (1953:109) and Oepk (1965:662) state, it can be rendered as *vainglory*, which implies person's vanity. The meaning *vainglory* (κενοδοξίαν) also combines with arrogance and pride in contrast to humility. It destroys the whole communal spirit through the rivalry and jealousy it introduces (Bockmuehl 1997a:110; Collange 1979:79). It describes the opposite of Christ, who being in the form of God *humiliated himself* by becoming a slave (2:6-7; Fee 1999:87). Stower (1991:115) explains that Paul exhorted his readers to solve the conflicts in the Philippian church by appealing to Christ's humiliation (2:6-8).

The positive argument, *but with humility considering others better than yourselves* (ἀλλὰ τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν v 3). The adversative conjunction *but* (ἀλλά) is in sharp contrast to the spirit that destroyed true community life. The dative case (τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ) indicates the means by which one can consider the other better than *oneself*. The noun *humility* (ταπεινοφροσύνη), originally used in the sense of low-lying, was metaphorically developed as being low socially, poor, of little social position and influence, powerless, unimportant (Esser 1986:259). The gentiles did not regard it as a virtue to be sought after (Hawthorne 1983:69-70; cf. Grundmann 1972:1-27).

There is a fundamental difference between the Greek world and the Biblical way. In the Greek world the word *humility* (ταπεινοφροσύνη) is looked on as shameful, to be avoided and overcome by act and thought (Esser 1986:270). In the New Testament, the word *humility* (ταπεινοφροσύνη) is used to envisage those events that bring a man into the right relationship with God and his fellow-man (Esser 1986:270). According to Jesus, he was subordinate to God, absolutely dependent on him, and devoted to him, and at the same time humble before men whose servant and helper he had become (Lk 22:27; Mtt 20:28; Mk 10:45; Grundmann 1972:20). According to Kent Jr *et al* (1996:30), this paved the way for the ethics of the believers that asks of them to be humble towards one another, mindful of their spiritual brotherhood and their complete subordination to Christ.

'Humility means being satisfied with one's status in society, not striving for honour at the expense of others. Selfish ambition and empty claims to honour run counter to humility' (Malina and Pilch 2006:305). Paul's exhortation to *humility* is based on the reality of Christ's self-humbling (Esser 1986:262-263). Believers in Christ, are responsible to equip themselves with Christ's mindset to serve. Hays (1996:29) evinces that just as Christ emptied himself by taking the form of a slave and humbled himself by becoming obedient to death on a cross, Paul exhorts his readers to become servants of the interest not of themselves, but of others. In the eyes of God humility is not shameful, and connotes the lowly service done by a noble person (Loh and Nida 1977:52). Therefore, to Paul, it was significant to employ his Christology for the ethical exhortation of his readers. Christ became the *exemplar*, who articulates the way of obedience (Hays 1996:29). Humiliation before God is the recognition of one's complete dependence on him. It leads to humility in the relationship with one's fellowmen (cf. 1 Peter 5:5-6; Loh and Nida 1977:52).

The last participial clause *considering one another better than themselves* (ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν v 3) shows believers how to behave in relation with fellow believers in the exercise of humility. The participle ἡγούμενοι means to *lead, guide, and to think, consider, regard* (O' Brien 1991:182). It specifically signifies a more conscious, a surer judgement, depending on more careful reckoning with the facts (Vincent 1979:56). It indicates the evaluation of others and of one's self in light of the holiness of God, the Christian gospel, and the example of Christ (Hawthorne 1983:70). The word *one another* (ἀλλήλους) as a reciprocal reference between entities is the direct object of the participle *consider* (ἡγούμενοι) distinct from *yourselves* (ἑαυτῶν; O' Brien 1991:182).

In non biblical Greek the word ὑπερέχω means to *hold over* (e.g. holding over someone), to *rise above* (e.g. in the sense of towering above the earth), or to *stand out* by reason of possessions, power, or regard obtained from others. In the LXX it indicates to *surpass, exceed* (Delling 1972:523). In the New Testament, the verb ὑπερέχω appears only five times, three of these in Philippians. All the New Testament appearances are participial and have a transferred sense of *standing out* (Phil 3:8; 4:7; O' Brien 1991:182). According to O' Brien (1991:182), the concept of *standing out by being better than or surpassing* indicates that each believer is to regard others as better than himself or herself. However, without *humility* it is not possible to treat the other better than oneself. Therefore, Paul urgently reminds his readers to consider one another better than themselves by pointing to the example of Christ (2:6-8). Such an attitude of considering one another better than oneself entails respect for one another, guarantees unity, while binding believers together in a mutually enriching community (Hawthorne 1983:70).

4.3.3.3.1.2 Mutual concern

Unit 5 (v 4) μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος σκοποῦντες ἀλλὰ [καὶ] τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστοι, *each one not looking for your own things, but [rather] the things of others*, continues the note of profound interest in others, which is an abiding characteristic of humility, in terms of caring for their interests (O' Brien 1991:183). The verb σκοπέω outside the New Testament means to *look at*, especially to *look at critically* as the judge does (Fuchs 1971:414-415). It appears only twice in the LXX (Esth 8:12; 1 Macc 4:5) meaning to *have a watchful eye* (Fuchs 1971:415). In Paul (Rm 16:17; 2 Cor 4:18; Gal 6:1; Phil 2:4; 3:17) it denotes to *look out for, notice, keep one's eyes on* someone or something and so to *fix one's attention on something* with deep interest (cf. 2 Cor 4:18; Gal 6:1; O' Brien 1991:184). Lightfoot (1953:110) evinces that Paul uses this word in the sense of *regarding as your aim*. Taking his idea from Lightfoot, Martin ([1959] 1987:98) states that Paul exhorts his readers to watch for the good points and qualities in other Christians; and when recognised, these good things should be absolutely applied to their lives.

On the negative side, he claims that Paul exhorts his readers not to be pre-occupied with their own interests and the cultivation of their own spiritual life so that they fail to show the noble traits to the others ([1959] 1987:98). His view is possibly based on the linkage with Paul's correcting the self-centered pre-occupation of a perfectionist

group at Philippi mentioned in 3:12-16([1959] 1987:98). However, as O' Brien (1991:185) strongly argues, in place of denoting *to hold something as a model before one's eyes*, the verb σκοπέω could here be rendered as *to look at attentively, fix one's attention on* something with deep interest in it (cf. 2 Cor 4:18; Gal 6:1). Therefore, it may be significant to render this verse as *be sure to protect the interests of others, and not just your own*, as the negative *not* (μή) indicates that the object of this particular interest and attention is not to be *one's own interest*, while the presence of *each one* (έκαστος) points out that 'every believer at Philippi was to take the injunction to heart' (Loh and Nida 1977:53; O' Brien 1991:185). The humble mind just described (v 3) cannot exist together with *strife* and *conceit* based on selfish-ambition seeking its own interests (O' Brien 1991:185). Paul's exhortation is both negative and positive, like in 1 Cor 10:24; 13:5; cf. 10:33; 11:1 (O' Brien 1991:185).

The contrastive phrase, *but [rather] the things of the others* ἀλλὰ [καί] τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστοι v 4), is softened by the conjunction *rather* (καί; O' Brien 1991:185). The adversative conjunction *but* (ἀλλά), with the conjunction καί in the absence of μόνον serves to signify the *contrastive emphasis* (Louw and Nida [1988] 1989:91.11), which means *but actually* or *but rather*, and not *but also* (cf. similarly LXX Ezra 2:15; Job 21:17; Isa 39:4; 48:6; Ezek 18:11; Bockmuehl 1997a:113-114). According to Beare ([1959] 1969:73), the word *one's own things* (τὰ ἑτέρων) indicates *rights*, in that the underlying circumstance might be one in which individuals claim high position for themselves in the congregation as a matter of right, probably based on the spiritual gifts which each one possesses. However, as O' Brien (1991:185) points out, it could not be limited to one's own rights in that there are many classical patterns where σκοπέω τὰ τινος points to being mindful of anyone's interests (Hdt. 1:8; Plato, *Phdr.* 232D; Thuc. *Hist.* 6.12.2; O' Brien 1991:185).

The plural ἕκαστοι is unusual, since the singular in the New Testament is normally used in this distributive appositional sense (O' Brien 1991:185). However, the plural is frequently found in classical Greek in this sense (O' Brien 1991:185). With connection to its meaning, Lightfoot (1953:110) sees it as *the repetition of the word*. On the other hand, Collange (1979:80) claims that it points not to the attitude of individuals, but to that of groups or factions. As O' Brien (1991:185) supposes, it is best to take it here as one of emphasis, possibly even as signifying an earnest repetition, giving the meaning *each and all*. Paul's concern is to remind his readers of not only considering others as better than themselves, but also caring for the others' interests in humility. Each of the believers should please his fellow believers in order to build them up, for even Christ did not please himself (Bruce 1989:64). That is why the example of Christ (2:6-8) is Paul's supreme argument in his ethical exhortations. For the believers it is crucially and essentially important to have the same attitude as that of Christ.

4.3.3.4 An attitude similar to that of Jesus Christ

Unit 6 (v 5) τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, *the attitude you should have is the one that Christ Jesus had*, is a significantly transitional piece linking the

ethical exhortation to Christology (2:6-11). The demonstrative pronoun *this* (τοῦτο) is set in front of the predicate *think this in you* and probably speaks of what precedes (Dahl 1995:11). According to Losie (1978:53), the demonstrative pronoun *this* (τοῦτο v 6) refers to the whole Christological part in vv 6-11 and not to Jesus Christ's traits of character. He rejects the ethical exhortation in that unit 6 (v 5) forces the argument against the view of the ethical example (1978:53). He hesitates to link vv 6-11 with 1:27-30 and 2:1-4. Without looking at the immediate context, we may easily make the same mistake as he did. Peterman (1997:114) states that the demonstrative pronoun *this* (τοῦτο v 6) as the object of the verb *think this* (τοῦτο φρονεῖτε v 5), should be combined not only with vv 1-4, but also with *which is also in* (ὃ καὶ ἐν v 5). It implies the Christology in vv 6-11. The imperative *think* (φρονεῖτε) purposely harks back to v 2 (φρονήτε/ φρονοῦντες) and immediately follows *this* (τοῦτο v 6; Fee 1995:199-200). Fee (1995:200) and Hawthorne (1983:80) disagree with Losie saying that the relative pronoun can point backward in this case to vv 2-4. Paul specifically says his readers should think according to *this* mindset *among them* (ἐν ὑμῖν).

Vincent (1979:57) thinks that the phrase ἐν ὑμῖν (v 5) points to *in you* rather than *among you*, as precluded by the following the phrase *in Christ Jesus* (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ v 5). However, Loh and Nida (1977:54) argue that the phrase ἐν ὑμῖν (v 5) in this context could best be rendered in the sense of *among you* or *within your Christian community*, not *within you* in the sense of *in your heart*, since in Pauline exhortation, the phrase *among you* (ἐν ὑμῖν) most frequently denotes what must take place in the community, even though that must be responded to at the individual level (Fee 1995:200). The phrase indicates that the readers should have *this attitude* among them which could more specifically point to *within each of you* in the sense of *among you* (Moule 1970:267). Therefore, the believers should learn to develop the attitude of selflessness and humility, regarding the needs of the other as priority (Fee 1995:200). As the basic imperative is then modified to that *which was also in Christ Jesus* (ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ v 5), their attitude should be the same as *in Christ Jesus*.

The phrase *in Christ Jesus* (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) surely refers to the person of Christ in whom this attitude of humility is found (O' Brien 1991:205). O' Brien (1991:205) says it is not necessary to supply the verb in v 5b, while the conjunction *also* (καί) is given its full force bringing out the parallel between *among you* (ἐν ὑμῖν) and *in Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ). Thus, the phrase *in Christ Jesus* (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) sets forth the condition, the sphere, the *locus* of the believers' lives, not the inward disposition of Jesus (Beare [1959] 1969:75). Their mutual relations in the community should be analogous with the relations of the believers with Christ (Beare [1959] 1969:76). Perkins (1991:104) says 'the harmonious unity and devotion to a common purpose, which are critical to the unity among believers, will be fostered if the Philippians follow the example of Christ in surrendering their self-interests to those of others'. This is exactly why Paul has appealed for a community-mindedness in association with the Christology that followed (Phil 2:6-11). He wanted his readers to be

exhorted to unity and mutual love, by following the example set through the way of Christ's life (Doble 2002:11).

4.3.3.5 Conclusion

The second ethical exhortation (2:1-5) is also grounded in Christology (vv 6-11). After Paul exhorted his readers to live in a way worthy of the gospel of Christ without fearing any opponents, he carried on exhorting them to have the same mind as Christ, in order to resolve the conflicts in the congregation in Philippi.

In this section, Paul appeals to his readers to love, applied in four ways: the first and the third are objective principles of the Christian life; the second and the fourth are subjective principles. As 2:6-11 describes the identity of Christ, Paul draws attention to the identity of the believers' new identity *in Christ*. Their lives are now characterised by brotherly love and mutual unity as well as by fellowship in mutual relations and involvement. Love as a spiritual reality has the power to bind believers together. In conflicts among believers, Paul draws attention to four characteristics to solve it, and to keep peace among them *in Christ*. Christ is the foundation of his exhortation to find unity and brotherly, mutual love among them.

By restoring the Christian characteristics of believers, their lifestyles can be transformed to think the same thing. It is founded on the same concern, to live harmoniously with each other on having the same love, which provokes unity and brotherly love in the midst of their conflicts. Their love implies reciprocal love for one another as a result of Christ's love for them. The unity among them signifies inner harmony in stead of conflict and self-interest. In the end, they overcome all kinds of difficulties, infidelities, and conflicts by practicing the same love, the same concern and unity. This kind of life style fulfils Paul's joy.

Paul exhorts his readers to have the same attitude as Christ. Strife and vainglory, in contrast to a humble mind, destroy the whole communal spirit through rivalry and jealousy. This way of life let people seek their own interests and benefits. They cause conflicts and fighting among people. Paul's intention with the attitude of Christ is a unique way of solving problems among them. That is why Paul points to the example of Christ (2:6-11) to exhort.

4.3.4 Work out your salvation (Phil 2:12-18: 1-11)

4.3.4.1 Introduction

This is the final part of the larger exhortative sections (1:27-30, 2:1-5, and 2:12-18) based on the Christology of 2:6-11. The ethical exhortation resumes with the usual imperative mood, or the use of participles with the force of the imperative (Hawthorne 1983:97). The combination between the Christology and its surrounding context is clearly through v 8. The first part of v 8 stresses Christ's *humility* (ἐταπείνωσεν v 8), a term that combines the Christology closely to the

immediately previous section *humility* (ταπεινοφροσύνη 2:3). However, this self-humiliation is further elucidated in 2:8 as an act of *obedience* (ὕπηκος 2:8) and this term, now selected in 2:12 (ὕπηκούσατε, *you have obeyed*) is the central thrust of 2:12-18 (Silva 1992:134). This section can be divided into three parts: Work out your own salvation (units 1-3; vv 12-13), live as blameless children (units 4-8; vv 14-16) together with an appeal to Paul's own ministry (units 9-11; vv 17-18; O' Brien 1991:289).

4.3.4.2 Work out your own salvation (2:12-13)

4.3.4.2.1 The obedience

Unit 1 (v 12) Ὡστε, ἀγαπητοί μου, καθὼς πάντοτε ὑπηκούσατε, *therefore, my beloved ones, as you have always obeyed* (v 12). The conjunction *therefore* (ὥστε v 12) commences the new sentence to indicate it as the result of the preceding argument, as Paul transmits the emphasis from Christology to the practical reality of the ethical exhortation (Bockmuehl 1997a:149). The thematical connections contain the continuing themes of unity (2:2-4; 2:14), salvation in the middle of suffering (1:28; 2:12,16) and Christian citizenship in the situation of a hostile public (1:27-30; 2:15; Bockmuehl 1997:149). There is also a verbal link between this section, to *obey* (ὕπηκούσατε v 12) and the preceding passage, *obedient* (ὕπηκος 2:8; Bockmuehl 1997a:149; Vincent 1979:64).

The affectionate vocative *my beloved ones* (ἀγαπητοί μου v 12) to call on the Philippian readers means that they are loved, not only by God, but also by Paul himself (cf. Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 15:58; Hawthorne 1983:98). The use of the familiar term *my beloved ones* (ἀγαπητοί μου v 12) softens Paul's exhortation. His commands, like those of God in whose name he speaks, are not burdensome (1 Jn 5:3), but are the affective expression of his pastoral mind. They are rooted, not in their familiarity or inherent attractiveness, but in Christ himself (1 Cor 16:24; 1 Thess 3:12; Bockmuehl 1997a:150; Martin [1959] 1987:114).

As you have always obeyed (καθὼς πάντοτε ὑπηκούσατε v 12). Before introducing the explicit exhortation, Paul praised his readers in Philippi for their past obedience, evident from the first day up to now (1:5; cf. 4:15), that is, from the time Paul had preached the gospel to them (Acts 16:12-40; O' Brien 1991:274-275). V 8 speaks of *obedience* to Christ, which was selected by Paul as his example for his readers (Bockmuehl 1997a:150). Paul's primary concern with the term *obedience* in this context would seem to be Christ-like obedience to God and by extension to the gospel of Christ (Bockmuehl 1997a:150). The Philippian believers had constantly obeyed the commands of God implicit in the gospel in response to Paul's original evangelism to them (Kent Jr. *et al* 1996:36).

Their obedience emulates the 'Lordly Example' of Jesus, who *humbled himself by becoming obedient to death* (2:8; O' Brien 1991:276). Paul offers Christ's obedience

to death (2:8) to his readers in Philippi as the pattern for their own obedience (2:12). Just as he suffered by obeying the will of God, so his readers should stand firm in the gospel, although they are suffering under their opponents (1:27-30; Hays 1996:29). As his beloved ones have consistently behaved in this godly way in the past, Paul confidently looked forward to their heeding to his further exhortation, as spelled out in the rest of the letter, in particular in vv 12-18 (O' Brien 1991:276). Therefore, Paul took Christology, whose original purpose was doxological and selected it for his ethical exhortation. Christ is the 'Example', who illuminates the way of obedience (Hays 1996:29).

4.3.4.2.2 *Work out your own salvation*

Unit 2 μὴ ὡς ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ μου μόνον ἀλλὰ νῦν πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ μου, μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε, *not only in my presence, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling* (v 12). The two phrases *not only in my presence, but now much more in my absence* (ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ μου μόνον ἀλλὰ νῦν πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ μου v 12) modify the imperative *work out* (κατεργάζεσθε v 12) by means of exhortation to his readers to *work out their own salvation* (τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε v 12; O' Brien 1991:280). Caird (1976:125) describes these two contrasting phrases well in the following way:

[T]he contrast between *presence* (παρουσία) and *absence* (ἀπουσία) must be interpreted at two levels. Superficially it means *presence* and *absence* from Philippi, but, if that had been all he had in mind, Paul would hardly have written *now ... much more*. It was over four years since he had been in Philippi, and even before that his *presence* with them had been only intermittent. He appears to be thinking of the past as the period of his *presence* and of the future as the period of his *absence*, because he could not avoid the suspicion that his absence was about to become permanent. As long as he was present in this life, the Philippians could turn to him for help and advice, but, once he was absent, they would be thrown on to their *own* resources and therefore to the grace of God.

However, O' Brien (1991:281) demonstrates that the first of the two phrases *in my presence* (ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ μου v 12) takes the exhortation of the readers as speaking of a possible future visit of Paul. The noun *presence* (παρουσία) already used in 1:26 denotes a possible future coming of Paul to be with his beloved ones in Philippi. The theme was taken up again in 2:23-24, although without the noun (O' Brien 1991:281). Although the description of Paul's future visit could be right, as Bockmuehl (1997:153) states, it seems more feasible that the phrase *in my presence* (ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ μου v 12) can be understood, not just retrospectively, but as a common reference to Paul's presence. Whether he is in Philippi, as in the past and possibly again in the future (2:24) or not, the Philippian believers should progress in their

salvation and advance the gospel, since Paul exhorted them that even *in his absence* (ἐν τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ μου v 12) the Philippian believers should work out their salvation with *fear* and *trembling*, which could mean the spiritual well-being of the church as a whole (Caird 1976:125; Witherington 1994a:71).

The imperative *work out* (κατεργάζεσθε v 12) appears twenty times in Paul. It implies *to bring about, produce, create*. In the Pauline epistles it is constantly a transitive noun, which takes as the object either evil or good (O' Brien 1991:277). It is thus used in the sense of working at something up to 'completion', therefore 'accomplishment', 'achievement'. It denotes that Paul exhorts the Philippian believers to keep working and never let up until their *salvation* is completed (Hawthorne 1983:98). However, we should not confuse that working out of salvation as implying *working for* salvation, but rather making salvation operational (Kent Jr *et al* 1996:36). Warren (1944:128-129) indicates that the salvation which is the object of the verb *work out* (κατεργάζεσθε v 12) is already in being, not at all waiting to be obtained, but here and now available or liable to be operated on or with, exercised, drawn out, brought into action, enhanced as to its good or aggravated as to its evil. Hawthorne (1983:98) states that since the verb *work out* (κατεργάζεσθε v 12) and the reflexive pronoun *your own* (ἑαυτῶν) are plural, it indicates that Paul's exhortation was not directed to an individual, but to the corporative effort in the common life together as a community (Hawthorne 1983:98). The individual believers should corporately try to build a better spiritual community, by standing firm in one spirit (1:27). Fee (1999:104) agrees that the imperative clause *work out your own salvation* (κατεργάζεσθε τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν v 12), is not dealing with individual salvation, but is an ethical exhortation dealing with the working out of salvation in the Christian community for the sake of the world.

The term *salvation* (σωτηρίαν) in the general sense of the health, welfare, well-being and especially protection and deliverance from the danger, here refers to the community's complete well-being, containing their spiritual prosperity both now and in the future (Caird 1976:125; Osiek 2000:70). The phrase *with fear* and *trembling* (μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου v 12) is a biblical expression appearing with a frequency in the LXX (e.g. Ex 15:16; Deut 2:25; 11:25; Ps 2:11; Isa 19:6) to describe the response of due reverence in face of a major challenge and especially in the presence of God and his mighty acts. It has become a conventional expression (1 Cor 2:3; 2 Cor 7:15) in relation to the Ephesian household code to describe the obedience of slaves (Eph 6:5; Bockmuehl 1997:153; Osiek 2000:70). Fear and trembling here do not mean to cower in terror, but to take seriously the responsibilities of Christian obedience and Christian citizenship with due awe and reverence (Bockmuehl 1997a:153). The God who saved his people is indeed an awe-inspiring God. Therefore, the working out of the salvation God has provided should be fulfilled in the sense of a holy fear and trembling in front of the God with whom they – and we – have to do (Fee 1999:105).

4.3.4.2.3 God's work

Unit 3 (v 13) θεὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας, *for it is God who works in you both to will and to work on behalf of goodwill* (v 13) is a definite theological foundation for the hearty, spirited exhortation of v 12, as the causal conjunction *for* (γὰρ) notes the reason (Bockmuehl 1997a:153). The participle *working* (ἐνεργῶν) with the definite article *who* (ὁ) in this context particularly refers to the mighty power of God, by which he raised Christ Jesus from the dead (Gal 2:8; cf. Col 1:29), and it is through the same mighty power that he currently works in believers (Eph 1:19; 3:20; Col 1:29; cf. Phil 3:21; O' Brien 1991:286). God who has exalted Christ, who enabled him to be universally acclaimed as Lord, works among those who work out their own salvation with fear and trembling (2:12-13; Dahl 1995:15). However, it does not mean that God is working it for them, but that God provides them with the working power (Fee 1999:105). It is surely God's power, which causes his people to work out their salvation, just as the same power (3:21) will fulfill his work at the parousia (Bockmuehl 1997a:153).

God works among the believers (ἐν ὑμῖν⁵⁵ v 13) in Philippi, in order to effectively bring about a change in their wills (τὸ θέλειν v 13) and in turn a change in their conduct (τὸ ἐνεργεῖν v 13; Hawthorne 1983:100). O' Brien (1991:287) elucidates the two infinitive clauses *both to will and to work* (καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν v 13) in the following way:

[T]his infinitival clause, which concludes the sentence, contains a number of significant features: (1) attention is drawn to each of the two infinitives through the repeated καὶ and the definite article τὸ before each verb: God's work in the Philippians has to do with both the 'willing' (θέλειν) and the 'achieving' (ἐνεργεῖν). (2) the logical subjects of these infinitives are the readers, that is, the recipients of the exhortation *work out* (κατεργάζεσθε v 12) in whom God is effectively at work. It is they who are to will and to achieve, precisely because God is at work in them. (3) the two infinitives are both in the present tense, and this suggests that an ongoing or lengthy process is in view before God's good purpose is consummated.

⁵⁵ On the one hand Vincent (1979:66) sharply rejects the possibility of rendering this preposition *among you* (ἐν ὑμῖν) by rendering it *in you* (ἐν ὑμῖν). On the other hand, Fee (1999:105) takes the possibility of both *among you* (ἐν ὑμῖν) and *in you* (ἐν ὑμῖν) describing that as in 1:6 and 2:5, when using this phrase in a corporate context Paul primarily indicates *among you* and further states that for that to happen it must start *in you*, that is, in the resolve of each of them to see to it that God accomplished his purpose in their community. O' Brien (1991:287) also states that while it seems correct that the phrase ἐν ὑμῖν can have either an individual or a corporate reference, the former in particular is in view at 1:6 and here at 2:13: the notion of God, which works to produce willingness and deeds in the Philippians, that is, through individual transformation, makes the best sense when the phrase is interpreted *in you* (ἐν ὑμῖν). In the end, they get to the same conclusion that, in this context, the most relevant rendering of it is, *in you* (ἐν ὑμῖν).

The first of the two infinitives *to will* (θέλειν) is more than a mere ‘wishing’. It signifies a resolving or purposeful decision (Rom 7:15, 18, 19; 2 Cor 8:10) that the imperative *work out* (κατεργάζεσθε v 12) presupposes (O’ Brien 1991:287). Such an inward and consistent determination by the believers in Philippi is owing to the effective divine activity (O’ Brien 1991:287). The doing of salvation involves the *will*, which implies the radical transformation of life by the Spirit (Fee 1995:238). Therefore, this infinitive *to will* (θέλειν) in this context denotes a definite purpose or decision (Vincent 1979:66). After the transformation of their lives, they can achieve a harmonious and healthy community. The second infinitive *to work* (ἐνεργεῖν) here speaks of the human activity. However, even in this context it is evident that God’s mighty power is at work. Therefore Paul exhorts his readers to press on with their decision (O’ Brien 1991:287). The willing wrought by God unfolds into the entire positive and determinate movements of the human will to make God’s will effective (Vincent 1979:66).

The phrase *for the sake of the goodwill* (ὕπερ τῆς εὐδοκίας v 13) could be connected with the participle clause *who works* (ὁ ἐνεργῶν v 13): *it is God who works in you the willing and the working so that he may carry out his good pleasure* (Vincent 19789:67). The preposition *on behalf of* or *for the sake of* (ὕπερ) indicates the regular sense (Fee 1999:106). The noun *goodwill* or *good-pleasure* can imply the will or pleasure of man (cf. Ps 141 [140]:5), but also the divine good-pleasure, God’s grace and blessing (Ps 5:13; 51:19[50:21]). It also signifies the divine purpose or determination (Bietenhard 1986:818). The word *the goodwill* (τῆς εὐδοκίας v 13) means that the operation of God, which evokes the will and work of believers, happens in the interests of the divine counsel (Schrenk 1964:746). This part brings together the sovereignty of God and the responsibility of man (Bietenhard 1986:819). Paul here exhorts that they could work out their salvation, for God is at work in energizing or arousing them both to will and to work this very thing for the sake of God’s good-pleasure. They are definitely requested to work out what God enables them to will and to work towards bringing about a united loving body of Christ as the center of salvation (Witherington 1994a:72).

4.3.4.3 Live as blameless children (2:14-16)

In Philippians 2 there is a prominent transition of mood from the conjuring injunctions in 2:1-5 to a sure result toward a blameless, even luminous, existence of the children of God amidst a perverse generation (2:14-18; Dahl 1995:12). After Paul summoned his readers to a Christ-like obedient life in vv 12-13, he continued in vv 14-16 to apply this same theme more specifically to their special circumstances, in their relationships both internally and with reference to outsiders (Bockmuehl 1997a:154-155). These three verses interestingly consist of a single sentence in Greek based on the imperative *do* (ποιεῖτε v 14; Bockmuehl 1997a:155). The believers are requested to *do everything without grumbling and dispute*, which reflects *selfish ambition* and *vain conceit*, rather than the humility that places the concerns of others ahead of one’s own (2:3; Fee 1999:107).

4.3.4.3.1 *Without complaint and dispute*

In unit 4 (v 14) πάντα ποιείτε χωρίς γογγυσμῶν καὶ διαλογισμῶν, *do everything without grumbling and dispute*, the entire exhortation *do everything* (πάντα ποιείτε v 14) is qualified with the negative characters *complaint and dispute* (γογγυσμῶν καὶ διαλογισμῶν v 14), which caused the trouble in the community (O' Brien 1991:290). The substance *everything* (πάντα v 14) as the object of the imperative *do* (ποιείτε v 14) is used to include all, having to deal with everything that is contained in their common and corporate life in the community in Philippi, but specially *working out their salvation* by standing firm and contending together for the gospel under the situation of suffering by opponents (Fee 1995:243). Here the preposition *without* (χωρίς) admittedly defines the believers' behaviour as how to act in the community, as well as amongst themselves. It is essential not to abide in *complaining and dispute* (χωρίς γογγυσμῶν καὶ διαλογισμῶν v 14), in order to work out their salvation and to have unity amongst each another.

The first of the two modifying substances, *without complaint* (χωρίς γογγυσμῶν v 14) is an echo of Israel's grumbling in the wilderness (1 Cor 10:10; Fee 1995:243; Rengstorf 1964:736). The word *complaint* (γογγυσμῶν v 14) expresses grumbling or secret talk, or whispering about someone (possibly about leaders). It signifies the complaining action that promotes ill will in place of harmony and good will (cf. Acts 6:1; 1 Pet 4:9; Hawthorne 1983:101). The second of the two modifying substances, *without disputes* (χωρίς διαλογισμῶν v 14) is used negatively in the New Testament with reference to evil thoughts or anxious reflection, which shows how strong the belief is that the sinful nature of a human being extends to one's thinking and indeed to one's very heart (Schrenk 1964:97). The term *disputes* (διαλογισμοί v 14) refers to the believers' actions, such as *quarrels* (Lk 9:46; Rom 14:1), probably both within the congregation and with outsiders (O' Brien 1991:292). Paul urgently exhorts his readers not to be involved in any complaints against one another or be engaged in futile arguments with one another. While involved in any of those activities their 'life together' will be implicated (Hawthorne 1983:101).

4.3.4.3.2 *The character of the children of God*

Unit 5 (v 15) ἵνα γένησθε ἄμεμπτοι καὶ ἀκέραιοι, τέκνα θεοῦ ἄμωμα μέσον γενεᾶ σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης, *so that you may be blameless, pure, blameless children of God in the middle of a crooked and depraved generation* indicates the purpose of all injunctions Pauls laid on the believers (2:3, 4, 12-14): so that (ἵνα) they may have a better quality of life than the outsiders (Hawthorne 1983:101; Marshall 1991:63). Paul used the negative actions of the Israelites in the desert to instruct his believers how not to act by implementing a partial quotation of Deut 32:5 (Witherington 1994a:72). Paul alluded to these words, but with exactly the opposite effect for his readers (Caird 1976:126). Paul admittedly exhorted his readers not to complain and argue so that they may become *blameless* and *pure* (ἄμεμπτοι καὶ ἀκέραιοι;

Marshall 1991:63).

The adjective *blameless* (ἄμεμπτοι v 15) derived from the verb *blame* (μέμφομαι) indicates a person or object which is blameless (Grundmann 1967:572). The word certainly refers to an observable behaviour, which cannot be blamed, that is to say, a conduct that cannot be blamed by others or by God (Fee 1995:244-245; Hawthorne 1983:102). The second adjective *pure* (ἀκέραιοι v 15) is connected to the heart, not with reference to ‘clean’, but to ‘innocence’ (Fee 1995:245). By faithfully sticking to the word of God and Paul’s instruction, they can keep themselves blameless from anything blameworthy (as ἄμεμπτοι v 15) and pure from foreign and improper matters in the heart (as ἀκέραιοι v 15; Kent Jr. *et al* 1996:37).

The phrase *blameless children of God* (τέκνα θεοῦ ἄμωμα v 15) is an allusion to Deut 32:5 (LXX) where the Israelites are described as a crooked and depraved generation (Marshall 1991:63). Paul deliberately alludes to the Old Testament to contrast the wilderness generation of Moses, who was no longer God’s children because of their sinful, faithless ways and blemish, with the followers of Christ, who are blameless (O’ Brien 1991:294). The word *children* (τέκνα) emphasises the idea of family resemblance, of sharing in the nature of the parent, in this case, of God (cf. Jn 1:12; Hawthorne 1983:102). The believers are God’s adopted children by virtue of their participation in Christ (Rom 8:14-17; Gal 3:26; 4:5-6; cf. Eph 1:5; Bockmuehl 1997a:156). Therefore, they should become his perfect children who reflect their father’s character by means of becoming blameless in their lives (O’ Brien 1991:293).

The adjective *blameless* (ἄμωμα v 15) as the attribute of the plural noun *children* (τέκνα) is the regular term for the righteous or godly person in the Psalms (Ps 15 [14]:2), as well as for describing the absence of defects in sacrificial animals (Ex 29:1; O’ Brien 1991:294). In the New Testament, Paul uses the term *blameless* (ἄμωμα v 15) to portray what kind of character the believers should have in God’s sight. According to Eph 1:4 their choice in Christ has the purpose of making them holy and blameless (O’ Brien 1991:294). Therefore, this adjective *blameless* (ἄμωμα v 15) in this context could point to the fact that the attitude of believers should be sincere and pious. As described above, the allusion to Deut 32:5 points out that the believers have replaced the Israelites as the children of God: ‘they are not only separate from the *crooked and depraved generation*, but also are to *shine like lights in the world* (O’ Brien 1991:294).

The term μέσον (v 15) is an adverb, used as an improper preposition, which denotes *in the middle, in the midst*. It points to the place where the believers should behave as children of God. The second part of the allusion *crooked and depraved generation* (μέσον γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης v 15) indicates the wilderness generation of Moses’ day (O’ Brien 1991:294). In the New Testament it signifies the Jews who were opposed to Jesus’ instruction (Mtt 17:17), or that of his delegates (Acts 2:40). In this context Paul applied his reproach to the entire pagan world, in whose midst these believers live and bear a witness, described as *those who oppose* in 1:28. It refers to the pagan people in Philippi, who seriously devoted themselves to Caesar as ‘lord’ and found those advocating another ‘Lord’ more than just a little

nettlesome (Fee 1995:246; O' Brien 1991:294). It is right in the middle of (μέσον) this *crooked and depraved generation* (γενεᾶ σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης v 15), the society that has distorted the truth of God, and corrupted of the ways of God (cf. Mtt 17:17; Acts 2:43; 13:10; 20:30) that the believers in Philippi, having become the children of God, and were strongly exhorted to live blameless, reflecting their father's character, e.g. as people who know the truth of God and who live in the direction of the truth (Hawthorne 1983:102).

4.3.4.3.3 Like lights in the world

In unit 6 (v 15) ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ, *in which you shine like lights in the world*, the phrase *in which or among them* (ἐν οἷς v 15) indicates the attitude of believers as *blameless* and *pure*. Paul intends to exhort his readers to live as *lights* in the hostile world. Therefore the phrase ἐν οἷς was used in this context to indicate the *instrument* rather than the antecedent *generation*, although Hawthorne (1983:102) and Vincent (1979:69) say that the phrase ἐν οἷς relates to the antecedent *generation* (γενεᾶς v 15). O' Brien (1991:296) and Collange (1979:111) think that ἐν οἷς is a pleonasm with *in the world* (ἐν κόσμῳ v 15). But ἐν οἷς is plural, while γενεᾶς and κόσμος singular. Therefore ἐν οἷς indicates the *instruments* referring to *the blameless and pure children of God*.

While O' Brien (1991:296) and Vincent (1979:69) see φαίεσθε as an indicative rather than imperative, Hawthorne (1983:103) admits that this verb can be both indicative and imperative, while the imperative is more likely in this context. The whole section 1:27-30, 2:1-5 and 2:12-18 form a strong exhortation of Paul using imperatives to encourage the readers to shine *by means of blameless and pure conducts*. Their Christian character should shine radiantly through their lives by means of their blameless and pure conducts *like lights* (ὡς φωστῆρες v 15).

Paul occasionally used the word *light* (ὡς⁵⁶ φωστῆρες) as the universal symbol of light stands in contrast to darkness: light is identified with God, while darkness is combined with the world (Borchert 1993:555). This word is applied to heavenly bodies in Gen 1:14, 16 (LXX). In contrast to the sinful and depraved people, Paul describes believers as children of God and as *lights* in the world. Paul did not attempt to identify believers with being divine or as possessing divine seed as in the Gnostic thought, but in this argument Paul exhorted believers to be responsible for their lives so that his work among them might be fruitful and not result in futility (Phil 2:12-18; Borchert 1993:556).

Paul uses the word *as lights* (ὡς φωστῆρες) to remind his readers of their heritage to exhort them, as children of light (1 Thess 5:5), to be the light of truth and goodness in the ethically corrupt world. A light does not shine for itself, but for the sake of the entire world. It implies that believers should live for the sake of others (Bruce 1989:85; Hawthorne 1983:103). Therefore, it is essential to walk according to the

⁵⁶ This is a comparative particle *as* (Reed 1997:315).

light and all the more so, since believers bear the duty to reach out into the world through their continual missionary endeavours, due to the fact that they remain responsible in front of God to live as lights in a dark world (Hahn 1986:495). They should shine as lights, which can be described *blameless* and *pure children of God* in the hostile world in which they live. The phrase *in the world* (ἐν κόσμῳ v 15) does not here indicate the natural, physical order of creation, but indeed the people of the world in its ethical and religious connotation (Martin [1959] 1987:120-121; Reed 1997:300). Due to the character of the believers, as *blameless and pure*, it remains their duty to exercise the eschatological ministry of the righteous in this crooked and depraved world (Bockmuehl 1997a:158). As lights in a spiritual dark world, they are strongly requested to hold fast to the word of life.

4.3.4.3.4 Paul's pride on the day of Christ

In unit 7 (v 16) λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχοντες, εἰς καύχημα ἑμοῖ εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ, *holding firmly to the word of life, in order that I may boast on the day of Christ*, the present participle ἐπέχοντες can be understood either as *hold fast* or *hold forth*. However, in this context the former is more reasonable rather than the latter, according to Witherington (1994a:73): In the preceding and following contexts Paul tries to solve the problem that prevented unity among the believers by using an example of unity, rather than of witnessing; Phil 3 clearly evinces protection from their opponents, not witnessing to them. Silva (1992:146) agrees that Paul emphasised the ethical conduct of his readers, not primarily evangelism. The present participle *hold fast* (ἐπέχοντες v 16) is used as an imperative, rather than an indicative (Hawthorne 1983:103).

The phrase *the word of life* (λόγον ζωῆς v 16) is the object of the participle *hold fast* (ἐπέχοντες v 16). It stands in the emphatic position, and does not speak of Christ as the word (Jn 1:1, 14) but refers to the gospel Paul preached (Hawthorne 1983:103). It is synonymous to the gospel, which offers the life of God to people wherever its message is received and obeyed (Martin [1959] 1987:121). The believers in Philippi have received the life of God through the hearing of the gospel as presented by Paul, and in reaction they obediently believed it (Hawthorne 1983:103). Paul's reference to life is to indicate 'eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord, which is God's gift to the believers' (Rom 6:23), who receive and enjoy the eternal life here and now through their participation in the risen life of Christ (Bruce 1989:86). Therefore, they must currently hold fast to *the word of life* (λόγον ζωῆς v 16) in spite of suffering due to opposition from outside (O' Brien 1991:298).

The phrase *in order that I may boast* (εἰς καύχημα ἑμοῖ v 16) as a construction, which points to purpose (3:20) belongs to the whole passage that precedes *so that you may be blameless and pure ...hold fast* (ἵνα γένησθε ἄμεμπτοι καὶ ἀκέραιοι (v 15) ... ἐπέχοντες (v 16), not merely to the final phrase *hold fast to the word of life* (λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχοντες v 16; O' Brien 1991:298). The word *boasting* (καύχημα) does not point to a vanity that deserves condemnation, but a deep joy or relevant pride that only the believers in Philippi can give Paul by means of their obedience to God's

command, as well as to his exhortation (cf. 4:1; 2 Cor 1:4; Hawthorne 1983:104). The time of Paul's boasting is related to the time of Christ's coming.

The phrase *on the day of Christ* (εἰς⁵⁷ ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ v 16) indicates that the boasting of Paul is clearly eschatological (1:6, 10), referring to the time when Paul, like all believers, will stand in front of the tribunal of Christ (2 Cor 5:10; cf. Phil 1:10), not for the purpose of finding out his eternal fate (cf. Rom 8:1), but to give an account of his work to his Lord (1 Cor 4:1-5; Bockmuehl 1997a:159; O' Brien 1983:104). Paul's strong entreaty to the believers is to hold fast to the gospel of life that he preaches. It is the message that not only brought them life for the future (e.g. eternal life), but also a change of their current life (Hawthorne 1983:104). Justification by faith goes hand in hand with a profound sense of responsibility from which self-interest has been expelled (Caird 1976:127). If they hold fast to the gospel and its demand for blamelessness and pureness, Paul will be able to boast about them in front of Christ, receiving the approval bestowed upon them by Christ on the day of his appearance (Hawthorne 1983:104).

4.3.4.3.5 Paul's commitment to the gospel

In unit 8 (v 16) ὅτι οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον οὐδὲ εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασα, *that I did not run in vain nor strive in vain*, the conjunction *that* (ὅτι v 16) does not indicate the foundation of his boasting since this has already been spoken of (vv 15, 16a), but is explicative of that basis and should be interpreted by *indicating that*, or *as the proof that*, which looks back from the glorious day to the days of his ministry on earth (Hendriksen 1962:126; O' Brien 1991:299). There are two negatives with two different verbs *run* and *strive* (ἔδραμον and ἐκοπίασα v 16). The repetition of the phrase, *in vain* (εἰς κενὸν v 16) is for emphasis.

The first of the two verbs, *run* (ἔδραμον with negative οὐκ v 16) is applied as a favourite metaphor of Paul picturing an athlete in the stadium running towards the finish to describe his ministry (Bruce 1989:86; O' Brien 1991:299). It also describes the believer's life (cf. Rom 9:16; 1 Cor 9:24(3x), 26; Gal 2:2; 5:7; 2 Thess 3:1). Paul's prior concern for his ministry of the gospel is not like running *in vain* (εἰς κενὸν v 16; Gal 2:2; cf. 2 Cor 6:1; 1 Thess 3:5; Bockmuehl 1997a:159). According to ch 3 Paul's desire is to strain forward to the heavenly reward with his personal testimony (Phil 3:12-14; Bockmuehl 1997:159). The second verb *strive* (ἐκοπίασα v 16) also reiterates the ministry of Paul (e.g. 1 Cor 4:12; 15:10; Gal 4:11; Col 1:29) and that of the others (e.g. 1 Thess 5:12; 1 Cor 16:16; Rom 16:6, 12; Bockmuehl 1997a:159). For Paul, the hard labour did not cause him to shrink from his ministry.

Rather the hard work, even to martyrdom, let him rejoice, since he was sure that it will promote the work of salvation among the believers in Philippi. This assumes

⁵⁷ The preposition εἰς should be interpreted not by *in view of*, *against*, or *up to* (as pointing to the time until which something carries), but *on* (e.g. the occasion on which something happens; O' Brien 1991:299).

that v 16 denoted his conviction that he will be alive at the time of Christ, and that v 17 as admission of the contrary possibility, was completely gratuitous (Vincent 1979:70). The context of *striving for* the gospel signified that the purpose of *striving* was in view, and that the repetition of *in vain* (εἰς κενὸν v 16) with the negative, fixed the attention particularly to Paul's great hope that his tough ministry, for the sake of the believers, would have been completely fruitful, and that he would not encounter the Judge on the last day with vain hands (O' Brien 1991:3000).

4.3.4.4 Paul's appeal to his ministry (2:17-18)

Even though v 17 commences with an adversative conjunction *but* (ἀλλά), it is connected with the preceding argument in terms of the fact that it illuminates Paul's hope of *boasting* in the Philippians on the day of Lord and points out that even his possible death cannot influence it (Bockmuehl 1997a:160). Paul uses the strong metaphorical language of sacrifice. He elucidates the life of the believers in Philippi as an acceptable sacrifice to God, to which he adds his own life as a drink offering over the sacrifice of the believers (O' Brien 1991:301; Witherington 1994a:73). Even though we are not sure whether Paul had in mind the Jewish or pagan sacrificial practice, the language of a drink offering was prominently general in the ancient world to permit us to leave the reference quite common (Bockmuehl 1997a:160). According to Bockmuehl (1997a:160), in both Judaism and in the pagan cult, sacrifices were generally fulfilled by pouring out a libation of wine or oil over the offering or at the foot of the altar. Paul was convinced that the believers' faith in this context constituted a sacrifice to God, for which his own ministry functioned as the accompanying drink offering (Bockmuehl 1997a:160).

4.3.4.4.1 A drink offering to complete his readers' sacrifice and service

Unit 9 (v 17) ἀλλὰ εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, *but even if I am being offered a drink offering on the sacrifice and service of your faith*. Fee (1999:110) argues that εἰ καὶ is not to be taken as concessive *even though*, but as intensive *if indeed this is happening*. However, it seems more reasonable to accept that the opening conjunction *even though* (εἰ καὶ), is a concessive clause, which sets forth the possibility of Paul's life being poured out as a drink offering, which indicated the real possibility of Paul's death as a martyr, not its probability or certainty (O' Brien 1991:303).

Bockmuehl (1997a:161) states that it was not something that took place in any case, but which was an imminent possibility. The present passive verb *being offered a drink offering*⁵⁸ (σπένδομαι v 17) does not denote that Paul feared that his death was near, but indeed that the pouring out of a libation accompanied the sacrifice (Silva 1992:150). According to Fee (1999:110) Paul's drink offering his imprisonment that went along with their *burnt offering*, as it pertained to their current struggle in

⁵⁸ It was a libation, usually a cup of wine, poured out on the ground to revere Diety; such offerings were often brought in both Jewish and pagan worship (Beare [1959] 1973:93).

Philippi. Hawthorne (1983:106) excludes the possibility of Paul's martyrdom, while the two metaphorical terms (*run* and *strive*) describe his rigorous apostolic activities. At the time he used the metaphor of libation he did not think of his death, but referred to his sufferings as an apostle in Philippi for the sake of the gospel, as well as for his readers in general (Hawthorne 1983:106). In the end, he got to the conclusion that his apostolic suffering and his readers' sacrificial gifts to him because of his apostolic position, connected to form a perfectly complete sacrifice to God (Hawthorne 1983:106).

It should, however, be considered that true suffering always includes the possibility of death. Therefore Fee and Hawthorne's arguments are not persuasive. Paul referred to the prospect of his martyrdom, which he encountered and considered himself, as well as his life's blood, as a sacrificial *drink offering* poured forth to God (Beare [1959] 1973:93). However, it did not speak of the literal shedding of blood, which was poured out in the pagan cult (cf, Ps 16:4); rather, he referred to the willingness in his mind of having his life sacrificed to God (O' Brien 1991:306). Paul pointed out how completely committed he was to proclaim the gospel and to fulfill his apostolic struggle (*ἀγών*). As an apostle who lived under the Lordship of Jesus Christ, he was ready, if it may be necessary, to obey God even to the point of death (v 2:8) to fulfill his calling (O' Brien 1991:306). Paul's view regarding himself *being offered as a drink offering* (*σπένδομαι* v 17), indicates that his work and ministry, whether in life or in death, was a drink offering *being offered* to complete the sacrifice and service of his readers (Bockmuehl 1997a:161).

The phrase *on the sacrifice and service of your faith* (*ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν* v 17) made sure that Paul thought of his death, not as a redemptive sacrifice, but as a willing drink offering on behalf of the true commitment of his readers to God (Brown 1986:432). The preposition *on* (*ἐπὶ* v 17) marks an addition to what already exists. It points to Paul's libation as an addition to the sacrifice of the believers in Philippi (Louw and Nida 1989:89.101; Martin [1959] 1987:124; O' Brien 1991:307). The believers' daily lives and services could be explained as a sacrifice as Paul exhorted the believers in Rome to present themselves *as living sacrifices, holy and pleasing to God* (Rom 12:1; Bruce 1989:88; Caird 1976:127). The word *sacrifice* (*θυσία* v 17) may also refer to the monetary offering which the believers sent to Paul while Paul uses the imagery of sacrifice in 4:18, which clearly refers to the monetary gift as *a fragrant offering, an acceptable sacrifice, to be presented as pleasing to God* (Bruce 1989:88; Witherington 1994a:73).

The word *λειτουργία* (v 17) indicates *service* to the people. In Hellenistic Greek, the word *service* (*λειτουργία* v 17) was widely used, to cover any kind of service. A complete new, religious and cultic use of the word was developed (Hess 1986:551). The word *service* (*λειτουργία*) in the New Testament is used in connection with the general popular use (Rom 15:27; 2 Cor 9:12; Phil 2:30), partly with the preceding Old Testament cultus (Lk 1:23; Heb 9:21; 10:11), and partly with an isolated figurative use of the LXX terminology, to bring out the importance of Christ's death or to characterise either Paul's missionary work with its readiness for martyrdom, or the believers' walk within the community (Strathmann 1967:227-228). Collange

(1979:114) says the word *service* (λειτουργία v 17) can refer to the public service.

It is possible that Paul used the word *service* (λειτουργία) in v 17 to refer to the gifts of the believers, as to the monetary gifts in 2 Cor 8:2 (Witherington 1994a:73-74). Kent Jr. *et al.* (1996:38) and Martin's ([1959] 1987:124) agree that the gifts of the believers sent to Paul out of their penury (2 Cor 8:2; cf. 4:19) were a sacrificial service, arising from their faith in God (τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν v 17). They take the words *sacrifice* and *service* in 4:18 as one phrase, governed by one definite article to indicate *a fragrant offering* acceptable to God (4:18). The phrase *of their faith* (τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν v17) qualifies both *suffering* (θυσία) and *service* (λειτουργία), not just *service* (λειτουργία). In this context, the phrase *of their faith* (τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν v17) can be understood comprehensively of the believers' faithful life, their confession and life as believers, or the practical outworking of their faith amidst suffering and trials, which are the characteristics of sacrificial service (O' Brien 1991:310). The sacrifice, which the believers offer, was first of all themselves (Rom 12:1); then their substance (2 Cor 9:12), their prayers, and their activities (Beare [1959] 1973:94).

4.3.4.4.2 Mutual joy (units 10-11)

4.3.4.4.2.1 Paul's joy with the believers

In unit 10 (v 17) χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν, *I rejoice and rejoice with all of you* (v 17), the verb *I rejoice* (χαίρω) indicates that even though Paul was suffering with the devastating possibility of martyrdom through his ministry on behalf of his readers in Philippi, it rather caused him to rejoice amidst his current hard labour and suffering, than to feel embittered (Kent Jr. *et al.* 1996:38). He was prepared not only to endure the current suffering, but also to lay down his life, with the hope of being with Christ. Their gifts convinced him that his ministry among the believers in Philippi was successful, and it filled him with real joy (Kent Jr. *et al.* 1996:38). Paul exhorts his readers to be glad and to rejoice with him in all circumstances for the sake of the Lord, as he rejoiced with them even amidst severe suffering as his suffering and their gifts are a complete sacrifice to God (Hawthorne 198s:106) and as his death will proclaim the gospel and magnify Christ (Martin 1987:125).

4.3.4.4.2.2 The believers rejoiced with Paul

Unit 11 (v 18) τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ ὑμεῖς χαίρετε καὶ συγχαίρετέ μοι, *in the same way you must rejoice and rejoice with me* (v 18), exhorted his readers in Philippi to adopt the same view on the issue (τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ), stated in the preceding verse. It seems strange that Paul exhorts them to *rejoice with him* (συγχαίρετέ μοι v 18) after having said that *he rejoices with all of them* (συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν v 18; Bockmuehl 1997:162). However, as Martin ([1959] 1987:124) and Engberg-Pedersen (2000:88) state, it summons the believers in Philippi to accept the news expressed in unit 10 with gladness and joy. He shared it with the believers in Philippi in spite of the prospect of martyrdom.

The verb *rejoice* (χαίρειν) together with its cognates, appear more than thirteen times in Philippians. The preposition *with* (σύν) and the long list of words compounded with it, are striking (Hawthorne 1983:106). They are evidence both of Paul's own joy, as well as of the various experiences, including joy, that he shared with his readers in Philippi (Hawthorne 1983:106). Paul encourages the believers in Philippi to share in his great joy, as he rejoices with all of them and he encourages them continually to be joyful with him (Engberg-Pedersen 2000:88). McDonald (1998:28) states that true obedience to God, which was so prominent in Christ, will express itself in unity of purpose (2:2), voluntary service (2:14), as well as in real joy (2:18).

4.3.4.5 Conclusion

As we observed in this section, Paul's concern moved from brotherly love and mutual concern to relevant conduct to work out their salvation. This exhortative section is divided into three parts: (1) work out your own salvation, (2) live as blameless children and (3) Paul's appeal to his ministry.

In the first part of Paul's exhortations, he affectively calls his readers 'beloved ones', to express his pastoral mind. He exhorts them to work out their salvation by their continual obedience as illustrated in 2:8. The obedience of Christ up to the death on a cross serves as an example for them. An obedient mind and working out their salvation in *fear* and *trembling* serve the spiritual well-being of the community as a whole. It does not imply working for salvation, but rather making salvation operational. Paul's ethical exhortation deals with the working out of salvation in the Christian community for the sake of the world. It does not matter whether he is present or absent, since God works in them to achieve a harmonious and healthy community in accordance with his good will. That is why Paul exhorts them to corporately build a better spiritual community by standing firm in one spirit. And he then moves his attention to the quality of their lives, how to act in a hostile and crooked society.

Paul exhorts his readers to do everything in their community, without complaining and arguing. These negative characteristics prevents them to live as light in the world, since it promotes ill-will and evil thoughts in stead of harmony and good will. Paul reminds them of their status as children of God through their participation in Christ. The character of God's children, as the standard of the family of God, is to be pure, blameless and faultless in a crooked and depraved generation. Paul exhorts them to shine like stars in a world that distorted and corrupted the truth and the ways of God. Their blameless, pure, and faultless lives will reflect their Father's character in this crooked and depraved world.

By their shining in the accordance with the word of God, Paul boasts that on the day of Christ it will be evident that he did not run and strive for nothing. He will rejoice with the believers, in spite of the fact that he is poured out as a drink offering, a

sacrifice in service of their faith. Paul calls upon them to rejoice in the Lord in all circumstances, as he rejoices even amidst severe suffering.

4.3.5 Final conclusion of sections 1:27-30; 2:1-5; 2:12-18

The ethical exhortation sections 1:27-30, 2:1-5, and 2:12-18 are connected to the Christological section, 2:6-11. Paul exhorts his readers in all circumstances to conduct themselves by following Christ as their example. Paul points to Christology as the foundation of his ethical exhortation to his readers to stand firm in their faith.

According to 1:27-30, the believers encountered opposition and suffering. Paul exhorts them to live in a way worthy of the gospel of Christ without being frightened by opponents. They should stand firm in one spirit, contending for the faith of the gospel. God is the Judge, who will destroy the opponents and exalt believers from suffering. God's grace does not only lead them to believe in Christ. It also leads them to suffer for his sake. Suffering is not only negative and cruel to the believers. It is particularly a sign that they belong to the family of God. They do not fight for themselves, but for the gospel, like Paul in prison, as a result of doing the work of Christ. Therefore, Paul submitted Christ's suffering and exaltation to his readers as the foundation of his ethical exhortations. They can expect their suffering to be replaced by exaltation at the revelation of Christ. Therefore Paul selected the suffering and exaltation of Christ as example to exhort his readers to endure hardships, amidst undeserved suffering.

According to 2:1-5, Paul was concerned to solve the conflicts among the believers. He exhorts them with the four characteristics of believers in Christ. They should live as one in spirit and purpose, and to abide in the same kind of love. The way to delight Paul is for them to have a humble mind and mutual concern, to consider others better than themselves without strife and vain-glory. As Paul exhorted them to have the same attitude as Christ, their way of life should be founded on Christ. Otherwise, they will not cope with conflicts. Christ has therefore been chosen as the primary example to exhort the readers.

In 2:12-18 Paul called his readers *beloved ones*, which refers to them being addressed as *the children of God* (v 15). As they have constantly been obedient to his instruction and preaching, they should continue to be eager to follow Christ *with fear and trembling*, in adoration of God. They will be able to corporately work out their salvation in unity, since it is God who works in them according to his good purpose. They should work out their salvation in their daily lives, as well as in their communal lives without *complaints* and *disputes*. This is only possible through humility, of which Jesus Christ is the best example.

Complaining and regularly engaging in disputes in and outside the congregation are definitely not typical of true believers. He exhorted them to become pure, blameless and faultless as children of God in a crooked and depraved generation, to reflect the true *light*, shining in the world, by living out the word of life, in order that he may

boast on the day of Christ's return. It will be the day of the fulfillment of their salvation, of Paul and the believers' exaltation. On that day they will be Paul's boast as blameless, pure and faultless children of God, as proof that he did not run or labour for nothing. As a prisoner for the sake of the gospel, Paul offers his life as a drink offering, a sacrifice in service of the believers. It means that he willingly accepts personal martyrdom on behalf of Christ. Therefore, he exhorted his readers to share with him in his joy, *in spite of* suffering. The joy of believers under suffering, finds its source in the self-humiliation of Christ, who was exalted by God (2:6-11).

As seen in these sections, Paul applies Christology to exhort his readers to follow Christ's example in their hostile society and in their congregation. All three these ethical exhortative sections relate to Christology.