

A n E x e g e s i s  
o f P h i l i p p i a n s 2 : 5 - 1 1

(A Hymn to Christ the Lord)

by

Luis Fidel Mercade

May 1962

Course: New Testament 336: The Meaning of Jesus Christ  
for the Early Church

Professor: Dr. Samuel MacLean Gilmour

Andover Newton Theological School

Newton Centre, Massachusetts

A  
Mar 28 .

## AN EXEGESIS OF PHILIPPIANS 2:5-11

### (A Hymn to Christ)

This New Testament passage has been the object of more intense study than perhaps any other, except the Sermon on the Mount. There is common agreement now that Paul is here quoting a hymn used by the early church. This conclusion has been reached on the basis of the poetical character of the passage and its soteriological content, which reflects the general Christology of the primitive Christian community, clothed in mythological garment. The taking over of the hymn by Paul shows to us how he was dependent on the church for his concept of Christ. This is not to deny that he blazed new trails in the Christological formulation, but to place him within the context in which he moved.

Two considerations have loomed large in our minds in dealing with these seven verses of Scripture. First, it is our purpose to exegete this passage in order to determine its original meaning in the context of the Christian community. Secondly, it is our intention to draw from the exegesis the Christological implications that we consider legitimate.

Beare<sup>1</sup> in his commentary has translated and arranged the hymn in what he thinks must have been its original poetical structure. It is a very natural arrangement and one into which the whole hymn falls. We shall set it before us in order to have clearly in mind its hymnic pattern, since the running translations tend to obscure it, and also for purpose of analysis and comparison as we proceed in our exegesis.

<sup>1</sup> F. W. Beare, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1959), pp. 73-74.

(5) Let this be the disposition that governs in your common life, as it is fitting in Christ Jesus. (6) For he  
(First Strophe)

- Being in the form of God  
Counted not as plunder  
Equality with God,  
(7) But stripped himself  
By taking the form of slave,  
Being made in the likeness of men;  
(8) And being found in shape as a man,  
He humbled himself  
In becoming obedient unto death  
(and that, death on a cross).

(Second Strophe)

- (9) Therefore God also exalted him to the highest station  
And conferred upon him the Name  
That is above every name,  
(10) That in the name of Jesus  
Every knee should bow  
Of dwellers in heaven, and on earth, and in the underworld,  
(11) And that every tongue should acclaim him:  
'Jesus Christ is Lord'--  
To the glory of God the Father.

The majestic sweep of this hymn is present from the very beginning.

It is a poem of an action which starts in heaven, moves into the earth and the underworld and culminates in heaven again. There is economy of words and breadth of meaning in each stage of action, It is a tremendous dramatic presentation of the story of salvation in mythological casting.

Structurally the hymn consists of two strophes, each of three stanzas, each stanza in three lines. The myth of the heavenly redeemer coming down from heaven and ~~returning~~ returning there again victorious is the framework into which the Christ event is cast. Beare describes this mythological casting thus:

- [ It [the hymn] is not a fragment, but a totality, a self-contained Hymn which recites the Descent of the Redeemer from heaven to the world of men and to the realm of the dead (the threefold universe); and his Ascent to heaven as Victor, enthroned in glory by God, to whom he has given complete obedience, and receiving the homage of the threefold universe in the acclamations of the mighty spirit-rulers of these realms which

• In Translation

he has subdued. This is the story of salvation, told in the form of the myth of the Heavenly Redeemer who descends from heaven that he may again ascend into heaven, laden with the trophies of victory and opening the way for his followers. The mythological construction is kept but the divine Hero of the myth is identified with Jesus; it is brought into effective relation with the concrete historical person of the saviour.<sup>1</sup>

From these observations in connection with the casting of the passage, several factors come to the fore that should be kept in mind as we go into our exegesis and draw conclusions as to the Christological import of the hymn. (1) This is the language of myth and raises the whole question of "demythologizing." (2) This myth has been taken over by the early Christians from current religious ideas. (3) The basic content of the hymn is soteriological and not Christological and ethical. It declares the story of salvation. (4) The myth is applied to the Christ event, including the historical part of his life. (5) The whole of the Christ event is made the basis for the ethical appeal and not just the human personality of Jesus. We speak here of the Christ event for lack of a better term that would do justice to the totality of the New Testament presentation of Jesus, which is never that of a mere human being.

With these points in mind, let us proceed to bring out the meaning of the passage.

Verse 5. Τοῦτο προεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

The *τοῦτο* here is retrospective and refers to the harmony and unity that Paul has been advocating the Philippian to have in the preceding verses. Moffat<sup>1</sup> translates the verse thus: "Treat one another with the same spirit as you experience in Christ Jesus." Beare's

<sup>1</sup> Beare, op. cit., pp. 74-75.

translation is even more to the point, although more free: "Let this be the disposition that governs in your common life, as is fitting in Christ Jesus." The Moffat<sup>1</sup> and Beare versions are different from the A. V. and the R. V., but are certainly correct from the standpoint of the Greek. In the Greek there is no verb in the relative clause, but both the A. V. and the R. V. furnish the verb "was." A literal translation of the words of the apostle would read: "This think among yourselves which also in Christ Jesus." The verb that naturally suggests itself for the clause is that of the first part of the verse. If *φρονητε* is supplied to the clause, the whole verse would read: "This think among yourselves which also you think in Christ Jesus."

In other words, Paul is advocating the kind of life in the community of Christians that they already share in Jesus Christ. This interpretation gives to the expression *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* the usual meaning that it has in Paul, namely, living union with the risen Christ. The verse does not refer to the imitation of the historical example of Christ, as the <sup>AV</sup> A. V. seems to imply, but rather to the realization in the life of the church of the life shared as members of the body of Christ. The relationship among themselves is analogous to the relation of the Christian <sup>to</sup> with Christ.

Before going in detail into the hymn, a few words about its vocabulary are in order. Beare<sup>1</sup> points out that the vocabulary and tone of the whole passage is peculiarly Christian, and Christian against a Hellenistic, non-Jewish background. This Hellenistic background is true to some extent only. But as a matter of fact, the hymn might be better

<sup>1</sup> Beare, op. cit., p. 77.

✓ AV  
KJV : accepted abbreviations  
RSV

understood against a Jewish background. There are ideas in the passage that can be related more appropriately to the Jewish tradition. The phrase "did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped" brings to mind the Genesis account of the fall of man. Thus the serpent spoke to Eve: "For God knows that when you eat it, your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil." We have underlined the words, "you will be like God," because they are the ones that are relevant to our phrase. Or again, the phrase might be understood against the background of Isaiah 14. There the Day Star, or Son of Dawn, obviously a heavenly figure, is reported to have said: "I will ascend above the height of the clouds, I will make myself like the Most High." These two Scripture passages really illuminate Philipians 2:6.

Also the concept of the servant-- *κορφή δούλου λαβών* -- can be meaningfully related to Isaiah 53. Of course, the identification of Jesus with the Servant of Isaiah was made by Christians, but the point at issue is that they were seeing Jesus against the backdrop of the revelation of God in the Old Testament, and not exclusively through Hellenistic concepts, although the latter cannot be excluded.<sup>1</sup> In either case, the category of myth is present.

Verse 6. *ὃς ἐν κορπῇ θεοῦ ἐπάρχων οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν  
ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶνα ἴσα θεῷ*

These are some of the translations of this verse:

A. V. : "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

R. S. V.: "Who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped."

Moffat: "Though he was divine by nature, he did not set store upon equality with God."

<sup>1</sup> On the whole question of the Jewish background of this passage, see Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 174-181.

*«You consistently mispell this scholar's name»*

Beare: "Being in the form of God  
Counted not as plunder  
Equality with God."

Both the R. S. V. and the Moffat<sup>1</sup> versions give the participial clause a concessive force by translating it "though he was in the form of God," and "though he was divine by nature," respectively. This is a better rendering than the "who, being in the form of God" of the A. V. and the "Being in the form of God" of Beare. This is so because there is an implicit contrast between the high state predicated here of Christ and the path he chose not to follow, i.e. between the participial clause and the main statement which follows.

The verb *ἐπαρχειν* means here no more than the simple "to be." *Μορφή* is found nowhere else in the New Testament, except in Mark 16:72. Kennedy says that the word "always signifies a form which truly and fully expresses the being which underlies it."<sup>1</sup> Michael comments as follows: "Though the word does not actually mean nature, yet a thing cannot be said to be in the *μορφή* of another unless it possesses the essential qualities of the other."<sup>2</sup> Cullmann relates *μορφή* to the creation story of Adam. He says:

¶ J. Héring has correctly pointed out that this Greek word corresponds to the Hebrew *תְּצַלֵּם* (image) of Gen. 1:26. The Peshitta indicates the same connection in translating *μορφή* with *demutha* here. Thus *μορφή* in Phil. 2:6 is immediately related to the concept *εἰκών*, since the Semitic root word *תְּצַלֵּם* or its synonym *דִּשָּׁן* can correspond to either of the two Greek words. This means that v. 6 does not refer to Jesus' divine 'nature', but rather to the image of God which he possessed from the beginning.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Michael, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

In this case Jesus was "the Heavenly Man, the pre-existent pure image of God, the God-man already in his pre-existence."<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, Cullmann interprets the word in the light of the Son of man concept. He sees the pre-existence of the Son of man postulated by the clause  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \upsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega\nu$ .

One thing is clear, regardless of the line of interpretation that one follows, the pre-existence of Jesus and his relationship to God are set forth in this clause. For our own part, we think, following the meaning of the word as explained by Kennedy and Michael, that the divine nature of Jesus is implied here, although we do not maintain that later theological distinctions are already present. Let us turn now to the following statement:  $\omicron\upsilon\chi\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\alpha\gamma\mu\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\gamma\eta\gamma\alpha\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \epsilon\iota\upsilon\alpha\iota\ \hat{\iota}\sigma\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omega$ . What does the phrase "equality with God" mean? Is being equal with God synonymous <sup>with</sup> of being divine by nature? An affirmative answer to this question is excluded by the fact that  $\upsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  refers to <sup>??</sup> essential being, while  $\hat{\iota}\sigma\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omega$  refers to a state or condition.

Some believe that Christ possessed equality with God before his incarnation; others, that that equality was achieved only at his exaltation. In deciding which way to take, we should remember that in Pauline thought equality with God and divinity of nature do not go together. Paul, even after Christ's exaltation, could conceive of a time when the Son himself, having completed his work, would be subjected to the Father (I Cor. 15:38). Yet we cannot conceive that Paul would think of the Son as having at that time ceased to be divine by

<sup>1</sup> Cullmann, op. cit., p. 176.



nature. Both Michael and Cullmann believe that equality with God was achieved at Christ's exaltation.<sup>1</sup> We believe Paul would even hesitate to go that far. Even if Christ was worshipped and recognized as God, and that seems to be the import of the last verses of this passage, there is implicit a subordination in Pauline thinking that should not be brushed aside. ~~Maybe~~ <sup>Perhaps</sup> there is an eternal subordination in the inner reality of the being of God which is the product of a choice of love. This last thought we put forth, hesitantly, but conscious of the fact that the subordination of the Son to the Father is present in Pauline thought, ~~as~~ <sup>and</sup> also in the epistle to the Hebrews and other New Testament writings.

The attitude of Christ to this equality of God is expressed by the words: οὐχ ἄρπαγνόν ἡγήσατο. The key word here is ἄρπαγνόν. It can be taken either in the active or passive sense; that is, "grasping," or "a thing being grasped." The A. V., taking it in the active sense, has translated the statement: "thought it not robbery to be equal with God." According to this version, Christ was conscious of his divine right to equality with God, in his pre-existent state and thus his condescension to his humiliation is all the more enhanced.

Michael ~~puts~~ <sup>has</sup> two objections to this view. "For one," he says, if this were the meaning, we should have expected the next clause to be introduced by 'nevertheless' or 'and yet.' For another, the drift of the passage does not lead us to expect just here a statement of Christ's consciousness of his right to equality with God."<sup>2</sup> Beth

<sup>1</sup> Michael, op. cit., p. 87; Cullmann, op. cit., p. 181.

<sup>2</sup> Michael, op. cit., p. 88.

the A. R. V. and the R. S. V. with their "a thing to be grasped" take the word in the passive sense. This seems to be the more acceptable translation.

Having decided that <sup>the</sup> noun is to be taken in the passive, there are still two possible meanings, i.e. "a plunder or booty retained," or "a plunder of booty to be grasped or snatched." In the former case it is assumed that Christ already possessed equality with God in his pre-existent state. He, therefore, did not look upon his equality with God as something to be retained at all costs. The latter meaning presupposes that equality with God was not something already possessed by Christ before the incarnation. "The second meaning," says Michael, "suits the derivation of the word better than does the former. The cognate verb appears invariably to denote snatching something not yet possessed."<sup>1</sup> This is the meaning implied in the A. R. V. and R. S. V. and the Moffat <sup>ε</sup>versions.

Another possible line of interpretation is that, although equality with God is something attainable for Christ, neither in his pre-incarnate state nor in his exaltation has he grabbed it. The Son of his own volition was and remains subordinate to the Father. This is a subordination in love and does not annul the exaltation, but rather enhances it, since ~~he~~ <sup>he has</sup> is subordinated yet one with the living God, even in his exaltation. This interpretation, as suggested above, is in line with the Pauline concept of subordination.

Verses 7-8. ἀλλ' ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, μορὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν δομιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ ὁχήματι σῦρεθεὶς

<sup>1</sup> Michael, op. cit., p. 89.

10

ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν, γενόμενος ὑπὸ ἡμοῦ  
 μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.

Verse 6 refers to Christ's pre-existent state. Verses 7 and 8 go together and refer to his incarnation or humiliation. The verb *κενεῖν* has been the object of innumerable theological disquisitions. However, Paul, or whoever wrote the hymn, does not tell us of what Christ did empty himself.

Some say that Christ divested himself of his divine nature. But it does not seem necessary to hold that the retention of divine nature and the assumption of the nature of a servant are incompatible.

Others affirm that Christ divested himself of equality with God. However, we said above that equality with God was not something that Christ possessed in his pre-incarnate state.

Lightfoot says: "He divested himself, not of his divine nature, for that was impossible, but of the glories and prerogatives of Deity."<sup>1</sup> This sounds akin to John 17:5: "Father, glorify thou me in thy own presence with the glory which I had with thee before the world was made." It would seem as if John ~~is~~ giving here an answer to our question. John 17:5

Michael believes that it is possible that the author was not thinking of any definite object for the verb. In this case the statement may have been intended as a general antithesis to grasping at equality with God. He also takes the suggestion of some that *κενεῖν* means here just "to pour out," with "himself" as the direct object,

<sup>1</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (Cambridge: Macmillan & Co., 1868), p. 110.

and of others that relate the term to Isaiah 53:12, in which it is said: "because he poured out his soul to death."<sup>1</sup> This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that in the next clause Christ is called a servant and is said to have been obedient unto death.

There seems to be no room here for any of the elaborate "kenotic" theories of the person of Christ advocated by some nineteenth and twentieth century theologians. The hymn speaks here of the incarnation without giving any inkling as to what the Christ left behind before he became incarnate. M. R. Vincent puts it this way:

Γ As regards *ἐκείνου ἐκένωσεν*, any attempt to commit Paul to a precise theological statement of the limitations of Christ's humanity involves the reader in a hopeless maze. The word *ἐκένωσεν* was evidently selected as a peculiarly strong expression of the entireness of Jesus' self-renunciation, and in order to throw the pre-incarnate glory and the incarnate humiliation into sharp contrast: to show that Christ utterly renounced and laid aside the majesty which he possessed in his original state. Its most satisfactory definition is found in the succeeding details which describe the incidents of Christ's humanity, and with this exegesis is compelled to stop. The word does not indicate a surrender of deity, nor a paralysis of deity, nor a change of personality, nor a break in the continuity of consciousness."<sup>2</sup>

Vincent's point of view appears to run parallel to Lightfoot's and to the Johannine solution of the problem. This position is "kenotic" in the sense that it affirms that Christ laid aside his majesty, but it does not believe in depotentialization, as H. R. Mackintosh, P. T. Forsyth, and Vincent Tayler hold.

It seems to us that Michael's exegesis is the most adequate on this point and the least theologically biased.

<sup>1</sup> Michael, op. cit., p. 90.

<sup>2</sup> \_\_\_\_\_, The Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), p. 89.

\* I believe the author's name in this instance should be written out. I believe the form you use is permissible only in bibliography.

Whatever may have been the meaning intended by the term *ἐκείνωσεν*, the author goes on to say that it was by taking the form of a servant and being born in the likeness of men that Christ emptied himself. The word form--*μορφή*--is the same one used in verse 6. It points to the reality of the condition now assumed by Christ. He truly became a servant. The word servant--*δοῦλος*--is the common word for slave and points to the completeness of Christ's renunciation.

The word *ὁμοίωμα* is used by Paul in Romans 1:23, 5:14, 6:5, and 8:3. In the last passage he speaks of God "sending his son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin." The word means likeness or similarity. It does not mean that Christ's humanity was not real. It just says that Christ was like men in general.

In the clause *καὶ ὁμοίωσας ἑᾷ φεῖς ὡς ἄνθρωπος*, Paul emphasizes again the likeness of Christ to other men. But the noun *ὁμοίωμα* applies only to the outward appearance, i.e. what can be apprehended by the senses. The word implies outward appearance, even more than *ὁμοίωμα*.

It was then as a man that "he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross." The death on a cross is the final act of self-renunciation on the part of the servant. Obedience was present from eternity, but now finds its climax on a cross--the symbol of suffering and shame. There was no limit to <sup>Christ's</sup> humiliation.

We cannot refrain from pointing out that the suffering servant of Isaiah 53 must have been in the mind of the author as he penned these lines. The conjunction of the words servant and death point in that direction.

The writer does not say to whom the servant is obedient. ~~Michael~~ believes that obedience was to God.<sup>1</sup> Beare, however, points out it must have been to the power of the Elemental Spirits.<sup>2</sup> Both positions are right. Christ was indeed obedient to God, but also he was subjected to the power of death. This last position is confirmed by Hebrews 2:14-15: "Since therefore the children share in flesh and blood, he himself likewise partook of the same nature, that through death he might destroy him who has the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver all those who through fear of death were subjected to life-long bondage."

Verses 9-11. διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερέψωκε, καὶ ἔχαριτάτο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα· ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, καὶ πάντα γλῶσσαι ἐξομολογήενται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν τοῦ πατρὸς.

Up to this point Christ has been the actor. It is he, who, though being in the form of God, did not consider equality with God a thing to be snatched. It was he who emptied himself; it was he who took on the form of a servant; it was he who was born in the likeness of other men; it was he who humbled himself; it was he who was obedient unto death, even the death of a cross. This is the dramatic climax of his self-humiliation.

Now God enters into action. It is God who superexalts him; it is God who confers upon him a name which is above every name. And in

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., p. 93.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., p. 84.

this exalted state Christ receives the worship of all those who dwell in heaven, on earth and under the earth. All is to the glory of God.

The verbal form ὑπερψωκε is very strong. The A. V. translates it "God...hath highly exalted him;" so also the A. S. V. and the R. S. V. Moffat renders it: "God raised him high." Beare, with his "God...exalted him to the highest station" comes nearest to the intensive force of the verb. Cullmann advocates translating the term "God did more than exalt him."<sup>1</sup>

This exaltation of Christ goes together with the name he has received. The name conferred upon him by God is above every name, not just every human name. The same thought is present in other New Testament writings in the expression that God made Christ to sit at his right hand. In Ephesians 1:20-21 we read: "He raised him from the dead and made him sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above every name that is named, not only in this age but also in that which is to come, and he has put all things under his feet."

The name given to Christ is most likely that of Lord, although other suggestions have been made. Lord is the rendering for Yahweh in the LXX and was a name commonly used in Gentile religion. Lord is the title par excellence that Paul and other New Testament writers applied to the resurrected Christ. It was given to Jesus after his resurrection and on account of it. "To Saint Paul and his age," says Maurice Jones, "the Christ, Incarnate, Crucified, and Risen, has become equated with the Most High God of the Jews, and for him is claimed exclusively the honour associated in paganism with the

<sup>1</sup> Cullmann, op. cit., p. 180.

supreme deity."<sup>1</sup>

Verses 10 and 11 <sup>declare</sup> tell the purpose of God in exalting Christ and conferring upon him a name which is above every name. To Christ is ascribed now the adoration due to God. Verse 10 has Old Testament overtones. In Isaiah 45:23 we read: "By myself I have sworn, from my mouth has gone forth in righteousness a word that shall not return! 'To me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear'" This verse is quoted in Romans 14:11. The praise in both cases is given to God. But in our text it is given to Christ. It is an indication of the lofty place that Christ occupied in the thinking of Paul and the early church.

Ἐπουρανίῳ καὶ ἐπουρανίῳ καὶ καταχθονίῳ are adjectives used as substantives. They can be either masculine or neuter. We take them as masculine and as referring to those beings of which Paul speaks in Romans 8:38, 39 and Ephesians 1:21, 6:12. The πᾶν γένος and the πάντα γένη obviously refer to personal beings.

Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ means the name belonging to Jesus and not the name Jesus. It is Jesus as bearing the name Lord, given to him by God.

The subject of verse 11 is the universal confession of the lordship of Christ. "Jesus Christ is Lord." This is what everyone should confess. It is the earliest creed of the Christian church. See Romans 10:9, I Cor. 12:3.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Michael, op. cit., p. 95.



The verse and the whole passage closes with a *εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρὸς*. This is in full agreement with Pauline theology. See I Cor. 15:28. It is fitting that the exaltation finds its climax and completion in the self-surrender to the Father on the part of the Son. "To God be all the glory" seems to epitomize the whole purpose of redemption.

Now let us turn to some of the truths set forth and the questions raised by this passage.

1. The whole question of "demythologizing" is raised by this passage. The apostle, or whoever wrote the hymn, speaks about the heavenly redeemer that came down from heaven, dwelt on earth, died and returned to heaven victorious. This is the language of myth used to explain the historical event of the life, death and resurrection of Christ. However, it is important to remember that the locus of the hymn is an historical event. In spite of Bultmann and others, we believe that it is impossible for man to express himself religiously without resorting to the language of myth. Only the language of myth can encompass the whole reality of God and the created universe, including man, in a short poetical form.

2. The events of redemption through Christ are described in this hymn in three stages: pre-existence, humiliation, exaltation. In the first two stages Christ is presented as the actor. In the final and climactic action, it is God who takes the initiative.

3. It is significant that the resurrection is not mentioned specifically, although it is presupposed. This is also in line with the thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is the exalted

Christ that is <sup>stressed</sup> emphasized and again the resurrection is presupposed. <sup>the</sup>  
 It seems that in the minds of the New Testament writers resurrection, ascension and exaltation are almost synonymous terms.

4. It is also significant that all the inhabitants of the three-story universe are affected by Christ's exaltation. Christ's redemptive work is thus conceived as having cosmic repercussions. <sup>consequences??</sup>

5. The hymn is saturated with Scripture. It has Old Testament references in verses 6, 7, and 8. In verse 11 there is a quotation from Isaiah. This link with the Old Testament is one of the outstanding characteristics of the New Testament. The New Testament writers saw no break between the Old and the New Covenants. Rather, they conceived of the relationship between them in the categories of promise and fulfillment, or shadow and reality, to use the special formulation of the Letter to the Hebrews. The writer of our hymn also found responsive chords to the new revelation in the old tradition.

6. There is a recognition that Christ somehow shares the <sup>μορφή</sup> of Deity--the quality of Deity. However, there is no attempt to explain the relationship between Christ and God except as it refers to the work of redemption.

7. There is a subordination of Christ to the Father that is obvious throughout. Yet Christ is worshipped as God is worshipped. ~~But~~ All is to the glory of God.

8. An affirmation of the present Lordship of Christ is the climax of the passage. This is the resurrection faith of the church. Jesus Christ is Lord, is the earliest creedal formula.

9. This passage provides material for trinitarian formulation,

although, of course, this doctrine is a later creation.

In the verb *KEVEN*, it has furnished many past and present-day theologians with the basic category for a distinctive Christological formulation. However, the passage does not tell in what it was that the self-emptying consisted. It only affirms the fact of the incarnation.

10. In the final analysis, it might be said that not even the language of myth can convey the meaning of the Christ event. So unexpected and inconceivable was the medium of revelation--a servant, a cross, exaltation--that even today men wonder when they hear of the event and say, <sup>like</sup> Festus said to Paul: "Paul, you are mad; your great learning is turning you mad."

*The servant looks good, like a servant should!*

### Bibliography

Beare, F. W. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians.  
London: Adam & Charles Black, 1959.

Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament.  
Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.

Lightfoot, J. B. St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians.  
Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1868.

Michael, J. High. The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians.  
New York: Harper & Brothers, 1927.

Vincent, Marvin R. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on  
the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon.  
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

\* In your bibliography, it is not necessary  
(wrong, according to Suidas) to put  
place of publication, etc., on a separate line.