



BRILL

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM 61 (2019) 409–422

Novum
Testamentum
An International Quarterly for
New Testament
and Related Studies
brill.com/nt

Christological Punctuation

A Note on Phil 2:7

Robert Matthew Calhoun

Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, TX, USA

robertmatthewcalhoun@gmail.com

Abstract

The 26th edition of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*, followed by the 27th and 28th editions, deleted a punctuation variant in Phil 2:7 noted in the 25th, which drew attention to a syntactical ambiguity in the construal of three successive participial phrases (7b–d). Resolutions of this ambiguity have significant consequences for the passage's christological perspective. Future editions should revise and restore this variant.

Keywords

punctuation – christology – form criticism – source criticism – hymn – Adam

Under the editorial leadership of Kurt Aland, the 26th edition of Nestle's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (1979, rev. 1981) introduced extensive revisions to the text and critical apparatus of the 25th (1964).^{*1} One immediately noticeable

* I presented an early version of this paper at the Southwest Commission on Religious Studies and Southwest Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting (Irving, Texas) on 11 March, 2018. I thank those present, as well as M.C. Baldwin, D.P. Moessner and C.K. Rothschild for critical feedback on earlier drafts.

1 Abbreviations of editions referred to herein include: NA-28 = B. Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (28th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012); NA-27 = B. Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (27th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993; rev. 1998); NA-26 = K. Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (26th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979; rev. 1981); NA-25 = Er. Nestle and K. Aland, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (25th ed.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964); NA-23 = Er. Nestle and K. Aland, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (23rd ed.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1957); Nestle-16 = Eb. Nestle and Er. Nestle, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, (16th ed.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1936); SBLGNT = M.W. Holmes, ed., *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010); TH

difference in Phil 2:6–11 is the poetic presentation (indentation and versification) of the passage, adapted from the arrangement devised by Lohmeyer in his seminal monograph *Kyrios Jesus*.² A less obvious change occurs in v. 7, where NA-26 omits a textual variant which appears in NA-25 and earlier editions. The deleted note says that Tischendorf puts a comma after ὡς ἄνθρωπος instead of a colon after γενόμενος.³ A closer inspection of modern printed editions of the Greek NT reveals six punctuation schemes of vv. 7–8a, all devised prior to Lohmeyer's study (1928):

1. ἀλλ(ᾶ)⁴ ἔαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθείς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν κτλ. (WH; Nestle-16; NA-23, 25, 26, 27, 28; UBS-2, 3, 4, 5; SBLGNT)⁵

= D. Jongkind et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament Produced at Tyndale House, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); UBS-5 = B. Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament* (5th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2014); UBS-4 = B. Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament* (4th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft and United Bible Societies, 1994); UBS-3 = K. Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament* (3rd ed.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1975); UBS-2 = K. Aland et al., *The Greek New Testament* (2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Württemberg Bible Society, 1968); WH = B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, eds., *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (repr.; New York: Macmillan, 1928). The division of verses (7a, 7b, etc.) follows the breakdown of lines in NA-26–28.

2. E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zur Phil. 2,5–11* (SHAW 1927/1928, 4. Abh.; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1928; 2nd ed., 1961) 5–6. Other passages typeset as poetry for the first time in NA-26 include, e.g., 1 Cor 8:6; Col 1:15–18 (NA-27, 28, 1:15–20); 1 Tim 2:5–6; 3:16; 6:7–8, 11–12, 15–16; 2 Tim 1:9–10; 2:11–13; Titus 3:4–7. Cf. the introduction of NA26 at 44* (in German, p. 6*): “The strophic printing of verse has been expanded, perhaps even too much at times, but further revision is always possible. The same holds for punctuation, which seeks to follow Greek usage in contrast to the earlier Nestle which was dominated by German usage, and the *Greek New Testament*, where the influence is English.”

For bibliography and history of scholarship on Phil 2:5–11 (the few studies I mention here are droplets in a vast ocean), see R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (SNTSMS 4; London: Cambridge University Press, 1967), repr. as *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1997), with updates in the introductions of the successive editions; also G.P. Fewster, “The Philippians ‘Christ Hymn’: Trends in Critical Scholarship,” *CurBR* 13 (2015) 191–206.

3. The punctuation apparatuses of UBS-2 and UBS-3 indicate differences in where the verse number 8 is placed (after 7c or after 7d); those of UBS-4 and UBS-5 mention instead that vv. 5–11 or 6–11 are “traditional material.”
4. ἀλλᾶ: WH; Nestle-16; NA-23, 25, 26, 27; UBS-2, 3, 4; SBLGNT. ἀλλ’: NA-28; UBS-5.
5. Cf. M.R. Vincent, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1897) 57, who marks a break after 7c in his translation, and links 7c with 7a–b in his comments (59); also M. Jones, *The Epistle of the Philippians, with Introduction and Notes* (WC 46; London: Methuen, 1918) 29, 32.

2. ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἔταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν κτλ. (Tischendorf)⁶
3. ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἔταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν κτλ. (Lachmann, Tregelles, Weiss, TH)⁷
4. ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἔταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν κτλ. (Wettstein)⁸
5. ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος· ἔταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν κτλ. (Stephanus, Griesbach)⁹
6. ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἔταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν κτλ. (von Soden)¹⁰

In a passage as heavily contested as Phil 2:6–11—with seemingly every word the subject of its own history of scholarly dispute—even minor decisions regarding punctuation can have significant interpretive ramifications.¹¹ The edi-

6 C. von Tischendorf, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (8th ed.; 2 vols.; Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869–1872) 2:712.

7 K. Lachmann, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1831) 382; S.P. Tregelles, ed., *The Greek New Testament* (7 vols.; London: S. Bagster & Sons, 1857–1879) 4:839–840; B. Weiss, ed., *Das Neue Testament: Handausgabe* (2nd ed.; 3 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902, 1905) 2:426–427. J.B. Lightfoot's commentary has commas on either side of 7c in the lemma, but in his exegesis he subscribes to option 1 (*Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes and Dissertations* [repr.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1953] 110–113).

8 J.J. Wettstein, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (2 vols.; Amsterdam: Dommeriana, 1751–1752) 2:270 (with double-letters resolved and the grave accent changed to acute on λαβών).

9 R. Estienne, ed., *Nouum Iesu Christi D. N. Testamentum: Ex bibliotheca regia* (2 vols.; Paris, 1550) 2:85–86; cf. F.H.A. Scrivener, ed., *Novum Testamentum textus Stephanici* (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1887) 460; J.J. Griesbach, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (2nd ed., 2 vols.; London: MacKinlay, Cuthell & Martin, 1810) 2:374 (with the grave accent changed to acute on λαβών).

10 H. Freiherr von Soden, ed., *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, vol. 2, *Text mit Apparatus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913) 775.

11 Punctuation has rarely played a major role in scholarly debate on the NT. Notable exceptions include: John 1:3–4, regarding which see D. Nässeqvist, "The Question of Punctuation in John 1:3–4: Arguments from Ancient Colometry," *JBL* 137 (2018) 175–191; John 7:37–38, on which see C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: SPCK, 1955) 270; and Rom 4:1, on which see R.B. Hays, "Have We Found Abraham to Be Our Forefather According to the Flesh? A Reconsideration of Rom 4:1," *NovT* 27 (1985) 76–98. For other examples, see K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids:

tions quoted above use colons and commas to guide the reader's construal of the three circumstantial participial phrases (7b, c, d) standing between the two finite verbs (ἐκένωσεν, 7a; ἐταπεινώσεν, 8a). The comma after λαβών and colon after γενόμενος in option 1 strongly suggest that 7c further explains 7b: Christ emptied himself *by taking the form of a slave*, that is, *by being born in the likeness of humans*. After καὶ linking the clauses,¹² the final phrase in 7d recapitulates vv. 7a–c:¹³ and, *being found in shape as a human*, he humiliated himself further in the brutal manner of his death. Tischendorf (option 2) groups 7c and 7d together, although he does not give clear direction as to whether they belong with the preceding or following main clause.¹⁴ Lachmann, Tregelles, Weiss and the new Tyndale House edition (option 3) firmly attach 7b to 7a, and 7d to 8a, but leave 7c floating between them.¹⁵ Stephanus and Griesbach (option 5) read all three phrases with ἐκένωσεν, while von Soden (option 6) reads 7c–d with

Eerdmans, 1989) 287. Cf. H.Y. Gamble's discussion of Irenaeus's complaint (*Haer.* 3.7.2) regarding the misreading of Paul by heretics because of misplaced "intervals of breathing," "as if the advent of the Lord could take place according to the working of Satan" (2 Thess 2:8) (*Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995] 229).

- 12 So G.D. Fee, "Philippians 2:5–11: Hymn or Exalted Pauline Prose?" *BBR* 2 (1992) 29–46, 40–41 and n. 42, in contrast to options 2, 5 and 6 where it joins participial phrases. Cf. P. Oakes, *Philippians: From People to Letter* (SNTSMS 110; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) 193–198, esp. 197; J. Gnllka, *Der Philipperbrief* (4th ed.; HThKNT 10/3; Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1987) 117, 121.
- 13 Interpreters occasionally categorize καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθείς ὡς ἄνθρωπος as an instance of *sorites* (σωρίτης, see LSJ 1750, s.v.), e.g., J.W. Thompson and B.W. Longenecker, *Philippians and Philemon* (Paideia; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016) 72–73. *Sorites* "refers to a chain of paired terms, the second of which is used as the first member of the next pair, resulting in an A ... B, B ... C, C ... D pattern" (D.E. Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003] 446–447). The term relates to logic; the rhetorical figures are, as Aune notes, ἀναδίπλωσις (if the doubling occurs once), and κλίμαξ (for a series of doublings). A clear case of ἀναδίπλωσις happens with θανάτου in 8b–c; cf. the repetitions of ὄνομα in 9b–10a. For references to the ancient sources, see H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft* (2nd ed.; 2 vols.; Munich: Max Hueber, 1973) 1:314–317 (§§619–624).
- 14 Cf. S.E. Fowl, who sees 7c and 7d as indicating that Christ's actions (i.e., 7a and 8a) are "situated in the human realm" (*The Story of Christ in the Ethics of Paul: An Analysis of the Function of the Hymnic Material in the Pauline Corpus* [JSNTSup 36; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990] 59–61).
- 15 W. Jaeger follows this punctuation, but his strophic arrangement makes it plain that 7c belongs with 7a–b, and 7d with 8a–c ("Eine stilgeschichtliche Studie, zum Philipperbrief," *Hermes* 50 [1915] 537–553: 537).

ἐταπείνωσεν.¹⁶ Wettstein (option 4), who sets off each phrase with commas, seems interested mainly in calling attention to the unclear syntax. Griesbach also prompts his readers to attend to other possibilities: he marks the comma after γενόμενος in 7c with an asterisk, which “indicates that this spot can be punctuated in various ways,” *locum variis modis interpungi posse, denotat*.¹⁷

The options listed above therefore disclose a syntactical ambiguity in the construal of the participial phrases in 7b–d—especially 7c. Also, aside from the noncommittal option 4, they offer solutions that presuppose the traditional understanding of christology, namely pre-existence and incarnation in vv. 6–7.¹⁸ Lohmeyer’s influential analysis of the passage as hymnic poetry opens up new ways of resolving the ambiguous syntax of 7b–d.¹⁹ He perceives the hymn (with some excisions) as having six strophes of three verses each and distributes the participial phrases in 7c–d between the second and third strophes (i.e., option 1 above).²⁰ Martin Dibelius, responding to Lohmeyer, places the break after 7d (option 5): “Offenbar wollen beide [7c and 7d] das Menschsein Christi feierlich umschreiben.”²¹ Ralph P. Martin divides the

16 H. Lietzmann accepts option 6 (*Messe und Herrenmahl: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie* [3rd ed.; AKG 8; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1955] 178).

17 Griesbach, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 1:xc.

18 On ancient interpretation, see G. Bostock, “Origen’s Exegesis of the Kenosis Hymn (Philippians 2:5–11),” in *Origeniana sexta: Origène et la Bible / Origen and the Bible* (ed. G. Dorival and A. Le Boulluec; BETL 118; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1995) 531–547; J.C. Edwards, “Pre-Nicene Receptions of Mark 10:45 // Matt. 20:28 with Phil. 2:6–8,” *JTS* 61 (2010) 194–199; B. Edsall and J.R. Strawbridge, “The Songs We Used to Sing? Hymn ‘Traditions’ and Reception in Pauline Letters,” *JSNT* 37 (2015) 290–311, 300–305. For a compilation of patristic comments in translation, see M.J. Edwards, ed., *Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians* (ACCS/NT 8; Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1999) 236–256.

19 Cf. the early strophic proposal of J. Weiss, “Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik,” in *Theologische Studien: Herrn Wirkl. Oberkonsistorialrath Professor D. Bernhard Weiss zu seinem 70. Geburtstag dargebracht* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897) 165–247, 190–191. His presentation of the text has no punctuation from the beginning of 6a until after ἐαυτὸν in 8a (comma), with a period after 8c.

20 Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus*, 5–6. E. Käsemann accepts Lohmeyer’s punctuation of 7c (“A Critical Analysis of Philippians 2:5–11,” *JTC* 5 [1968] 45–88, 70). See also K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (SNT 7; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1972) 144–156, 148; Gnllka, *Der Philipperbrief*, 111–124.

21 M. Dibelius, *An die Thessalonicher 1–II, An die Philipper* (3rd ed.; HNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1937) 77. Before the quotation above, he writes: “Die beiden Partizipia γενόμενος und εὔρεθείς sind rhetorisch durch die beiden Substantiva auf -μα fest miteinander verbunden.... Es geht also nicht an, das erste auf die Menschheit und das zweite auf den ‘Mensch’ = Menschensohn zu beziehen (Lohmeyer), aber auch nicht, das erste mit ἐκένωσεν und das zweite als Bezeichnung des Zeitpunktes mit ἐταπείνωσεν

passage into six couplets, with 7c–d together forming the third.²² In his exegesis he groups these phrases with v. 8 (option 6).²³ While these analyses ultimately choose between the options put forward by earlier editions of the NT, Joachim Jeremias's rendition of the poetic structure can be taken to support a new addition to the list:

7. ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβῶν· ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος καὶ σχήματι εὐρέθει· ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἔταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν κτλ.²⁴

Jeremias proposes three strophes of four lines each, and he punctuates the end of the first strophe (6a–7b) with a *period*.²⁵ Several other scholars adopt or adapt his hypothesis.²⁶ But while Jeremias and his followers do not regard his repunctuation as disturbing the overall christology of

zu verbinden." Cf. R. Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen* (SUNT 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967) 120–123; G.F. Hawthorne, *Philippians* (WBC 43; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983) 75, 87. G. Strecker regards all of v. 8 as a Pauline addition, so the participial phrases in 7b–d in the original hymn construe with 7a perforce: "Redaktion und Tradition im Christushymnus Phil 2 6–11," *ZNW* 55 (1964) 63–78; idem, *Theology of the New Testament* (ed. F.W. Horn; New York/Berlin: De Gruyter; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000) 69–74.

22 Martin, *Hymn of Christ*, 36–38.

23 Martin, *Hymn of Christ*, 197–228.

24 This reading has an antecedent in A. Deissmann, *Paulus: Eine kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1925) 149. Deissmann here quotes the Greek text with a colon after 7d (option 5), but he does not follow this in his translation: "... der ein Dasein hatte in Gottes Gestalt, | Und doch das Gottgleichsein nicht räuberisch begehrte, | Sondern sich selbst entäußerte, | Eines Sklaven Gestalt annehmend;—| Der, Menschenbild geworden und als Menschenwesen erfunden, | Sich selbst erniedrigte, gehorsam bis zum Tode, | Zum Kreuzestode."

25 J. Jeremias, "Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen," in *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii* (ed. J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik; Haarlem: Bohn, 1953) 146–155, 154; idem, "Zu Phil ii 7: ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν," *NovT* 6 (1963) 182–188, 186.

26 E.g., L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1959) 382–383; J.M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (SBT 1/25; London: SCM, 1959) 50–51; C.-H. Hunzinger, "Zur Struktur der Christus-Hymnen in Phil 2 und 1. Petr 3," in *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde: Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern* (ed. E. Lohse, C. Burchard and B. Schaller; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 142–156; O. Hofius, *Der Christushymnus Philippi 2,6–11: Untersuchungen zu Gestalt und Aussage eines urchristlichen Psalms* (WUNT 2/17; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1976), 4–12; U.B. Müller, "Der Christushymnus Phil 2 6–11," *ZNW* 79 (1988) 17–44, 19–20; idem, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Philipper* (THKNT 11/1; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1993) 89; J. Reumann, *Philippians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33B; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008) 333, 369–372.

pre-existence,²⁷ Charles Talbert grasps how dramatically it can impact interpretation.²⁸ Accepting Jeremias's placement of a period after 7b, he presses the case that the first two strophes (6a–7b and 7c–8b) are not describing successive stages in a narrative,²⁹ but are parallel: Christ did not “empty himself by taking the form of a slave” through the setting aside of a celestial form and the adoption of a terrestrial one,³⁰ but by “becoming obedient to the point of

-
- 27 “Die erste Strophe handelt von dem Präexistenten, die zweite von dem Irdischen, die dritte von dem Erhöhten” (Jeremias, “Zur Gedankenführung,” 154). Cf. J.-F. Collange, *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians* (London: Epworth, 1979) 103.
- 28 C.H. Talbert, “The Problem of Pre-Existing in Philippians 2:6–11,” *JBL* 86 (1967) 141–153, 147. Cf. G. Howard, “Phil 2:6–11 and the Human Christ,” *CBQ* 40 (1978) 368–387.
- 29 Scholars often read vv. 6–11 as an abbreviated narrative. See, e.g., Fee (“Philippians 2:5–11,” 39–43), who perceives a two-part structure of humiliation (I, vv. 6–8) and exaltation (II, vv. 9–11), with the former divided into two temporally successive parts (I.1, vv. 6a–7c; I.2, vv. 7d–8c); idem, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 191–197. Cf. F.W. Beare, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (BNTC; London: Black, 1959) 73–88, 74–75; J.P. Hellerman, *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi: Carmen Christi as Cursus Pudorum* (SNTSMS 132; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 129–131; Thompson and Longenecker, *Philippians and Philemon*, 71; P.A. Holloway, *Philippians: A Commentary* (ed. A. Yarbro Collins; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017) 120–121. Others see a division occurring between 6c and 7a: Christ is pre-incarnate (v. 6), incarnated (vv. 7–8), and exalted (vv. 9–11). See Jones, *Epistle to the Philippians*, lxxv; T.H. Tobin, “The World of Thought in the Philippians Hymn (Philippians 2:6–11),” in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune* (ed. J. Fotopoulos; NovTSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 91–104, 93; M. Bockmuehl, “The Form of God’ (Phil. 2:6): Variations on a Theme of Jewish Mysticism,” *JTS* 48 (1997) 1–23, 4 n. 8. For chiastic analyses, see M. Hooker, “Philippians 2:6–11,” in *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. E.E. Ellis and E. Gräßer; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 151–164, 159; D.P. Moessner, “Turning Status ‘Upside Down’ in Philippi: Christ Jesus’ ‘Emptying Himself’ as Forfeiting Any Acknowledgment of His ‘Equality with God’ (Phil 2:6–11),” *HBT* 31 (2009) 123–143, 139–143.
- 30 Romans 6 and Galatians 4 are sometimes invoked to resolve any difficulty with how “taking the form of a slave” can reasonably equate with “being born in the likeness of humans,” e.g., Käsemann, “Critical Analysis,” 66–67 (“Here [in the context of a religious hellenism] man as such, i.e., man in metaphysical universality, is a slave, the slave of εἰμαρμένη, of matter, of the planets and powers”); C.A. Wanamaker, “Philippians 2. 6–11: Son of God or Adamic Christology?” *NTS* 33 (1987) 179–193, 188–189; C.B. Cousar, *Philippians and Philemon: A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009) 55; Beare, *Commentary*, 82–83; G.B. Caird, *Paul's Letters from Prison: Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon* (New Clarendon Bible; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976) 121–122. Cf. the remarks of Hellerman, *Reconstructing Honor*, 143–144, on the social significance of obedience and slavery.

death" (8b).³¹ The path then opens for Talbert to explain the christology in neo-Adamic terms.³²

More recently, interpreters have expressed strong reservations about the form- and source-critical exegesis of vv. 6–11.³³ As Paul Holloway observes in his new commentary, the quest for sources in Paul's letters "now appears to

31 Talbert, "Problem of Pre-Existence," 148: "The phrase ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος is parallel to ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων. It is not an explanation of ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών. That the parallelism between the first two strophes breaks the link between μορφὴν δούλου λαβών and ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος 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 abolished." J. Murphy-O'Connor ("Christological Anthropology in Phil., 11,6–11," *RB* 83 [1976] 25–50, 30–31) characterizes pre-existence as a "Vorverständnis," which "seems to be derived from an uncritical acceptance that is facilitated by the dogmatic understanding of Christ as the second person of the Trinity and by certain statements of Paul which seem to imply the pre-existence of Christ." While this might be true of much (especially recent) publication, orthodox christology does not seem to underpin the older history-of-religions interpretations, e.g. R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistic Mystery-Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance* (PTMS 15; Pittsburg: Pickwick, 1978) 454–456; W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1970; repr., Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013) 154–155, 207–209; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; London: SCM, 1952, 1955) 1:175–176. For further references and discussion, see Martin, *Hymn of Christ*, 120–133. For explorations of angelic christology, see J.A. Sanders "Dissenting Deities and Philippians 2:1–11," *JBL* 88 (1969) 279–290; C.A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (AGJU 42; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1998) 337–339; Holloway, *Philippians*, 117–118 and 121–123 (on metamorphosis); cf. J. Fossum, "Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism," *VC* 37 (1983) 260–287.

32 Talbert, "Problem of Pre-Existence," 149–152. Regarding Christ as last or new Adam, see 1 Cor 15:21–22, 45–49; Rom 5:12–21. Cf. R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966) 75–114; J.D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 199–204, 241–242.

33 See, e.g., O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (2nd ed.; NTL; London: SCM, 1963) 177; Fee, "Philippians 2:5–11," 30–37; Bockmuehl, "Form of God," 2–5; R. Brucker, "Songs, 'Hymns,' and 'Encomia' in the New Testament?" in *Literature or Liturgy? Early Christian Hymns and Prayers in Their Literary and Liturgical Context in Antiquity* (ed. C. Leonhard and H. Löhr; WUNT 2/363; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014) 1–14; idem, "Christushymnen" oder "epideiktische Passagen"? *Studien zum Stilwechsel im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt* (FRLANT 176; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997); M. Peppard, "'Poetry,' 'Hymns' and 'Traditional Material' in New Testament Epistles or How to Do Things with Indentations," *JSTNT* 30 (2008) 319–342; Edsall and Strawbridge, "Songs We Used to Sing"; cf. the more cautious remarks of Fowl, *Story of Christ*, 31–45. On similar criteria applied to Rom 1:3–4, see R.M. Calhoun, *Paul's Definitions of the Gospel in Romans 1* (WUNT 2/316; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011) 92–106.

have run its course.”³⁴ The verses do not scan,³⁵ nor do they break easily into parallel *stichoi*.³⁶ Even with its intractable exegetical difficulties, the passage is interpretable as a concise prose hymn written by Paul himself using strategies of brevity in both style and content.³⁷ However, the syntactical insights of Jeremias and Talbert should not be forgotten or cursorily brushed aside because they are embedded in hypotheses of pre-Pauline hymnic poetry which have lately fallen out of scholarly favor. Even those few who agree with Talbert’s thesis that the text extols Christ as a new Adam tend to rely on the punctuation scheme printed in their critical editions (i.e., option 1),³⁸ which both assumes and reinforces a christology of pre-existence.

34 Holloway, *Philippians*, 115–117. Arguments for the pre-Pauline and hymnic-poetic character of the passage have hardly disappeared, however; see, e.g., C. Osiek, *Philippians, Philemon* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 2000) 55–58; Tobin, “World of Thought,” 91–92 (pre-Pauline and used in worship, but not poetry); Cousar, *Philippians and Philemon*, 52–53.

35 Cf. B. Eckman, “A Quantitative Metrical Analysis of the Philippians Hymn,” *NTS* 26 (1979–1980) 258–266.

36 A. Yarbro Collins describes vv. 6–11 as “‘rhythmic prose,’ a ‘prose hymn,’ or a brief encomium” (“Psalms, Philippians 2:6–11, and the Origins of Christology,” *BibInt* 11 [2002] 361–372, 367). She also observes that, while the passage uses three types of parallelism (synonymous, antithetical, climactic), “the Philippians passage does not have the structure typical of canonical psalms,” with each line having two related cola (366).

37 On ancient rhetorical theory regarding encomia as applied to passages of the NT in general, and Phil 2:6–11 in particular, see E. Krentz, “Epideiktik and Hymnody: The New Testament and Its World,” *BR* 40 (1995) 50–97; Brucker, *Christushymnus*, 23–173; M.W. Martin and B.A. Nash, “Philippians 2:6–11 as Subversive *Hymnos*: A Study in the Light of Ancient Rhetorical Theory,” *JTS* n.s. 66 (2015) 91–138.

38 See esp. Hooker, “Philippians 2:6–11,” 160–164; J.D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) xviii–xix, 114–21; idem, “Christ, Adam, and Preexistence,” in *Where Christology Began: Essays on Philippians 2* (ed. R.P. Martin and B.J. Dodd; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998) 74–83; idem, *Theology of Paul*, 281–288. (For critiques of Dunn’s thesis, see Wanamaker, “Philippians 2. 6–11”; L.D. Hurst, “Christ, Adam, and Pre-Existence Revisited,” in Martin and Dodd, *Where Christology Began*, 84–95.) Some interpreters understand *both* a pre-existent christology and allusion to Adam in v. 6, e.g., Cullmann, *Christology*, 176; Käsemann, “Critical Analysis,” 73; Caird, *Paul’s Letters from Prison*, 118–124, 121; N.T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Thought* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991; repr., Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 56–98. S. Eastman argues that the divine pre-existent Christ adopts the persona of Adam in the incarnation, with Paul using theatrical technical terminology (σχημα, ὁμοίωμα) in v. 7 (“Imitating Christ Imitating Us: Paul’s Educational Project in Philippians,” in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard Hays* [ed. J.R. Wagner, C.K. Rowe and A.K. Grieb; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008] 447–451, 442–445; cf. eadem, “Philippians 2:6–11: Incarnation as Mimetic Participation,” *JSPL* 1 [2011] 1–22).

Viewed from the perspective of syntax, however, option 7 makes a strong case. In context the translation of 7c–d would run thus:

... who, although he was in the form of God, did not regard equality with God as something to be exploited, but emptied himself by taking the form of a servant; [and who,] although he was in born in human likeness and was found in human form, humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death—even death on a cross.

Verses 6–8 have *two* relative clauses: *ὃς οὐχ ἡγήσατο ἀλλ' ἐκένωσεν* and *(ὃς) ἐταπείνωσεν*.³⁹ Whereas option 1 holds that *καί* coordinates the second clause with the first resulting in the placement of the colon after 7c, option 7 sees the two clauses as having been arranged *asyndetically*,⁴⁰ with *καί* joining the participial phrases in 7c and 7d. Therefore, as Talbert recognized, the second clause recapitulates the first (see Table 1).

TABLE 1 Talbert's arrangement of Phil 2:6–8

6a–7b	7c–8c
ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων	ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος
οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν	καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθείς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν
μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν	γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ

Each part (6a–7b; 7c–8c) briefly captures the origin (*ἀρχή*) and end (*τέλος*) of Christ, with his choice as the turning point between them (A, B, A'). Alternatively, one might understand them to outline *who he was*, *what he chose to be instead*, and *how he chose it*. Either way, the clauses compress the narrative of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον into extremely concise summaries. Whether the story begins in heaven with a pre-existent Christ depends mainly upon the christological

39 Cf. Deissmann's translation, quoted in n. 24 above. Regarding the role of such relative clauses (also attributive participial phrases) as instances of the "mythological expanded epithet pattern," see Calhoun, *Paul's Definitions*, 106–119.

40 Cf. the absence of a conjunction between the attributive participial phrases in Rom 1:3 and 4: περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ γενόμενος ..., τοῦ ὀρισθέντος....

presuppositions one brings to 6a. If Paul's Philippian audience did not already have a concept of a pre-existent Christ, one can see how they might hear the concessive participial phrases in 6a and 7c–d as evocative of Genesis 1–3 and the idea of Christ as the new Adam.⁴¹ Evocation here does not mean, however, that Paul is collapsing the narratives of Adam and Christ into a unitary pattern.⁴² As he says in Rom 5:14, the former is a τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος. Both have

41 I agree with D. Steenburg ("The Case against the Synonymity of *Morphē* and *Eikōn*," *JSNNT* 34 [1988] 77–86; cf. idem, "The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God," *JSNNT* 39 [1990] 95–109) that μορφή and εἰκών are not *synonyms*, such that one can use them interchangeably. I disagree, however, with his contention that μορφή, if it "more specifically connotes the visible aspect or physical appearance of God" ("Case against Synonymity," 78), would force reconsideration (77) of the proposal that Paul is evoking Adam in Philippians 2. He asks: "If the mundane Christ were simply being compared to the mundane Adam, why would specific reference to Christ's/Adam's visible/physical representation of God be sufficiently significant within the theme of the hymn that the author would choose to speak of the *morphē theou* rather than the more general and common *eikōn theou*?" Paul may have selected the phrase μορφή θεοῦ because the "image of a slave" would make no sense in the context, while the "form of God" is entirely comprehensible as encompassing God's act of creating Adam according to his own "image and likeness." Steenburg himself cites the passages that cinch the *possibility* of describing God's creation of Adam in terms of μορφή: *Sib. Or.* 8.265–68 and 8.442–43. Both are explaining Christ's role in the creation of Adam. The former says: "Let us both, child, make mortal tribes, copying our likeness. Now I with my hands, then you with a word, will tend our form so that we may produce a common construct." (ποιήσωμεν, τέκνον, ἄμφω | εἰκόνας ἡμετέρας ἀπομαζάμενοι βροτὰ φύλα· | νῦν μὲν ἐγὼ χειρσίν, σὺ δ' ἔπειτα λόγῳ θεραπεύσεις | μορφήν ἡμετέραν, ἴνα κοινὸν ἀνάστημα δώμεν.) This passage's use of "form" is somewhat obscure, but the other passage is clearer: "Look, let us make a man like in all respects to our form, and let us give him the life-supporting breath to have" (ποιήσωμεν ἰδοὺ πανομοίον ἀνέρα μορφή | ἡμετέρη καὶ δώμεν ἔχειν ζωαρχέα πνοιήν). (Trans. J.J. Collins, *OTP* 1 [1983] 317–472, at 424, 429; text J. Geffcken, ed., *Die Oracula Sibyllina* [GCS; Leipzig: Henrichs, 1902] 159, 170.) The *Poimandres* (*Corp. herm.* 1.12) likewise connects εἰκών and μορφή in its retelling of Gen 1:26: "But the father of all, the Nous (being life and light), bore an Anthropos similar to him, whom he loved as his own offspring. For he was very beautiful, since he had the image of Father. For even God truly loved his own form, and gave him all his own creations." (ὁ δὲ πάντων πατήρ ὁ Νοῦς, ὢν ζωὴ καὶ φῶς, ἀπεκύησεν Ἄνθρωπον αὐτῷ ἴσον, οὗ ἡράσθη ὡς ἰδίου τόκου περικαλλῆς γάρ, τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς εἰκόνα ἔχων· ὄντως γάρ καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡράσθη τῆς ἰδίας μορφῆς, παρέδωκέ (τε) τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πάντα δημιουργήματα.) (Text A.D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, eds. and trans., *Corpus Hermeticum* [4 vols.; Budé; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1946–1954] 1:10.) On this tractate's reception of Genesis, see C.H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), esp. 145–169; G.G. Stroumsa, "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ," *HTR* 76 (1983) 269–288, 273–274.

42 Cf. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 115–118, e.g.: "Μορφή δούλου probably refers therefore to what Adam became as a result of his fall" (115); or, "likeness of men' probably by way of contrast denotes the kind of man that Adam became and so the kind of man that all men now are" (116); Dunn also regards τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ as contrasting with "the lot and portion of man's slavery (to corruption and the powers)" (117), i.e., ὁμοίωμα ἀνθρώπων. Paul does

the dignity of having been created according to God's εἰκών and ὁμοίωσις (Gen 1:26). If the plural ἀνθρώπων in 7c is the superior reading (instead of ἀνθρώπου in B46 et al.),⁴³ Paul indirectly affirms that Christ exists ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ by virtue of his descent from Adam; he has the *same* dignity as all other humans.⁴⁴ Yet, as God's Son, he has a status comparable to only one other. The choices of such figures—and the φρονεῖν that informs their choices (Phil 2:5)—have universal consequences. Whereas Adam's creation in God's εἰκών prompts him to *reach* (ἀρπάζειν) for an even higher status,⁴⁵ Christ “emptied” and “humiliated himself” by *taking* (λαβεῖν) the form of a slave,⁴⁶ whose status stands at the opposite extreme. He embraced his chosen shame fully in the manner of

-
- not need for Adam and Christ to have structurally identical stories in order for the latter to surpass the former and to rectify the universal damage caused by his transgression.
- 43 B.M. Metzger dismisses the singular ἀνθρώπου as a correction to bring it into line with the nearby singulars δούλου and ἄνθρωπος, though he notes the possibility that “the Adam-Christ typology implicit in the passage accounts for the substitution” (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [2nd ed.; New York: United Bible Societies; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994] 545–546). Marcion's text reads the singular as well (per Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.20). Assimilation to Rom 1:23 may also be possible (ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνας φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἐρπετῶν), in order to make the connection with Genesis 1–3 slightly more evident.
- 44 Paul's utilization of this idea in 1 Cor 11:7–8 forces the qualification, *male* humans: “For a man (ἀνὴρ) must not cover his head, *because he is the image and glory of God* (εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων), but the woman is the glory of the man.”
- 45 Cf. the serpent's temptation of Eve in Gen 3:5: ἦδρει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐν ἧ ἄν ἡμέρα φάγητε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ [the forbidden tree], διανοιχθήσονται ὑμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, καὶ ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοὶ γινώσκοντες καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν. Hooker (“Philippians 2:6–11,” 160–161) suggests that “[b]eing in the form of God *meant* likeness or equality with God, as in the case of Adam in Gen 1:26. The word ἴσα in Phil 2:6 is normally translated ‘equal,’ but it can be used in a much more general sense in the LXX to mean ‘like,’ and the phrase would therefore be appropriate as a reference to Gen 1:26.”
- 46 The difficult term ἀρπαγμός has spawned its own mini-library of studies devoted to it; see, e.g., R.W. Hoover, “The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution,” *HTR* 64 (1971) 95–119; N.T. Wright, “Ἀρπαγμός and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5–11,” *JTS* 37 (1986) 321–352; idem, *Climax of the Covenant*, 56–98; J.C. O'Neill, “Hoover on *Harpagmos* Reviewed, with a Modest Proposal concerning Philippians 2:6,” *HTR* 81 (1988) 445–449; M.W. Martin, “Ἀρπαγμός Revisited: A Philological Reexamination of the New Testament's ‘Most Difficult Word,’” *JBL* 135 (2016) 175–194. Hoover, building upon an earlier article by Jaeger (“Eine stilgeschichtliche Studie,” see n. 15 above), proposes that the word is idiomatic with ἡγεῖσθαι, meaning “to take advantage of.” This seems provisionally satisfactory, as long as the idea of *taking* or *seizing* does not disappear into the alleged idiom. The idea of what Christ “did not regard as a ἀρπαγμός” links thematically with what he chose to take instead, the “form of a slave.” In other words, an idiomatic reading of ἡγεῖσθαι ἀρπαγμόν does not by itself solve the problem of the christological orthodoxy (or its lack) in vv. 6–11.

his execution.⁴⁷ God then enacts a final reversal of status, exalting him to the highest station. Therefore, instead of elaborating how Christ's ἀρχή fulfills the prophetic promises in terms of Davidic ancestry κατὰ σάρκα (Rom 1:2–3), Paul in Phil 2:6–11 deploys Christ and Adam as positive and negative παραδείγματα of the kind of φρονεῖν required of the Philippians.

Paul is certainly capable of exploiting polysemy in his arguments, although he does not appear to be doing so here.⁴⁸ His addressees have more detailed information, presumably delivered to them by Paul himself, about Christ's ἀρχή. For later readers who lack this information, the elegant βραχυλογία in vv. 6–8 has become obscure, such that scholars today put forward mutually exclusive interpretations of the passage's christology. Aids for readers like punctuation existed well before Paul wrote.⁴⁹ But if he or his scribe used it in Phil 2:7, the earliest extant manuscript of the passage (P46) offers no evidence.⁵⁰ The pseud-epigraphic letter to the Colossians suggests that early readers saw the "hymn" in Philippians 2 as needing clarification, perhaps even correction:⁵¹ The author, adopting Paul's persona, ensures that ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν can mean nothing other than Christ is εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (1:14–15). With the presupposition of the Pauline doctrine of pre-existence firmly in place, difficulties with the ambiguous syntax in v. 7 become less urgent. With or without punctuation in the texts before

-
- 47 On crucifixion as a form of execution deemed suitable for slaves, see G.G. O'Collins, "Crucifixion," *ABD* 1 (1992) 1207–1210; Hellerman, *Reconstructing Honor*, 144–148; J.G. Cook, *Crucifixion in the Mediterranean World* (WUNT 327; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014) 418–430; Holloway, *Philippians*, 124–125. The elevation (ὑπερυψοῦν) acquires interesting resonances in light of J. Marcus, "Crucifixion as Parodic Exaltation," *JBL* 125 (2006) 73–87.
- 48 In other words, he does not return to vv. 6–8 to unpack both the Adamic and pre-existent/incarnational figure of Christ later in Philippians (if one assumes it to be a unitary letter, which it may not be; see esp. H.D. Betz, *Studies in Paul's Letter to the Philippians* [WUNT 343; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015]). On Paul's exploitation of ambiguity and polysemy in Romans, see Calhoun, *Paul's Definitions*, 193–218.
- 49 See A. Mugridge, *Copying Early Christian Texts: A Study of Scribal Practice* (WUNT 362; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016) 80–83, with references to additional literature.
- 50 F.G. Kenyon, ed., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, fasc. 3 suppl., *Pauline Epistles* (2 vols.; London: Emery Walker, 1936–1937) 1:144 (87v), and n.b. his comment regarding the manuscript at 1:xiv: "There is a very small amount of punctuation with a high dot by the original scribe...."
- 51 Cf. M.M. Mitchell, "Corrective Composition, Corrective Exegesis: The Teaching on Prayer in 1 Tim 2:1–15," in eadem, *Paul and the Emergence of Christian Textuality: Early Christian Literary Culture in Context, Collected Essays Vol. 1* (WUNT 393; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017) 302–322; for discussion of a similar pseud-epigraphic correction of 1 Corinthians 15, see R.M. Calhoun, "The Resurrection of the Flesh in *Third Corinthians*," in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood* (ed. C.K. Rothschild and T.W. Thompson; WUNT 284; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011) 235–257.

them, readers would automatically rule out any solution that might lead to a “heterodox” christology.

In conclusion, the punctuation of Phil 2:7 in critical editions of the NT steers interpreters toward certain christological channels and away from others. Editors of future editions ought to restore or revise the punctuation variant from NA-25, in order to warn readers not to overlook the syntactical conundrum presented by the participial phrases in 7b–d, and to encourage consideration of the exegetical implications of whichever solution is chosen.