Who Existed in the Form of a "Second Adam"? The Christ-Hymn as Pre-Paulinic Composition

Autographical Islam

Abstract

The christ-hymn, or kyrios-hymn is a scholarly designation for the Pauline *carmina* of Epistle to the Philippians 2:6-11. To many, the pericope relays the message of a pre-existent and divine hypostasis which, through humility and servitude, divested his divine prerogatives and assumed the form of not only humanity, but of the servant Jesus of Nazereth. The purpose of this article is to determine whether contemporary scholarship and research on this hymnic passage yields a similar canvas of deity and humility or a picture more starkly adherent to the context, structure and form of the Christ-hymn that presents to us something discrete to the common interpretation. Firstly, we should note that the dialogue on the Christ-hymn is described by academics as a "sophisticated intellectual exercise" that has yielded invariable nuances and creative speculation. However, scholarship has progressed to a point where common ground has been established on certain premises of which we shall cover here.

1.1 Introductory Remarks

To commence, the majority of scholars agree that the christ-hymn is a pre-Pauline composition from a Semitic/Aramaic background, that likely functioned around the 1st-2nd century CE, as a Christian liturgical-hymn among the Christian community at Philippi, that would be similar to a Christ-hymn that is mentioned to have been used in the cultic worship of early Bithynian Christians by Pliny the Younger, the official Roman governor of Bithynia during the reign of emperor Trajan around the first-half of the second century. Pliny reports,

"They asserted that this was the sum and substance of their fault or their error; namely, that they were in the habit of meeting before dawn on a stated day and **singing alternately a hymn to Christ as to a god**, and that they bound themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wicked deed, but that they would abstain from theft and robbery and adultery, that they would not break their word, and that they would not withhold a deposit when reclaimed. This done, it was their practice, so they said, to separate, and then to meet together again for a meal, which however was of the ordinary kind and quite harmless." (Epp. x, 96-7: Lightfoot's translation.)

Pliny's report to emperor Trajan presents an eye-witness account from Christian apostates on the early worship of Bithyinan Christians around 111-112 AD. The fixed day that Bithynian Christians would meet was likely the Lord's Day: Sunday on which, ceremonial gatherings would be held before "day's work". We have attestations in Acts of the Apostles (Acts 20:7) Revelation (Revelation 1:10), the Didache, Ignatius and Barnabas (Magn. 9, 1; Barn, 15, 9; Did. 14. 1) of such observance on the Lord's Day. Furthermore, Kraemer and Ratcliff argue that the 'oath' which is mentioned in the report, is likely the recitation of the Decalogue. Just as how the Decalogue would be recited during Sabbath worship in Jewish synagogues, Pliny's report presents a similar form of recitational vows that substantiate the primitive Jewish-Christian character of the early Bithyian Christians, but more precisely, the development of early Christian liturgy and worship during the second century. Following the recitation of the oath, according to Pliny's report, Bithynian Christians would sing a 'hymn of Christ as to a god' antiphonally. Evidently, the eyewitness account reflects proximate information on the Christian liturgy in Bithynia from the perspective of the local Christian apostates, however this very familiarity ceases when the subject of the object of worship during such liturgy is mentioned. While the eyewitness account does not yield any compelling details to suppose that the apostates themselves had partaken such meetings, we do know that the information dispensed, is sufficiently intimate to be familiar with the liturgical traditions of Bithyinan Christians during the second century. Nonetheless, what appears obscure is how Christ is established as an object of worship during the singing of the hymn. Does the hymn praise Christ as the God of Israel, a God anointed by the God of Israel, a divine medium between God and humanity, or a divine messiah who is God on earth and heaven etcetera. We could not answer from the data available to us here, but ostensibly, the Christian apostates did not know definitively either. The report wholly captures Christ as the object of praise and veneration, but does not capture the *character* of Christ as the object of worship. Such ambiguity in early Christian liturgy and christology is not peculiar from the lens of scholarship on early Christianity but merely instantiates the staggering proportion of syncretic variability of primitive christological developments that went hand-in-hand with early Christian liturgy.

To wrap up this introductory note, it should be known that hymns are not foreign in the New Testament tradition. New Testament hymnology propounds formal classifications of several New Testament putative *carmina* in the tradition:

1. The Lukan Canticles
2. Hymns in the Apocalypse (Revelation)
3. Jewish-Christian fragments and phrases (ex. 'Amen, Hallelu-jah, Hosa'na, Marana tha, 'Abba)
4. Distinctively Christian forms

More specific classifications that may overlap include:
(a) sacramental (Eph. 5.14; Tit. 3.4-7);
(b) meditative (Eph. 1.3-14; Rom. 8.31-9; I Cor. 13);
(c) confessional (I Tim. 6.11-16; 2 Tim. 2.11-13);
(d) Christological (Heb. 1.3; Col. 1.15-20; I Tim. 3.16; Johni. 1-14; 1 Pet. 1.18-21, 2.21-5; 3.18–21; Phil. 2.6–11).

Scholars categorize both the christ-hymn of the Bithynian Christians reported by Pliny the Younger and the christ-hymn of the Phillipi Christians preserved and redacted by Paul of Taurus in his epistle to the community at Philippi as a predominantly christological *carmina* with some potentially confessional overlay.

The redaction of the *kyrios-hymn* by Paul is thought to include unique Pauline insertions during the process of weaving the *carmina* in the epistle to the Philippians with the purpose to 'correct the triumphalist emphasis on the victory of Christ' according to Martin. Likewise, the more influential monographs of Philippians 2:6-11 on the delineation of the hymnic structure and form, from Martin, Jeremais and Lohmeyer agree to additions to the initial form of the christ-hymn. The phrases excised as Pauline additions from the initial form of the hymn, is loosely contended to be:

"Taking the servant's form" (v. 7)
"Even death on a cross" (v. 8)
"The heavenly, earthly and demonic" (v. 10)
"To the glory of God the Father" (v. 11)

With that, we shall briefly cover the arguments for and against the Pauline authorship of Philippians 2:6-11.

1.2 Question of Pauline Authorship

Arguments against Pauline Authorship
1. **Greek text based on a underlying Semitic original; un-Pauline, un-Greek terminology**
   - Participial style of v.5-v.7 is a distinctly-known style common of Semitic hymnic prayer-speeches; linguistically possible only in Semitic writing
   - ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν (v.7) and εὑρεθεὶς ὡς (v.7) are un-Pauline and un-Greek phrases
2. **"The Language Test"**

- Hapax legomena; absence of Pauline terms; some terms never used in the entire New Testament corpus
- Foreign embedded theological ideas: a) the concept of Jesus as 'equal with God' (contrasting the subordination of I Cor. 15.28) b) the designation of Him as δούλου;
- The use of the verb (ὑπερ-)ύψωσεν which is Johannine rather than Pauline (Paul's customary verb is ἐγεὶρειν/ἐγείρω)
- Christ received (χαρίζω) a gift from God, whereas Paul normally uses the verb of men as being the recipients; and the threefold division of the cosmos in verse 11, which is subjugated to a new Lord rather than redeemed from sin.
- D.M. Stanley states, "that the exaltation of Christ should be regarded as a grace to the Sacred Humanity is an idea that is unparalleled in the Pauline writings' (CBQ, 16, 423). In his subsequent discussion, he clarifies, 'The most convincing proof of the pre-Pauline origin of this Christian hymn is that Paul never conceives Christ's glorification as a reward for his sufferings. That this is the most satisfactory exegesis of the text remains to be seen. (Christ's Resurrection, p. 101)
- Lack of Pauline christological and soteriological themes; no mention of the doctrine of redemption through the Cross, the resurrection of Christ, the place of the Church, no reference to redemptive significance of Christ's death ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν etc.
- Length of the series of christological expressions in the hymn is foreign to Paul, Schweizer states, "It cannot be shown in any other of Paul's writings that he would assemble together such a long series of Christological expressions unless led to do so by the context"

3. **The Ebed Yahweh Teaching**

David M. Stanley, in his investigation of the apostle Paul's transmutation of the Ebed YHWH teaching concludes, "Thus the soteriology [Ebed YHWH] of Phil 2:5-11 is not in Paul's usual style." Furthermore, a soteriological trademark of Paul's letters, the redemptive significance of Christ's suffering is absent from the hymn as mentioned previously. For indeed, the central role of redemptive Pauline soteriology has led Stanley to further conclude that, "The appointment by Christ to continue His work as the Servant of Yahweh led Paul to rethink the theology of the Redemption along lines quite different from that of the primitive [apostolic] preaching. Where Palestinian Christianity tend to follow the lead given them during His earthly life and construct a soteriology based upon fulfillment of the prophecy of Deutero-Isaias, St. Paul preached of the Redemption as a new creation. In his view, Christ was regarded rather as the Second Adam." Here, Stanley admits that Paul's soteriology veers from the primitive apostolic tradition of the Deutero-Isanic Ebed YHWH attested, from the Petrine and gospel record.

One reason Stanley argues for this separation is the Gentile audience of Pauline Christianity. He states, "Paul would develop this theme rather than that of the 'Ebed Yahweh may also have been due to the fact that it was his vocation to preach the Gospel to pagans rather than to Jews [...] Moreover, it was precisely in these pagan communities that Christianity appeared in all its novelty and freshness as "a new creation." Where the Jewish Christian remained conscious of the continuity between his new-found beliefs and the religion of Israel, the Gentile Christian was equally aware of the unbridgeable chasm separating his new religious life from the old: it was simply a new creation" We should pay heed to Stanley's example of how pagan settings from the intended [Gentile] audience of Pauline literature and ministry work in fact, influenced the development of Paul's theology and soteriology.

4. Paul's debt to his predecessors (pre-Pauline Hellenistic Christianity in Syria)

We know that during the years of Paul's conversion to Christianity from Pharisaic Judaisim, Paul visited Arabia, returned to Damascus, went up to Jerusalem "after three years", and then "came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia" (Gal. 1.17, 21), to be sought out eventually by Barnabas who found him at Tarsus and brought him back to Antioch' (Acts 11.25) Wilhelm Bossuet's thesis, which argues that the formation of Paul's thought was predominantly shaped by the Hellenistic-Christian churches, that Paul came into contact with during his conversion experience with is summarized by R.P. Martin, "The christology of these Greek-speaking Christians in Syria was characterized chiefly by a cultus of Jesus as Lord (κύριος). The picture Bousset paints is that of a worshiping community which invoked Jesus as their cult-deity in the same way as contemporary religious groups worshiped Isis or Serapis. He thus explains the *Kyrios-religion*, with such cultic rites as baptism and the Eucharist; and above all, he is able on this basis to draw a picture of the throbbing devotional life of such early Christian meetings as are described in 1 Corinthians 12-15. In such an atmosphere there would be formulated a 'doctrine of Christ' which matched the cultic needs of the community. We read of men prophesying, speaking in strange' tongues' and evincing abnormal gifts from the Spirit's direct inspiration. They saw visions, were rapt in ecstasy and found an outlet for such pent-up, highly charged emotions in psalms, hymns and odes inspired by the Spirit, as they made melody in their hearts to the heavenly Kyrios." As an ancillary note, we know that Paul had no qualms in citing pagan poets in his epistles to Christian communities (ex. Aratus, Menander, Epimenides).

Arguments for Pauline Authorship

1. **Hymnic style and content could explain unusual vocabulary**
   - Christ-hymn as early Christian confessional/christological tribute could explain the unusual vocabulary

- Silence of certain Pauline ideas does not predicate negation of such ideas in the hymn
- Exiguousness of the hymnic material could cast doubt on whether our hymnological data is sufficient to determine pre/post-Pauline composition
- Paul is probably capable of producing hymnic material juxtaposed to the composition of Phil 2:6-11, he also knew Aramaic and Greek and therefore fits the qualification of a potential author of Lozhymer's model
- Linguistic and verbal similarities with other passages in Phillippians

2. **Pauline doctrines in the hymn (Jesus as Lord of glory, Two Adams)**
   - Concept of Jesus as the Lord of glory which we trace back to his conversion experience before the gates of Damascus
   - Schema of obedience in Christ which reversed the primal disobedience of the first Adam, a theme which is worked out in considerable detail in Romans 5

Martin concludes the evidence is at a stalemate, however, this opinion is robustly incorrect. Firstly, the disputation for Pauline authorship hinges on several apothegmatic suppositions: a) the absence of central Pauline soteriological and other christological themes does not implicate the negation of Pauline themes in the hymn and b) the absence of conventional Pauline terms, verbs and clauses (hapax legomena) does not negate the Pauline terminology and verbs in the hymn. While such aphorisms are generically true, they are not informative, definitive and do not hold any explanatory power. We cannot resolve why such silence occurs from such aphoristic argumentation nor can such arguments negate the absence of Pauline and other peculiar properties of the hymn either. What such disputation can *only* do is state the very obvious: some of the characteristics of the christ-hymn are Pauline. Secondly, the majority of the datums for Pauline authorship can, more or less, be explained by the redactionary process of the christ-hymn into the Epistle to the Philippians by Paul, that would clearly adduce Pauline characteristics in the post-redaction form of the hymn. As mentioned previously, this redactionary process would include Pauline additions into the hymn, of which we would expect to find verbal and linguistic agreements with other portions of the Epistle to the Phillippians, had Paul truly weaved the carmina into his epistle. Likewise, granted that Paul possessed the mastery of Aramaic and Greek poetry and hymnology as argued by pro-Pauline scholars, the probability of Paul as an *editor* of the carmina is just as, if not even more plausible, then Paul as a potential *author* of the hymn. Thirdly, the observance of Pauline notions of Jesus as Lord of glory, and the concept of dual-Adamic theology in the christ-hymn cannot be postulated as anything more than a surface-level premise. It would be difficult to imagine Paul borrowing and editing a pre-Pauline hymnic composition of Christ that contained notions he did not, at least, agree with, or the community of Philippi would not resonate with, according to Paul's cognition. Lastly, we have ancient Greek and Semitic

hymnological literature that could be used as referential data for New Testament hymns in determining their character, form and background, along with several *carmina* solely within the Pauline corpus, not to include the entire New Testament corpus. If we are able to identify an underlying Semitic original of the Greek christ-hymn, then asserting that the data at our hands is 'exiguous' is not accurate but potentially biased. however, more data is always helpful.

1.3 The Background and Origin of the Hymn

We will now cover the background and origin of the hymn. This is where the most creative speculation occurs on the subject. Gordon D. Fee, commenting on the diversity, states, "every imaginable background has been argued for" Some of those backgrounds include:

> a. Heterodox Judaism (Lohmeyer)
> b. Iranian myth of the Heavenly Redeemer (Beare)
> c. Hellenistic, pre-Christian Gnosticism (Käsemann)
> d. Jewish Gnosticism (J. A. Sanders)
> e. OT Servant passages (Coppens, Moule, Strimple)
> f. Genesis account of Adam (Murphy-O'Connor, Dunn)
> g. Hellenistic Jewish Wisdom speculation (Georgi)

Instead of taking the strenuous route of covering each proposed background, we shall hone our focus on the two best candidates for the background of the Christ-hymn in Philippians scholarship: a Semitic/Aramaic background of Jewish-Christian origin and a Hellenistic/Greek background of pre-Christian Gnostic origin. These backgrounds, garnering acceptance from divergent waves of Philppians scholarship, adduce strengths and avowed deficiencies of which we shall briefly address here.

The Aramaic-Retrovision Hypothesis

Firstly, the theory of the original Semitic background of the hymn is the progeny of Ernst Lohmeyer's 1961 linguistic and stylistic analysis of the structure and form of the hymn that yielded an hypothetical Semitic background of the christ-hymn. Comparing the hymn with passages in the Old Testament psalms and prophetic narratives, what Lohmeyer deemed as the "basic form of Aramaic poetry," was found to be present in the Son of Man hymns in the Book of Daniel. However, Lohmeyer's claim was met with stern criticism from other scholars such as F.W. Beare who strongly disputed an underlying Aramiac exemplar and illuminating the embedded meanings through hypothetical reconstructed Aramaic expressions, and rather supposed a more Hellenistic background that may have been produced by a "close Hellenistic

Paulinist". However, ignoring such criticism, a group of several scholars following Lohmeyer's contribution, came forth with monographic reconstructions of a potential Aramaic original of the hymn. Levertoff's transliteration of an "Galilean" Aramaic christ-hymn is a noteworthy attempt at such reconstruction which reads:

   I.   1. *Bidmúto de-eláha itóhi*
        2. *Weḥáshba lo háwa leshalála*
        3. *Itóhi le-péḥma de-eláha.*
  II.   1. *Ela sárik we-hípshit et náphshe*
        2. *Udemúta de-ábda násba*
        3. *Be-tzílma de-ínsha itóhi;*
 III.   1. *Ék bar-násha ishtàkaḥ*
        2. *We-náphshe sháphal we-mákaḥ*
        3. *Ádma le-mótha ishtámaᶜ (Mota de-tzeliba)*
 IV.   1. *Al-kén agbéhe eláha*
        2. *We-yáheb lo shéma sagíha*
        3. *De-gebíha mikól shemáhin;*
  V.   1. *De-bishéma de-Yeshúa*
        2. *Tikrá kol bírka*
        3. *De-bishemáya u-be-ára we-dele-táḥat de-ára*
 VI.   1. *We-kól lishán nóde*
        2. *Yeshúa mashíḥa hu mára*
        3. *Le-shúbḥa de-eláha abúhi*

While the reception of Levertoff's retrovision was faced with heavy criticism from the French scholar, Pierre Grelot, Levertoff's monograph has been decorated as an remarkable contribution. Nevertheless, Grelot along with Fewster note that the Aramaic of first-century Palestine, presumably when this hymn was constructed, is not well-attested, which, consequently, compels scholars to appeal to Aramiac glosses from later centuries, and may not accurately reflect the development of the Galilean-Aramaic dialect during the context of the Jewish-Christian hymn. In the case of Levertoff's Aramaic reconstruction, he heavily relies on the Peshitta and Christian Palestinian Lectionary (5th-6th century). Yet, Fitzmyer further notes, that while more first-century Aramaic glosses such as that of the Palestinian Targum will aid the reconstruction of the Aramaic, the Greek diction and idioms of the hymn may not strictly correspond to any appropriate contemporary Aramaic gloss or even earlier Aramaic, to which later Aramaic glosses must be considered. Fewster, leveling his criticism of the Aramaic hypothesis off this premise, asserts that the task of reconstructing a consistent Aramaic gloss leads to nothing more than speculation and borders on special pleading. However, this must be discounted. Fitzmeyer correctly notes that the difficulties of an Aramaic hypothesis, subsist not in the Aramaic, but in the delineation of the hymnic structure, and even the Greek component words and accents used. The differences of such monographic proposals does not necessarily reflect a *faux* in the Aramaic retrovision hypothesis, but represents the hassle in deconstructing a first-century hymnnic composition with rather scarce data. All in all, the general rhythmic flow and structural symmetry of the Aramaic retrovision that may adduce a

antiphonal style of hymn-singing, is what has led many academics to accept the Aramaic/Semitic, Jewish-Christian hypothesis.

The Hellenistic-Greek Hypothesis

Nextly, the proposal of an Greek-Hellenistic background, is a serious candidate that supposes that the Philippians 2:6-11 is an Hellenistic prose hymn. However, we must be arrant to state that the majority of the arguments for a Hellenistic background, postulate obvious and uninformative propositions, such as the fact that the hymn is written in classical Greek. Such disputation usually fails to demonstrate any deeper, inferential connection between ancient Hellenism and the christ-hymn. However, while the language of the hymn cannot solely be declarative of an Hellenistic origin, it should merit some consideration as a factor in the debate. To the contrary, the Hellenistic terminology, idioms and phraseology of the *carmina* are not merely Hellenistic, due to their Greek heritage, but because a number of these characteristics are reflected in classical Hellenistic thinking. For example, some scholars argue that supposing μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων as a primitive Jewish-Christian formula is theologically untenable. Following Behm's learned article in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, a more recent advocate of a pagan religious setting for this terminology is Ulrich B. Miiller, in his 1993 commentary and several earlier studies. His Greek references include Euripides, Bacchae 4f: where Dionysus has changed his μορφή (morphe) from a divine one to that of a man (cf. ibid. 53f.). Similar statements can be found in relation to other gods, or indeed in relation to human beings like Pythagoras, whose biographer tells us that he was thought to be a god appearing ev ανθρώπινη μορφή (Iamblichus, Vita Pythagorae 30). We can assume that this kind of religious language was relatively commonplace and similar terminology is not difficult to find in other Greek religious texts. Hence, aside from Paul's personal Hellenistic background, the hymn adduces a number of classical Hellenistic tropes that seem to tell the veracity of this hypothesis. Another factor of this hypothesis is the rhetorical structure of Phil 2:6-11 that according to several scholars conforms to the principles of classical Greek rhetoric. Robbins argues that Phil 2:6-11 adduces the principles of periodic structure set forth by the classical rhetoricians and authors such as Cicero and Demetrius, that presents a coherent, logical and symmetrical development of thought that must have been the product of deliberate composition based on ancient Greek rhetorical principle. Martin and Nash posit a more innovative proposal that places Phil 2:6-11 as a subversive *hymnos* that creatively flips ancient rhetorical theory and the classical genre of *hymnos* to beget a god of the christ-hymn is praised for conventionally shameful actions of servitude and lowliness. No matter how Greek rhetoric may have influenced the composition of the hymn, it seems reasonable to assume that at the very least, such rhetorical influence is possible given the Hellenistic milieu of the New Testament tradition that would have included the cultivation of Greek rhetoric. Lastly,

Lohmeyer concluded that ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων (v.10) could not have been originally Semitic, and many scholars following his landmark analysis accept this conclusion, which would implicitly support the hypothesis of a Greek background.

Conclusion

Nevertheless, it's clear that the solution is not strictly Semitic or Hellenistic, but likely incorporates a variety of syncretistic backgrounds during the composition of the christ-hymn. The Aramaic-retrovision hypothesis seems to be the most proficient explanatory model for Phil 2:6-11 as a pre-Paulinic hymn in terms of rhythmic structure and poetic symmetry, but yields gaps that seemed to be amended by Hellenistic inputs and parallels. Modern text-critical methodology would describe this *blend* as the principle of **contamination**. Essentially, New Testament literature is highly contaminated to the extent that there is more prior probability that the composition of the New Testament text as a process came into contact with several external traditions/influences with perhaps an progenitor tradition as the autograph. Lohmeyer, noting such contamination, argued that the hymn was a Jewish-Christian psalm, where the author's mother tongue was likely Semitic, who knew Greek proficiently.

1.4 The Interpretation of the Hymn: Kenotic or Adamic?

How the hymnic nature of Philippians 2:6-11 relates to its meaning and interpretation is the final pertinent subject of inquiry. Gordon D. Fee argues along with Hooker, that, "If the passage is pre-Pauline, then we have no *guidelines* to help us in understanding its meaning." Fee and Hooker contend that presupposing the pre-Pauline position, erodes the hymn of the present Pauline context and therefore of obtaining any correct meaning. This is not entirely true, however. For indeed, if we cannot appeal to Pauline literature for exegetical guidance, then there is solely one thing we can infer from. The hymn itself, or more precisely the form and structure of the hymn. Charles H. Talbert encapsulates this, in an axiomatic rule of interpretation, which is "The proper delineation of form [of the hymn] leads to the correct interpretation of meaning"

For starters, Jeremais' well-received arrangement and reconstruction of the hymn, in an attempt to correct the limitations of Lohymer's arrangement, has three strophes, with four lines, each strophe instantiated as a complete thought, and the focus point being the inner parallelisms of the hymn. A weakness of prior reconstructions including Lohymer's as pointed out by a number of scholars is that such parallelisms were previously neglected. Following Jermais, Talbert accepting the parallel items of the hymn, proposes his own hymnic

construction. Talbert argues that the parallel structure of the first two strophes, (Strophe 1: ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, who, as He already existed in the form of God did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, but emptied Himself by taking to the form of a bonds-servant Strophe 2: ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν, γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, and being born in the likeness of men, and being found in human form, he humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death) requires that they must share the same basic meaning, meaning the hymn starts with the earthly historical Jesus (his birth) and ends with the exaltation as kyrios, hence eliminating the notion of pre-existence. He states, "That the parallelism between the first two strophes breaks the link between μορφὴν δούλου λαβών (taking the form of a bonds-servant) and ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος (being born in the likeness of man) is significant because it has been this link that has formed the crucial point in any argument for the pre-existence of Christ in this hymn. Without this link, all necessity to interpret the passage in mythological terms is absent" Talbert's interpretation is generally seen as reasonable and for good reason. The link between μορφὴν δούλου λαβών and ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος has been traditionally viewed as an Pauline incarnational formula, almost describing the chronological sequence of the Incarnation. Jesus of Nazareth exists in the form of God with the Father (pre-existence) then through humility, divests himself of his Godhood and divine distinction, and takes the form of a humble bonds-servant (kenosis) and is born in the likeness of men, or as a human thereby taking the appearance of man (Mary's conception) This incarnational formula of Phil 2:5-11, however falls apart, once we realize that there is no link between μορφὴν δούλου λαβών and ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος because they are formal parallel constructions of two different thoughts. If Talbert's interpretation is correct, then the hymn yields a rather different formula, namely the Adamic-Christ typology. We've already touched on how the Adam-Christ typology is characteristic of Pauline theology, and how Paul's audience would have been familiar with such typology (Romans 5:2) Furthermore, the Adam-Christ typology was known outside of the Pauline circle, and is quoted by both Mark and Luke (Mark 1:13, Luke 4;1)

Talbert contends that the usage of ὁμοιώματι has parallel to Genesis 5, where Seth, the son of Adam is described as "after his image" and "in his own likeness"

Gen 5: ἔζησεν δὲ Αδαμ διακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη καὶ ἐγέννησεν κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν αὐτοῦ καὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Σηθ

It's important to note that Adam, both refers to the prophet Adam, in the singular and the "men or mankind" in the plural. Hence, when the LXX of Genesis tells us that Seth is a son of Adam, who was born into his likeness, this is a parallel to Jesus of Nazareth similarly being

born in the likeness of man or Adam. This parallel to Genesis makes it plausible that Jesus is being depicted as a son of Adam in the first line of the second strophe. Secondly, the first line of the first strophe reads, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων. Since it is a formal parallel to ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, they must have the same basic meaning according to Talbert's rule of interpretation. Firstly, μορφῇ (form) is virtually synonymous with ὁμοίωμα (likeness, resemblance) for example, where the LXX has the term ὁμοίωμα in Deut 4.12, Symmachus uses μορφῇ. 2) καὶ ἡ μορφὴ is used in Dan 3.19 to translate the Aramaic וּצְלֵם while elsewhere ὁμοίωμα is used to translate the Hebrew וְצַלְמֵ. Furthermore, the connection between ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων and οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ in Phil 2:6 without a doubt echos Genesis 3, where Adam and Eve through the temptation of the serpent grasp for equality with God, by eating the fruit, while Jesus does not take advantage of such equality. Hence Jesus is being depicted as a second Adam, that reverses the action of the first Adam, by humility. This is further corroborated by the parallel structure of Gen 5.1 and Gen 5.3, where the son of Adam is made in the (εἰκόνα) of God, which is in formal parallel to the son of Adam (Seth) being the son of Adam, born in his own likeness and image (human nature) Therefore, the first lines of strophe 1 and 2, declare that Jesus is the Second Adam and the son of Adam. Furthermore, The New Testament record demonstrates that early Christians knew traditions of the Second Adam and the Son of Adam (Romans 5.12, Mark 1.13, Luke 4.1, Luke 4.23) The fact that both traditions are reported in Luke, illustrates how early Christians saw no conflict between them.

Furthermore, the end of the second line of the first strophe ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν is an uncommon Greek phrase and is grammatically harsh. The explanation for such Greek abnormalities is the claim that ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν (he emptied himself) is a literal Greek rendition of the Hebrew "he poured out his nephesh" in Isaiah 53.12. If so, then this phrase refers to the servant's surrender of his life. It is significant that ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν is explained by the short third line, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών. Since δοῦλος and παῖς are both used in the LXX to render the עֶבֶד of Deutero-Isaiah, since δουλεύων is found in the LXX at Isa 53.11, and since Aquila reads ὁ δοῦλος instead of ὁ παῖς at Isa 52.13, δοῦλος is fitting in this explanatory phrase. The phrase "he emptied himself" is, thus, most probably a reference to Jesus as the servant who surrendered his life to God. The second line in Strophe 2 also reads, ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν (he humbled himself) is formally parallel to ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν and therefore must share the same basic meaning of the Isaianic Servant of Isa. 53. In the LXX ταπεινόω is used for עָנָה. In the niphal עָנָה can mean "humble oneself." It is the niphal participle of עָנָה, moreover, which is used in Isa 53.7 with just such a meaning. "He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself." This is the meaning of the Hebrew, though the LXX reads differently. Again it refers to the surrender of the servant's life to God. Also, ταπεινόω is used in early Christianity of Jesus in connection with Isa 53.1-12 as an illustration of his attitude (I Clem 16.2, 17, a passage which is almost certainly independent of Phil 2). This makes it likely that ἐταπείνωσεν, just as ἐκένωσεν, is an echo of the servant of

Second Isaiah. Both phrases, "he emptied himself" and "he humbled himself," are, therefore, to be read against the backdrop of Isa 53. Both refer to the servant's surrender of life and are therefore synonymous in meaning and parallel in structure.

Talbert concludes that, "It would seem that the formal parallelism between the first two strophes is the clue to their meaning. Indeed, any interpretation which takes them as other than parallel in meaning as well as form flies in the face of all the clues furnished the reader by the author of the hymn and takes the less probable for the more probable explanation of the language. Parallel structure points to parallel meanings. That the parallelism between the first two strophes is intended to point to a common meaning is significant because there is no question that strophe 2 speaks of the human existence of Jesus. This would mean that strophe 1 also would be a statement not about the pre-existence of Jesus but about his earthly life. Strophe 1 says that Jesus, unlike Adam, did not grasp for equality with God but rather surrendered his life to God. Strophe 2 says that Jesus as a son of Adam surrendered his life to God. Both are concerned with the decision of Jesus to be God's servant rather than to repeat the tragedy of Adam and his sons."

Through analysis of the formal parallelism, and backdrop of the first-half of the hymn, we can argue that the Kyrios-hymn does not attest the pre-existence of Jesus, but rather demonstrates how Jesus is characterized as a son of Adam, a Second Adam that reverses the decision of the first Adam, and is a "Ebed YHWH" that surrenders his life to God, a parallel to the humble servant of Isaiah 53.

The second half of the hymn i.e. Jeremias' third strophe, however, has adduced a lack of pertinent treatment by Talbert and Murphy-O'Connor and an attestable academic laxity from Philippians scholarship more generally. Yet, some scholars consider the second-half of the hymn to yield a more compelling disputation against a cosmic and pre-existent character of Jesus of Nazareth in Phil 2:6-11 than the first-half of the hymn. Firstly, pro-Pauline scholars assert that ὑπερύψωσεν (v.9.) refers to the final heavenly exaltation of Christ as the Son of Man on the throne of God and reigns supreme and lordly over all, which evinces a reticulated structural symmetry of the hymn that commences with heavenly pre-existence as God the Son, the kenotic descent of God the Son, and the assumption of the bond-servant, Jesus of Nazareth and the climatic and final exaltation of Jesus of Nazareth in heaven as Lord and supreme over all on earth and heaven. Yet, even under the pro-Paulinic hypothesis, some academics contravene this supposition of heavenly exaltation that is frequently presupposed with the term ὑπερύψωσεν. However, shifting to the pre-Paulinic paradigm, there lacks any sufficient or adducible connotation of ὑπερύψωσεν that propounds an heavenly enthronement as an corollary exposition. Rather,

this is superadded on the basis of several New Testament passages (Rom 8:34, Heb 1:13, etc.) The pre-Paulinic hymnic background postulates an original Semitic and potentially Hellenistic, non-Paulininc context that along with the hymn, does not either claim nor implicate that Jesus is exalted in heaven at the right hand of God. The non-Paulinity of the concept of ὑπερύψωσεν in Phil 2:9 is expounded by Howard, Käsemann and Hamerton-Kelly who especially emphasizes this *motif* by remarking "this Christology of exaltation cannot be attributed to Paul, for him the resurrection was the turning point, while here it is the ascension. The climax for the hymn comes when Christ is enthroned as Lord of the worlds" (Hamerton-Kelly, Pre-Existence, 160. Käsemann Critical Analysis," 51-52) Therefore, if the backdrop of first-half of the hymn places the figure of Jesus of Nazereth in his earthly ministry as an Adamic and Ebed-YHWH character, then such an 'earthly' characterization ought to be conducive in the second-half of the hymn, hence an earthly post-resurrection exaltation of Jesus of Nazareth. This tradition of a post-resurrection exalted state is strongly attested in the synoptic tradition: The Gospel of Matthew ends with the resurrected Christ saying: 'All authority has been given to me in heaven and on earth' (Matt 28:18). The Matthean tradition attributes this logia to the mouth of Jesus during what appears to be the pre-ascension period. Ancillarily, Matthew makes no mention of the ascension through the whole narrative. This Matthean tradition ascribes all authority to Christ both in heaven and on earth during his earthly presence which corroborates the fact that a heavenly enthronement is not prerequisite for their subjugation in Matthean tradition. Furthermore, the first Gospel written by John Mark, also ends with the story of the pre-ascension empty tomb (16:1-8, 9-20 is not autobiographical to the initial form of the Gospel of Mark and was added later). As the women, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, enter the sepulcher they see a young man in white garments who tells them that Christ has risen and that he will be seen by his disciples in Galilee. Hence, we see that there is no mention of the ascension, while the resurrection is key during Mark's exaltation episode. Luke-Acts, however, does make mention of the ascension period (Acts 1:9 and Luke 24:51) but dramatized the post-resurrected Jesus to an extent that demonstrates Jesus' heavenly potency during his earthly presence, post-resurrection and pre-ascension. Two men clothed in dazzling apparel ask the women why they seek the living among the dead (24:1-12). The two men on the road to Emmaus hear from Christ himself that it was necessary for him to suffer and to enter into his glory (24:26); shortly afterwards he vanishes out of their sight (24:31). Jesus appears miraculously among the disciples and tells them to wait in the city until they receive heavenly power (24:36-53).

Any erudite reader knows that the heavenly coronation of Jesus was espoused by the early church (Eph 1:20-23, Heb 1:3), but that the post-resurrection glory and lordship of Jesus prior to the ascension episode was likewise a tradition of the early church that was of more pertinence. The vision of the early church lay not in a transcendent deified being who was impersonal and isolated in heaven but manifested in Jesus of Nazareth who was glorified on earth, yielding a more proximitate, personal and divine character. Hence, Howard concludes that the author of christ-hymn uses ὑπερύψωσεν to refer to the glorified post-resurrected and pre-ascension state of Jesus of Nazareth and not that of heavenly enthronement.

Nextly, the phrase καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα (to name him the name) following ὑπερύψωσεν is conventionally taken to mean that God named Christ his own name, Yahweh through his gift of κύριος which ostensibly is the Septiguant's rendering of the Tetragrammaton, YHWH, the name of God in the Old Testament. Nevertheless, translating καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα as "to ***name*** him the name" is not accurate for several reasons: 1) This concept of "naming" is ordinarily expressed by ἐπωνόμασεν (he/she/it-give-ed-a-name) τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν (Gen 5:2, 3), or ἐκάλεσεν (he/she/it called) τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (Matt 1:25) yet for Phil 2:9 we see that χαρίζω is used. 2) 3 The word χαρίζομαι is never used with this meaning elsewhere in the NT nor ever in LXX. While "to give a name to someone" in modern linguistic theory means "to name someone a name," this usage is unsubstantiated in pre-Christian Greek literature. Rather, the phrase καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα would roughly translate to "to give/grant/bestow him the name" meaning that the divine name was bestowed to Jesus not as an object to claim as his own, but as an object that was gifted for him to possess and use. This distinction is apropos because contravening what scholars such as R.H. Fuller contend, there is an inadmissible connotation with this particular translation of καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα that instantiates the bestowed name *more so* as an functional identity rather then a ontic or ontological identity. We observe a close parallel to this in 1 Enoch 69:13-14 where the angel Kâsbeêl asks Michael "to show him the hidden name, that he might enunciate it in the oath, so that those might quake before that name and oath who revealed all that was secret to the children of men." The context of this passage does not explicitly identify the name that Kâsbeêl wished to know but even without knowing this, the Enochian passage captures the idea attested in the christ-hymn, namely that God has bestowed his name to Jesus for him to use as an instrument of divine authority and potency over heaven and earth. Lastly, along with καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα is that the name here is asserted to be κύριος or "Lord" which is what the hymn calls the exalted Jesus in v.11. Internal

consistency would necessitate,that if the the name that was bestowed to Jesus is the tetragrammaton YHWH, yet Jesus is explicitly called κύριος in v.11, then κύριος must be the Septuignant rendering of the tetragrammaton YHWH and therefore, the title κύριος is the tetragrammaton YHWH. However, we know that this is demonstrably aberrant. The problem with this line of reasoning is that κύριος is not the unique name of God in LXX. While it is true that God is called κύριος in the Old Testament as "Lord of all", κύριος is used in reference to other characters aside from God (Exod 22:8, 21:29). Hence, not only is κύριος not a unique title for God, but had κύριος been equal to the tetragrammaton YHWH as many pro-Pauline scholars claim, but other individuals in the Old Testament narrative that have been adducibly bestowed the same form of exaltation as Christ has in the hymn of Philippians through the same divine title κύριος must be conceded to have exalted and perhaps deified to the same magnitude as the character of Jesus in Phil 2:6-11. Not to mention, discoveries in Egypt around the 20th century and the Judaean desert show that in the pre-Christian Greek biblical records the tetragrammaton was never represented by the surrogate κύριος, but rather "when the Septuagint was translated no attempt was made to translate YHWH but the Christians who felt no longer bound by the tradition of their predecessors did not hesitate to replace it by "kyrios", the equivalent of 'adon — a thing they would not have dared to do had the name appeared as sacred to them as it did to the Massoretes some seven centuries later" (Howard, 18) All of these corollaries point to a simple and robust fact: The tetragrammaton prior to the New Testament period has never been instantiated by the written surrogate κύριος nor has been deemed by primitive Judaic tradition as an equal title for the God of the Old Testament. Rather, this notion of κύριος as a written surrogate for YHWH is a by-product of the early Christian innovation.

1.5 Conclusion

Philippians scholarship has, for the most part, established Phil 2:6-11 as a pre-Paulinic liturgical hymn of Semitic background with potential Greek/Hellenistic touch, that illustrates Jesus as not a cosmic, pre-existent and heavenly entity, but as a Adamic and a "Ebed-YHWH" prototype who is bestowed with the divine name, exalted to κύριος, a functional identity that grants Christ authority and potency of the earth and in heaven.