

THE CHRIST-HYMN IN PHILIPPIANS

2:5-11

A REVIEW ARTICLE

By I. HOWARD MARSHALL

The annual Tyndale Lectures delivered under the auspices of the Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical and Theological Research have not infrequently given an earnest of good things to come from the lecturers who have delivered them. The first New Testament lecture on *The Speeches in the Acts* (delivered in 1942 and published in 1944) was the harbinger of Professor F. F. Bruce's two major commentaries on the Greek and English texts of the Acts, and since that auspicious beginning there have been lectures on such subjects as 'The Pastoral Epistles and the Mind of Paul', 'The Relation of St John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary' and '2 Peter Reconsidered' which have been followed by important studies in these fields.¹

In 1959 Dr Ralph P. Martin delivered a New Testament lecture (published in 1960) entitled *An Early Christian Confession*, in which he gave a full and richly documented exposition of Philippians 2:5-11. He followed this piece of work up with a commentary on the Epistle as a whole (1959), and this at once received acclaim as being a work of high merit. Not content with these achievements, he has pursued his studies further, obtaining the award of a London Ph.D. *en route*, and has now put us further in his debt with a definitive work on Philippians 2:5-11.² In this book he offers an exhaustive discussion of his chosen passage in the light of everything of note written about it during the past sixty years to 1963, and gives us his own care-

¹ D. Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles and the Mind of Paul*, Tyndale Press, London (1956); *The Pastoral Epistles*, Tyndale Press, London (1957); A. Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship*, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1960); E. M. B. Green, *2 Peter Reconsidered*, Tyndale Press, London (1961); *2 Peter and Jude*, Tyndale Press, London (1968).

² R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii. 5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 4), Cambridge University Press (1967). xii, 364 pp. 55s.

fully wrought exposition of the passage, its background in early Christianity, and its significance for the proclamation of the gospel today.

The enormous amount of scholarly material to be discussed—Dr Martin has a bibliography of about 500 items—has made for a bulky monograph, and the author has clearly had difficulty in organizing his survey. There is a certain amount of repetition, and at times one feels that the logical structure of the discussion could have been improved. These factors, however, simply point to the complexity of the themes to be discussed and illustrate the author's desire to do justice to every point of view, including a few which he has momentarily rescued from oblivion in order to indicate how just was their consignment to that abode.

I

Dr Martin has divided his book into three parts. In the first he discusses the background of the passage and gives a survey of recent lines of interpretation. Starting from second-century evidence he shows that the early church had the custom of singing hymns to Christ, *carmina Christi*, as he calls them. He then provides New Testament evidence for the existence of such hymnology and thus gains a context in contemporary church life and worship for the 'hymn' which is generally thought to be embedded in the passage.

The character of the passage as a hymn was established beyond doubt by the seminal work of E. Lohmeyer who proffered an analysis of it into six strophes each of three lines. Various attempts have been made to improve upon the analysis of Lohmeyer, the most important being that of J. Jeremias who obtains three strophes of four lines at the cost of regarding parts of verses 10 and 11 (in addition to a phrase in verse 8 already noted by Lohmeyer) as Pauline additions to the original hymn. Dr Martin is not entirely happy with Jeremias's analysis,³ and he develops a suggestion by R. Bultmann in his own rearrangement of the lines of the hymn to give six couplets which would have been suitable for antiphonal chanting. We may here reproduce his translation of the hymn:

³ Jeremias finds the passion (ἐκένωσεν) in the first strophe of the hymn, which deals with the pre-existence of Jesus, and places the turning point of the hymn (διδό, v. 9) in the middle of a strophe.

- A (a) ⁶Who, though He bore the stamp of the divine Image,
(b) Did not use equality with God as a gain to be exploited;
- B (a) ⁷But surrendered His rank,
(b) And took the role of a servant;
- C (a) Accepting a human-like guise,
(b) ⁸And appearing on earth as the Man;
- D (a) He humbled Himself,
(b) In an obedience which went so far as to die.
- E (a) ⁹For this, God raised Him to the highest honour,
(b) And conferred upon Him the highest rank of all;
- F (a) ¹⁰That, at Jesus' name, every knee should bow,
(b) ¹¹And every tongue should own that 'Jesus Christ is Lord'.

After this analysis and a summary of the evidence for an Aramaic *Urschrift* for the hymn, Dr Martin discusses the authorship of the hymn. If it is a separate composition included in the Epistle to the Philippians, it need not necessarily be by Paul himself. At this stage in his book the author is content simply to set down the finely balanced arguments on both sides, and deals with the questions of language, the presence of non-Pauline ideas and the absence of characteristic Pauline theology, and the probability of Paul's debt to his predecessors for various parts of his teaching. One point which he does not make is that, if Paul himself was the author of the hymn, he is hardly likely to have added those interpretative glosses found in the present form of the passage and thus spoiled the poetic symmetry of his own composition.

Finally in this part of the book, Dr Martin outlines the various types of modern interpretation of the passage. He begins with three legacies from the nineteenth century. (1) The Lutheran 'Dogmatic' view that the hymn does not refer to the pre-existence of Christ, but has as its subject the incarnate, earthly Christ. Dr Martin regards this interpretation as defunct, but in the period between the writing of his book and its publication it has once again showed signs of life. (2) The so-called christo-

logical theory of 'kenosis' found support in this passage for its view that Christ 'divested Himself of His divine attributes of omniscience and omnipotence' and revealed His divine Person solely, 'through a human consciousness'. Most modern scholars agree that this question of doctrine cannot be settled by reference to a single verse. (3) Many scholars have found that in the hymn the ethical example of Christ is held up for imitation by His followers. Already at this stage in his discussion Dr Martin argues for his view that neither in its present context in Philippians nor in its original setting was the hymn meant to set an ethical example before Christ's followers. So far as the present setting of the hymn is concerned, it is argued that verse 5 should be translated: 'Think this way among yourselves which you think in Christ Jesus, *i.e.* as members of His church', rather than with the familiar: 'Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus' (RV), and that Paul rarely uses the example of Christ to enforce an exhortation.⁴ Consequently, modern study of the hymn, especially since Lohmeyer, has turned into different channels and has been primarily concerned with the background of thought to the hymn as providing the key to its interpretation. We may note five of the interpretations which Dr Martin tabulates.⁵

(4) Lohmeyer's own view was that the hymn depicts a cosmic, soteriological drama against a mythological background, and that this background is to be found in heterodox Jewish speculation regarding the primal man. He believed that this figure (the Son of man of Daniel 7:13) was fused with that of the suffering Servant.

(5) Of particular importance is the view of E. Käsemann, which Dr Martin summarizes at length in an appendix. Käsemann interprets the hymn against a gnostic background and firmly rejects any ethical or dogmatic interpretation of the hymn. 'No definition of His nature is given. The hymn is concerned with events in a connected series; and events which show contrasts. The hymn tells the story of a heavenly Being . . . who comes down and is obedient. Finally He is exalted and

⁴ In an appendix Martin outlines more fully the arguments of E. Käsemann against finding an ethical example in the hymn, especially the fact that the hymn sets forth a soteriological drama and not a 'paradigm of virtue'; he then summarizes the more recent criticism of this view by E. Larsson but does not find it convincing.

⁵ We omit mention of the theories of A. A. T. Ehrhardt, W. L. Knox and K. Bornhäuser, which have found little, if any, acceptance among scholars.

enthroned as World-Ruler over all the spiritual forces which the ancient world thought of as peopling the inter-space between the planets and the stars, and exercising a malign influence upon the dwellers upon earth. But as He is and remains a heavenly *Anthropos*, the obedience He shows (and not to His Father, an assumption which the commentators read into the text) cannot be displayed for our imitation.' (p. 91). Recent commentators have been much influenced by Käsemann's views, but a recent article by D. Georgi has shown how needless is his appeal to gnosticism to explain various features of the hymn.

(6) A return to interpretation within a biblical context was made by O. Cullmann and J. R. Geiselman, and (7) the importance of Hellenistic Judaism has been stressed by E. Schweizer.

(8) Finally, the question of the setting of the hymn in primitive Christianity has been raised by J. Jervell who has suggested that the hymn is not eucharistic (Lohmeyer) but baptismal; in baptism believers are conformed to the image of their Lord as depicted in the hymn. This understanding of the hymn is independent of Jervell's further theory (pp. 247f.) that the hymn holds together two diverse Christologies in verses 6-8 and 9-11.

In summing up these approaches Dr Martin makes plain his own view that the hymn is not a piece of dogmatic theology; it contains neither an ethical example nor a piece of christology but 'a piece of *Heilsgeschichte*'. Its background should be sought possibly 'in some Greek-speaking Christian community whose biblical traditions had been modified by Hellenistic Judaism' (pp. 83f.).

In the second and weightiest part of his book Dr Martin proceeds to give a minute exegetical study of each phrase of the hymn; the discussion is in fact so full that the reader is sometimes in danger of losing its thread, and occasionally he may not be absolutely certain which of several competing interpretations is commended by the author.

The translation of the hymn reproduced above will already have given some indication of the general character of Dr Martin's interpretation of it.

Beginning with verse 6a, he notes that there are three types of interpretation. There is first the philosophical interpretation

of μορφή according to which 'the pre-incarnate One shared in the divine essence without actually being identified with it' (p. 102). Martin himself prefers to find the background of μορφή in the LXX. In the LXX μορφή is closely akin to εἶδος and ὁμοίωμα, and refers to outward form. As applied to God it means his δόξα or 'glory'. This is confirmed by the way in which μορφή is equivalent to εἰκὼν, both being translation-equivalents for מְצֹלָה, and by the fact that εἰκὼν and δόξα are equivalents, both being used to translate תְּמוּנָה. This leads Martin to a detailed discussion of the New Testament teaching about Christ as the image of God (2 Corinthians 4:4; Colossians 1:15) or as the glory of God, and about Christ as the Second Adam. 'What Paul had learned at the feet of Gamaliel about the "glory" of the first Adam—the idealized picture of the Rabbinic schools—he transferred to the last Adam as He had revealed Himself to him in a blaze of glory' (p. 119). The third type of interpretation turns away from Greek philosophy and the LXX to the gnostic sects of the Hellenistic world and holds that Paul's thought is a Christianizing of the myth of the heavenly redeemer who abandoned his divine nature when he came down to earth. Despite the advocacy of this view by R. Bultmann, E. Käsemann, W. Schmithals and G. Bornkamm, Martin believes that the arguments of E. Percy and others have rendered it untenable. Nevertheless, he is persuaded that some such speculations in a Jewish dress may have contributed to the hymn. In this case it is speculation 'about a Heavenly Original Man in Hellenized Judaism' which gave the author of the hymn interest in this mode of expression.

In verse 6b the problem of ἀπαγμός has to be faced. The word has a passive sense, and Martin solves the old problem of whether it means a *res rapta* or a *res rapienda* by invoking the phrase *res retinenda*.⁶ Christ refused to exploit the position which He held for His own advantage. Taking the phrase ἵσον τῷ Θεῷ to mean 'independence from God' (cf. John 5:18), he argues that Christ implicitly possessed lordship over the world; 'He did not raise Himself up in proud arrogance and independence—although He might have done so—but chose by the path of humiliation and obedience to come to His lordship in the way

⁶ Martin does not give the origin of this phrase. It appears to go back to L. Bouyer. For further discussion of ἀπαγμός as *res rapienda* see J. Geweiss, 'Die Philipperbriefstelle 2, 6b' in J. Blinzler et al. (ed.) *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* Verlag F. Pustet, Regensburg (1963) 69-85.

that pleased God' (p. 152). In an appendix, Martin finds it probable that there is a contrast between Adam and Christ at this point, but he is less certain that there is an intended contrast with the fall of Satan.

Probably the greatest strife has raged over the interpretation of verse 7a, b. After a discussion of the linguistic possibilities for ἐκένωσεν, Martin examines the proposed meanings for the two phrases together. He discusses and rejects the traditional 'kenotic' view; Christ did not empty Himself of the μορφή Θεοῦ. The verb κενόω has a metaphorical rather than a metaphysical meaning: 'He made Himself as nothing' (p. 195). And He did this by becoming a man, for 'His Servanthood is a synonym for His humanity'. Martin discusses Käsemann's view that Christ's slavery was to the evil, elemental spirits of the universe without at this point pronouncing definitely for or against it. He is plainly much impressed by the theory that the servant imagery is drawn from Isaiah 53, and on the whole favours it, but feels that the hymn needs to be set in the wider context of the suffering righteous men in Judaism suggested by E. Schweizer. He speaks finally of 'a suspension of His role as the divine Image by His taking on an image which is Man's—a role that will blend together the pictures of the obedient last Adam and the suffering servant' (p. 196).

Following Dibelius and later scholars, Martin regards verses 7c and 8a as belonging together in one couplet and consequently being synonymous; he thus rejects Lohmeyer's analysis which separated the two lines, and found contrasting ideas expressed in them. The clue to the meaning of the couplet is given by verse 8b, where ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν indicates the willing humiliation which Christ underwent in becoming man and suffering death. The meaning of verse 7c is ambiguous: does the use of ὁμοίωμα mean that 'Christ became Man completely and in the fullest sense, or . . . merely presented the picture of a Man, which appeared like a man, whereas, in actual fact, He remained in the world as a divine being'? (p. 201, quoting O. Michel). Of the various answers proposed to this question, Martin prefers that of Michel who finds here a use of the 'epiphany style' of Daniel 7:13; Ezekiel 1:26, *et al.* in which the writer shrinks from identifying a divine being too closely in human language. Nevertheless, Martin holds that verse 7c is ambiguous as it stands, but its meaning is confirmed by the

clear statement in the parallel line 8a which 'declares that all His external appearance showed that He was an empirical man among men' (p. 206). He then discusses Lohmeyer's view that εἰσθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος reflects the Aramaic כְּבֶר־אִנּוּשׁ of Daniel 7:13 and that Jesus is presented as the heavenly Man who appears upon earth. His objection to this view is the disparity between the wording of the hymn and the LXX of Daniel 7:13, ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, but he seems to be prepared to accept the counter-argument that ἄνθρωπος is the Hellenistic equivalent of ὁ υἱὸς (τοῦ) ἀνθρώπου, and to translate: 'And being made known by His appearance in the status of the Man.'

The discussion of verse 8b, c is not too easy to follow. Three views of the meaning are outlined. For many scholars this section of the hymn provides the clearest evidence for the use of the suffering Servant motif in the hymn. But Martin holds it to be strange that there is no mention of the sin-bearing, vicarious work of the Servant; he does indeed mention the parallel example of the use in Acts, but does not recognize that this is an argument against his position. He also argues that, since the Servant motif is often bound up with the imitation of Christ, and since the 'ethical interpretation' of the hymn is very fragile, it is unlikely that the thought of the Servant is to be found here. Here Martin withdraws the exegesis of this verse found in his commentary, and many may feel that his earlier thoughts were better than his second ones. From this view, Martin turns to the suggestion that Christ humiliated Himself by becoming obedient to the powers of evil, including death, over which He triumphed when God exalted Him. He rejects the fully developed gnostic interpretation of Käsemann, but holds that Christ did 'put Himself in an emphatic voluntary fashion under the control of death'. Thus he aligns himself with those commentators who stress that the hymn says nothing about obedience being rendered to God. Finally, mention is made of the rabbinic coupling of humiliation and obedience, and the martyr theology of Judaism according to which innocent suffering has atoning value for sin, but Martin holds that this approach cannot provide a definitive understanding of the text.

With verse 9 the hymn reaches its turning point, but there is no need to find a disparate Christology in the second part, as has been argued by J. Jervell. The first problem to be faced is whether Christ's exaltation was a reward for His obedience

(cf. διὸ καὶ) or an act of divine grace. Martin opts for the latter view: 'Christ did not force the hand of God, as a doctrine of merit implies' (p. 232). He rejects Lohmeyer's interpretation of the passage which is based upon the philosophical presuppositions that from time to time vitiated his exegesis.⁷ The second problem concerns the 'name'. The actual name is no doubt that of Κύριος, and the gift of it signifies that Christ is now installed in the place of office and power, exercising the sovereignty which properly belongs to God. Käsemann, however, has pointed out that there cannot be any increase in the power of One who was in the image of God before His incarnation, and that therefore the bestowal of the name means that Christ is now openly revealed to men and rules over the universe; thus the unknown and hidden God is revealed to men—in Christ. The third problem is the meaning of the prefix in ὑπερύψωσεν. It is to be taken not in a comparative but in a superlative sense; 'Jesus takes the highest station' far above all other powers. He is Lord not merely of the church, but of the universe.

This last point is confirmed in the discussion of verse 10. The verse does not describe the submission of all creatures to Christ as they call on His name. Rather it pictures an enthronement scene in which the proclaiming of the name of Jesus causes all creatures to admit that He is the rightful Lord of the universe. The beings described in verse 10b are probably hostile spirit-powers who confess their defeat and surrender to Christ. The time of this act of exaltation cannot be simply placed in the present, for evil is still active. The scene is therefore, 'the presence of God, for whom there is no past, present or future. Already now in His sight the world's salvation and reconciliation is a *fait accompli*; but the Church sees it only in prospect and vision. The Church knows it only as an article of faith and hope' (p. 269).⁸

Finally, Martin considers the christological confession in verse 11b, c. He argues that the final phrase 'to the glory of God the Father' is meant to safeguard the inviolability of the Father's status (there is no rivalry within the Godhead) and to show

⁷ For illustration of this point see the discussion of Lohmeyer in G. Lundström, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh (1963) 156–162.

⁸ One feels that by this way of expressing the matter Martin has succumbed to some degree to the philosophical approach of Lohmeyer. Can one really say that there is no past, present or future for God?

that from 'henceforth God is known, not as a mysterious and capricious Fate, but as the Father of Jesus Christ into whose hands the destinies of life are committed' (p. 281). If, however, Christ is thus given a cosmic position as Lord, it is hard to fit this Christology into the thought of the Jerusalem church, despite the evidence of Acts 10:36. But this point leads us to consider the setting of the hymn.

Thus we reach Part Three of the book which attempts to place the hymn in its first-century context. First, there is the question of its place in the Epistle. Having rejected the view that it offers an ethical example to the readers, Martin holds that it tells them 'how you came to be incorporated into Christ—for the hymn tells you of His "way" from glory to ignominy and shame; and thence to glory again—and you are "in Him"; and, as such, you are called to live a life which has His redeeming acts as its foundation' (p. 290). At the same time, the final verse of the hymn reminds the readers that they too stand under the lordship of Christ. It assures them that the spirit-powers which hold men in thrall are defeated. These thoughts lead the author to accept Jervell's association of the hymn with a baptismal context. Baptized into Christ, Christians are called to live out the life of Christ as they become conformed to His image.

As a self-contained unit, the hymn is an ode sung to Christ. It is concerned more with what He accomplished than with who He was, and its stress lies on the lordship of Christ. It thus presents a soteriological drama, and should not be interpreted as a piece of dogmatic theology; one should not, for example, try to make its Christology conform to the Athanasian creed.

The author of such a hymn is heir to many traditions. 'His background is Jewish, but it is Greek ideas which stand at the forefront of his mind' (p. 297). The hymn is a missionary manifesto which sets forth Christ, the universal Lord, as the answer to the religious quests of the Graeco-Roman world. This thesis is supported by a comparison between the ideas of the hymn—what it says and omits—and those of the Palestinian *paradosis* in 1 Corinthians 15:3-5. The latter passage is concerned with the forgiveness of sins and interprets Christ's work 'according to the Scriptures'; the hymn is devoted to 'the assurance that God in Christ is in control of the universe and

that life has meaning' (p. 302). A possible candidate for the authorship is Stephen, the Stephen pictured by W. Manson in his seminal study of *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (1951). (This suggestion would have important implications for the date of the hymn, but the author does not raise this point.)

The relevance of the hymn, thus interpreted, is demonstrated by a brief survey of the Hellenistic world in which men longed to be set free from uncertainty and fear in a cold and unfriendly universe. Like the 'Song of the Star' in Ignatius, *Ephesians* 19, the hymn attests the victory of Christ over the aeons, so that life now derives its purpose from the meaning which Christ's incarnate existence gives to it.

This context and the hymn's answer to it are of importance for the church today. Modern man is not interested in prophecy and not oppressed by guilt, but he wants to know whether the universe is simply the product of blind, cosmic forces and whether life has a transcendent meaning. To such questions the Christ-hymn gives the answer.

II

Such is the general outline of this significant book. It remains to offer some assessment of its contribution, to raise a few critical questions and to see what aspects of the hymn require further study. There can be no doubt that Dr Martin has rendered a valuable service to New Testament scholarship. He has provided full summaries of the most significant recent contributions to the study of the Christ-hymn,⁹ and accompanied these with a perceptive and judicious appraisal of their value. Nor has he been content to offer a *Forschungsbericht*; he has given his own consistent and carefully framed exposition of the hymn, and provided a starting point for further research. Nevertheless, on a number of points critical comment is possible, and we may now proceed to offer some marginal comments on the author's thesis.

We begin with the question of form. It may be doubted whether the analysis of the passage offered by Martin is the last word on the subject. Two main criticisms may be offered.

⁹ The one important item which fails to appear in the bibliography is the 98 pp. Beiheft by W. Schmauch to the 1964 (13th) edition of E. Lohmeyer's Commentary. Pp. 19-33 discuss recent literature on the hymn.

First, Martin's analysis requires the omission of some three phrases (verses 8d, 10b and 10c)¹⁰ from the original form of the hymn. As we have hinted above, it seems unlikely that Paul would have so spoiled the symmetry of a hymn, when quoting it in the Epistle, whether it was his own earlier composition or from another hand. It is just possible that he added the brief comment in verse 8 in the written form of the hymn, if his readers were already acquainted with the hymn, but the presence of two further glosses is disturbing.¹¹

Second, it is far from clear that the glosses in verses 10 and 11 differ in language from the rest of the hymn. This point seems to be valid, whatever be one's view of the authorship of the hymn as a whole. The language is neither more nor less Pauline than that of the hymn as a whole, nor can it be said that the thought expressed is particularly Pauline.¹² This is true even of the phrase in verse 8, which Martin himself says is free from distinctively Pauline doctrine (pp. 57f.). We may in fact say that it is hard to find any good reason why Paul should have made these additions to the hymn for his purposes in the Epistle, whereas at least two of the phrases are perfectly comprehensible as original parts of the hymn. This means that the only reason for jettisoning the phrases is their metrical unsuitability.

It is, therefore, worth asking whether any of the alternative analyses fare any better.¹³ We can, I think, dismiss fairly quickly the more recent proposal of C. H. Talbert who uses the criteria of parallel expressions and chiasmic devices in the hymn to offer a new division of the hymn into four strophes of three lines each; his analysis suffers from the defects that it produces lines of such unequal length that the result can no longer be called a 'hymn', and that the second strophe (ἐν ὁμοιώματι . . .) begins with a very abrupt asyndeton.¹⁴ More important is the

¹⁰ With Martin I here adopt the versification of the English translations; v. 8 begins at καὶ σχήματι . . .

¹¹ It is not clear whether Martin himself has come to a final decision regarding these two glosses; at any rate he comments as fully on them as on any other part of the hymn.

¹² Cf. R. P. Martin, *op. cit.*, 34 n. 1.

¹³ C. K. Barrett has indicated the possibility that the pre-Pauline form of the hymn contained no reference to the pre-existence of Christ and that Paul himself inserted the phrase ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων (and presumably other material); *From First Adam to Last*, A. and C. Black, London (1962) 70-72.

¹⁴ C. H. Talbert, 'The Problem of Pre-Existence in Philippians 2:6-11', *JBL* 86 (1967) 141-153.

question whether the objections raised by later authors to Lohmeyer's analysis really stand.

The first objection is that of Dibelius that verses 7c and 8a are so similar in meaning and form that they should be joined together instead of being assigned to different strophes (pp. 31, 197f.). This is far from compelling. There is no good reason why the first line of one strophe should not summarize the thought of the preceding strophe before embarking upon a new thought.¹⁵ The second objection is made by J. Jeremias, namely that Lohmeyer's strophes do not always terminate at the end of sentences. This is an equally weak argument. In fact, each of Lohmeyer's strophes does conclude at a natural break in the sentence structure. If the objection were to be pressed, it could equally well be made against Martin's own scheme of couplets. The case, therefore, against Lohmeyer's analysis is a weak one, and in favour of Lohmeyer it must be urged that his scheme does provide a coherent analysis which is able to include the whole wording of the hymn, except of course for verse 8d. It is doubtful whether any of the schemes subsequently offered (even those which allow verse 8d a place in the original hymn) are a real improvement on Lohmeyer's.

The question of form is interesting in itself. It does not materially affect the meaning of the hymn.¹⁶ C. H. Talbert, however, has used his analysis in support of the claim that verses 6a and 7c (which begin his first and second strophes respectively) are parallel in form and consequently have the same point of reference. By this argument he is able to claim that the hymn does not refer to the pre-existence of Christ but to His earthly condition as the second Adam. He thus gives some critical support to the hypothesis of J. Harvey that the hymn does not speak of pre-existence.¹⁷ This reassertion of the Lutheran 'Dogmatic' view of the hymn does not carry conviction.¹⁸ It is impossible to make sense of numerous phrases in verses 6-8 if they are understood solely against the background

¹⁵ The device is not uncommon in the hymns of C. Wesley who often makes a link between the last line of a verse and the first line of the next. In 'Jesu, Lover of my soul', the concluding line 'Thou art full of truth and *grace*' is taken up in the opening line of the next verse, 'Plenteous *grace* with Thee is found'.

¹⁶ Thus Lohmeyer's interpretation of v. 8a in terms of the Son of man is not dependent upon his strophic analysis but must be judged by other, weightier criteria.

¹⁷ J. Harvey, 'A New Look at the Christ Hymn in Philippians 2:6-11', *ExpT* 76 (1964-65) 337-339.

¹⁸ D. F. Hudson, 'A Further Note on Philippians 2:6-11', *ExpT* 77 (1965-66) 29.

of the earthly life of Jesus. In what sense could the earthly Jesus be said to have been tempted to be equal with God? Why does the hymn use the aorist participle in verse 7c, and what meaning is to be assigned to εὑρεθείς in verse 8a? We may surely regard this interpretation of the hymn as without secure foundation.

III

One of the points which, as we have seen, Martin constantly reiterates, and on which he has changed his mind since the publication of his commentary on Philippians, is that the hymn does not provide an ethical example for Christians to imitate.¹⁹ He puts forward four arguments against this thesis. (1) The somewhat technical language of the hymn speaks against the view that it is presenting a simple, ethical picture of Christ. (2) Verse 5 does not refer to the mind 'which was also in Christ Jesus'. (3) Paul very rarely uses the ethical example of Jesus to reinforce an ethical appeal. To be a Christian is not to follow in the footsteps of the earthly Jesus but rather to share in His risen life. (4) Only verses 6-8 provide an example of humility; verses 9-11 form an irrelevant appendix.

We may question the force of these arguments. (1) Granted that the hymn was originally composed for a christological or soteriological purpose, there is no reason why Paul should not have given it a fresh application in this Epistle. There are plenty of examples in the New Testament of items of teaching (e.g. the parables) being used to instil more than one lesson, and the line between interpretations of the work of Jesus as an example and as a means of salvation is a fluid one (e.g. Mk. 10:42-45; 1 Pet. 2:21-25).

(2) One of the reasons sometimes brought forward for regarding the hymn as an independent, earlier composition is that the quotation goes beyond the immediate point of issue; the ethical point of comparison is indeed confined to the first half of the hymn. But there may be something to be said for relating verses 9-11 to the ethical appeal of Paul. The influence of the hymn on the thought of the Epistle as a whole has been noted by various scholars,²⁰ and in particular attention may be

¹⁹ R. P. Martin, *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians*, Tyndale Press, London (1959) 95-96.

²⁰ Cf. R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi*, 58f.; T. E. Pollard, 'The Integrity of Philippians', *NTS* 13 (1966-67) 57-66.

drawn to the way in which 3:11 and 3:20f. bring out the thought of glorification with Christ for those who share in His humiliation and suffering on earth (cf. 2 Tim. 2:11-13 for the same thought in a piece of traditional material).

(3) It should be emphasized that an ethical interpretation of the hymn in its context in Philippians is not dependent upon any particular translation of verse 5. We still await a fully satisfactory rendering of this *crux*. Martin's own translation of it is exposed to the objection already made by E. Lohmeyer that it makes the verse tautological.²¹ Certainly the tautology would be eased if we could supply φρονεῖν δεῖ rather than φρονεῖτε in the second clause, but we are bound to wonder why Paul did not express himself more explicitly if this was what he meant. There is perhaps more to be said for the second part of Lohmeyer's own rendering: 'Also seid gesinnt; das (sehet ihr) auch an Christus Jesus.'²² This requires that we should supply βλέπετε or ὀψατε in the relative clause and regard ἐν as introducing an example; the fact that this construction recurs twice in Philippians (1:30; 4:9) reinforces this interpretation (*pace* Martin, p. 84).²³

(4) The view that Paul makes little use of Christ as an example is, as Martin admits (p. 72), disputed. I am not convinced that the arguments which Martin quotes against his own case from the work of E. Larsson (pp. 86-88) can be so easily dismissed. The argument in Romans 15:1-7 is of especial importance in this regard. It is noteworthy that the general theme of this section of Romans is harmony within the church; Christians must not seek to please themselves because Christ did not please Himself (Rom. 15:2f.); they are 'to be of the same mind one with another according to Christ Jesus' (Rom. 15:5, RV; cf. 12:16); they are to receive another, as Christ also received them to the glory of God (Rom. 15:7). The similarity of thought with Philippians 2 is apparent, and the use of Christ as an example in Romans 15 suggests that the thought of His example cannot have been far from Paul's thoughts in Philippians. Furthermore, it is of interest that in Romans 14 there is teaching about Christ

²¹ E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon*,¹³ Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen (1964) 91 n. 3. Cf. E. Larsson, quoted by R. P. Martin, *op. cit.*, 86f.

²² Lohmeyer's argument (*ibid.*) that the two halves of the verse must be taken independently is less firmly based.

²³ Lohmeyer also cites *T. Simeon* 4:5: καθὼς ἴδετε ἐν Ἰωσήφ.

which echoes the Christ-hymn (Rom. 14:9) and the same passage from Isaiah 45:23 is quoted (Rom. 14:11).²⁴ It is also significant that in 1 Corinthians 10:31-11:1, where Paul explicitly refers to the example of Christ, the context is again one of harmony in the church brought about by a willingness to please others rather than seeking one's own advantage. There is probably here the thought of submission to the commands of Christ through Paul,²⁵ but at the same time there is certainly the fact of an example to be followed (*cf.* 1 Thes. 1:6). Alongside these passages should also be mentioned 2 Corinthians 8:9, where Paul is surely suggesting that readers should show the same kind of χάρις (2 Cor. 8:6) as was demonstrated by Christ in His renunciation of His riches.²⁶

We seem, therefore, to be justified in speaking with W. Kramer of a 'conformity-rule'. It is true, as he says, that 'the acts which form the basis of our salvation cannot be "imitated"'. But, he continues, 'the practical instructions derive their obligatory character from the fact that they conform to the conduct of Christ'.²⁷ There is of course a world of difference between the situation of the Christian and that of Christ Himself, but it is one of the paradoxes of early church thought that it could urge its members to be like Christ and long that He might be formed in them (Gal. 4:19); the identity between the Lord of glory and the earthly Jesus was not forgotten.

These considerations suggest that the Christ-hymn is used in Philippians as a means of putting the example of Christ before the readers, and we would urge that Martin's interpretation of the hymn in its present context would be strengthened by a return to the view which he held earlier.

IV

A problem of particular interest is the original setting of the hymn in early Christianity. It is one of the most important conclusions of Dr Martin's book that the hymn can be explained fully and convincingly in Jewish terms; there is no need to

²⁴ Is it possible that already in Rom. 14:11 Paul is thinking of Christ rather than of the Father? And what is the relationship between the use of Is. 45:23 in the two passages? Is Rom. 14-15 evidence for the existence of the Christ-hymn at that date?

²⁵ W. Michaelis in *TDNT* IV, 666-673.

²⁶ *Cf.* Eph. 4:32-5:2; Col. 3:13; 1 Tim. 6:13; 2 Cor. 10:1.

²⁷ W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, SCM Press, London (1966) 34a = 139.

invoke Greek philosophy or gnostic mythology as direct sources for the thought of the hymn, even if (as in the case of the Gospel of John) these may exercise a more indirect and peripheral influence upon it. Further, we can say definitely that the hymn was adopted by Paul as expressive of his Christology, and the parallels which we find in his Epistles suggest that its characteristic thoughts were an integral part of his theology and not a set of new ideas which he readily took over because they could easily be fitted into his theological framework. Our suggestion above that similar ideas are present in Romans 14–15 would be strengthened if E. Stauffer is right in claiming that the hymn lies behind Romans 10:6–13.²⁸

These points lead up to the question whether the hymn is a Pauline composition. What I find difficult to understand is why, after stating that he will leave the question of authorship open until the conclusion of his exegesis of the hymn (p. 45), Martin in the end comes down against Pauline authorship; I fail to see how the results of Martin's exegesis tip the very finely poised balance against Paul. One or two points need fuller consideration before a final verdict is reached. (1) As Martin himself allows, the hymn can be translated into Aramaic. While it is uncertain whether the hymn did in fact originally exist in Aramaic,²⁹ it is possible that the fact of translation into Greek would account for the unusual vocabulary and the unusual employment of Pauline words in the hymn. (2) The absence of Pauline soteriology noted by Martin (pp. 49f., cf. p. 297 n. 3) as an argument against Pauline authorship loses its force when one observes that other passages in his Epistles make similar omissions; the obvious example is Romans 10:6ff. which entirely ignores the atoning work of Christ. (3) The thought of the hymn is not only closely worked into the context of Philippians (see above) but can also be paralleled from other Pauline letters. It may be asked whether it is more likely that in his use of the ideas in the hymn Paul is drawing on his own or on somebody else's inspiration.

These arguments do not prove Pauline authorship; they

²⁸ E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, SCM Press, London (1955) 246f., 284 n. 372.

²⁹ In my article 'The development of Christology in the Early Church', *Tyndale Bulletin* 18 (1967) 77–93 (90–92) I claimed that the hymn has at least an Aramaic background, although it has not been proved that it was originally composed in Aramaic. See, however, the Additional Note below.

merely suggest further lines of investigation. It would certainly seem that the possibility of Pauline authorship remains open,³⁰ and it is perhaps wisest to abide by Martin's verdict on p. 45 and say '*Non liquet*'.

It is doubtful how much weight we should assign to Martin's own positive and, as he himself would no doubt be the first to emphasize, tentative suggestion that Stephen is a candidate for the authorship. This seems to be a case of *ignotum per ignotius*; we simply do not know enough about Stephen to marshal arguments for or against him. What the naming of Stephen does in fact signify is that the ideas which find expression in the hymn belong to the earliest stage of primitive Christianity.

This suggestion may be confirmed by a consideration of the widespread diffusion of the christological scheme found in the hymn. The two inter-connected themes of pre-existence and humiliation and of humiliation and exaltation which provide the three 'stages' in the hymn are widely attested in early Christianity.

Thus the coupling of the death and resurrection of Jesus has a firm basis in 1 Corinthians 15:3-5 (Aramaic background!); 1 Thessalonians 4:14; 2 Corinthians 5:15; Romans 4:25 and 14:9, and also in the speech material in Acts 2:23f.; 3:15; 10:39f. and 13:29f. Where the interest is centred more especially on the person of Jesus the idea of suffering followed by glory is predominant (Lk. 24:26; Heb. 12:2; 1 Pet. 5:1), but this type of statement may also include the specific thought of Christ's work of atonement being followed by His glorification (1 Pet. 3:18-22; Rev. 5:12). A further logical development is when the thought of Christ's death is replaced by that of His earthly life (Rom. 1:3f.; 1 Tim. 3:16; the two members of the formula are transposed in 2 Tim. 2:8). Of particular importance is the fact that this two-stage formula is associated with the title of Son of man, both in the Gospels and in Acts 7:55f.³¹ The use of this title is indicative of the great age of this type of formula,

³⁰ One notable advocate of Pauline authorship, overlooked by Martin, is W. G. Kümmel (Feine-Behm-Kümmel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Quelle & Meyer, Heidelberg (1964) 241; more positively, W. G. Kümmel, *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte*, Elwert Verlag, Marburg (1965) 222).

³¹ Note how in Acts 7:55f. Jesus (the earthly character) and the glorified Son of man are identified. On the suffering and exaltation of the Son of man in the Gospels see M. D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, SPCK, London (1967); C. K. Barrett, *Jesus and the Gospel Tradition*, SPCK, London (1967).

and there is good reason to believe that it goes back to Jesus Himself.

The pre-existence of Christ (mentioned incidentally in 1 Cor. 8:5f.; 10:4) is paired with the earthly life of Jesus in the so-called 'sending' formulae (Gal. 4:4; Rom. 8:3, *cf.* 32; Jn. 3:16) and in other passages which contrast the two stages (Jn. 1:1-14; Eph. 4:9f.; 1 Pet. 1:20). The logical development of this formula to give the contrast between pre-existent glory and earthly humiliation is found in 2 Corinthians 8:9. We do not need in the present context to differentiate the various ways in which the earthly existence of Christ is related to His glory, in terms of kenosis, kypsis or epiphany.³² It is certainly not the case that these are mutually exclusive categories of interpretation.

Finally, we have the combination of these two types of statement in the three-stage Christology which is expressed (sometimes without explicit reference to the middle stage, which has to be inferred from references to descent and ascent) in such passages as Romans 1:3f.;³³ Colossians 1:15-20;³⁴ Hebrews 2:9 (*cf.* 1:3f.); John 3:13; 6:62 and 17:5.

The wide range of areas of New Testament thought from which these texts are cited strongly suggests that it would be wrong to limit the diffusion of the ideas expressed in the hymn to the Pauline area of primitive Christianity. Nor should we confine its influence to the so-called Hellenistic Gentile Mission.³⁵ The cumulative effect of Martin's exegesis is to confirm the view that the origins of the hymn lie in the Jewish church. The position which we have thus reached is one which has the weighty support of W. G. Kümmel. In his important essay on 'Mythos im Neuen Testament'³⁶ he argues that the mythological³⁷ explanation of the person of Jesus in terms of

³² For the use of these terms see E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, 285, n. 382; R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*, Lutterworth, London (1965) 217.

³³ This is certainly Paul's own interpretation of his words in view of his clear expression of pre-existence elsewhere. As a pre-Pauline formula, the text did not imply that Christ became Son of God at the resurrection, but it is impossible to say whether pre-existence was consciously in mind at this stage.

³⁴ R. P. Martin, 'An Early Christian Hymn' (Col. 1:15-20), *EQ* 36 (1964) 195-205.

³⁵ *Pace* R. H. Fuller, *op. cit.*, ch. 8. For what follows *cf.* my article cited above (n. 29).

³⁶ Published in 1950; reprinted in W. G. Kümmel, *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte* 218-229.

³⁷ Kümmel's own definition of 'mythological' is that it refers to statements which report the activity and experience of divine beings in the world of time and space. He believes that in this sense we must use mythological language, even if we cannot

the widespread oriental myth of the descending Redeemer has two historical roots. On the one hand, Jesus Himself spoke of Himself as the coming Son of man, and, on the other hand, the first Christians believed that God had raised Jesus from the dead and exalted Him as the heavenly Lord. He concludes: 'Und Paulus steht mit der Verwertung dieses Mythos (*sc.* Der in Phil. 2:5ff. verwertete Mythos) keineswegs allein im Neuen Testament. Mit demselben Mythos vom herabsteigenden und aufsteigenden Erlöser haben Johannes, der Epheser- und der Hebräerbrief, and die Pastoralbriefe die Gestalt Jesu gedeutet. Es handelt sich hier also zweifellos um einen Mythos, dessen Wurzeln in die Grundlagen der neutestamentlichen Verkündigung zurückreichen und der auch infolge seiner grossen Verbreitung im Neuen Testament als zentral bezeichnet werden muss.'³⁸

Where we may perhaps go slightly further than Martin is in asking how far back the ideas expressed in the hymn may be traced. Martin gives the impression that to a certain extent he accepts the division of the primitive Jewish church into Hebraic and Hellenistic sections and he assigns the hymn to the latter group. But the evidence continues to accumulate that this division is a somewhat arbitrary one. Most recently R. P. C. Hanson has drawn attention to the significance of Paul's upbringing in Jerusalem (Acts 22:3); he writes: 'It may of course be said that Luke's information must be incorrect, in view of Paul's perfect acquaintance with the Greek language and his constant use of the LXX. But this is really to beg the question, *i.e.* to assume that one who had been brought up in Jerusalem could not have absorbed so much Hellenistic Jewish culture, whereas in fact Paul might be regarded as one of our strongest witnesses to the fact that there were circles in Jerusalem open to this culture. . . . There certainly was a continual flow of Greek-speaking Jews from the Dispersion into Jerusalem. This conclusion would suggest that a rigid distinction of the sources of early Christianity into Semitic or Aramaic-speaking sources which are early, and Hellenistic or Greek-speaking sources, which are late (or later), is a precarious one.'³⁹ We may further

always share the ancient cosmological conceptions which shape the myths and must exercise discrimination between different mythological conceptions in the New Testament.

³⁸ W. G. Kümmel, *op. cit.*, 223.

³⁹ R. P. C. Hanson, *The Acts* (New Clarendon Bible), Clarendon Press, Oxford (1967) 215. Cf. how R. P. Martin himself (*op. cit.*, 83 n. 2) cites further authorities to the same effect with evident approval.

remind ourselves that the distinctions, theological and otherwise, which are frequently drawn between the Hellenists and the Hebrews on the basis of Acts 6:1, generally go far beyond the evidence supplied by Acts and are probably much exaggerated. We should beware of erecting an artificial theological distinction in the early church. Consequently, any idea of late origin which might be thought to be implicit in Martin's description of the hymn as 'Hellenistic' needs most careful scrutiny. However, the fact that Martin felt able to suggest Stephen as a candidate for the authorship of the hymn implies that he is prepared to assign a very early date to the ideas in the hymn.

V

A final theme which we raise for discussion is the interpretation of the hymn proposed by Martin. He finds in it a soteriological drama which deals with 'the purposelessness of existence and the conquest of those agencies which tyrannized over Hellenistic man' (p. 301). This is an interesting proposal, for it suggests that the message of the early church to the Hellenistic world was not concerned so much with sin and guilt as with the meaning of life, and it opens up the possibility that modern preachers may make the victory of Christ rather than the atonement the theme of their evangelistic message. But before we accede too readily to this suggestion a *caveat* needs to be uttered.

First, such other examples as we have of preaching in the Hellenistic world do not give unequivocal support to the view that this was the essence of the church's message to the world. Paul himself makes it plain that his message was 'Christ crucified' for both Jews and Greeks and that he saw the cross as the demonstration of God's saving power (1 Cor. 1:18, 23; 2:2). The missionary preaching in Acts presents Christ not as the answer to the purposelessness of human existence but as a Judge and Saviour. One hesitates to build a case upon Hebrews which was more probably written to Jewish than Gentile Christians, but, should the latter theory be correct, it is significant that the Epistle expounds the work of Christ in terms of a sacrifice for sin. The same uncertainty surrounds the recipients of the Gospel of John, but its emphasis upon Jesus as the revealer of God in no way obscures the author's message that He gave Himself to

death for sinners. It is, therefore, open to question whether the gospel was transposed into another key for a Hellenistic audience.

Second, the traditional summary in 1 Corinthians 15:3-5, which Martin contrasts with Philippians 2:6-11, is specifically stated to be a summary of the evangelistic message of the early church. There is no indication that the 'hymn' in 1 Timothy 3:16, in which Martin finds a parallel to the outlook of Philippians 2:6-11, was a summary of preaching, and the same is true of the passage in Philippians itself. It is more likely to be a song of praise used by the church in its own worship, and it leads up to the thought of cosmic adoration of Christ as Lord rather than of personal confession of Him by the individual convert.

Finally, it must be urged that the contrast between the contents of 1 Corinthians 15:3-5 and of Philippians 2:6-11 which Martin presents in tabular form (pp. 302f.) is misleading. Much of what he finds in the hymn has surely been read into rather than out of the hymn.

In our judgment, therefore, Martin's attempt to assess the significance of the hymn must be received with a good deal of caution. Here is another point where further study is required.

One other point of interpretation should be mentioned. I find it difficult to be certain exactly how much doctrinal significance Martin wishes to attribute to the teaching of the hymn about the person of Christ. There are two sets of remarks in his book on this theme. On the one hand, he declares several times that the hymn 'is not a pronouncement of dogmatic theology' (p. 67); 'the placing of the hymn in the cultic life of the early Church has made it impossible to regard Philippians ii. 5-11 as a pronouncement of dogmatic theology' (p. 82; cf. p. 295). On the other hand, he seems to contradict these statements by the way in which he agrees with E. Käsemann's criticism of M. Dibelius's denial of all doctrinal significance to the hymn: 'It is a *petitio principii* . . . to say that the technical terms of theology have no place in the language of devotion and cultus. . . . There is no criterion by which we can measure what is liturgical and distinguish it from the dogmatic element in the early Christian literature' (p. 173). Similarly, he cites with approval J. Jervell's description of the hymn as a 'liturgical Christological confession in which there are statements of a logical-terminological-theological character expressed strongly

with clarity and precision' (*ibid.*). This second set of statements is surely nearer the truth. If what Martin is seeking to guard against in his first set of statements is the danger of thinking that the New Testament writers necessarily attached to their theological terminology precisely the same sense as was given to it in the statements of later theologians, then we agree with him. The Athanasian Creed is to be tested against the New Testament and not *vice versa*.⁴⁰

If this is so, the theological statements in the hymn are surely to be taken with the utmost seriousness. They contain ontological implications even if the primary interest of the hymn lies in the work of Jesus. In this connection there is one small point where Martin has laid himself open to misunderstanding. This is when he speaks of the self-emptying of Christ as 'a suspension of His role as the divine Image by His taking on an image which is Man's' (p. 196). Taken by itself this statement sounds like an expression of kenoticism. Having firmly dismissed the 'kenotic' interpretation of the verb ἐκένωσεν, it looks as though Martin has readmitted the doctrine to the hymn by his interpretation of the two natures. This, however, can hardly be the case. From his earlier discussion it is clear that Martin is thinking of the divine μορφή of Christ in terms of outward glory, and he puts his point more clearly when he says that the incarnation 'necessarily involved an eclipsing of His glory as the divine Image', and categorically denies that 'the text teaches the surrender of divine attributes and the exchanging of Christ's deity for His human nature' (p. 194). He is surely, therefore, saying the same as Charles Wesley's lines, 'Veiled in flesh the Godhead see' and 'Mild He lays His glory by'.⁴¹

As was indicated above, the points raised here are much more suggestions for further study and advance than criticisms of the author's argument. After discussing another book the reviewer concluded that it offered 'a hypothesis to be carefully tested rather than a foundation upon which one can safely build'; he is in

⁴⁰ On the heresy charge against A. S. Geyser (R. P. Martin, *op. cit.*, 295 n. 1), see the summary of an article (in Dutch) by P. A. van Stempvoort in *New Testament Abstracts* 9:3 (1964-65) no. 1021. It should be emphasized that Geyser's interpretation of the hymn (whether or not it be regarded as 'heretical') is not substantiated by Martin's exegesis.

⁴¹ At the same time, I should not want to understand μορφή purely in terms of role or outward form. Incidentally, Martin does not seem to have faced up fully to the arguments brought forward by Käsemann for understanding the word to mean 'Daseinsweise'.

no doubt that in the case of Dr Martin's book the reverse is the case. Here is a sound basis for further advance.⁴²

⁴² Misprints and errors have been noted as follows: p. 40; Lohmeyer's commentary on *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* is in the *HZNt* (cf. p. 331), not *Meyer* series. P. 55: the first sentence in the second paragraph is clumsily expressed. P. 67, note 4: read '80' for '70'. P. 78 note 2: the summary of Cullmann's approach should be included here rather than on p. 76. P. 87, line 13: read 'concluded' for 'excluded'. P. 110, line 5 from foot: read 'revelations' for 'revelation'. P. 343, *s.v.* 'Käsemann, E': read '83' and '173' for '82' and '172' respectively. P. 354: read 'Wisdom' for 'Widsom'.

On pp. 26 and 329 a reference to the original publication of E. Käsemann's article in *ZTK* 47 (1950) 313-360 should have been included.

Additional note: A valuable contribution to the study of Philippians 2:6-11 which appeared after the completion of the above article is R. Deichgräber, *Gottes hymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit*, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen (1967). This thesis is of special interest because it independently confirms several of Martin's results although it sets doubts against others. The author is interested more in the form, language and style of early Christian hymns than in their theology, and discusses Philippians 2:6-11 in the context of a thorough study of early hymns. Philippians 2:6-11 is the oldest example of a Christ-hymn and expresses the early church's rejoicing in God's historical act of salvation in His Son. Deichgräber accepts the structure of the hymn suggested by Bultmann and Jeremias and followed by Martin; he lays great stress on the use of *parallelismus membrorum*, whose presence he regards as fatal to Lohmeyer's analysis. (He rejects, however, Jeremias's strophic divisions, and his derivation of verse 7a from Is. 53:12.) He accepts the excision of *θανάτου δὲ σκαραποῦ*, but is less sure about the other excisions proposed by Jeremias; their language is not specifically Pauline, but they do disturb the length of the lines of the hymn. Of especial importance are Deichgräber's strong criticisms of the arguments for a Semitic basis for the hymn, and the list of features in it which he finds to be clearly Hellenistic. The hymn, he concludes, is not Palestinian Jewish Christian, but Hellenistic Jewish Christian. Finally, he argues that there is no sufficient evidence to associate the hymn specifically with either baptism or eucharist and proposes a general connection with Christian worship. With regard to the present context of the hymn, it is argued that hymns were used secondarily in paraenesis and that this is the function which this hymn fulfils in Philippians. This view is confirmed by a careful refutation of Käsemann's rendering of Philippians 2:5 and by the argument that the theme of humiliation and exaltation in the hymn could readily be used in paraenesis.