An Early Christian Confession

R. P. Martin

[p.v]

CONTENTS

[p.vi]

ABBREVIATIONS

AV	English Authorized Version
CQR.	*Church Quarterly Review*
E.T.	English translation
Exp. T.	*The Expository Times*
H.E.	*Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius
J.B.L.	*The Journal of Biblical Literature*
J.T.S.	*The Journal of Theological Studies*
KJ	*Kyrios Jesus* by E. Lohmeyer
LXX	Septuagint Version
MT	Massoretic Text
RV	English Revised Version, 1881
T.W.N.T.	*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*
Z.N.T.W.	*Zeitschrjft für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

[p.7]

AN EARLY CHRISTIAN CONFESSION

I. INTRODUCTION

PHILIPPIANS ii. 5-11 exercises a twofold influence upon the would-be commentator. It both attracts and repels. This ambivalent reaction is the result, on the one hand, of the importance of the section for our knowledge of early Christianity and of Paul's Christological teaching; and, on the other hand, of the difficulty which the interpreter faces as he comes to weigh the significance, and ponder the meaning, of these profound words. If A. B. Bruce in 1876 could write of the diversity of opinion as 'enough to fill the student with despair, and to afflict him with intellectual paralysis',[1] how much more is the modern student amazed at the variety and complexity of more recent scholarly research on this portion of God's Word. 'This section belongs to the most difficult passages of the Pauline letters', comments E. Lohmeyer in the introductory sentence to this passage in his Commentary.[2]

Yet the section induces a fascination which invites the attempt to study it closely. It is important not only for its own sake, but also because it represents a type of literature which New Testament study has detected and classified as 'cultic' or 'confessional'. Philippians ii. 5-11 is best described as a piece of early Christian kerygmatic confession which found a place in the cultus of the primitive Church.[3] It represents one of the earliest attempts to state, in confessional form, the Church's belief in the person of the Redeemer and Lord, the price He paid to fulfil the divine purpose which brought Him into the world, and the honour He received at the completion of His mission.[4] The setting of this confession in the cultic life of the early Christians may be described in the following ways.[5] First, it shows clearly that the early Church worshipped Jesus as the exalted Lord. Right at the beginning of the Christian age the followers of Jesus, the people of the way

[p.8]

(cf. Acts ix. 2, xxii. 4, xxiv. 14), hailed Him in worship, confession and prayer as well as in preaching as *Maran-Jesus* and accorded Him such divine honour as belonged properly to their covenant God.[6] Secondly, a literary piece such as Philippians ii. 5-11 presupposes a cultus,[7] i.e. a clearly defined religious devotion which centred upon Him as Lord and drew its inspiration from His living presence in the midst of His people. Thirdly, we may with confidence believe that this confession of Jesus as exalted Lord and Christ laid the foundation for later Christology.[8] Indeed, Jeremias says explicitly of this Hymn to Christ that it 'is the oldest document on which the whole Christology of the later times, especially the doctrine of the three states of existence of Christ (i.e. pre-existent, incarnate, exalted), was built up.'[9]

II. THE FORM AND AUTHORSHIP OF PHILIPPIANS ii. 5-11

The credit for the separate analysis of the section goes to E. Lohmeyer whose monograph remains the outstanding single contribution in recent times.[1] Before him, the poetic and liturgical character of the verses had been recognized by J. Weiss and A. Deissmann[2] who arranged the section in two strophes of four lines and two strophes of seven lines respectively. H. Lietzmann, in his monumental study of the Eucharist,[3] has a chapter on the antecedents of the Eucharistic prayer in Hippolytus, and refers to the 'Christological hymn' of Philippians ii which he sets out in lines somewhat similar to Lohmeyer's pattern.

Lohmeyer proceeds from the assumption that what we have in these verses is a Christological Hymn set in rhythmical form, and composed of six strophes, each with three lines. It is a self-contained unity because it begins with God in eternity, and concludes with the same thought.[4] It is best understood as a primitive *carmen Christi,*[5] which may be set out in the following way:

[p.9]

    I   Being in the form of God,
       He considered it not a thing to be seized
       To be equal with God;

    II But emptied Himself,
       By taking the form of a slave,
       Coming in human likeness.

    III And appearing on earth as Man, He humbled Himself,
       Becoming obedient unto death (indeed,
         death on a cross).

    IV Wherefore God exalted Him,
       And bestowed on Him the name
       That is above every name;

    V That in the name of Jesus Every knee should bow,
       Of things in heaven, on earth, and under the earth,

    VI And every tongue confess:
       'Jesus Christ is Lord',
       To the glory of God the Father.

The evidence for this description is found in the following unusual features.

a. Stylistic evidence

There is a stately and solemn ring in these words which is noticeable when the Greek text is read aloud.[6] It is reminiscent, says Bonnard,[7] of the Old Testament psalms and the religious poetry of the Old Testament. There are extraordinary features which betray the form and style of poetry. For example, we may instance the rhythmical quality of the sentences, the use of parallelism based on the number of syllables in a line, and the presence of rare words and phrases. Such evidence indicates that we are dealing with the literature of liturgy rather than epistolary prose.

[p.10]

A. M. Hunter sums up the impression which the style of the piece makes in his conclusion, 'The style of the whole is solemn, stately, liturgical, and it ends with a rhetorical clause.'[8]

b. Linguistic evidence

It is an incontrovertible fact that many of the key-words of the section are *hapax legomena* in Paul's writing; and even, in some cases, in the entire New Testament. The word ἁρπαγμός is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. It is absent from the LXX, and is quite rare in secular Greek.[9] The verb 'highly exalted', ὑπερυψοῦν, likewise is not found again in the New Testament, although it reappears in an Old Testament citation of Psalm xxxvii. 35-37 in 1 Clement xiv. 5.[10] The threefold enumeration, 'in heaven, on earth, and under the earth' is unique in New Testament writings.

Μορφή is found only once elsewhere in the Received Text of the New Testament: in the Markan appendix at Mark xvi. 12. The verb 'emptied', translating κενοῦν, is used in four other places in the Pauline literature but never with the precise meaning of ii. 7 where it is used absolutely in contrast to the other Pauline usages which are usually in the passive voice. The phrase, 'in the name of Jesus', is also something of a unique specimen. The customary Pauline term is 'in the name of the Lord Jesus' or 'in the name of Jesus Christ'.

The word translated 'obedient', ὑπήρκοος, has a special meaning in the context, which is not found elsewhere. In classical Greek it usually connotes political subjection. In two other New Testament examples, it is obedience to men (to Moses, Acts vii. 39: to Paul himself, 2 Cor. ii. 9) which is in view. In the sense of religious obedience to God it is unique here in the New Testament literature.

This cursory examination of the language of the passage reveals that there are many exceptional terms and words; and confirms the impression that we are here dealing with a piece of literature which is in a class of its own in the New Testament.

[p.11]

c. Contextual evidence

Philippians i. 27-ii. 18 forms one closely-knit section of the Epistle. The dominant theme is exhortation. 'What Paul expects from the Church' is one commentator's summary of the contents.[11] The 'Hymn' of verses 5-11 clearly interrupts the flow of the hortatory theme, and points to the fact that the section has been inserted at this juncture as a citation by the apostle of what would be to him the appropriate quotation to support his admonition to the Philippians. The introductory formula of verse 5 is clear evidence of this. A. M. Hunter writes of the Hymn as resembling '"a purple patch" stitched into the fabric of the exhortation';[12] while W. K. L. Clarke comments, 'The more we press the actuality of Philippians as a genuine letter, the more probable it is that St. Paul did not pause in his dictation to compose an exquisitely balanced and rhythmical piece of prose.[13]

By this cumulative evidence the conclusion now appears irresistible that Philippians ii. 5-11 is detachable from the pastoral context of the Pauline letter of which it forms a part. It is marked out as a fragment of liturgy by the unusual style and the employment of expressions which are more in keeping with the style of poetry and worship than the results of the dictation, presumably *ad hoc,* of a letter to a factious and local community of Christ's people at Philippi. We find that this conclusion is now generally accepted as part of the wider concern to find in the Epistles of the New Testament fragments of hymnic and liturgical compositions which were incorporated into the writings of the apostles and the apostolic men. This is a vast field which offers a fascinating line of investigation, and we can only refer to it in passing.[14]

The designation of the section as a Christological Hymn has a distinct bearing on the matter of *authorship.* Lohmeyer argues that the section must be pre-Pauline on the ground that the Greek text is based on an underlying Aramaic original. 'The author's mother-tongue was Semitic';[15] and this is shown by traces of Semitic style in the text. The participial style which is found in the

[p.12]

first half of the Hymn is a well-known feature of Semitic hymnic prayer-speech, with the participle doing the job of the finite verb, preserving the continuity of thought and action, and producing what Lohmeyer calls 'a ballad-like tone'. This is a linguistic trait which is possible only in Semitic writing, and finds illustration in the psalms of the Old Testament and the odes of Solomon.

Lohmeyer mentions also constructions which are unlikely in a Greek composition. The phrases ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν and εὑρεθεὶς ὡς call forth his brusque verdict that they are not only unPauline but unGreek too.[16]

Another distinguishing characteristic which indicates that the Hymn had a Semitic origin is the construction of the Section in threes.[17] There are three stresses to a line, three lines to a strophe, three strophes in each part of the entire composition with the first half containing three steps down from the Lord's heavenly state to humanity and Servant-hood and ultimately the humiliation of death. And there is the threefold division of the cosmos in verse 10. Furthermore, if we accept Jeremias' modification of Lohmeyer's analysis,[18] there is an extra feature of the Hymn covering the threefold state of the Person of Christ in His preexistence, His humiliation and His exaltation. Jeremias has detected this triadic structure of early Christian hymns elsewhere in the New Testament.

Lohmeyer draws the conclusion that, in view of the presence of rare words and the obvious Semitic flavour of the piece, the author must have belonged to the early Jewish-Christian community at Jerusalem. He goes even further with the suggestion that the Hymn belongs to the Eucharistic liturgy of the Jerusalem church and was sung at the celebrations of the Lord's Supper in that early community.[19] This startling view has not met with approval by those who would follow Lohmeyer in his general thesis about the origin of the Hymn and its pre-Pauline authorship.[20] In fact, later discussion would take the composition away from Jerusalem, and locate it in Antioch in the Syrian province

[p.13]

where there was a large Jewish population, and where Paul spent his early years as a missionary and in contact with the bilingual churches.[21]

The denial of apostolic authorship is not, however, merely a subjective guess. There are, according to its proponents, certain factors which militate against the traditional view.

First, we may observe the absence of the great Pauline theme of redemption. Although it is on the cross that the Lord of glory brings His life of obedience to a climax, no redemptive significance is attached to that death. In fact, Lohmeyer would remove the phrase, 'even the death of the cross', as a Pauline interpretative gloss on the score that it breaks the metrical

structure of the Hymn.[22] But even if the phrase is allowed to stand, it adds little by way of explanation to the meaning of the death. There is no thought of ὑπὲρ or περὶ ἡμῶν.[23] There is no reference to the redemption of humanity from sin by the cross. Rather the outcome is that the entire cosmos is subjected to a new Lord.

Secondly, no mention is made of the resurrection of Christ which was a doctrine dear to the heart of the apostle and central in his preaching as the evidence of I Corinthians xv shows.[24] Here in Philippians ii. 9, as in Hebrews (except xiii. 20), the thought proceeds directly from the cross to the exaltation of the Lord.[25]

Thirdly, there is no reference to the Church as the company of those for whom Christ laid down His life (contrast Ephesians v. 25). Instead, the reconciliation is one which embraces the whole order of created life which is comprehensively covered by the phrase in verse 10.[26]

The noticeable absence of these Pauline *characteristica* provides the ground for a denial of Paul's hand in the composing of the Hymn. Could he have written a noble tribute to the Lord, it is argued, and omitted those very ideas and emphases which we know to have been so vital to his theology?

There is, moreover, a further consideration. If we may assume for the moment what will be shown later, that one of the main categories of interpretation is the doctrine of the Servant of the

[p.14]

Lord whose obedience, submission unto death and glorification are the prototype of the presentation of Christ here, we may note the statement of R. H. Fuller: 'Paul never makes use of any of the Servant language, except where he is quoting tradition which he has received from pre-Pauline Christianity'.[27] If this is a sound judgment, it would buttress the already imposing argument that Philippians ii contains a pre-Pauline Hymn which Paul inherited from his Jewish-Christian predecessors, from those who were 'in Christ' before him (Rom. xvi. 7). He utilized it at this point in his Epistle to illustrate and enforce the lessons of humility and submissiveness which he was setting before the Philippian Christians.

The evidence is, however, not all on one side. To champion the cause of the apostolic authorship is not an easy business in these days, and especially when the arguments ranged against it are so strong and clear. We cannot deny the cogency of the point that ideas that we associate with Paul are missing from the section; nor the unmistakable data of the rare words and phrases. Rather, the line to be taken will be to admit all this; but then to suggest that there are factors which explain the evidence, and make it unnecessary to postulate an unknown authorship. The rhythmical and liturgical style of the piece betraying an early Christian confession may be taken as proved. But this one concession may in itself explain some of the other features which Lohmeyer and Hunter have so acutely detected, *viz,* the unusual vocabulary and the absence of certain ideas which the apostle elaborates elsewhere in great detail. If the section was originally composed as a Hymn, or confession of faith, in tribute to the Church's Lord, the employment of exceptional words and constructions might well be expected. Presumably the author had a certain picture in mind of the Subject in whose praise and honour the Hymn would be written, and it would be unnatural to ask that every truth about Him and His work should be included in one short tribute. The author would have to be

selective of his ideas, and this one fact may go far to explain the omission of those features which we

[p.15]

find in the undoubtedly genuine Pauline works. As Henry reminds us simply, 'un silence n'est pas une negation'.[28]

Also we are learning from recent Pauline studies that there is danger in too much confidence in the value of word-statistics as a determining criterion of apostolic authorship; and we cannot be over-dogmatic about just what the apostle could or could not have written.[29]

This leads on to the point that Paul is capable of an exalted and poetic style when the occasion serves. 1 Corinthians xiii and Romans viii. 31 ff., xi. 33 ff. are the clearest examples of this ability to scale the heights of sublime poetry and to compose in a style which is as far removed from that of epistolary prose as is Philippians ii.[30] There are also other examples which may have been his guide and incentive, for instance the liturgical psalms of the Old Testament and the Servant poems of Isaiah. It would be a risky conclusion to set a limit to the ability of the apostle in his literary composition, and to say dogmatically that he was not capable of producing a hymn in a style appropriate to the literary *genre* he is being inspired to produce.

W. D. Davies has offered the point that the doctrine of Christ as the second Adam is distinctively Pauline.[31] As will be shown later, this view is another valuable key to the elucidation of the whole passage. In his discussion of the second Adam doctrine in the New Testament, he reaches the conviction that 'the conception of Christ as the Second Adam was probably introduced into the Church by Paul himself'.[32] If this is so, our Hymn is the most conspicuous example of the way his renewed mind was working in the formulating of the contrast between the first Adam and last Man from heaven.

Against Lohmeyer's description of the verses as a pre-Pauline Eucharistic liturgy, we may set the verdict of Stauffer who has examined the credal elements in the New Testament and finds twelve criteria which mark out credal formulae. Many of these criteria are present in Philippians ii, and this endorses Stauffer's statement that these verses are to be classified as a Pauline in-

[p.16]

carnational formula which Paul composed at an earlier date than the writing of the Philippian letter and inserted there.[33]

On the linguistic side, it is a fact that there are typically Pauline elements in the text which should not be overlooked.[34] His use of σχῆμα and his employment of the verb 'to kneel', which is used in the same Old Testament quotation from Isaiah xlv. 23 in Romans xiv.11, are cases in point. Κύριος Ἰησοῦς is his favourite Christological appellation in, e.g., 1 Corinthians xii. 3 and Romans x. 9, which are both credal statements. There are also the two main ideas which form the central convictions of his Christology: the obedience of the Lord which reverses the disobedience of the first Adam, a theme which is worked out in considerable detail in Romans v; and the bestowal of a name on the exalted Christ (cf. Eph. i. 20-23). If an underlying Semitic original may be taken as demonstrated by Lohmeyer, then

this raises an obvious question. Need we look any further than the apostle himself for the author? We require, as a candidate for authorship, a Christian whose mother tongue is Aramaic and one with equal facility in the use of Greek. The apostle has just that qualification.[35]

III. AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF PHILIPPIANS ii. 5-11

The method of many modern interpreters is to begin with an examination of the language of the Pauline text and subject the key-words to close study. We may proceed, then, to some of the controverted words and phrases, and observe the conclusions of modern lexicographical study.

a. ὑπάρχων
This word, which is rendered by the plain participle 'being' in the AV, is more suitably translated 'being originally', as in the RV margin. ὑπάρχειν can often mean simply 'to exist', and we may compare the very frequent usage of the participle with a predicate noun to mean 'who is, since he is'. There is also the connotation of 'what belongs to someone, his possession', or, in the phrase ὑπάρχει μοί τι, 'something at my disposal' which would be

[p.17]

rendered by the simple verb, 'I have'.[1] So we read in Ecciesiasticus xx. 16, 'A fool will say, I have no friend' (οὐχ ὑπάρχει μοι φίλος).

Perhaps we ought to bear this nuance in mind when we come to interpret the Christological text of Philippians ii. 6. Our Lord, in His pre-incarnate state, had possession of the 'form of God'. The usage of ὑπάρχειν to denote an original or fundamental possession is attested by 1 Corinthians xi. 7 which is an important parallel in view of its meaning. Man is the εἰκών and δόξα of God, but not by acquirement. Rather, he is that by nature, in virtue of his original creation at the hands of God (Gn. i. 27: κατ᾽ εἰκόνα in the LXX: cf. Col. iii. 10). This would be true of the first man Adam who enjoyed this dignity as the original gift of God.

In this context, then, while it is not absolutely required, the meaning seems clear. 'He who was originally possessing the "form of God" 'is the introductory description of the pre-existent Lord.[2]

b. ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ
The discovery of the exact meaning of this phrase is handicapped by the fact that the word μορφὴ is found only here in Paul's writing, although cognate words are elsewhere used by him.[3] Of first importance is to notice that Paul does not say that Christ existed as the μορφὴ Θεοῦ, but that He was in that μορφή; or, as we may submit, He possessed that μορφή. Earlier writers viewed the term through the spectacles of Greek philosophy, and reached the conclusion that here was a word which expressed the metaphysical notion of οὐσία as the equivalent of deity.[4]

The exact wording ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ and the more likely background of the apostle's thought in the world of the Old Testament and Hellenistic Judaism would support a more profitable line of thought. Instead of the parallels to be found in Aristotle's highly formal statements about μορφή, it is more in keeping with the apostle's essentially Hebraic outlook to seek an interpretation of the phrase in the language of the Old Testament.[5] This is done in the suggested equation of μορφή and εἰκών (image). We may

[p.18]

also observe the way in which both words are directly related to the word for 'glory' (δόξα). Thus the meaning is that our Lord's pre-existent state was one in which He uniquely shared in the divine splendour which, to the Hebrew mind, would mean that He was the visible representation or manifestation of the presence of God Himself.

The lines of evidence for this thesis are:

i. εἰκών and μορφή are interchangeably used in the LXX and synonymous in other places. There is a good example of this equivalence in a text in the *Corpus Hermeticum*.[6]

ii. That εἰκών and δόξα are parallels is shown in the LXX's translation of *t^e mûna|h* by both these words. μορφή is also the LXX translation of *t^e mûna|h* in Job iv. 16.[7]

iii. Our Lord as the 'image and glory of God' is attested Pauline teaching; and especially in his doctrine of Christ as the last Adam.[8] There are other notable instances of the fact that the New Testament writers saw in the Old Testament conception of the glory of God a prefigurement of the status of Christ.[9]

iv. This is confirmed by the Johannine witness to the preexistent state of the Logos as enjoying the δόξα of the Father.[10]

v. Further confirmation comes from the identification of the pre-incarnate Christ with the divine and pre-existent wisdom of Hellenistic Judaism.[11]

The consensus of modern interpretation then would agree that the enigmatic phrase 'in the form of God' is another way of saying that, in His eternal state in the Father's presence, the Lord existed as the image and glory of God. J. Behm expresses this very clearly when he says, ' "The form of God", in which the preexistent Christ was, is nothing else than the divine "glory"; the Pauline "being in the form of God" corresponds completely with John xvii. 5 "the glory which I had with thee before the world was" ', quoting Calvin in support.[12]

c. ἁρπαγμός

This term poses one of the most thorny questions in the whole

[p.19]

field of New Testament exegesis. There is, on the one hand, the need to define the exact connotation of the word;[13] and, on the other hand, the discovery of the precise meaning in relation to the context of Paul's Christological thought.

On the first point, we must reach a decision on the question whether ἁρπαγμός is active, denoting an act of robbery or usurpation with a cognate form ἁρπαγή as a synonym; or passive as the description of what is done by the action, whether in the bad sense of 'prize, booty', or in the good sense of 'good fortune', 'lucky chance'. Here the synonym would be ἅρπαγμα or εὕρημα

.

The first view which defends the active meaning of ἁρμαγμός is now largely abandoned, although it is a common meaning in non-biblical Greek.[14] The only conceivable way in which it could be applied is the signification which J. Ross gives.[15] He admits that the active force of 'an act of plundering' would not be understood by Paul's readers as though he meant that our Lord were robbing God, but rather that he was telling them that the Messiah, Christ Jesus, did not think that to be on an equality with God spelt rapacity, plundering, self-aggrandizement. On the contrary, He voluntarily and gladly rejected the earthly idea of Messiahship for the spiritual. Ross finds this choice illustrated in the temptation presented to the Lord in the wilderness when He was tempted by the Devil to seize the kingdom in opposition to the will and purpose of God.

But this interpretation faces the decisive question: What exactly did our Lord refuse to plunder? To this there is no satisfactory answer; and there is no help from other biblical texts, because ἁρμαγμός in its active sense of *rapina* (so the Vulgate, which is followed by the AV), 'robbery', is not found again in the New Testament and is absent from the LXX.

The passive meaning, then, must be accepted. ἁρμαγμός is equivalent to ἅρπαγμα; as has been amply demonstrated,[16] with the meaning of 'spoil, prize'. We have still to determine the exact force even if this translation be accepted. The issue here is to decide whether 'the prize' was something which the pre-incarnate

[p.20]

Lord was tempted to hold fast to, or something which He refused to snatch violently. It is the controversy which was centred upon the choice of the terms *res rapta* or *res rapienda.*

i. *Res rapta* is the term used to carry the following meaning. Our Lord was faced with the temptation to hold tightly the equality which He already possessed. He rejected this temptation, in one of three ways. With Lightfoot the verse may be rendered, 'He did not look upon His equality with God as a prize to be clutched', i.e. He already possessed divine equality and resolved not to cling to it. So He chose to renounce it in becoming a Man. On another interpretation the sense reads as follows: He did not regard equality as a prize to be grasped because He already had it, and therefore there was no need for Him to snatch it because it was already His as the eternal Son of God. Or, with Barth,[17] the sense may be that while holding fast that divine equality He accepted also the consequences of His decision to become incarnate in human form.

All these views command support, but there are difficulties. Against the first mentioned, we may doubt, with Kennedy, whether the verb underlying ἁρμαγμός, translated in AV 'robbery', has been correctly understood. It means 'to seize', 'to snatch violently', and it is not permissible to glide into the sense of 'to hold fast'. The second interpretation hardly does justice to the construction of the whole sentence in view of the place of the emphatic word

ἁρμαγμός and the strong adversative which follows. It also minimizes the force of 'highly exalted' in verse 9 which may be translated, 'God did more-than-highly exalt'.

ii. *Res rapienda.* This phrase expresses the view that He was tempted to seize what He did not actually possess, namely, the equality with His Father. This He refused to do, deliberately declining to seek His possession by an act of usurpation, and chose rather to embrace God's will in the humiliation of His incarnation and death. To support this, it is maintained that it is only this understanding of ἁρμαγμός that does justice to the basic idea of its verb ἁρπάζειν, which means 'to snatch violently, to seize', and not 'to hold in possession', 'to hold fast to'.[18] The notion of violent

[p.21]

seizing is apparent in the other uses of the verb.[19] But it is still an open question whether the term means to lay hold upon something which one does not already possess (*res rapienda*). It is still a possibility that it can mean 'to hold something convulsively' as a bandit would seize his booty and so hold on to it. The point at issue in the Pauline context is then, Did Christ, who enjoyed equality with God as His possession, refuse to consider that equality as His prize and to hold on to it in His decision to enter upon His incarnate life; or was the prize something which He could have grasped at and made His own by self-assertion, but He refused to do this?[20]

There is a third view, however. This stems from the connotation of ἁρμαγμός as 'a piece of good fortune', 'a lucky find', 'a treasure trove', as though it were εὕρημα or ἕρμαιον.[21] Bonnard[22] takes the illustration of a spring-board (*tremplin*) with the same general presentation of the opportunity which the pre-existent Christ had before Him. He existed in the 'divine condition' as the unique image and glory of God, but refused to utilize this favoured position to exploit His privileges and assert Himself in opposition to His Father. It remains an open question whether the windfall had already been seized and is waiting to be used, or whether it had still to be appropriated.

But it seems more in keeping with the tenor of this view to interpret ἁρμαγμός as the actual holding of a privilege which opens up the future opportunity of advantage, if only the possessor will exploit it to his own profit. This the pre-incarnate Christ refused to do. He already had as His personal possession the unique dignity of His place within the Godhead, a vantage-point from which He might have attained that equality with God which the later verses show to be the bestowal and honour of the name of Lord. He possessed the divine equality *de jure* because He existed eternally in the 'form of God':[23] He could have seized the glory and honour of the acknowledgement of that office *de facto*, if He had grasped His sovereignty by self-assertion and desire for power in His own right. He considered the appropriation of divine honour *in this way*

[p.22]

an intolerable temptation. He rejected it and chose rather to be proclaimed as equal with God as 'the Lord' by accepting His destiny as the incarnate and humiliated One.[24]

From this understanding of ἁρμαγμός we are able to appreciate the background of the apostle's reference. It seems clear that the background here is the contrast between the two Adams.[25] The probability of this is confirmed by the negative structure of the sentence: 'He

did not count it a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself.' This unusual wording suggests that Paul has also in view the instance and example of another person who *did* count equality with God as a desirable thing, and from a favoured position *did* aspire to his own glory.[26]

The 'form of God', if taken in the sense of 'the image and glory of God', describes the state of the first man at his creation (Gn. i. 26, 27).[27] Adam reflected the glory of the eternal Son of God who from all eternity was 'with God' (Jn. i. 1, xvii. 5) as the express image of the ineffable and invisible God (Heb. i. 3). In His pre-existent 'form' He is seen as the visible representation of the divine glory (Is. vi. 1-5; cf. Jn. xii. 41). The first ἁρμαγμός was attempted as Adam, 'the son of God' (Lk. iii. 38), and made a little lower than God (Ps. viii. 5, RV), asserted himself to be 'as God' (see Gn. iii. 5), i.e. to be lord in his own right and independently of God his Maker. He was given a relative dominion (Gn. i. 28, ii. 19, 20), but he grasped at the specious promise of an absolute lordship, *eritis sicut deus,* which was held out to him by the serpent if only he would assert himself in rivalry and disobedience against God.[28] But he failed in this senseless aspiration. The Son of God, however, faced with a parallel temptation, refused to use His favoured position to exploit His privileges and assert Himself in opposition to His Father. In contrast to the first Adam, He refused the opportunity to rival God, and chose instead the way of obedience as the pathway to His lordship.

d. ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν

It is this phrase which has given its name to the celebrated theory

[p.23]

of k*enosis.*[29] By this term, in its classical formulation, we are to understand that in becoming Man Christ divested Himself of the relative attributes of diety, *viz,* omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence, and even suffered the extinction of His eternal self-consciousness.[30] On this view the secondary object of the verb, He 'emptied himself' (RV) which is the correct translation of ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, is the μορφή Θεοῦ which He possessed in eternity, and which is taken in the sense of His nature as a Member of the Godhead. Later writers, even those who accept a modified form of the kenotic theory, agree that this cannot be the correct meaning, and is open to damaging theological objections as well as to criticisms on exegetical grounds.[31] Linguistically the self-emptying is related to the taking of the form of a servant, and the verse teaches nothing about the abandonment of the divine attributes.[32]

What exactly is meant by the words, He 'emptied himself'? Of what did the eternal Son of God divest Himself in His momentous decision not to cling to, or clutch at, equality with the Father? There are certain definable consequences of His pre-incarnate choice,[33] and this is clearly implied in the structure of the sentence: 'He did not... but', where the strong adversative ἀλλά, translated 'but', prepares for the statement of what the incarnation meant to our Lord on the positive side. On the one hand, He refused to succumb to the temptation represented by the term ἁρμαγμός and on the other hand, He followed the inevitable consequence of the choice not to exploit the prize within His grasp. This consequence is described by the words of the verb under consideration.

i. For those who interpret ἁρμαγμός as His possession which He voluntarily let go, and find the phrase 'equality with God' as a synonym of this possession, the consequence follows that He was willing to forgo, for the purpose and the period of the incarnation, the equality He had

known from all eternity. Lightfoot so regards the meaning of the word: *'Though* He pre-existed in the form of God, yet He did not look upon equality with God as a prize which must not slip from His grasp, *but* He emptied Himself, divested

[p.24]

Himself (not of His divine nature, for this was impossible), but of the glories, the prerogatives, of Deity.'[34] This He did by taking the form of a servant.

ii. We have earlier noted the view that ἁρμαγμός has been taken to refer to a prize which lay within the reach of the pre-existent Son but which was not His actual possession. This has been identified with the 'equality with God', which was not His possession in His pre-incarnate existence. It was rather a future possibility which He declined to accept by seizure, but which was realized as He accepted the obedient role of the incarnate One, who was at the last exalted to the rank or status of equality with God. On this interpretation He cannot have emptied Himself of what He did not then possess, and those commentators who adhere to this view of ἁρμαγμός as *res rapienda* have to look elsewhere for their explanation of the content of the verb κενοῦν. They find it in the 'conditions of glory and majesty that inevitably pertained to his divine nature'.[35] Or alternatively, they submit that the verb may be taken in the sense of a general antithesis to the temptation of snatching at the equality which He refused. 'He poured out Himself' is the way that W. Warren takes it, teaching that He did not consider the equality with God as an opportunity of self-aggrandizement, but effaced all thought of self and poured out His fullness to enrich others.[36]

Allied to this suggestion is the further idea that the phrase ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, which is found nowhere else in Greek,[37] and is grammatically harsh, may go back to a Semitic original in Isaiah liii. 12, 'he poured out his soul unto death' (RV). Warren, it appears, first drew attention to this verse, and his idea has since then been developed by later writers.[38] The novelty of this view lies in its implication. It removes the Christological verse completely from the doctrine of the incarnation and concentrates all attention on the cross. It sees the death of Jesus as the supreme display of the outpouring of Him who so loved the race that He emptied Himself to the uttermost in self-giving and sacrifice for man's redemption. On this view the text says nothing about the pre-

[p.25]

incarnate choice of the Son and its cost to Him in eternity; and the structure of the Hymn is broken by mentioning the death of the cross before the circumstances of the incarnate life have been given.[39] How far we are to expect formal consistency and logical, historical order is the issue here.[40] If the Hymn, however, *does* proceed in orderly fashion from the pre-existence to the earthly life and from the earthly to the exalted states, we must limit the choice behind the words to that of the pre-incarnate One who accepted in His mission to earth the abnegation and renunciation of His heavenly glory.[41]

The apostle did not make such a sharp distinction between the Lord's choice to become incarnate and the inevitable consequence of that choice in His obedience unto death. It was His *sacrifice,* which commenced at His incarnation and was consummated at His passion, that was the impressive thing. Here, as in 2 Corinthians viii. 9; Galatians iv. 4, 5; Romans viii. 3; and Hebrews ii. 14-16, x. 5 ff., the two thoughts are not to be kept rigidly separate. The conclusion then is this. In order to fulfil the divine will for human redemption, He emptied

Himself of that native glory which He enjoyed as the unique image and likeness of His Father from all eternity. He was prepared to lay aside that splendour and accept the humble conditions and obscurity of the earthly life as the Servant of God in whose form He appeared. And 'the form of the servant' was a decisive step to that final offering of Himself when on Calvary He did, to the fullest extent, 'pour out His soul unto death'.

e. μορφὴ δούλου

Attention is drawn to the use of δοῦλος in this phrase by the fact that this is the only place in the New Testament where the word is applied to Christ. The reasons for its employment in this context are variously given. Lightfoot suggests that δοῦλος is used instead of ἄνθρωπος (which is the obvious parallel with Θεός of verse 6) because the former is the stronger word, and it contrasts with the –ύριος of verse 11: 'He, who is Master (κύριος) of all, became the

[p.26]

slave of all'.[42] Dibelius sees here only an example of the way in which the writer varies the expressions on the ground of poetic euphony.[43]

Much more credible is the view that the direct background here is the picture of the Servant in Isaiah's prophecy, and this derivation is accepted by the overwhelming majority of commentators.[44] The most apparent objection,[45] that is the word here is δοῦλος and not παῖς as in the LXX, is not a serious one for the following reasons:

i. C. F. Burney has shown that 'both Greek terms (δοῦλος, παῖς) are indifferently used in LXX to render the עֶבֶד of Deutero-Isaiah, but the preference is for παῖς (δοῦλος in 49. 3, 5; παῖς in 42. 1, 49. 6, 50. 10, 52. 13); and it is παῖς which is used of our Lord as the ideal Servant in Acts 3. 13, 4. 27, 30'.[46] While, therefore, παῖς θεοῦ would have been the more usual phrase, assuming that the derivation is from Isaiah's prophecy, it cannot be said that δοῦλος is wholly inappropriate.

ii. This conclusion is endorsed by the variation in textual tradition. In Isaiah lii. 13 Aquila reads ὁ δοῦλος in place of ὁ παῖς. Moreover, the verb δουλεύειν is used in the LXX of Isaiah liii at verse ii, which suggests that there is no great distinction between the two terms.

iii. If we may, with any degree of plausibility, find a key to the understanding of Philippians ii. 5-11 in Isaiah's Servant poems, it will explain not only the use of δοῦλος here but the entire phrase μορφὴ δούλου. Otto Michel and L. Cerfaux[47] have drawn attention to the textual tradition underlying Isaiah lii. 14 where the LXX reads τὸ εἶδος and ἡ δόξα. These same Greek words corresponding to מַרְאֵהוּ וְתֹאֲרוֹ recur in liii. 2. Aquila reads for this pair ὅρασις αὐτοῦ καὶ μορφὴ αὐτοῦ in Isaiah lii. 14 and there is a variant reading of μορφή at liii. 2. Michel suggests that both Aquila and Philippians ii. 7 refer to an older Greek translation of the Isaiah text. This may sound like a piece of special pleading, but if there is any justification in the view that we are reading here in Philippians ii. 7 a version in Greek of the Old Testament picture

[p.27]

of the Lord's Servant, a flood of light is thrown on the enigmatic phrase 'the form of a servant'. Even if this proposal is not fully acceptable,[48] we are still entitled to hold that Paul has the Servant-idea in mind, but prefers the word δοῦλος because of the implicit antithesis of that word with κύριος.[49]

The older commentators (e.g. Calvin[50]) treated the entire verse as the vivid record of our Lord's true humanity. He comes to share our human nature in all its frailty and finitude (Rom. viii. 3; Heb. ii. 7, 14), and to enter upon His earthly life circumscribed by the restrictions imposed upon Him by that nature, with the glorious exception that He was without sin.

The newer view which traces a linguistic nexus between the Hymn and Isaiah lii-liii emphasizes the reality of His coming in human form, but underlines also the mission and destiny upon which He embarked. δοῦλος has the plain meaning of 'slave', but it would be erroneous here to give it a social connotation.[51] The title rather is one of dignity as Lohmeyer has pointed out,[52] and has an honoured application to such servants of God as Moses (Ex. xiv. 31; Nu. xii. 7; Ps. cv. 26) and the prophets (Am. in. 7; Je. xxv. 4; Dn. ix. 6, 10), who are seen as receiving a commission of service from God Himself. In Isaiah lii-liii it is the Servant of God *par excellence,* and points forward to Him who laid aside the glory of His native sphere with the Father and assumed the office of One who is both suffering Servant and ideal Man.[53]

f. καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος

The meaning of σχῆμα is outward appearance or form,[54] and when used with the verb εὑρίσκεσθαι, it denotes the external appearance of the incarnate Son as He showed Himself to those who saw Him 'in the days of his flesh' (Heb. v. 7). The thought of the Hymn is thus taken a stage further. The preceding verse has stated His entrance upon the scene of time and the official or functional destiny which He came to fulfil. Now there is unmistakable witness to His full, personal humanity in the declaration that, in the eyes of those who saw His incarnate life, He was 'as a man'.[55] The

[p.28]

present verse, then, serves two purposes. It states, without equivocation, the reality of His human nature. That He was truly Man and not only, as the preceding words 'in the likeness of men' might suggest, that He became 'like' a man, is made very plain by the phrasing here.[56] The second purpose is to carry forward the life of the Lord, and lead up to His humiliation on the cross.[57] Verse 7 refers to the point of His entry upon His earthly career in the offices He came to fulfil. This verse has that earthly life in view, throughout the time when He 'went in and out' among men (Acts i. 21), and so it is a window into the circumstances of His incarnate existence; for the whole of that existence is expressed in terms of 'humiliation'.

We are now ready to enquire into the meaning of that κένωσις which the eternal Son of God underwent in order that He might discharge the mission of redemption for which He came to earth. If the foregoing argument has been on the right lines, there can be little doubt as to the scope and significance of His self-emptying and humiliation. In the pre-incarnate choice He made there was inevitably bound up the limitation of His glory. In His incarnation He accepted the full consequences of that decision, so that to all outward appearance He came 'as Man to men' (*Diognetus,* vii. 4), as the Gospel records testify. His true stature was concealed in the weakness of His mortality, and His glory was veiled in His humility.[58] The κένωσις

was this act of self-abnegation in which His native glory, which He had from all eternity enjoyed (Jn. xvii. 5, 24) as being in the form of God, was hidden in His becoming Man; and the state of His humanity is known as His self-chosen state of humiliation (ἐταπέινωσεν ἑαυτὸν of verse 8) because this was the price He paid for the curtailment of His splendour.

The truth is expressed in the lines of a Scottish paraphrase:

> 'His greatness He for us abased,
> For us His glory veiled;
> In human likeness dwelt on earth,
> His majesty concealed.'

[p.29]

It now becomes apparent that there is no foundation here for any other theory of κένωσις. Paul does not make the μορφὴ Θεοῦ and the μορφὴ δούλου mutually exclusive as though he implied that Christ exchanged His divine condition for His human existence. He did not cease to be God in becoming Man, and there is a strong consensus of modern scholarship to buttress this orthodox conclusion, which Karl Barth expresses vigorously, 'He is God continuously equally in the obscurity of the form of a servant'.[60] If the question is pressed, What is the exact nature of His 'self-emptying'?, the answer would be supplied in His readiness to assume our nature and appear in 'the form of a servant'.[61] This, as we observed earlier, is the exegetical connection between ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν and μορφὴ δούλου λαβών. He emptied Himself in that He took the servant's form; and this necessarily involved an eclipsing of His glory as the divine image in order that He might come, in human flesh, as the image of God incarnate. He condescends to come 'in the flesh' (1 Jn. iv. 2; 2 Jn. 7), taking our nature upon Him and fulfilling the role of the last Adam as the perfect Man in whom the image of true Manhood is to be seen.[62] So He is described in the New Testament as 'the last Adam' (1 Cor. xv. 45), 'the second man' (1 Cor. xv. 47) of whom Adam was a τύπος (Rom. v. 14), 'the new man' whose image is renewed in His people (Col. iii. 10; cf. 2 Cor. iii. i8; 1 Cor. xv. 49; Rom. viii. 29).[63]

g. ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν, γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ

It has already been suggested that the scope of the verb ἐταπείνωσεν, 'he humbled himself', covers His entire life upon earth in its devotion to the Father and the acceptance of our human lot.[64] It is clear that humiliation and obedience are intimately associated, for it is the Lord's willingness to be obedient to His Father's will and purpose that leads Him to accept the life of humiliation, even to the extent of the final obedience of the death of the cross.

The dominant motif is the coupling of humility and obedience

[p.30]

which is evidently drawn from rabbinical sources, as recent studies have shown.[65] We should not miss, however, the eminent suitability of the thought in the light of Paul's pastoral concern for the Philippians. He is anxious to impress upon them the need for humility in their church's life (ii. 3); and, at the same time, to call them to an obedient submission to his own apostolic authority for their corporate good.[66] What finer enforcement of this appeal for the

conduct which befitted those who were 'in Christ' (verse 5) could there be than this reminder of their Lord who was both humble and obedient? The introductory sentence of the Hymn confirms this. It runs literally, 'Let this mind be among you, as also in Christ Jesus'. There is no verb in the second part of the sentence, and we should supply, not the verb 'to be' (as in AV, RV), but the same verb as in the first part. So the exhortation means, 'think this way among yourselves, which also you think in Christ Jesus', i.e. 'as members of His Church'. The conduct they show to one another in the fellowship of the Church should be such as would be expected of those who are 'in Christ', which is the famous Pauline formula that can often be tantamount to 'in the fellowship of His people'.[67] To this community of Christ's people, harassed by intense strife and where pride has raised its ugly head, Paul would show, in the picture of an obedient and humiliated Lord, how sadly it was failing to appreciate His lowliness of mind and contradicting His spirit of obedience to the divine will.[68]

The obedience of Christ is a cardinal feature of His atoning work.[69] The whole of His life was controlled by His obedient acceptance of the Father's good pleasure so that the confession with which He came into the world ('Lo, I come... to do thy will, O God', Heb. x. 7 f.) was turned into His daily experience. He could say at every turn, 'I do always those things that please him' (Jn. viii. 29; cf. Jn. iv. 34, v. 30, vi. 38). It is this undeflected submission to the divine will and eager embracing of it which gives proof of His divine-human nature,[70] and prepares the way for the 'infinite value' which attaches to the sufferings of Calvary. In this sense we may approve the well-known dictum of Bernard that

[p.31]

'it was not the death that pleased, but the will to die', as stating the spiritual principle which gives value to His work.[71] It provides also the *rationale* of the work of redemption, for it reverses the primal disobedience of Adam, and offers to God, on our behalf, the unheard-of perfect acceptance of God's will, even unto death.

The solemn words *'unto death'* are the climax of the first half of the Hymn, coming, as they do, at the end of the third strophe. They signify the utmost limit of the Son's humiliation. As there is no greater love than that which is shown in the sacrifice of a man's life for his friends (Jn. xv. 13), so there is no more exemplary obedience than the acceptance of the Father's will in the receiving of the cup of suffering and death. This 'will to die' in utter submission to God's age-old, redeeming purpose marks Him out as the true God-become-Man; for, as Lohmeyer says in a brilliant insight, only a divine being can accept death as *obedience*;[72] for ordinary men it is a necessity, to which they are appointed by their mere humanity (Heb. ix. 27).

There is perhaps an even deeper significance in these words. Lohmeyer has pointed out how in Jewish theology death is shown as a monarch, or even as a kingdom itself. So it may be that our Lord's obedience unto death is like an entrance into this realm, a kind of *descensus ad inferos*.[73] This thought of death, which is in places almost personified as a demon power which enslaves humanity, is firmly embedded in the New Testament.[74] If we are right in referring the utter limit of His humiliation to His becoming enslaved by the tyranny of death, it would take the scope of His identification with us in our sin to the furthest extent; and there are strong grounds for this view.[75]

In what seems to be an extra line in the metrical arrangement of the Hymn[76] the apostle completes the thought of the death to which the Lord became subject. It was 'the death of the

cross'. This phrase must be understood from two points of view. It would have special meaning for the Philippian readers who were resident in a Roman city where revulsion against this form of capital punishment would be very strong. In giving expression to his

[p.32]

feelings about crucifixion, Cicero uses words which convey something of the horror of the cross—*crudelissimum taeterrimumque supplicium;* he also says, 'Far be the very name of a cross, not only from the body, but even from the thought, the eyes, the ears of Roman citizens'.[77] To the Roman mind there could be no greater object of shame and scorn than the picture of a God upon a cross![78]

And this attitude of disgust was shared by the Jew, albeit for different reasons.[79] For him, death by crucifixion came under the rubric of Deuteronomy xxi. 23, 'he that is hanged is accursed of God' (cf. Gal. iii. 13), for it meant that the victim was 'outside the pale of Israel; that he was *ḥe⌃rem*',[80] i.e. under a ban of excommunication from God's covenant. If the messianic interpretation of the Servant poems in Palestinian Judaism is accepted, then it was the manner of Jesus' death on a Roman cross that was the real scandal to the orthodox Jewish mind;[81] for the crucified is under the sentence of divine wrath.[82] Christ's humiliation to the extent of the accursed cross is, then, His uttermost self-giving. From the glory of His Father's throne He enters upon an historical existence. He identifies Himself with men and is obedient to His destiny as the Servant of God. He yields Himself still more to the yoke of submission and to the curse of death by crucifixion. This is the lowest point in the dramatic *parabola*[83] of this Hymn as 'these three stanzas lead, in one great sweep, from the highest height to the deepest depth, from the light of God to the darkness of death' (Lohmeyer).[84]

h. διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεος αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωεσεν

Even to the reader of the English version it is noticeable that with this sentence and verse there is a distinct change in language and thought. At this juncture the role of chief Actor in the drama of incarnation and redemption is transferred. Attention has, up to this point, been focused on the self-humbling and obedience of the divine Son with reflexive pronouns in verses 7 and 8 contributing to this emphasis. Now it is God the Father who, as it were, takes the initiative and becomes the principal Actor in the new

[p.33]

sequences of the second section of the Hymn. This new beginning is even more obvious in the Greek where the language, which up to verse 9 has been terse and economical with participial constructions (five in number) instead of main verbs, becomes ornate and full of echoes of Old Testament Semitic constructions and allusions. In place of the pronouns there are proper nouns ('God', who is mentioned by name for the first time, 'Jesus', 'Jesus Christ', 'God the Father'); and main verbs ('highly exalted', 'given') are followed by subordinate clauses with the copulative 'and' twice, rather than participles.

However much the two parts of the Hymn are different in style and syntax they are complementary in one important respect. The humiliation of the incarnate One, who is the 'divine Hero' of the first three stanzas, is followed by His exaltation; and this close connection is the main thing which binds the two parts together. The pattern which is followed is one which is a favourite theme with Jewish and rabbinical writers,[85] and is found

very clearly expressed in the teaching of Jesus Himself (see Mt. xviii. 4, xxiii. 12; Lk. xiv. 11, xviii. 14; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 7; Phil. iv. 12). The obedience of the Son is crowned by this act of exaltation in which the Father raises Him from the dead, and elevates Him to the place of honour. The transition from humiliation to exaltation is denoted by 'wherefore', which prepares for what follows by introducing the result of His obedient submission unto death.[86] Because He was so obedient He is now honoured by the Father's act of power.

The verb ὑπερυψοῦν, translated 'highly exalted',[87] is generally taken as covering both the resurrection which is tacitly assumed, and the ascension. It is the second aspect of Christ's victory over death which is more prominent, however.[88] God has exalted Him not only by raising Him from the dead but by installing Him, following His ascension, in the seat of power and might. This teaching is found to be confirmed in Acts ii. 33; cf. Acts v. 31.

The exact sense of the verb needs a more careful definition, however. Is the meaning that the Lord resumes the glory which

[p.34]

He laid aside when He condescended to come in 'the form of a servant',[89] or is the prefix ὑπέρ to be given its full force with the idea that He is exalted to a place which He had not reached previously?[90] The second alternative appears more in keeping with the drift of the Hymn's theology, although we must be on our guard not to overpress the significance of the verb.[91] What is meant is on these lines. He who stooped so low to the humiliation of death is now lifted up to the glorious rank of equality with God. The elevation which followed is not in regard to His nature or His inherent place within the Godhead.[92] It is rather the conferring of a new 'function' and the ascription to Him of that which could only be His after the submission and sacrifice of His earthly life. This humiliation followed directly upon His refusal to be exalted in any other way than the way which was in keeping with His Father's design and purpose. To corroborate this we may recall the teaching of Hebrews ii. 9 which shows that it is only after the suffering of death, that is, His voluntary humiliation, that the Son is crowned with glory and honour (cf. Lk. xxiv. 26); and Hebrews v. 8, 9 in which the 'perfection' of Christ as our High Priest could only be achieved as He first 'learned obedience' by His sufferings.[93]

i. ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τό ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα

This honour now conferred upon Him is expressed by the bestowal of 'a name', i.e. a character and an office which He chose to assume not by exploiting His own privilege and insisting upon His 'right', but by self-abnegation which was prepared to await the Father's gift. The contrast between these alternatives is very forcefully presented by the verbs οὐχ ἁρπαγμόν ἡγεῖσθαι and ἐχαρίσατο. He declined the opportunity to advance Himself by an assertion of His own 'right', and now after His career of self-humbling and death there comes to Him in the Father's good pleasure[94] the very thing He might have grasped; the 'name which is above every name', which in this context can only be that of 'Lord'.[95] The root meaning of this term κύριος denotes rulership

[p.35]

based on competent and authoritative power, the ability to dispose of what one possesses.[96] It is essentially a *functional* term;[97] and this endorses the conclusion we reached about the verb 'highly exalted', in which the prefix corresponds to the preposition in the phrase the 'name which is above (ὑπέρ) every name'. The place of dignity He enjoyed and the supreme name He received are both expressive of His new office.[98] Following the resurrection and ascension He is installed as κύριος (Acts ii. 36; Heb. i. 4, viii. 1) by divine fiat and proclaimed as 'Son of God *with power'* (Rom. i. 4); and this is a function and name of God Himself. κύριος recalls the LXX translation of the covenant name Yahweh, and proclaims that Jesus Christ is installed in the place which properly belongs to God and exercises the sovereign authority which God most rightly possesses. Of this fact there are, according to the subsequent verses, two outstanding proofs.

j. ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσηται ὅτι ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρός·

The two final strophes of the Hymn are devoted to the praise of the Name which ranks above all other names. In a scene which is majestic in its setting and in those stanzas which describe the universal scope of cosmic worship, it is remarkable that we are confronted with the human, earthly name of the Redeemer. It is in the name of 'Jesus'[99] that every knee bows, and it is the same familiar name that all the suppliant worshippers confess as supreme Lord. The setting is supra-historical,'[100] the language is exalted, but the divine Being, now glorified, is Jesus the Nazarene in the character of His historical-redemptive ministry.[101]

The first reference to His sovereign authority, which is guaranteed by the possession of His name, is the universal submission He receives. 'Every knee' to Him is bent in obedient subjection (cf. Phil. iii. 2I). In further definition of the words 'every knee'

[p.36]

there follows the triadic phrase 'of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth'. These words are represented in the Greek by three adjectives with connecting particles. The AV and RV take the adjectives to refer to implied neuter nouns: hence 'things', a translation for which Lightfoot argues. But it is more likely that the reference is a personal one as in the parallels of Ignatius and a third-century magical papyrus.[102] It is intelligent beings, in heaven, on earth and in the underworld, who bend the knee in obeisance and worship.[103]

Liturgical expression is joined to cultic action as we read of the confession of every mouth: 'Jesus Christ is Lord'. This second reference to the obedience of cosmic authorities confirms beyond a doubt that Isaiah xlv. 23 is being quoted.[104] In the prophetic context the unique greatness of Israel's God is proclaimed; and the application of this text to the Church's Lord (as in Romans xiv. 11) provides unmistakable evidence of His pre-eminent position at the Father's right hand and His receiving such glory and worship as can only fittingly be ascribed to God Almighty. Nonetheless, He occupies His exalted station 'to the glory of God the Father'. His throne is no rival to His Father's. On the contrary, as He has overcome the temptation to rival God and to aspire to an exalted place, He is accorded by the Father that honour of co-regency which is pictorially expressed as sitting on His Father's throne (Rev. iii. 21; Heb. i. 8-14; cf. Ps. cx. 1; Polycarp, *Epistle to the Philippians,* ii. 1). He lives and reigns in

heaven (1 Cor. XV. 25), not as a δεύτερος Θεός, but a sharer in the glory of that full equality with God which is His Father's gift to His obedient Son. And such is the Father's will (1 Cor. xv. 27a; Eph. i. 20-23) until the consummation of all things when God shall be 'all in all' (1 Cor. xv. 28).

This raises the question of the time of the worship elaborately described in verses 10, 11. The universal acclamation in which angels, men and devils join may either be contemporaneous with the church age, following the Lord's ascension; or still future, at the time of *Hisparousia.* Most of the MSS read the future indicative,

[p.37]

which supports the second alternative. On this reading He will not be acclaimed as universal Lord until His second coming. But, in the context of the Hymn, we should almost certainly prefer the reading of the aorist subjunctive. 'The cosmic homage is the effect of the exaltation of Christ, which means his heavenly enthronement';[105] and this has taken place on His return to His Father's presence, as in Revelation v. 1-14. From a cultic standpoint, then, which views His glory *sub specie aeternitatis,* His dominion is already acknowledged and His triumph over all His foes complete.

His enthronement has a number of ramifications. He receives in this way the worship which the first Adam, according to rabbinic thought,'[106] had and later forfeited because of his vain designs to rival God. He receives a universal dominion, like the Son of man in Daniel vii. 14, 27, and angelic worship (Heb. i. 6), so that it is as the Lord of the world that He is confessed, and not simply the Lord of the Church. If this is the case, the confession, 'Jesus Christ is Lord', which scholars generally accept as the earliest Christian creed,[107] represents an important factor in preparing for missionary preaching beyond the limits of Jewish Christianity. It is a distinctive pointer to the universal scope of the gospel, for the lordship which is proclaimed is the lordship over all created life, and not simply His rule in the Church. And the final note recalls us to the purpose of His pre-incarnate choice, His advent and His obedience unto death. 'Christ died and lived again that he might be Lord' (Rom. xiv. 9, RV); and in this office where He is installed at the Father's pleasure He is the living token of a full reconciliation between God and redeemed humanity.[108] So the last word is the most impressive. The final word is 'Father', the Father of Jesus whose pre-mundane will the Son accepted and whose mission of redemption He carried through and to whose glory He is now enthroned in power and honour. It is by that choice and mission and victory, corresponding to the three 'states' of God's Son, that the Father of Jesus becomes the Father of redeemed humanity; and by the pre-existent Son, the humiliated Servant and exalted Lord, God and the world are reconciled.

[p.38]

IV. CONCLUSION

We have traced the course of one of the earliest Christian creeds with its high doctrine of the Person and work of the Church's Lord. Such a study leads naturally, not only to an enhanced appreciation of who He is and what He did, but also to a desire to worship Him. It may indeed be said that this is the acid test of a true Christology.[1] Does it lead the enquirer to bow down and confess, My Lord and my God? James Denney reminds us that 'the Church's confession of faith should be *sung,* not signed'.[2] And so some verses based on our study may fittingly

sum up our conclusion. They express the three 'states' of Christ, and present Him according to the pattern of Paul's Hymn.

'My heart and voice I raise,
To spread Messiah's praise;
Messiah's praise let all repeat;
The universal Lord,
By whose almighty word
Creation rose in form complete.

A servant's form He wore,
And in His body bore
Our dreadful curse on Calvary:
He like a victim stood,
And poured His sacred blood,
To set the guilty captives free.

But soon the Victor rose
Triumphant o'er His foes,
And led the vanquished host in chains:
He threw their empire down,
His foes compelled to own
O'er all the great Messiah reigns.'[3]

APPENDIX OF NOTES

I. INTRODUCTION (pp. 7, 8)

1. A. B. Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ,* 1876, 4th ed. reprint, Grand Rapids, 1955, p. 8.

2. E. Lohmeyer, *Die Brief an die Philipper* in the Meyer series, Göttingen, 11th ed. revised by W. Schmauch, 1956, p. 90. This title is hereafter abbreviated as *Commentary.*

3. Nothing has 'been more characteristic of recent research than the gradual detection of early kerygmatic fragments in the New Testament, in which the original eschatological meaning of the christological titles used in the *kerygma* is still apparent, and is clearly distinct from the later metaphysical use'. J. M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus,* London, 1959, pp. 111, 112, quoting Phil. ii. 5-11 as illustration.

4. On this section as a confession, cf. A. Seeberg, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit,* 1903, pp. 181, 182. Other places where a 'confessional' theme has been detected in the New Testament are Acts viii. 16, 378, xi. 17, 20, xvi. 31, xix. 5; Rom. x. 9; 1 Cor. xi. 3; Col. i. 15-20, ii. 6; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 18-22.
     There are full discussions of early Christian creeds in O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions,* E. T. London, 1949 and J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds,* London, I 950, chapter 1, 'Credal Elements in the New Testament', pp. 1-29.

5. Cf. A. M. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors,* London, 1940, p. 101.

6. The use and significance of κύριος (=מר) as a Christological title is discussed by L. Cerfaux in his contribution *s.v.* to *Supplément au Dictionnaire de Ia Bible,* Fasc. xxiv, cols. 200-228, Paris, 1950. See also F. C. Grant, *An Introduction to New Testament Thought,* New York-Nashville, 1950, pp. 130-137; N. Geldenhuys, *Supreme Authority,* London, 1953, pp. 31 ff.

7. Cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *op. cit.,* p. 18. The psalm as a *carmen Christi* is a forerunner of the antiphonal hymn sung to Christ as God which Pliny later found in the Bithynian churches. *Ep. ad Traianurn,* xcvi: 'stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum

invicem....' Lightfoot interprets the words *secum invicem* as implying antiphonal singing, but remarks that *carmen* does not necessarily presuppose a metrical composition or hynm. See his edition of *Ignatius, The Apostolic Fathers,* pt. II, vol. I, London, 1889, p. 31. On the other hand, this sense is given to *carmen* in Tertullian, *De Orat.* xxvii; cf. Eusebius, *H.E.* III, xxxiii, I; V, xxviii, 5. Antiphonal singing of psalms was part of Jewish cultic practice. Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy,* Oxford, 1925, p. 75 and O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship,* London, 1953, pp. 21, 22.
     The evidence for these early Christian *carmina* may be found in Acts xvi. 25; Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16, while examples have been detected in such passages as Eph. v. 14, the canticles of the early chapters of Luke (i, ii), in the Pastoral Epistles (e.g. 1 Tim. iii. 16: cf. 2

Tim. ii. 12, 13; Tit. in. 4-7) and in the Apocalypse. Some of the hymn fragments in the Apocalypse may be derived from the worship of Hellenistic synagogues (e.g. iv. 8, 11, xi. 17, 18, xiv. 7, xv. 3, 4), while other references are to hymns of distinctively Christian origin (e.g. v. 9, 10, 12, 13, xii. 10-12, xix. 1, 2, 5, 6-8).

Compare also Heb. vii. 26-28 on which J. Schneider, *The Letter to the Hebrews,* E.T. Grand Rapids, 1957, p. 67, says, It is 'a piece that has the sound of a hymn... in the solemn style of a cultic song of praise'.

The New Testament passages which can be associated with early Christian worship are collected in F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica,* I; *Reliquiae liturgicae vetustissae,* part i, Paris, 1900, pp. 1-51.

8. E. Lohmeyer describes it as the so-called *locus classicus* of Pauline and early Christian Christology. See his study *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil.* 2, 5-11, Heidelberg, 1928, pp. 4, 89. This title is hereafter abbreviated as *KJ.*

9. J. Jeremias, 'Zur Gedankenfuhrung in den paulinischen Briefen: Der Christushymnus, Phil. 2. 6-11' in *Studia Paulina* in honorem J. de Zwaan, edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik, Haarlem, 1953, p. 154: '...ist der *älteste Beleg* für die die gasamte Christologie der Folgezeit grundlegend bestimmende *Lehre von den drei Seinsweisen Christi*'.

[p.41]

II. THE FORM AND AUTHORSHIP OF PHILIPPIANS II. 5-11 (pp. 8-16)

1. *KJ.* Tribute to this epoch-making study is made by most subsequent writers on this section of Paul's letters. In a review which appeared in the *Exp. T.*, XL, No. II, Aug. 1929, pp. 519, 520, J. Moffatt praised the monograph as 'one of the most brilliant and stimulating contributions to the discussion (of the Lordship of Christ)... that have been made for long'. See also the comments of J. Jeremias, *art. cit.* in *Studia Paulina,* p. 153; and O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments,* Tübingen, 1957, p. 179 note I: 'Alle weitere exegetische Untersuchung dieses Textes fusst auf dieser grundlegenden Arbeit'.

Since Lohmeyer, the drift of modern discussion is excellently and comprehensively assessed by P. Henry in his article *Kénose* in *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible,* Paris, 1950, Fasc. xxiv, cols. 7-161; and E. Käsemann, 'Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2, 5-11' in *Zeitschrjft für Theologie und Kirche,* 47, 1950, 313-360. There is a summary of earlier views in Vincent Taylor, *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching,* London, 1958, chapter V.

2. A. Deissmann, *St. Paul,* E.T. London, 1912, p. 169; cf. K. Grayston, *The Epistles to the Galatians and to the Philippians,* London, 1957, pp.91, 92.

3. H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl,* Bonn, 1926, p. 178.

4. 'L'hymne se clôt comme ii a commencé, en Dieu', comments Henry, *loc. cit.,* col. 37.

5. Lohmeyer, *Commentary,* p. 91.

6. Deissmann, *op. cit.,* p. 170.

7. P. Bonnard, *L'Épître de saint Paul aux Philippiens,* in the series *Commentaire du Nouveau Testament,* Paris, 1950, p. 47.

8. A. M. Hunter, *op. cit.,* p. 47. For the metrical aspects of the verses see Henry, *loc. cit.,* col. 10 and in general the article 'Die Bedeutung der Kolornetrie für das NT' by R. Schütz in *Z.N.T.W.,* xxi, 1922, pp. 162-184, especially pp. 182-184: 'Die religiöse Sprache des Alterums war keine prosaische, sondern eine poetische' (p. 182).

In Phil. ii 5-11 the most noteworthy features are:

[p.42]

Examples of synonymous parallelism:
θεοῦ-θεῷ; θανάτου in verse 8; ὄνομα in verses 9, 10;
ἀνθρώπων-ἄνθρωπος; πᾶν-πᾶσα.

Examples of antithetic parallelism:
μορφῇ θεοῦ-μορφὴν δούλου; ὑπάρχων-γενόμενος; ἐταπείνωσεν-ὑπερύψωσεν.

Example of assonance: δοῦλος-κύριος.

Henry's conclusion is expressed in the sentence, 'L'ensemble de ces traits révéle une composition soignée, d'une rhétorique presque recherchée.'

9. The strangeness of the word ἁρπαγμός has led to a conjectural emendation. Ἄπραγμον is proposed for ἀπραγμόν. There is no evidence to support this transposing of the letters. For details see E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology,* E.T. London, 1955, p. 284, who refers to F. Kattenbusch's article 'Ἅρπαμόν? Ἄπραγμον! Phil. 2, 6 Em Beitrag zur paulinischen Christologie' in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* civ, 1932, pp. 373 ff. See also M. Goguel, *The Birth of Christianity,* E.T. London, 1953, pp. 210-211 note 4 for other references to earlier writers who made this suggested emendation. Goguel concludes, 'I do not think the text can be corrected as there is no ambiguity in the manuscripts and the meaning is perfectly clear.'

10. Correcting the references in Arndt and Gingrich's adaptation of Bauer's *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament,* Cambridge, 1957, p. 849.

11. G. Heinzelmann, *Der Brief an die Philipper* in the series *Das Neue Testament Deutsch,* Göttingen, 1955, p. 93.

12. A. M. Hunter, *op. cit.,* p. 48.

13. W. K. L. Clarke, *New Testament Problems,* London, 1929, p. 146.

14. On early Christian hymns see the references given on p. 40, note 7; also Hunter's chapter IV which is entitled 'Pre-Pauline Christian Hymns'; M. Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach to the Literature of the New Testament,* E.T. London, 1936, pp. 246-254; and H. Leclercq's article Hymnes' in *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie,* vi, 2, Paris, 1925, pp. 2826 ff.

15. *KJ,* p. 9.

16. ʽεὑρίσκεσθαι ὡς... ist nicht nur unpaulinisch, sondern ungriechisch', *KJ,* p. 8.

17. The closest parallel to this 'Dreizeiligkeit' is found in the so-called 'Song of the Star' in Ignatius, *Ephesians,* xix. As a 'Christushymnus', Lohmeyer, *KJ,* p. 64, has divided the Ignatian text into six strophes, improving on C. F. Burney's earlier attempt to divide it into four strophes in Syriac in his work, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel,* Oxford, 1926, pp. 161 ff. In Lohmeyer's analysis strophes II, III, IV, and V are built up of three lines each.

18. Jeremias, *loc. cit.,* p. 154. See also the same author's comments on the triple-action form of early coronation hymns in the New Testament in his *Jesus' Promise to the Nations,* E.T. London, 1958, pp. 38, 39. He describes the three verses of Phil. ii. 9-11 as containing: (a) Elevation in verse 9a (b) Proclamation of the Name above every name in verse 9b (c) Homage to the Enthroned One by gesture and confession in verses 10 f.

19. *KJ,* p. 66: 'em Stück ältester eucharistischer Liturgie... seine palastinensische Herkunft'.

20. The fact that there are no specific Eucharistic motives and characteristic Eucharistic terms such as redemption, the new covenant, fellowship, *parousia* in the psalm was quickly pointed out by H. Windisch in his review of Lohmeyer's treatise in *Theologische Literaturzeitung,* No. 11, 1929, cols. 246-248.
    The tentative proposal of Käsemann, following A. Seeberg, to place the *Sitz im Leben* of the Hymn in a baptismal context is still more unlikely. *Loc. cit.,* p. 360.

21. Cf. Hunter, *op. cit.,* p. 49; J. Héring, *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue,* Paris, 1937, p. 161.

22. *KJ,* pp. 8, 44-46; and his *Commentary,* p. 96 where Lohmeyer gives the reason for the gloss. It 'arises from the paraenetic interest' in the situation of the Philippian church as a persecuted community. The church is thereby to be encouraged by the reminder that its Lord died in humiliation on a cross.

23. E. Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und semen Nachfolgern,* Zürich, 1955, p. 54 note 224; and for the Hymn in the light of 1 Cor. xv. 3-5, pp. 112 ff.

24. E. Peterson regards the omission of the resurrection as 'decisive' for attributing the Hymn to Jewish Christians. See his article, 'La liberation d'Adam de 1' ἀνάγκη' in *Revue Biblique,* LV, 1948, p. 209.

25. That the verb ὑπερυψοῦν in verse 9 refers to the exaltation of Jesus rather than His resurrection is shown by J. G. Davies, *He Ascended into Heaven,* London, 1958, p. 29. His conclusion is that ὑψόω and its intensive form ὑπερυψόω may be taken as the equivalents of ἀναβαίνω. and may, therefore, be understood to refer to the Ascension. Dibelius finds 'the central saving-event' in Hebrews not in the cross or resurrection but in 'the entrance into the heavenly sanctuary' (*der Eingang ins himmlische Heiligtum), Theol. Blätter,* xxi, Jan. 1942, quoted by U. Simon, *Heaven in the Christian Tradition,* London, 1958, p. 267 note 3.

26. The exalted Christ is Lord of the world which renders to Him cosmic submission rather than religious worship. See Lohmeyer, *Commentary,* p. 97 and note 4. The reason why the Church is omitted is given by E. Schweizer in his essay, 'Discipleship and Belief in Jesus as Lord from Jesus to the Hellenistic Church' in *New Testament Studies,* vol. II, No. 2, Nov. 1955, p. 97: Why is the Church not named? 'By the very fact that she sings this hymn, she belongs already to those who bow the knee and confess with their tongues that Jesus Christ is Lord. By the very act of singing she confesses herself to be indeed saved by Him—and that sin itself consists in refusing to sing praises for what he has done, in sinking back again into anxiety, in worshipping the powers and authorities instead of the one name.'

27. R. H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus,* London, 1954, p. 57. This point is strongly made by Lohmeyer and Bonnard, *op. cit.,* p. 48; cf. Käsemann, *loc. cit.,* p. 346. See also V. Taylor, 'The Origin of the Markan Passion Sayings' in *New Testament Studies,* vol. I, No. 4, 1954, pp. 159-167: 'All the indications in the Pauline Epistles, it may be claimed, go to show that the Servant teaching as applied to Christ is pre-Pauline; and, coupled with the evidence of the later New Testament writings, they suggest that by the time Paul wrote this teaching was already on the wane. It is significant that Paul, like John and the writer of Hebrews, never applies the name "the Servant" to Jesus' (p. 162).

28. Henry, *loc. cit.,* col. 33.

29. See. B. M. Metzger's article in Exp. T., LXX, No. 3, Dec. 1958,

[p.45]

pp. 91-94. Writing on the denial to Paul of the authorship of the Hymn in Col. i. 15 ff., C. F. D. Moule, *The Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon,* Cambridge, 1957, pp. 61, 62, wisely comments, 'Arguments based on rhythm, parallelism, and supposed strophic arrangement are precarious enough at the best of times, and most of all, when there is no recognizable quantitative metre by which to judge.... The rarity elsewhere in the Paulines of certain words in a passage like this is not necessarily an indication of spuriousness: one must ask, rather, whether there were any better or more natural terms at the writer's disposal, if he needed to introduce this particular theme; or whether there are any words here which it seems impossible that St. Paul himself would have used.'
  See also the observations of E. E. Ellis on the subject of statistical analysis in his book, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament,* Edinburgh, 1957, pp. 7 f.

30. See the full study *Chiasmus in the New Testament* by N. W. Lund, University of North Carolina Press, 1942, pp. 137-225; and on 1 Cor. xiii, the same author in *Journal of Biblical Literature,* I, part iv, 'The literary structure of Paul's Hymn to Love'.

31. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism,* London, 1948, pp. 41 ff., against C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel,* p. 47.

32. W. D. Davies, *op. cit.,* p. 44.

33. E. Stauffer, *op. cit.,* Appendix III, pp. 338, 339 for the 'zwölf Kriterien formelhaften Glaubensgutes'; and for his verdict on the form of Phil. ii. 5-11 see p. 284 note 372.

34. And there are obvious parallels in the neighbouring context of the Philippian Epistle. Compare:

ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας (ii. 3) and οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο (ii. 6).
(The verb ἡγεῖσθαι is frequent in chapter iii)
κενοδοξίαν (ii. 3) and ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν (ii. 7)
ταπεινοφροσύνη (ii. 3) and ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν (ii. 8).
See also iii. 21, iv. 12
εὑρεθῶ (iii. 9) and εὑρεθεὶς ὡς (ii. 7)
μετασχηματίσει (iii. 21) and σκήματι (ii. 7)
ἐχαρίσθη (i. 29) and ἐχαρίσατο (ii. 9)
εἰς δόξαν . . . θεοῦ (i. II) and εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός (ii. 11).

[p.46]

35. Since this section of the present Lecture was prepared, a full survey of the contemporary discussion about the authorship of Phil. ii. 5-11 has been presented by J. M. Furness in *Exp. T.,* LXX, No. 8, May 1959, pp. 240-243. His conclusions are similar to those given above.

III. AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF PHILIPPIANS II. 5-11 (pp. 16-37)

1. For the details of these meanings of ὑπάρχειν see Arndt and Gingrich, *Lexicon,* pp. 845, 846.

2. Lightfoot takes ὑπάρχων as implying the contrast between the original and the after state. See his note on Gal. ii. 14. On Phil. ii. 6 he writes that the word denotes 'prior existence' but not necessarily 'eternal existence'. The latter idea, however, follows in the present instance from the conception of the divinity of Christ which the context presupposes. But see B. W. Horan's article 'The Apostolic Kerygma in Philippians ii. 6-9', *Exp. T.,* LXII, No. 2, Nov. 1950, p. 60 for the meaning of ὑπάρχων as 'being essentially'.

3. For the cognate forms see Gal. iv. 19; Rom. ii. 20; 2 Tim. iii. 5; Rom. xii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 18.

4. Cf. Lightfoot's conclusion on the use of μορφή in Phil. ii. 6: '....it is used in a sense substantially the same which it bears in Greek philosophy'. *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians,* London, 1896, p. 132. See also E. H. Gifford, *The Incarnation,* London, 1911 ed., pp. 12 ff. and Henry, *loc. cit.,* col. 18.

5. Reference may here be made to the author's contribution on the subject of μορφή in *Exp.T.,* LXX, No. 6, March 1959, pp. 183, 184.

6. The credit for the development of this linguistic connection between μορφή and εἰκών goes to J. Héring. His discussion is most conveniently to be consulted in his book, *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue,* pp. 162 ff. For a full investigation into the literary connections of the word εἰκών see F.-W. Eltester's study, *Eikon im Neuen Testament,* Beiheft 23, *Z.N.T.W.,* Berlin, 1958. The chief reference which is important for the close relation between μορφή and εἰκών is Gn. i. 26 where the divine pronouncement reads: 'Let us make man in our image (צֶלֶם: LXX

κατ᾽ εἰκόνα), after our likeness (דמות)᾽. The Aramaic equivalent of צלם is used in Dn. iii. 19 where it is rendered by the Greek μορφή.

The text of the *Corpus Hermeticum* is i. 12-15 (in the edition by A. D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, Paris, 1945, pp. 10-12) quoted in Henry, *loc. cit.,* col. 21; cf. col. 42. This text shows, as Eltester remarks, *op. cit.,* p. 133 note 14, the terms μορφὴ θεοῦ, εἰκὼν θεοῦ and ἴσος θεῷ side by side in the same context. See also C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks,* London, 1935, pp. 149 ff. and the discussion in Eltester, *op. cit.,* pp. 80-83, and especially the earlier conclusion on p. 10 of his work which shows the equivalence of εἰκών and μορφή.

7. The intimate connection between εἰκών and δόξα is found in the LXX and in the New Testament usages. See the *Exp. T.* article already quoted p. 183 and Eltester, *op. cit.,* pp. 23, 24.

8. The proof of this statement is given in the citation of the two verses where the apostle calls his Lord the image of God (2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15: on which see Eltester, *op. cit.,* pp. 130 ff.). Εἰκών must be accorded its full biblical significance. It means, not simply a copy or a reflection of an original, but the visible manifestation or 'objectivization' of the original's essence. Cf. C. Masson, *L'Épître de St Paul aux Colossiens,* 1950, pp. 98, 99; Héring, *op. cit.,* p. 165.

For Christ as the 'Lord of glory' see 1 Cor. ii. 8 and the references in note 9.

9. See A. M. Ramsey, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ,* London, 1949, *passim;* and H. Kittel, *Die Herrlichkeit Gottes,* Beiheft 16, *Z.N.T.W.,* Berlin, 1934, pp. 183 ff. Heb. i. 3: ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ; Jas. ii. 1 and Jn. i. 14 are examples; cf. Acts vii. 55. May the καί be epexegetical in this last named reference, i.e. 'Stephen saw the glory of God, that is, Jesus standing at His right hand'? As far as Paul is concerned, the *fons et origo* of his conception of Christ as the divine 'glory' may be traced to his conversion-experience. The narrative in Acts (ix. 3, xxii. 6, ii, xxvi. 13) clearly emphasizes this point. It was the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ (2 Cor. iv. 4; cf. Gal. i. 15, 16) which arrested him and made such an ineffaceable impression upon him that thereafter his dominating picture of the Lord was that of Him as God's eradiated brightness, 'the outward shining of the inward being of God'. He is seen as 'the visible radiance of the divine light': so Kittel, *T.W.N.T., s.v.* δόξα ii, pp. 240,

251. For the conversion-experience of the Damascus road encounter with the glorified Christ as the controlling source of Paul's theology, cf. H. W. Beyer, *Der Brief an die Galater,* in the series *Das Neue Testament Deutsch,* Göttingen, 1955, p. 12.

10. For the Johannine δόξα of the pre-existent Christ see Kittel, *op. cit.,* pp. 254-256 with reference to Jn. xii. 41 and xvii. 5, 24.

11. The argument for the relation of the divine wisdom to the preexistent Christ proceeds along two lines:

a. The rôle of Wisdom in creation in the book of Wisdom vii. 25, 26, and the teaching of such New Testament passages as 1 Cor. viii. 6 and Heb. i. 3.

b. Allusions to the rock of Wisdom x. 17, Xl. 4 and Philo which some have traced in 1 Cor. x. 4.

See the discussion in Eltester, *op. cit.,* pp. 133 ff.

Other references may be added, e.g. *Aboth* v. 6 and *Tosephta Sukkah,* iii. II. But there is a criticism of this line of reasoning in W. D. Davies, *op. cit.,* pp. 153 ff.

12. In his article *s.v.* μορφή in *T. W.N.T.,* iv, p. 759: 'Die μορφὴ θεοῦ, in der der präexistente Christus war, ist nichts anders als die göttliche δόξα; das ἐν μορφὴ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων des Paulus entspricht ganz J17, 5; τῇ δοξῇ ἡ εἶχον πρὸ τὸν τοῦ κόσμον εἶναι παρά σοί'. The quotation from Calvin is from his commentary on Phil. ii. 6: 'Christ, then, before the creation of the world, was in the form of God, because from the beginning He had His glory with the Father, as He says in John xvii. 5.' The same conclusion is succinctly expressed by J. Weiss, *The History of Primitive Christianity,* vol. II, E.T. London 1937, p. 478: 'The "divine form" which he possessed before becoming man (Phil. 2: 6) was nothing less than the divine *Doxa;* and may we not understand this statement to mean, in the Pauline sense; Christ was from the beginning none other than the *Kabod,* the *Doxa,* of God himself, the glory and radiation of his being, which appears almost as an independent hypostasis of God and yet is connected intimately with God?' Cf. also *idem* pp. 492, 493. It is interesting to note what looks like a parallel to this meaning in the letter of the church of Lyons cited in Eusebius, *H.E.* V. ii. 2: '... who also were such emulators and imitators of Christ, who being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, that, though being in such glory (ἐνμ τοιαύτῃ δόξη ὑπάρχοντες) and having

[p.49]

suffered martyrdom... they neither proclaimed themselves martyrs, nor indeed did they permit us to address them by this name.'

13. The possibilities of meaning are stated fully by Henry, *loc. cit.,* col. 23.

14. See Moulton-Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament,* London, 1914-1929, p. 78.

15. J. Ross, *J.T.S.,* XI, 1909, pp. 573, 574. Cf. the comments on this article in the *Exp. T.,* LXIX, No. 3, Dec. 1957, p. 93.

16. So Henry, *loc. cit.,* col. 24. He points out that substantives ending in -μος no less than those ending in -μα indicate the result of an action; and that doublets ending in -μός and -μα are used in the same sense. For example, see the use of φραγμός and its equivalent φράγμα in Mt. xxi. 33; Mk. xii. 1; Lk. xiv. 23; Eph. ii. 14.

17. Karl Barth who supports this view teaches that the phrase ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγεῖσθαι means 'to hold something convulsively' (*krampfhaft an etwas festhalten*) as a robber would clutch his prize and hold it to himself. There is no thought, says Barth, of the abandoning of His Godhead which He retained throughout His incarnate existence; the *kenosis* 'consists in the renunciation of His being in the form of God alone… He did not treat His form in the likeness of God (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ) as a robber does his booty... In addition to His form in the likeness of God He could also—and this involves at once a making poor, a humiliation, a condescension, and to that extent a κένωσις—take the form of a servant.' These quotations are from his commentary, *Erklärung des Philipperbriefes,* Munich, 1928, *ad loc.* especially p.

55, and the exposition in *Church Dogmatics* iv, The Doctrine of Reconciliation, I, E.T. Edinburgh, 1956, p. 180.

18. So H. A. A. Kennedy, *The Expositor's Greek Testament,* London, 1903, iii, pp. 436, 437. Kennedy doubts the legitimacy of Lightfoot's translation 'did not look upon equality with God as a prize, a treasure to be clutched', i.e. τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ is something which He already possessed and resolved not to cling to. He points out that the basic connotation of the verb ἁρπάζειν is 'to seize, snatch violently'. 'Thus it is not permissible to glide from the true sense "grasp at" into one which is totally different, "hold fast". Are we not obliged, then, to think of the ἁρπαγμόν (ἅρπαγμα) as something still future, a *res rapienda*?'

[p.50]

19. Compare the uses of the verb ἁρπάζειν in Acts viii. 39; 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4; I Thes. iv. 17.

20. This meaning is well brought out by C. A. Anderson Scott's translation: 'He did not regard it as a thing to be grasped at to rise to equality with God'. *Footnotes to St. Paul,* Cambridge, 1935, p. 192; and cf. his exposition in *Christianity according to St Paul,* Cambridge, 1927, pp. 271, 272.

21. This translation is offered by various authorities. It goes back to W. Jaeger's contribution, 'Stilgeschichtliche Studie zum Philipperbrief' in *Hermes,* 1, 1915, pp. 537 ff. especially pp. 550-552. A. D. Nock, *St. Paul,* Oxford, 1946, translates: 'did not regard equality with God as a piece of luck', while W. K. L. Clarke takes ἁρπαγμόν as equal to εὕρημα and renders 'lucky find' or 'treasure trove', *op. cit.,* p. 144. L. Cerfaux, *Le Christ dans la théologie de S. Paul,* Paris, 1954, p. 289, paraphrases as 'considérer ou traiter quelque chose comme une bonne aubaine'.

   The justification for this translation is given in the authorities cited by Arndt and Gingrich, *s.v.* For the virtual equivalence of the words ἅρπαγμα and ἕρμαιον in the statement οὐχ ἅρπαγμα οὐδὲ ἕρμαιον ἡγεῖται τό πρᾶγμα (Heliodorus vii, 20, 2) cf. Giiford, *op. cit.,* p. 34: cf. also Isidore of Pelusium, *Epist.* iv, 22: εἰ ἕρμαιον ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσον οὐκ ἂν ἑαυτὸν ἐταπείνωσεν.

   The most interesting example is that of Plutarch, *Alex. fortuna aut virtute,* 1, 8 (330D) which Lightfoot and Giiford had noted and mentioned as illustrating the meaning of ἅρπαγμα which is equivalent to ἕρμαιον and denotes 'a highly-prized possession, an unexpected gain'. The text reads: οὐ γὰρ ληστρικῶς τὴν Ἀσίαν καταδραμών, οὐδὲ ὥσπερ ἅρμαγμα καὶ λάφυρον εὐτυχίας ἀνελπίστου σταράξαι καὶ ἀνασύρασθαι διανοηθείς.

   A. A. T. Ehrhardt makes this text the starting-point for a speculative theory based on the supposed parallel between Jesus Christ and Alexander the Great (the title of his article in *J.T.S.,* XLVI, 1945, pp. 45-51). We may note, however, his comment on the use of ἅρπαγμα. here. Alexander refused to exploit his good fortune ('He did not overrun Asia on a looting expedition, treating those territories as falling to him by the fortune of war, and so his to seize….'). Christ refused to regard equality with God as a privilege to be exploited, a piece of good fortune to be enjoyed. *Loc. cit.,* p. 47.

[p.51]

The same view of ἁρπαγμός is taken by W. L. Knox who, without quoting Ehrhardt, refers to the Plutarch story, and comments that it is hardly likely that Paul knew such a view of Alexander, but may have heard such views applied to Heracles whom Alexander imitated. See

pp. 237, 238 of his article, '"The Divine Hero" Christology in the New Testament', in the *Harvard Theological Review,* XLI, 4, Oct. 1948, pp. 229-249. But cf. the critique in Henry, *loc. cit.,* cols. 39, 40. It is most interesting to find λαφυρόν, 'spoils of war', used in the text of Plutarch in conjunction with ἅρπαγμα. The text of Aquila in Isaiah liii. 12 reads λάφυρα in place of σκῦλα in the LXX.

22. Bonnard, *op. cit.,* p. 43: 'Le Christ, qui jouissait d'une condition divine, n'a pas considéré cette condition (qu'il possédait) comme un tremplin pour s'en prévaloir contre Dieu et atteindre ainsi l'égalité avec lui'. This meaning of ἅρπαγμὸν ἡγεῖσθαι is supported by E. Käsemann's rendering 'to utilize to one's own advantage' (*etwas für sich ausnützen*). He treats the phrase as a proverbial expression (*die sprichwörtliche Redensart*). *Loc. cit.,* p. 333. L. Cerfaux, *op. cit.,* pp. 289, 290, accepts a similar interpretation which makes the prize neither *res rapta* nor *res rapienda,* but rather 'un objet possédé sans doute justement mais dont il ne faut pas user orgueilleusement et comme par bravade.'

23. Compare Calvin's comment on Phil. ii. 6: 'Being such as He was, He could have shown Himself equal to God without doing wrong to anyone; but He did not manifest Himself to be what He really was, nor did He openly assume in the view of men what belonged to Him by right' (*sed non prae se tulit quod erat, neque palam sumpsit in oculis hominum quod iure suum erat*), quoted from P. van Buren, *Christ in our Place,* Edinburgh, 1957, p. 13.

24. With Lohmeyer and Bonnard then, it is impossible to decide between the two formulae of *res rapta* and *res rapienda* if they are regarded as mutually exclusive. On the contrary, the above interpretation includes both ideas. The pre-incarnate Christ had the full dignity of His place as the second Person of the Trinity, with the exception of that acknowledgement which could only be His by His installation and function as Lord (Κύριος). He might have secured this by personal seizure and self-assertion, but He resolved that the future honour which could have been His possession by acquisition would come to Him as His Father's gracious gift. The ἅρπαγμός which He refused to exploit to His own end

[p.52]

was the 'privilege' or advantage which lay within His power, the point of vantage from which He might, had He chosen, have set up His own Lordship in rivalry to His Father's.

This line of interpretation follows partly the train of Lohmeyer's thought in his *Commentary,* pp. 92, 93. He recognizes that the motif of the Hymn is the determination of the path that Christ chose as the way to His Lordship. This choice, according to Lohmeyer, is in contrast to that of Satan who attempted to be equal with God. See later for this possible background. The Son of God, on the contrary, resolved to gain His Lordship by the way of sacrifice and suffering. His way is a paradox which is expressed in the formula, 'through becoming Man His way leads to Lordship'. Lohmeyer relates this paradox to the theme of divine election which he traces back to Isaiah's doctrine in the picture of the suffering Servant. 'To be chosen by God means to suffer upon earth.' So with the fulfilment of this prophetic truth. In order to show Himself divine it was necessary for Him to pass through time and to suffer as Man.

25. This key to an understanding of the Hymn is widely accepted. It was stated as early as 1908 by F. P. Badham, *Exp. T.*, XIX, No. 7, pp. 331-333. O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments,* p. 182, says categorically, 'Except for this background of the Pauline teaching of the two Adams', this verse (ii. 6) 'is scarcely intelligible'; and offers a full and

convincing application. The almost solitary voice of dissidence from this suggested background is that of W. Foerster, *T.W.N.T.* i, p. 473.

26. Another possible background is the proposed contrast between Christ and Satan. In the apocalyptic tradition Satan's fall from heaven is the result of his πλεονεξία, the desire to grasp more than his due which God had appointed him. See, for example, *Life of Adam and Eve,* xv where Satan is robbed of his glory because he would not worship Adam, but aspired after lordship in his own right. E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology,* E.T. London, p. 64, gives the following account of the tradition about the rebellion and fall of Satan: 'We are told (in Jewish sources: e.g. *Slavonic Enoch,* xxix. 4, 5: *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch,* edited by W. R. Morfill and R. H. Charles, Oxford, 1896, p. 36) that the devil belonged to the most glorious of the angels, and was himself the leader of one of the angelic hosts. But in a decisive

[p.53]

hour he refused to obey God... (and) God hurled him down into the depths. The early Church, and Paul in particular, knew about these traditions of a pre-human catastrophe in the will of creation, and accepted them (cf. 2 Peter ii. 4 ff.; Jude 6). It is quite plain that what is in Paul's mind in Phil. ii. 6 ff. is this picture of Satan and his *superbia,* and it is that which he contrasts with such emphasis with the picture of Christ and his *humibitas*'. This background, although very suggestive and interesting, has not been generally accepted, and that of the disobedience and fall of Adam is to be preferred. Dibelius, for example, who supported the analogy with Satan's fall in his book, *Die Gesterwelt im Glaubens Paulus,* Göttingen, 1909, pp. 105 f., later in his *Commentary* retracted this support.

There are points of contact between the two temptations and falls, Satan's and Adam's, in their rejection of God's authority, and their proud ambition to be as God. Compare Is. xiv. 14, 'I will be like the most High' and Gn. iii. 5, RV, 'ye shall be as God'.

27. Cf. D. Cairns, *The Image of God in Man,* London, 1953, pp. ig if. with reference to Eichrodt who takes the second term (דמות) as defining more clearly than the first (צלם) what is meant: 'In God's image, that is to say, in His likeness'. It is of great significance that the LXX uses εἰκών to render דמוח in Gn. i. 26, 27, v. 3, ix. 6; that the same Greek word is used to translate צלמא in Dn. ii (4 times) and iii (9 times), and μορφή is used to translate צלמא in Dn. iii. 19 that Phil. ii. 6 in the Peshitta version has דמחא to render μορφή and that Delitzsch translates both Col. i. 15 and 2 Cor. iv. 4 by using צלם Cf. J. Behm, *T.W.N.T.* iv, p. 759; and G. S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man,* London, 1948, p. 193 note 3. For the linguistic details, cf. Eltester, *op. cit.,* pp. 13 ff. and K. L. Schmidt's essay '"Homo Imago Dei" im Alten und Neuen Testament' in *Eranos-Jahrbuch,* 1947, XV, *Der Mensch,* Zürich, 1948, pp. 149-195, especially pp. 165 ff. See, too, the factual details provided by C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Man,* London, 1951, pp. 94, 95. He examines the usages of the Hebrew words צלם, דמוח and חמגה with their LXX equivalents, and concludes that 'for the LXX translators the three *Hebrew* terms were synonyms.'

28. See the exposition of E. Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament,* E.T. London, 1958, pp. 170, 171.

29. See the clear statement of the meaning of *kenosis* in J. J. Müller's

[p.54]

commentary, *The Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and to Philemon,* London, 1955, pp. 83-85; and the acute comments of L. Morris in *The Lord from Heaven,* London, 1958, pp. 73, 74; cf. also Henry, *loc. cit.,* cols. 156, 157.

30. V. Taylor, *op. cit.,* chapter xix; G. C. Berkouwer, *The Person of Christ,* E.T. Grand Rapids, 1954, *passim;* L. Berkhof, *Systematic Theology,* Grand Rapids, 1941, pp. 327-329.

31. On the theological side, see the critique of *kenosis* by D. M. Baillie, *God Was in Christ,* London, 1948, pp. 94-98. After an examination of the linguistic evidence and the interpretation put upon it in the interests of the kenotic theory, J. S. Lawton, *Conflict in Christology,* London, 1947, p. 132 concludes, 'it is impossible to assign to the passage that decisive place which it obviously holds in the construction of kenotic Christology.'

32. V. Taylor, *op. cit.,* p. 77: 'the reference is to a pre-incarnate renunciation coincident with the act of "taking the form of a servant"'; Henry, *loc. cit.,* col. 28: 'L'action marquee par l'indicatif aoriste paraît être concomitante avec celle du participe aoriste qui suit, comme en Eph. i. 9, et la kénose, au sens large, consisterait bien dans le fait même de "prendre la forme d'esclave"'.

33. We cannot follow Dibelius here when he quotes Lk. i. 53; Ru. i. 21 to prove that the verse shows simply—but expressed poetically—that Christ was poor (*er machte sich arm*). He refuses to define His poverty more closely. 'Alle diese Erwagungen sprechen gegen eine streng terminologische und für eine poetisch-hymnische Interpretation' is his conclusion about all the key-terms of the Hymn, *Commentary, 4n die Thessalonicher an die Philipper,* Tübingen, 3rd ed., 1937, p. 77.

34. Lightfoot, *op. cit.,* pp. 111, 112.

35. J. H. Michael, *The Epistle to the Philippians,* London, 1928, p. 90.

36. W. Warren, *J.T.S.,* XII, 1911, pp. 461-463.

37. The suggested parallel in Is. xlix. 4, κενῶς ἐκοπίασα καὶ εἰς μάταιον καὶ εἰς οὐδὲν ἔδωκα τὴν ἰσχύν μου although quoted by E. C. Selwyn, *The Oracles in the New Testament,* London, date of preface 1911, p. 250, and listed by Henry, col. 46 and Cerfaux, *op. cit.,* p. 286 note 2, is rather far-fetched.

[p.55]

38. See the bibliography cited in the article by D. R. Griffiths, *Exp. T.,* LXIX, No. 8, May 1958, pp. 237-239, and by J. Jeremias in the translation of his study of the term παῖς θεοῦ in *T.W.N.T.* v, p. 708 now published as *The Servant of God,* London, 1958, p. 97. The conclusion from this suggested derivation of ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν from the Hebrew נפשׁו … הצדד of Is. liii. 12 is clearly stated by H. Wheeler Robinson, 'the Kenosis was properly that of the Crucifixion, though naturally involving the Incarnation', in *The Cross in the Old Testament,*1955 ed. London, p. 105; and especially by Jeremias in his contribution to *Studia Paulina* where he writes that the use of Is. liii. 12 'bezieht sich dann auf die Priesgabe des Lebens, nicht auf die Kenose bei der Inkarnation', quoting C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures,* London, 1952, p. 93 in confirmation (p. 154). See also Dodd's article in *J.T.S.,* XXXIX, 1938, p. 292.

39. There is criticism of Jeremias on this point by Otto Michel, 'Zur Exegese von Phil. 2, 5-11' in *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis, Festschrift* Karl Heim, Tübingen, 1954, pp. 83, 84; and recently there is a criticism, on the linguistic side, of the identification of הַצְדָה ... גַפְשׁוּ and ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν by M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant,* London, 1959, p. 121.

40. There are two points which should be borne in mind before we insist that the thought of the apostle must proceed in logical sequence. The first is the argument of H. Wheeler Robinson in his discussion of the verse in the light of Is. liii. 12. He grants that, on first reading, it would appear that the incarnation is in view in ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, but the apostle's parenthetic style may account for the peculiar form of the clauses. 'When he has begun to express this divine humiliation unto death, with the memorable words of Is. liii. 12 in his mind as its apt expression, he checks himself after saying, "He emptied himself—" before adding the completing words "to death", at the remembrance of the human life which was the necessary pathway to that death of the Cross, and describes the humiliation of this life on earth as a "servant" prior to the great humiliation of the Cross; hence the parenthetic clauses, which grammatically follow the word which envisages the goal of the Cross, though logically they precede this, as the preparation for it.' *Op. cit.,* p. 104, note 23.

The second observation is the way in which the text of Is. Lii-liii appears to be used in the Hymn without any reference to logical or

[p.56]

historical sequence. For example, the glorification of the Servant in Is. lii. 13 with the key-verb ὑψωθήσεται is the frontispiece to the chapter of His humiliation, whereas in the Philippians text at ii. 9 it comes as the climax of the Hymn and as the result of His obedience unto death.

41. If the question is posed, Why does the apostle then not refer to the Lord's glory rather than to His 'form'? the answer will be given with Michel that special stress is placed on the 'form of the servant' in the contrast of the later verse. *Loc. cit.,* p. 82, note 1.

42. *Commentary,* p. 112.

43. Dibelius, *op. cit.,* pp. 77, 78.

44. Cf. J. Jeremias, *T.W.N.T.* v, pp. 708, 709 (= *The Servant of God,* p. 97). The most outstanding exceptions among scholars to the view that Phil. ii. 5-11 depends linguistically upon Isaiah liii are W. Michaelis, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Philipper,* Leipzig, 1935, p. 37 who says explicitly 'Auch an den "Knecht" Jes 53 ist übrigens nicht zu denken'; and E. Käsemann, *loc. cit.,* p. 336 who maintains that δοῦλος has nothing to do with the *'ebed Yahweh* doctrine, but is a Greek idea!

45. This objection is voiced by, e.g., K. Rengstorf, *T.W.N.T. s.v.,* ii, p. 282; and, recently, M. D. Hooker, *op. cit.,* p. 120.

46. C. F. Burney, *op. cit.,* p. 108.

47. Michel, *loc. cit.,* p. 92; L. Cerfaux, *op. cit.,* p. 285.

48. But it is further supported by the fact that ὁμοίωμα also is found to be interchangeable with μορφή and εἶδος in the Greek Bible. See Ezk. i. 26 where the divine glory appeared in the form of a 'likeness as the appearance of a man' (LXX reads ὁμοίωμα ὡς εἶδος ἀνθρώπου: and MT reads the key-term דמות). It may be submitted, therefore, that there is a parallelism in the lines of verse 7 in which μορφὴν δούλου is parallel with ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων. The incarnate Son entered upon His earthly career to assume the office of the Servant of Yahweh which entails a true *incarnation* and acceptance of human life with all its 'historical risks' ('tous les risques historiques', as Bonnard puts it, quoting the New Testament meaning of γένομενος as always marking an historical happening).

        The endeavour to find in this participle (as in Rom. i. 3; Gal. iv. 4) an indirect allusion to the Virgin birth is not altogether convincing.

[p.57]

        See H. E. W. Turner, *Exp.T.,* LXVIII, No. 1, Oct. 1956, p. 12; cf. V. Taylor, *op. cit.,* p. 217, note 1. γένομενος can have the plain sense of 'being born', as in Jn. viii. 58.

49. Cf. A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ,* London, 1926, p. 135, note 3.

50. 'So when this name of Servant is given to Him, we must understand that it is because He has taken our nature, not merely humbled Himself, but even making Himself absolutely nothing.' Calvin's sermon on Is. liii in T. H. L. Parker's ed. London, 1958, p. 31.

51. For this view cf. Henry, *loc. cit.,* col. 30. The term δούλος may conceivably denote Jesus' subjection to demonic powers. He willingly identified Himself with men in their enslavement to the στουχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (Gal. iv. 3, 9); and, by entering their thraldom, He passed into the control of the ἀρχόντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (1 Cor. ii. 8) and under the demon power of death. This line of interpretation would be confirmed if our view of the words 'unto death' in verse 8 were accepted. See pp. 31, 63. Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body,* London, 1952, pp. 38, 39; M. Werner, *The Formation of Christian Dogma,* E.T. London, 1957, p. 127; and Weiss' words: 'Paul calls this "the form of a servant" because he, though born Lord of all things, became like men, the slave of "the elements of the world".' *Op. cit.,* ii, p. 493. Cf. also the recent study of G. B. Caird, *Principalities and Powers,* Oxford, 1956, especially pp. 97, 98.

52. Lohmeyer, *Commentary,* p. 94: ' "Knecht" sein bedeutet in der religiösen Sprache des Judentums nichts anderes als von Gott erwâhlt sein; so heissen die grossen Frommen der Vergangenheit mit Stolz und Ehrfurcht.'

53. The exact meaning of ὁμοίωμα is much controverted. See the discussion in Arndt and Gingrich's *Lexicon, s.v.* p. 570. The point at issue is in the question as stated by Michel, *loc. cit.,* p. 89. Is Christ who appears in 'the likeness of men' fully and perfectly Man, or is the picture here one of a person who is only seen as Man, since He is, in reality, remaining in the world as *ein Gottwesen,* a divine Being? Bauer's reply (in the *Lexicon* just mentioned) to this question covers both aspects, but he is not as emphatic as Michel on the Lord's full humanity. 'Jesus in His earthly career was similar to sinful men and yet not absolutely

[p.58]

like them' is his conclusion on the Pauline usage of ὁμοίωμα. In the light of the parallel text in Rom. viii. 3 and the usage of ὁμοίωμα in LXX, this is as far as verse 7 goes, and needs to be supplemented by the unequivocal statement of the Lord's true humanity in verse 8.

Part of the reason for Paul's choice of this word is its close connection with the Adam-Christ parallel (cf. Rom. v. 14), 'In the likeness of men' is the equivalent of 'in the image of the true man', with a backward glance to the Genesis narrative. This is how Lightfoot takes it. 'The plural ἀνθρώπων is used; for Christ, as the second Adam, represents not the individual man, but the human race', *Commentary,* p. 112.

54. Arndt and Gingrich, *Lexicon,* pp. 804, 805 furnish a good illustration from Josephus of a king who exchanged his kingly robes for sackcloth and takes on a σχῆμα ταπεινόν.

55. See Lightfoot's note, *op. cit.,* pp. 112, 113.

56. It is at this point that the verdict of Michel may be fully endorsed: 'Die ganze Christologie des Neuen Testaments hängt an dem entscheidenden Ereignis, dass Jesus nicht nur menschenähnlich oder menschengleich war, sondern selbst em Mensch war.' *Loc. cit.,* p. 90.

57. So Lohmeyer, *Commentary,* p. 95, εὑρεθεὶς 'refers not to the beginning but to the course of this human life'. He goes on to conclude, therefore, that 'this line is completely separated from what has gone before. It can only serve to explain the thought of humiliation'. Jeremias, however, objects to this division in his article in *Studia Paulina,* p. 153.

Lohmeyer, as it was earlier noted, has pointed out how unGreek is the expression εὑρεθεὶς ὡς, and makes this the starting-point for an elaborate theory that the underlying Semitic original of these words is to be discovered in the Aramaic of Dn. vii. 13: אנש כבד meaning 'as a son of man'. This title he takes to mean 'a man carrying the appearance of a divinity' as in *Enoch* (xlvi. 1 ff.) and the *Ezra Apocalyse* (2 *Esdras* xiii); cf. Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14. On this reading, what is in view is not Christ's humanity but His transcendental state as the heavenly man who came to earth to accomplish a redemptive mission for mankind. Most scholars regard this identification of Paul's ὡς ἄνθρωπος with כבד as forced and unnatural; and there is little to commend Lohmeyer's endeavour to find here the background in the Iranian myth of *anthrōpos* (*KJ,* pp. 39-41; cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, *II Esdras,* London,

[p.59]

1933, pp. 158-164). For a discussion of the supposed dependence of Paul upon the myth of the 'heavenly man' see J. M. Creed, *J.T.S.,* XXVI, 1925, pp. 113-135; A. E. J. Rawlinson, *op. cit.,* pp. 125 ff.; A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle,* E.T. London, 1931, p. 167; and W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah,* London, 1943, Appendix D.

ὡς is quite naturally taken as equivalent to ἴσα. Christ was seen to be, to human view, like a man. But it is certainly arguable that ἄνθρωπος here is Paul's version of the full title 'the Son of man' in the gospel tradition. See E. Stauffer's chapter xxiv, *op. cit.,* pp. 108-111, with the conclusion, 'The idea of the Son of man lives on in the Pauline letters under a new christological word that gives linguistic expression to the same thing under the term "Man" and its further developments and correlatives. This terminology (e.g. ἄνθρωπος, δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος, ἄνθρωπος, ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἔσχατος Αδάμ, κεφαλή, εἰκών) gives a far more distinct expression to the antithesis between Christ and Adam than the name Son of man could do' (p.111).

58. There were occasions, however, when His inherent glory shone through the veil of His *humilitas carnis* which surrounded His *divina majesta* as Calvin says in his commentary on Mt. xxvii. 45. See for this reference *Corpus Reformatorum,* lxxiii, 777, 778: 'Although in the death of Christ, the weakness of the flesh concealed the glory of His divinity for a short time, and though the Son of God was disfigured by shame and contempt, and, as Paul says, was emptied, yet the heavenly Father did not cease to distinguish Him by some marks, and during His lowest humiliation prepared some indications of His future glory, in order to support the minds of the godly against the oifence of the Cross'; quoted from van Buren, *op. cit.,* p. 49.

There is the evidence of His miracles (cf. John ii. II) and especially the witness of the transfiguration when His glory (δόξα, Luke ix. 32) was displayed to favoured eyes. This confirms the interpretation of μορφῇ θεοῦ offered above. What became apparent on the holy mount was the 'glory' or 'form' of God, as His μεγαλειότης was seen, He received from the Father τιμὴ καὶ δόξα and there came the voice from the μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα (2 Pet. i. 16-18). This μορφῇ θεοῦ underlay His earthly form, the μορφῇ δούλου, but was concealed in His incarnate existence.

59. Lohmeyer, *KJ*, p. 35 (cf. his Commentary, p. 93), seems to imply this

[p.60]

in his view that by His *kenosis* He creates a new substantial Being; and he says explicitly of His return to the Father's presence in glory, 'This is a new marvel; for it means not only a new worthiness—the highest which it is possible to imagine—but also a new Being' (*ein neues Sein*), *Commentary,* p. 97.

60. K. Barth, *op. cit.,* p. 56 (=*Commentary ad. loc.*): 'Er ist Gott fortan, gleich in der Verborgenheit der Knechtgestalt'. This sentence is quoted with approval by V. Taylor, *op. cit.,* p. 78. Cf. Henry, *loc. cit.,* col. 32 and the earlier conclusion of E. H. Giiford, *op. cit.,* pp. 8-12 where he maintains that ὑπάρχων denotes both the pre-existence and the continued existence of Christ in the form of God; and pp. 30-36 where he defines the *kenosis* as the laying aside of that equality of conditions, such as glory, majesty, and honour, which He possessed in His pre-existence, and to which He prayed to be restored in Jn. XV11. 5. We may note also the force of the participle in 2 Cor. viii. 9, πλούσιος ὤν; not 'He became rich' or 'He ceased to be rich'.

61. This interpretation follows the line indicated by Karl Barth in his exposition, *Church Dogmatics,* iv, The Doctrine of Reconciliation, I, E.T. 1956, pp. 179-183: 'In addition to His form in the likeness of God, He could also—and this involves at once a making poor, a humiliation, a condescension, and to that extent a κένωσις—take the form of a servant.' So the *kenosis* 'does not consist in ceasing to be Himself as man, but in taking it upon Himself in a way quite other than that which corresponds and belongs to His form as God'. He quotes Augustine:' Sic se inanivit: formam servi accipiens, non formam Dei amittens; forma servi accessit, non forma Dei discessit' (*Sermo,* 183, 4 f. = *Patrobogia latina,* ed. Migne, xxxviii, 990) (p.180).

62. Cf. S. V. McCasland, '"The Image of God" according to Paul', in *J.B.L.,* LXIX, 1950, pp. 85-100.

63. Cf. Ignatius, *Eph.* xx. 1: thy τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον,' Ἰησουν Χριστόν. The identification of ὁ νέος ἄνθρωπος of Col. in. 10 with Christ is made by Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die*

Kolosser und an Philemon, Göttingen, 9th ed. 1953, p. 142. The argument is based on the way in which the apostle can speak of the Christian as putting on Christ (Gal. iii. 27; Rom. xiii. 14); and the declaration of Col. iii. 11 that Christ is both everything (πάντα) and 'in all' (ἐν πᾶσιν), i.e. indwelling all the members of His Church. 'So kann das für unsere Stelle kaum anderes bedeuten,

[p.61]

als dass Christus der neue Mensch ist.' Cf. the full discussion in Eltester, *op. cit.,* pp. 158 ff.

64. Humility is an outstanding characteristic of life under the Torah according to the witness of Jewish literature. It is more than just an isolated virtue; it is the quality which marks out the righteous (*ḥasidim*). Cf. *Aboth* vi. 4 for 'the life of privation' which is the sign of devotion to the Torah. It is also connected with the fate of the Jewish martyrs (*Enoch* cviii. 7). The LXX version of Is, liii. 8, however, is the nearest parallel to the use of the verb ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν in Phil. ii. 8. Yet the free act of the Son of God, expressed in the use of the reflexive pronoun, is an important feature which is not found in Is. liii.

65. Michel, *loc. cit.,* pp. 86 ff.; W. D. Davies, *op. cit.,* pp. 262 ff.; E. Schweizer, *op. cit.,* 35 ff. of which the sentence, 'The concept that the righteous individual must pass through the suffering, humiliation, and shame imposed by God in order, finally, to be exalted by him, is widespread in the Judaism of the time', *New Testament Studies,* II, No. 2, Nov. 1955, p. 88, is a summary.

66. So we find that the example of the obedient Lord (ii. 8; cf. Heb. v. 8) is applied to the Philippians' situation directly following the citation of the Hymn; and the word 'wherefore' of verse 12 is the connecting-link between the example (ὑπήκοος) and the application (ὑπηκούσατε). 'Il a obéi, donc (καθὼς) obéissez', comments Bonnard. Cf. the link in Heb. v. 8 and 9 ὑπακοὴν... ὑπακούουσιν. The way in which they are to obey is in submission to his apostolic directives, with an obedience which is referred to in such texts as 2 Cor. vii. 15, x. 6; 2 Thes. iii. 4; Phm. 21.

67. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament,* i, E.T. London, 1952, p. 311:' "In Christ", far from being a formula for mystic union, is primarily an *ecclesiological* formula' (italics in the original). E. Lohmeyer adopts the unusual view that in. the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ in verse 5 the ἐν carries a paradigmatic meaning with the phrase constituting 'a sort of formula of citation' (*eine Art von Zitationsformel*). It corresponds to בְּ which is used (e.g. *in Aboth* iii. 7: 'it is written in David'; cf. Rom. xi. 2; Heb. iv. 7) to introduce an authoritative quotation. So in Phil. ii. 5 it paves the way for the Hymn in which the example of Christ is made authoritative for the Philippian community. See *KJ,* p. 13.

[p.62]

68. This application re-appears in 1 Clement xvi: 'For Christ is of those who are humble-minded (ταπεινοφρονούντων) not of those who exalt themselves over His flock... (He) came not with the pomp of pride or of arrogance... but was humble-minded (ταπεινοφρονῶν), as the Holy Spirit spake concerning Him (quoting Isaiah liii and Psalm xxii). You see, beloved, what is the example (ὑπογραμμός) which is given us; for if the Lord was thus humble-minded (ἐταπεινοφρόνησεν), what shall we do, who through Him, have come under the yoke of His grace?'

69. The *locus classicus* for this term in Paul's writings is in Rom. v. 12 ff. where the contrast παρακοὴ-ὑπακοή first Adam-second Adam, is most clearly brought out. On this parallel see the recent study of R. P. Shedd, *Man in Community,* London, 1958, section iii (pp. 93-123) *passim* and pp. 151 ff. For the wider perspective of the New Testament doctrine of the obedience of Christ, see E. Hoskyns and N. Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament,* London, 1931, pp. 192 ff., 216-222.

70. He gives proof of His divine nature, not so much by what He *is* as by what He *did,* as E. Käsemann, *loc. cit.,* p. 335, has observed. In contrast to later Christological thought, there is no speculative interest in the Hymn. The danger of divorcing the person of Christ from His work is strikingly pointed out by J. M. Creed, in *Mysterium Christi,* edited by G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann, London, 1931, p. 129; 'Unless the doctrine of the Incarnation is nailed to the Cross it tends to lose definition and to evaporate into a cosmic principle'.

71. In speaking in this way of Christ's obedience as the principle which underlies His redemptive work we are not unmindful of the *caveat* entered by J. Denney. He says rightly that, unless the terms 'obedience' and 'God's will' are more exactly defined, 'it is inadequate, ambiguous, and misleading to speak of obedience as the principle of the Atonement. Christ's obedience is not merely that which is required of all men, it is that which is required of a Redeemer; and it is its peculiar content, not the mere fact that it is obedience, which constitutes it an atonement... The obedience of the Incarnate One has... its redemptive value, i.e. its value for us... not simply as obedience, but as obedience to a will of God which requires the Redeemer to take upon Himself in death the responsibility of the sin of the world.' *The Death of Christ,* London, 1911, pp. 232, 234.

[p.63]

72. Lohmeyer, *KJ,* p. 4I; *Commentary,* p. 96.

73. Lohmeyer, *Commentary,* p. 96; *KJ,* p. 43 quoting Rev. i. 18. The presence of the *descensus* idea in verse 8 is denied by R. Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror,* London, 1954, p. III, but for no cogent reason. It is offered as a possibility by G. S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man,* London, 1948, p. 194, note 1.

74. 2 Tim. i. 10; Heb. ii. 15; Rom. Viii. 38, 39; I Cor. xv. 55, 56; and for death as the agent of Satan cf. Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glaubens Paul us,* Göttingen, 1909, pp. 41-43.

75. The evidence to support this may be set out:
    a. The germane New Testament data for the doctrine of Christ's *descensus ad inferos.* E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter,* London, 1947, pp. 319-322 surveys the evidence in Rom. x. 6-8; Eph. iv. 8-10; Phil. ii. 10; Rev. v. 13, and above all i Pet. iii. 19, iv. 6, on which see the latest discussion by C. E. B. Cranfield, *Exp. T.,* LXIX, No. 12, Sept. 1958, pp. 369-372. We may also add Acts ii. 27, 31. This belief, which Selwyn regards as 'part of the current coin of New Testament teaching' (p. 322) is concerned with our Lord's going to the underworld after death rather than His submission to the power of death on the cross; but there is a close connection between the two ideas.
    b. Phil. ii. 10 suggests that those agencies which now confess His Lordship and victory are those to which He was subjected in His humiliation. They include τὰ καταχθονία; and this is confirmed by Ignatius, *Trallians,* ix. 1: 'Jesus Christ... was truly persecuted under

Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died in the sight of those in heaven and on earth and under the earth.'

c. The metrical structure of the Hymn is set in triadic sections and phrases, as was earlier noted. The three 'states' through which Christ passes are 'divine-earthly-infernal', corresponding to the three stanzas of the first section. In each strophe 'this membership of each kingdom is pictured' (Lohmeyer, *KJ,* p. 43); and at the triumphant conclusion of the Hymn we see the three realms to which He has been subjected lying at the feet of the exalted One (*KJ,* p. 43; *Commentary,* p. 96). See for comparison J. G. Davies, *op. cit.,* p. 61.

76. Θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ is regarded by many commentators since Lohmeyer's day as 'a Pauline interpretative gloss'. He bases this judgment on metrical grounds, and deletes the phrase from the original

[p.64]

version of the Hymn because it spoils the formal structure of the poem. But when he says that the manner of the death cannot take away from the death or add anything to its humiliation (*Commentary,* p. 96), does he not overlook the special degradation which death by crucifixion would hold for a Jew?

77. Cicero, *Pro Rabirio,* v. 10; cf. *in Verrem,* v. 66: 'How shall I describe crucifixion? No adequate word can be found to represent so execrable an enormity.'

78. Cf. the satirical inscription, 'Alexamenos worships his god', found at Rome as the caption of a *graffito* and used to depict a Christian who is reverencing a crucified figure with an ass's head.

79. The 'shame' (αἰσχύνη) of the cross (Heb. xii. 2) and the 'scandal' (σκάναλον) to the Jew of the Christian preaching which centred in that message (1 Cor. i. 23) are familiar themes in the New Testament.

80. W. D. Davies, *op. cit.,* 284. Something of the horror suggested by this form of death is conveyed in the Qumran Commentary on Nahum, published by J. M. Allegro in *J.B.L.,* LXXV, June 1956, pp. 89-93. On the Nahum text the *pesher* is, 'This passage refers to the Lion of Wrath who wreaked vengeance on the seekers after smooth things, and who used to hang men alive on trees, as was never done before in Israel, for he that is hanged alive on a tree....' (J. T. Milik's translation, *Ten Tears of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea,* E.T. London, 1959, p. 73).

81. So J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God,* p. 77; and W. D. Davies, *op. cit.,* pp. 273 ff. But see W. D. Davies' later note, p. 366.

82. Cf. Calvin on Phil. ii. 8: 'By dying in this manner (on a cross) He was not only covered with ignominy in the sight of men, but was accursed in the sight of God.'

83. This figure of speech is taken from E. Brunner, *The Mediator,* E.T. London, 1934, pp. 561-563.

84. Lohmeyer, *Commentary,* p. 96.

85. See E. Schweizer, *op. cit., passim.* A typical illustration may be drawn from the Passover *Haggadah,* 'One should begin with the disgrace and end with the glory' (*Pesaḥim* x. 4).

86. Bonnard sees no link between the cross of Christ and His elevation

[p.65]

in honour; but he is hardly correct in this denial. Cf. Barth, *Erklärung,* p. 60.

87. The LXX uses the cognate verb ὑψοῦν in Is. lii. 13 in conjunction with the verb δοξάζειν. These two verbs are frequently associated in LXX. See L. H. Brockington, 'The Septuagintal Background to the use of Δόξα᾽ in *Studies in the Gospels,* ed. D. E. Nineham, London, 1955, p. 2.

88. ὑψοῦν is 'used invariably in the LXX as a translation of *nasa*' and *rum,* wherever in the Psalter the "elevation" or enthronement of either the king, the Anointed One, or Yahweh himself is under consideration', C. S. Mann, 'The New Testament and the Lord's Ascension' in *C.Q.R.,* Oct.-Dec. 1957, p. 457; and ὑπερυψοῦν which occurs only in Phil. ii. 9 in the New Testament is used to translate the *niph'al* of עלה, 'exalted far above all gods' in Ps. xcvii (xcvi). g: LXX, σφόδρα ὑπερυψώθης ὑπὲρ πάντας τούς θεούς. This is the best LXX parallel; σφόδρα Clement xiv. 5.

89. Those who interpret ἁρμαγμός as *res rapta* accept this connotation of ὑπερυψοῦν and explain the prefix ὑπὲρ as superlative. Rom. viii. 35 may be cited as evidence for the use of the stronger form of a verb as though the simple verb νικάω was too weak to express the glorious triumph of the believer through Christ. Cf. Henry, *loc. cit.,* col. 34; Schweizer, *Erniedrigung u. Erhöhung....,* p. 66, note 286.

90. A clear argument for this meaning is presented by J. Héring, *op. cit.,* p. 163. God exalted His Son, giving Him 'une dignité supérieure a celle dont il avait joui dans sa pré-existence'. This has recently been accepted by O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments,* p. 185.

91. It is confirmed by the biblical idea of Christ's session at the Father's right hand. Exaltation, which is pictorially expressed by this metaphor, denotes co-regency i.e. the receiving and enjoyment of a dignity equal with God as W. Foerster, *T.W.N.T. s.v.* κύριος, iii, 1088, E.T. *Lord,* London, 1958, p. 100 has shown on the basis of Ps. cx. 1.

92. Commenting on ὑπερύψωσεν, H. A. A. Kennedy, *op. cit.,* p. 483 says: 'It is nothing to do with His nature. The Divine glory which He always possessed can never be enhanced. But now, in the eyes of men and as claiming their homage, He is on an equality with God.'

93. 'At first sight it is a strange thought that even the Son of God had to learn obedience. But without this obedient readiness to walk the

[p.66]

path of soul anxiety and death's agony, the exaltation of the high-priestly dignity was impossible. Through His humiliation Christ was being prepared for the ministry which He had to render as the eternal High Priest.' J. Schneider, *op. cit.,* p. 46.

94. ἐχαρίσατο is derived from χάρις and bears the sense of 'granted by the exercise of a favour'.

95. This is now the generally accepted as conclusive; but it is denied by W. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu,* Göttingen, 1903, pp. 65 ff. and W. L. Knox, *Harvard Theological Review,* XLI, No. 4, Oct. 1948, p. 238 who presents a case for the supreme name being that of 'Jesus'.

96. See *T.W.N.T.,* iii, p. 1043 (= *Lord,* p. 9).

97. So O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie...* pp. 185, 186.

98. See Lightfoot's *Commentary ad loc.* for his comment on the Hebrew sense of שֵׁם 'not meaning a definite appellation, but denoting office, rank, dignity'.

99. The knowledge of a name is a characteristic Semitic idea. It implies, for example, the ability to render honour to the one who possesses the name, as in Jdg. xiii. 17. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι is a formula of invocation and worship as in the LXX usage and Eph. v. 20. So Arndt and Gingrich, *Lexicon,* p. 576; but they translate Bauer's version of Phil. ii. 10: 'when the name of Jesus is mentioned every knee should bow'. On this view, the preposition is evidently to be understood as 'instrumental' (so also C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek,* Cambridge, 1953, p. 78). The proclaiming of the name of Jesus is the accompanying circumstance of the submission; cf. Acts ii. 38 for ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in this sense.

100. Lohmeyer, therefore, speaks of 'the timelessness of eternity', *Commentary,* p. 97.

101. Lohmeyer, *KJ,* p. 56: 'selbst der Name Jesu scheint gewählt, urn in dem Reich des Geschichtlichen zu bleiben'.

102. *Trallians,* ix. 1: and lines 36, 37 in C. K. Barrett, *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents,* London, 1956, p. 32; cf. A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East,* E.T. New York, 4th ed., 1927, p. 261. The text reads: καὶ σὺ λάλησον ὑποῖον ἐὰν ᾖς ἐπουράνιον ἢ ἀέριον εἴτε ἐπίγειον εἴτε ὑπόγειον ἢ καταχθόνιον.

[p.67]

103. Lohmeyer has an interesting note on this cultic posture. Genuflexion is an oriental gesture of utter submission on the part of those who feel their need so keenly that they cannot stand erect before their God, in contrast to the free and upright posture of Hellenistic worshippers. See Acts vii. 60, ix. 40, xx. 36, xxi. 5; cf. Mk. xv. 19 Lk. xxii. 41; Eph. iii. 14. *KJ,* p. 59.

104. AQ in Is. xlv. 23 read ἐξομολογήσεται. in place of א*B ὀμεῖται.

105. R. Leivestad, *op. cit.,* p. 144; so O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions,* E.T. London, 1949, pp. 59-62; but, on the other hand, cf. E. Schweizer, *New Testament Studies,* II, No. 2, Nov. 1955, pp. 95, 96.

106. W. D. Davies, *op. cit.,* pp. 42, 46. Adam is spoken of as worthy of the angels' worship according to such texts as *b San.* 59 b; *Gen. R.* viii. 1; *Life of Adam and Eve,* xii. 1. When he succumbed to the devil's temptation he was robbed of his glory (cf. *Life of Adam and Eve,* xx). There are rabbinic traditions that what Adam lost in the fall will be restored when the blessed time comes. See Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T....* i. 19, iv. 886 ff., iii. 247-255.

107. O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions,* pp. 22, 23 and *passim;* F. F. Bruce, *The Spreading Flame,* London, 1958, pp. 238 ff. The formula, 'Christ is Lord', characterizes every early Christian confession of faith; and its significance is well assessed by H. Riesenfeld in his essay, 'The Mythological Background of New Testament Christology' in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatobogy,* ed. by W. D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge, 1956, p. 94: 'The sentence "Jesus Christ is Lord"... was fitted to transcend all frontiers and thus made the world mission possible.'

108. Cf. Lohmeyer's notable conclusion on these verses: 'In order to snatch back the world from the power of Satan, and to re-instate God, He who was in the form of God, took the road from heaven to earth; that He became Lord is the sign that the victory is won, and therefore, the word "Father" betokens that now God and the world are "reconciled" and made one', *Commentary,* p. 98. We put the word 'reconciled' in inverted commas because it may be a play on words in the original where *versöhnt* suggests an allusion to the *Sohn Gottes* through whom the reconciliation is made.

[p.68]

IV. CONCLUSION (p. 38)

1. It is significant that Paul of Samosata, a leading exponent of dynamic Monarchianism in the East, forbad the singing of hymns to Jesus as Lord. See Eusebius, *H.E.,* VII, xxx, 10.

2. See the *Exp. T.,* LX, No. 9, June 1949, p. 239.

3. This hymn is by Benjamin Rhodes, 1743-1815.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

Since the text of the Lecture was prepared, and the Appendix of notes compiled, the commentary of F. W. Beare in the series *Black's New Testament Commentaries,* London, 1959, has appeared. It was not possible to use this important work in the preparation of the Lecture or the Tyndale Commentary; but this final note gives opportunity briefly to summarize Professor Beare's position.

He is convinced by those arguments which have been offered in favour of the non-Pauline authorship of the Hymn, and regards Lohmeyer's analysis (which he translates into modern English) as 'wholly convincing' (p. 74). But he adopts the novel view that the Hymn is not pre-Pauline in origin; rather, it is work of a disciple of Paul's (p. 30), 'a gifted writer of his own circle' (p. 78) whose tribute to the Lord against a Hellenistic, non-Jewish background the apostle adopts with his *imprimatur.*

The discernible sources are the Old Testament, and possibly an Iranian redemption myth of the descent of the Redeemer (here following Lohmeyer); but there is no clear proof of an underlying Aramaic original as Lohmeyer suggested and P. P. Levertoff actually reconstructed in W. K. L. Clarke's book, *New Testament Problems,* p. 148.

In his exegesis, he treats the phrases ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων and τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ as equivalent, so that ὑπερύψωσεν 'is given a superlative, not a comparative sense' and 'the thought is not that God exalts him to a higher rank than he held before' (p. 85). But in the other view which he rejects there is little warrant for the suggestion that Christ gains His prize 'by storming the heights like a Titan'. It is the Father's gracious gift to His obedient Son.

[p.69]

The Lord's obedience is taken to mean His submission to the elemental spirits of the universe (see Section III, note 51 *supra*); and the homage that is rendered to the exalted One is offered by 'the mighty spirits' that rule over the three realms of heaven, earth and hell. The commentator is sceptical, however, about the value of this teaching and joins the school of R. Bultmann with its plea for 'demythologizing' (pp. 30 ff., 75). He can find little room for the malevolent influence of demons in the modern world. But there is undeniable evidence from the *data* of spiritualism, 'Satanism' and the clinical investigations into demon-possession; and there are the popular appeals of astrology and fortune-telling which seem to guide the destinies of so many in civilized society. D. H. C. Read's chapter, 'The Devil comes back' in his book, *The Spirit of Life,* London, 1939, is a timely reminder that we cannot easily dismiss demonic influences as 'antiquarianizing' (p. 31).

There is an excellent paragraph (p. 87) to show that there is no rivalry between the throne of the glorified Christ and the throne of the God who exalts Him.

For good measure, an extended note on the 'kenotic Christology' by E. R. Fairweather passes the theory of *Kenosis* under penetrating review, and exposes its deficiencies. See further the author's review of Professor's Beare's commentary in *Theology,* LXII, No. 474, Dec. 1959, pp. 514, 515.