

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Art Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-2003

Hermeneutical Implications of Certain Pre-Pauline Passages in the Pauline Corpus of the New Testament

Inta Ivanovska

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_ivanovskai@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.csl.edu/ma_th



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ivanovska, Inta, "Hermeneutical Implications of Certain Pre-Pauline Passages in the Pauline Corpus of the New Testament" (2003). *Master of Art Theology Thesis*. 102.

https://scholar.csl.edu/ma_th/102

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Art Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

HERMENEUTICAL IMPLICATIONS
OF CERTAIN PRE-PAULINE PASSAGES IN THE PAULINE CORPUS
OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

A thesis presented to the faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

by

Inta Ivanovska

May, 2003

Approved by: James Voelz Advisor
Louis Brighton Reader
Timothy P. Dost Reader

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....	1
a. The Problem.....	1
b. Purpose/Goal.....	2
c. Structure.....	2
d. Critical Presuppositions.....	5
e. Definition.....	6
f. Criteria for the Identification of Pre-Pauline Formulae.....	7
II. Exegetical Study.....	13
a. Romans 1:3-4.....	13
b. 1 Corinthians 11:23-25.....	21
c. 1 Corinthians 15:3b-5.....	30
d. Philippians 2:6-11.....	36
III. Conceptual Implications.....	47
a. Apostleship and the Church.....	47
b. Scripture and the Church.....	51
IV. Hermeneutical Implications.....	56
Conclusion.....	67
Selected Bibliography.....	69

Introduction

The Problem

Postmodern linguistics and philosophy have challenged the possibility that an author, a text, or a reader of a text possesses or can possess complete objectivity. It claims that an “independent, objective, reason-driven *reader*” is merely a “communally-dependent, subjective, presupposition-bound *agent*.” Similarly, an author is regarded as a subject who through the text merely expresses the perspectives he has acquired through his own, contextually-shaped experiences. Moreover, once created, a text is not to be regarded as an entity which bears its own intrinsic meaning; nor is a text the expression of an “original,” authorial intent. Rather, a text is merely a “symbol” which receives its meaning and intention by means of the interpretative process. According to this understanding, the quest for the right or the wrong intrinsic interpretation of a text is regarded as destined to failure, if it is not simply illegitimate. Interpretation is itself the exercise of perspective governed by a subjective reader rather than by any “objective” meaning of the text.

If true, this postmodern claim calls into question the traditional Lutheran assertion that Holy Scripture possesses an intrinsic meaning granted by the Holy Spirit and as such is determinative for the Church’s faith and life. There is a formal authority of the Scriptures which bestows, authenticates, and guarantees the subject matter (material principle) of the Scriptures. For this reason, Holy Scripture, according to its own nature and reality, is and can function as the sole norm for Christian faith and life. Furthermore, the postmodern claim implicitly compromises traditional dogmatic claims such as the perspicuity and sufficiency of the Scriptures. In addition, the distinction between the

Scriptures as the *norma normans* and various creedal statements as *normae normatae* is rendered virtually meaningless, since subjective interpretation itself establishes the meaning of text.

Purpose/Goal

This study will attempt to demonstrate that the idea of a “presupposition-bound” and “community (Church) influenced” text (regarded both in its writing and in its reception) is not hostile to the understanding of Scripture as articulated in Lutheran dogmatics. Rather, this paper will attempt to demonstrate that during the Apostolic period the primitive church considered a “creedal”¹ awareness crucial for the appropriation of God’s revelation in Christ as revealed in the Scripture and for the exposition of that revelation for the ongoing faith and life of the Church throughout the ages. In short, the apostolic writing of the Scriptures assumed and required a “creedal” content and context which was already present in the Church through liturgy, hymn, acclamation, confession, and the like.

Structure

The question of the relation between the text of Scripture and the community whose Scripture it is can be addressed as either a historical or as a systematic question. The questions of the relation between Scripture and tradition, the continuity of the Church, the formation of the canon, and the like would offer profitable entrées to reflections on the implications of postmodern hermeneutics for a Lutheran understanding

¹ By this I do not mean the Chalcedonian, Nicene, Athanasian etc. fixed later formulas, but rather that the basic content of these creeds was already understood, the *prime kerygma* of the Church.

of Scripture. This paper, however, will proceed by way of an exegetical inquiry. As the entry point of our discussion, we will focus on four Pauline passages which scholarly consensus acknowledges as containing traditional, pre-Pauline material. That is, Paul adopts and uses material which lies at hand and is apparently already in use in the primitive Christian Church. The four passages from the epistles of Paul which will be considered are Rom. 1:3-5, 1 Cor. 11:23-26, 1 Cor. 15:3-9, and Phil. 2:6-11. In each case, the study will summarize the evidence which demonstrates the traditional, pre-textual character of the passages. Then the study will summarize the scholarly discussion concerning the function which Paul gives to these pre-Pauline traditions within his epistles. The study will also discuss the most likely application of this traditional material within the life of the primitive Church.

The survey will show that Paul used prior traditions almost exclusively in rhetorically powerful and thematically crucial contexts of his letters. The use of this traditional material is not merely ancillary or illustrative. Paul cites this material as authoritative argument or as a summary conclusion for the issue at hand. Moreover, in trying to uncover the likely *Sitz im Leben* of this traditional material in the Church, our discussion will test the hypothesis that Paul most probably used traditions which he drew from significant and constitutive realities in the life of the Church, such as sacraments, communal worship, teaching and witnessing (up to the point of martyrdom). Scholars have distinguished five possible circumstances that contributed to the creation and the distinct shape of the formulae of faith:²

1. Baptism³ and the catechumenate;

² O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (London: London Press, 1949), 18.

2. corporate worship,⁴ liturgy,⁵ hymns, preaching;
3. exorcism;⁶
4. persecution;⁷
5. polemic against heretics,⁸ apologetics.

Of course, a certain creedal formula may have a *Sitz im Leben* in more than one of the above.

The exegetical findings will serve as the basis for the hermeneutical discussion of the second part of the study. In this part of the study we will explore the idea of the intrinsic inseparability of the Scripture (both in its composition and its reception) from the life of the Church and its creedal awareness. We will consider three major claims: (1) a creedal perspective was not derivative from the Scripture but was already present within the early Church milieu; (2) the Scripture itself partakes of this perspective and so is not “objective” according to the standards of modern reason; (3) when any reader interacts with the text of Scripture, he must possess the relevant creedal standards and be attentive to those realities of the Church which provide the rules, the referents, and the criteria by which the text itself wishes to be understood. To collaborate and illustrate our discussion we will adduce appropriate and relevant material from the ecumenical creeds,

³ Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.9.4 speaks of the “rule of truth” received in baptism. Also Tertullian, *De Spectaculis* 4; *De Corona* 3; Justin Martyr, *1 Apology* 61; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechisms*; *Apostolic Constitutions*; *Syriac Didascalia*.

⁴ Many scholars draw here parallels with the *Shema*, which was recited in Jewish synagogues.

⁵ Especially the Eucharistic liturgy; see the *Apostolic Tradition* ascribed to Hippolytus.

⁶ So says Justin, *Dial.*, 30:3; 85:2; 76:6.; cf. The rule of faith either proclaimed by “the exorcist-healer” (Acts 3:6, 4:10) or by evil spirits (Mark 1:24; 3:11; 5:7).

⁷ The term “to suffer death by martyrdom” comes from the Greek μαρτυρέω – “to bear witness.” Also 1 Tim 6:12-16 states that Christ Jesus before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession. Also *Mart. Poly.* 8:2; Tertullian, *De Corona*, 11.

⁸ Ignatius of Antioch against the Docetists, *Ad Trall.* 9; *Ad Smyrn.* 1.

Lutheran confessional writings, and the works of Irenaeus, Chemnitz and other significant church thinkers.

Critical Presuppositions

Before identifying confessional and liturgical formulas which existed prior to the written text of the New Testament, we must take a position regarding two possible approaches to this task:

(1) On the one hand, one may methodologically disregard the subsequent development of the Church's teaching and its historically "fixed" creeds and apart from them attempt to discern the "primitive origins" and the "primitive meanings" of the text impartially. This manner of proceeding methodologically assumes discontinuity between the New Testament and the subsequent church;

(2) On the other hand, one may allow oneself to be guided and advised by the subsequent creedal developments and consider them as extended commentaries on the earlier formulas. This manner of proceeding methodologically assumes continuity between the New Testament and the subsequent church and its developing teaching.

The first posture will not be adopted for three reasons: linguistic, conceptual and historical. Linguistically, a reader's absolute impartiality is impossible, for it rests upon the impossible situation where a reader has no relation with the text – no common concepts, no common language, nor any "memory" of the community from which the Scriptures arose.⁹ Conceptually, such an approach involves one in an intellectual conundrum, for by viewing a historical development as irrelevant to or an impediment to

⁹ On the interrelation of text, context and reader, see J.W. Voelz, *What Does This Mean: Principles of Biblical Interpretation in the Post-Modern World*, 2nd ed. (St. Louis: CPH, 1997).

discerning the meaning of its own source, one has already taken a position, and hence is not impartial. Historically, if one considers subsequent tradition as a barrier to understanding its source-tradition (for example, holding that the later “fixed creeds” of the Church provide no valid insight into the proto-creeds of the eyewitnesses of the Jesus Event), then one also should be reluctant to use the traditions that “poured into” the Christian proto-creeds, i.e., Jewish messianic and “One God” traditions.

The second method, however, understands a creed to be a historically conditioned *continuous* phenomenon, shaped and, as it were, “updated” both by the canonical revelations of God in history and by the continuous appropriation of those revelations into the life of the faith-community. In a sense, they are “of a piece” with apostolic authoritative revelation in the New Testament, and this substantial unity is achieved via adherence to the same *regula fidei*. This will be the working assumption of the current research.

Definition

A creed is the Church’s response to the self-revelations of God in the history of Israel and in the life of Jesus. Creeds are formulae that bear witness either to what God has done (narrative), or, based upon the works of God and His own witness to Himself, attempt to define who God is (statement). Both forms of creeds are intrinsically linked, because one can know God only through His deeds and revelatory words. A creed is the summary statement of a single person or a community as the revelation of God is “translated” and “appropriated” into his or its life. However, at this point a question may be asked: if creeds are the Church’s *response*, does that mean that they are not in

themselves a part of revelation? In other words, are creeds merely man-made constructs? In reality, right confessions/creeds are possible only through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:3; Matt. 16:15-17), and their conceptual content is guarded from generation to generation by the process of *paradosis*, the process of receiving and delivering (1 Cor. 15:3). However, it is still man, or the Church, that does the confessing. Creeds or creedal formulae reflect to some degree the need or the use of a creed. Thus, for example, Baptismal creeds briefly summarize the whole economy of God's revelation. Creeds may, however, arise for specific liturgical, doctrinal or exhortative reasons, and therefore may concentrate on different aspects of the revelation. Because Paul's letters arise out of certain "epistolary circumstances," the traditional formulae he adopts for use tend to be "partial" and "incomplete"; that is, they encompass material limited by the specifics of the argument or one's rhetorical intent.

Criteria for the Identification of Pre-Pauline Formulae

It may be beneficial to summarize at this point the tell-tale signs for identifying traditional, pre-textual, and specifically pre-Pauline material. In various ways these criteria will be used in the sections which discuss our four Pauline passages.¹⁰

I. Contextual – content evidence:

1. clearly stated quotation of a "saying";

¹⁰ This enumeration presents a modified compilation of criteria found in following works: W. Hulitt Gloer, "Homologies and Hymns in the New Testament: Form, Content and Criteria for Identification," *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 11 (1984):116-132; C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964); R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), 21. (Fuller's findings were based on the work of E. Stauffer and E. Norden.)

2. the continuance of the formula after its content has ceased to be relevant to its immediate context;
3. material containing basic elements of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, the facts of faith etc., presented in “condensed” sentences or clauses;
4. contexts dealing with Church’s liturgical and sacramental practice, evangelism/proclamation/teaching, apologetics and persecution trials, or exorcisms.

II. *Linguistic evidence*:

1. the quotation particle ὅτι (sometimes γάρ and δέ) after verbs of saying/confessing, believing, transmitting, etc.;
2. the presence of certain (introductory) formulae, frequently using such words as the following:
ὁμολογία ὁμολογέω
πίστις πιστεύω
μάρτυς μαρτυρέω
παραλαμβάνω παραδίδωμι.¹¹
τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πιστέως
3. *hapax legomena* and terms and phrases not characteristic of the author.

III. *Stylistic evidence* – the presence of one or more of the following characteristics that usually create an abrupt change from the epistolary style of the immediate context.

Common features are:

1. parallelism;
2. rhythm;
3. chiasmus;¹²

¹¹ Equivalent to the Hebrew קבל and מסר which are technical rabbinical terms for receiving and transmitting of an objective body of authoritative teaching.

¹² See N. W. Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1942), 224.

4. antithesis;
5. participial style;¹³
6. arrangement in strophes, verses or stanzas;
7. highly stylized construction:
 - a) parison – the use of words which end with the same sound to produce rhythm and sometimes rhyme;
 - b) homoeoptoton – the resemblance of grammatical cases at the beginning, middle, or end of the line;
 - c) homoeteleuton – the repetition of the same ending;
 - d) isocolon – a perfect equality of clauses;
 - e) frequent repetition of basic homological titles for God, Jesus or the Spirit.

IV. *Syntax evidence:*

1. syntactical disturbance – the structure is broken by the introduction of the quoted homology or formula;
2. use of the relative clause introduced by relative pronoun (ὅς);
3. a preference for participles rather than finite verbs;
4. indirect discourse – verbs meaning to declare, call, show, or prove that take the infinitive-accusative construction;
5. relative clause with linking participle.

These criteria do not occur in creedal formulae alone, and therefore caution should be exercised so that the mere appearance of these criteria is not, in and of itself, regarded as

¹³ E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1956).

demonstration of traditional material. Many Old Testament quotations exhibit the same contextual and linguistic peculiarities (I:3, 5; II:2). Some indirect or direct speech, not necessarily containing any proto-creedal material, may well exhibit certain aforementioned syntactic characteristics (IV:4). Likewise, it is acknowledged that parallelism (III:1) was a significant feature of both Greek and Hebrew poetry¹⁴ and therefore the primitive Church would be likely to compose its hymns according to this pattern. Nigel Turner¹⁵ also warns that parallelism is a normal stylistic characteristic of the apostle Paul, most likely used in view of the fact that the letters were expected to be read aloud. The same can be said about chiasmus (III:3), antithesis (III:4) and other stylistic markers. Especially in the case of such an accomplished writer as Paul, identification of pre-Pauline creedal formulae based only on stylistic evidence can be fraught with methodological dangers.

A caution must be voiced with regard to what an interpreter might label as a *hapax legomena* or identify as phrases uncharacteristic to the author of the text. The entire textual corpus of the New Testament is small enough to make it possible for the writers never to employ even quite common Greek words, and this problem is magnified when the reader tries to analyze the vocabulary of a single New Testament author. Moreover, before one undertakes such a linguistic exercise, one has to determine the limits of the authentic textual corpus of the author, which, in the case of Pauline studies is much-debated issue. The task is aggravated by the fact that the writings of a single author such as Paul may have been composed over a long period of time and in different

¹⁴ Robinson, T. H., *The poetry of the Old Testament* (London: Duckworth, 1957).

¹⁵ Nigel Turner in his *Grammar of the New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976), 87.

locations. “Uncharacteristic” vocabulary may be simply the effect of accommodations to ever-changing demands of time and place.

There has been a tendency among certain scholars to distinguish extra-biblical creedal formulations also on the grounds of an incompatibility of theologies – for example, the formulae are taken to display certain theological emphases alien to or at least unrepresentative of the author of a text. Such a view presents the author as either a villain or a fool. He maybe a villain who deliberately uses traditional material even though it is alien to his own thought and reshapes it according to his purposes. Otherwise he is open to the charge of a certain weak-mindedness, since he failed to discern an inconsistency between his own theological arguments and the tradition he cites approvingly (an inconsistency which the interpreter scholar *was* able to discern!). In contrast to any such skepticism, this study will abide by the principle that the extra-biblical source should not be played off against the author who quotes it. The immediate context may demand that the author cite only certain aspects of the given creedal formula, but this selectivity does not constitute a reshaping of the formula’s initial meaning.

Finally, a word must be said about the “inherited” formulae of the Christian Church. Since the New Testament writers claim their faith affirmations to be a continuation and fulfillment of the hope of Israel, a significant part of their creedal terminology and concepts have their direct origins in the Old Testament. The New Testament writers view these creedal formulae as the universal property of the people of God, who have enjoyed and used them from the day of creation and will continued to do so until the climax of the confession of “every tongue” in the heavenly kingdom. The

single criterion for the identification of these “inherited” pre-New Testament creedal formulae is universality. They stand implied or attested to both in Old and New Testament writings, regardless of time, place or authorship. However, even though the signifiers of the inherited formulae may remain the same, in the eyes of the New Testament writers the Christ Event has attached their true referent, Jesus, to them, thereby illuminating and, in some cases, supplying the correct emphasis to aspects of their initial meanings. In other words, there are certain pre-Pauline statements that have a universal appeal that spills over from the Old Testament into the Pauline corpus.

Exegetical Study

Romans 1:3-4

... εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ,...

περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ

τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα,

τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης

ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν

Johannes Weiss was the first to suggest that Romans 1:3-4 was a pre-Pauline formula.¹⁶ Since then his thesis has received a significant elaboration and is now upheld by the majority of scholars. The mass of the evidence favoring Weiss' proposal is so notable that even the scholars who champion the Pauline authorship of these verses, while advancing objections to one point or another, are ultimately forced to admit that the weight of evidence indicates that Paul at least must have used "a number of traditional expressions."¹⁷ The following is a summary of the most significant indications that Rom. 1:3-4 is pre-Pauline tradition.¹⁸

¹⁶ J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* (Goettingen: 1917), 89.

¹⁷ V. S. Poythress, "Is Romans 1:3-4 a Pauline confession after all?", *Expository Times* 87 (1975-76):180-83.

¹⁸ See V. H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), 50-51; J. D.G. Dunn, *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 38a: Romans 1-8* (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1998), 5-6; E. Käsemann, *An die Römer*, (Tübingen: 1974); A. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors* (London, 1961), 24-28; Cullmann, O., *The earliest Christian Confessions*, transl. J. K. S. Reid (London: Lutherworth Press, 1949), 41; Schreiner, T. R., "Romans," in *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*, ed. M. Silva (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1998), 38; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. K. Grobel, vol. 1. (New York, Scribner, 1951), 49-50; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 2nd ed, in *Black's New Testament Commentaries*, (London: Black, 1991), 20.

First, the immediate context presents a descriptive “code word,” εὐαγγέλιον (v. 1), followed by a prepositional phrase (περὶ+ gen., “about,” “concerning”), introducing an explanatory summary of the content of the “Gospel.” Since the term εὐαγγέλιον was a word in common Christian usage, the reader was alerted to expect a “dictionary entry” to follow which gives, most probably, an universal, approved, traditional definition.¹⁹

Second, the prepositional phrase περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ... Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, which summarizes the content of the εὐαγγέλιον, is interrupted by two participial constructions which are arranged in antithetical parallelism. This is a structure characteristic of fixed formulae. Both participles, τοῦ γενομένου and τοῦ ὀρισθέντος, are aorist, both are substantive (masc. gen. sing.), and both refer to one and the self-same subject which surrounds the participial phrases, forming a well-rounded *inclusio*. The majority of scholars regard only the two parallel phrases introduced by the participles as the genuine pre-Pauline formula, and even then they disagree about the precise wording.²⁰ However, if the interrupted prepositional phrase is “rejoined,” it presents a significant string of titles commonly attributed to Jesus: ὁ υἱός [θεοῦ], Ἰησοῦς, χριστὸς, κύριος [ἡμῶν].²¹ One may consider Paul to be combining two formulae of pre-Pauline tradition (one being the double-sonship formula and the other the creed of the universal names of Jesus); or one may consider Paul to be quoting only one formula, surrounding it with the universal titles; or, one may even consider the entire passage to be a word-for-word quotation of a formula. However, none of these options need concern us here. None of the titles used in Rom. 1:3-4 can be claimed to be originally from Paul. It is

¹⁹ The approach used also in 1 Cor. 15:1-4, 2 Tim. 2:8, ad 1 Tim. 3:15-16.

²⁰ Dodd, Hunter, Manson, Dunn, Neufeld etc.

²¹ A string very much like this is thought to be implicit in the word ΙΧΘΥΣ: Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς θεοῦ Υἱός Σωτήρ.

evident that Paul is making a careful effort to represent his Gospel in the most traditional wording possible.

Third, there are three pairs of phrases which are set in juxtaposition: (1) κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης; (2) τοῦ γενομένου and τοῦ ὀρισθέντος; (3) ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ and υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει. Such parallelism alerts the reader to the poetic quality of the text. The text has a certain “creedal ring,”²² which, when used in the context of an epistolary greeting, suggests the use of a traditional formula. The pair “son of David” and “son of God” is attested as a basic creedal material in 2 Tim 2:8 and, later, in Ignatius’ *Letter to the Smyrneans* 1:1.²³ A question has been raised about the authorship of the pair κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα [ἁγιωσύνης]. It is certainly true that the terms σάρξ and πνεῦμα, in combination with the preposition κατὰ, are typically Pauline in style and could be indicative of a Pauline interpolation in an otherwise traditional creedal formula.²⁴ On the other hand, a significant group of scholars have pointed out that the combination of σάρκx / πνεῦμα is a very common and fundamental Christological concept, and they point to evidence from non-Pauline sources (the Gospel tradition, 1 Pet. 3:18; cf. 1 Tim 3:16).²⁵ In support of the later thesis, it is occasionally argued that the use of the pair in these verses does not display the usual Pauline antagonistic opposition between the “flesh” and the “spirit.” However, this argument is not convincing. The contrast between the “flesh” and the “spirit” need not be antagonistic. The distinction between the two is still indicated by the phrase “in power” (attributed only to the realm of

²² See Hunter, 24.

²³ Ignatius, *Letter to the Smyrnaeans* 1:1: “... being fully persuaded with respect to our Lord that He was truly of the seed of David according to the flesh, and the Son of God according to the will and power of God” (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 1.86).

²⁴ Bultmann, Kuss, Wengst.

²⁵ Hahn, Käsemann, Schweitzer, Wegenast, Zimmermann, Dunn, Cullmann etc.

the Spirit). Moreover, one would expect that in Jesus' case the σάρκx / πνεῦμα concepts might interact in an exceptional way.²⁶ A more convincing argument concerning the σάρκx / πνεῦμα combination as of pre-Pauline origin is the *hapax legomena* wording πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης. If it were a Pauline interpolation, then we certainly would not expect a construction so entirely uncharacteristic of Paul (see below).²⁷ Therefore, this study concurs with the view that the phrases in question have their origin in a traditional, pre-Pauline formula.

The fourth indication of the traditional, non-Pauline character of Rom. 1:3-4 is the use of the verb ὀρίζω. This verb is wholly uncharacteristic of Paul; it is never used elsewhere by Paul although it is widely employed in Acts. There is a variant reading presented in the Old Latin textual tradition and possibly in the Latin translation of Irenaeus. It reads προορίζω. This form of the verb is used in the New Testament, especially in Paul, to indicate God's "predestination" of the elect (Rom. 8:29-30) or God's pre-determined plan of salvation (Acts 4:28; 1 Cor. 2:7; Eph. 1:5,11). The variant seems either to underline Jesus' pre-existence, combating possible adoptionistic interpretations, or merely to confirm the fact that what was "prophesied beforehand" (προεπηγγέλλομαι) by the prophets in the holy writings (v. 2) should likewise have been "pre-determined to be appointed" in God's salvation plan. The present study favors the *lectio difficilior*, that is, the form ὀρίζω.

²⁶ See, for example, Ignatius, *Letter to the Smyrnaeans* 3:3.

²⁷ Jewett's argument that Paul inserted term "holiness" (being the 3rd redaction) as a descriptive genitive added to "spirit" because of the ethical concerns is hard to accept. His theory is based on the fact that Paul talks about sin and sanctified life later in his epistle as well as on the assumption that the Hellenistic Christians, motivated by the abused freedom in the spirit, took the flesh/spirit opposition as a permit for moral "libertinism." See R. Jewett, "The Redaction and Use of an Early Christian Confession in Romans 1:3-4," in *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders*, ed. D. E. Groh and R. Jewett (New York; Lanham; London: University Press of America, 1985), 117.

The fifth indication of the traditional origin of Rom. 1:3-4 is the phrase πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης. This phrase is apparently a Semitism and not characteristic of Paul. The usual Pauline term is πνεῦμα ἅγιον.²⁸ One problem arises when one considers that the standard LXX translation of קדשׁ הרוח is τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον [αὐτοῦ]; if the pre-Pauline formula is indeed a Semitic original, it would be logical to expect the translation to reflect the standard Greek rendering. However, this observation does not strengthen the likelihood of a Pauline origin of the whole formula or the likelihood of a Pauline interpolation of the phrase. In fact, it suggests the contrary. The well-educated Paul could not have been even the translator of the formula. He is simply relating a traditional text in precisely the way he found it in the Christian community, either among the Gentiles or among the Diaspora Jewish Christians.

Sixth, the theme of the Davidic descent of Jesus is not a theme elaborated theologically in the Pauline corpus. The only other instance where Paul mentions the Davidic descent of Jesus is 2 Tim. 2:8 where it merely stands among other creedal, traditional claims of faith, which Paul reminds Timothy to hold on to and “to remember.”

Finally, some scholars have suggested that the apparent “adoptionist” Christology of Rom. 1:3-4 suggests the use of an earlier tradition.²⁹ Paul, it is claimed, uses the “higher” Christology of pre-existence. However, whether one reads into the term ὀρίζω an idea of “adoption to a higher form of being” or, on the other hand, “enthronement” of the Son-of-

²⁸ Rom. 5:5; 9:1; 14:17; 15:13,16; 1 Cor. 6:19; 12:3; 2 Cor. 6:6; 13:14 etc.

²⁹ For the exhaustive summary of different arguments, see Schreiner, T. R., “Romans,” 38 - 44. However, the most probable explanation to the problem, in my view, is expressed in Barrett, 22: “The earliest Christology has superficially an adoptionistic tinge; but this is not to say that it was “Adoptionist” in the technical sense (anachronism!). The first attempts at Christological thought were made not in essential but in functional terms (a thought expressed also in Cullman).... The Son of man had come in weakness and humility; he was to come in glory and power.... It is not denied that the doctrine of the two natures is a proper metaphysical interpretation of the primitive eschatological faith.”

God-in-power is, in my view, a matter of one's presupposition. The term in itself does not demand an adoptionistic interpretation. There is no reason to doubt that Paul could use a traditional terminology to advance his theological argument while maintaining a coherence with the remainder of his own material. The other option leads to a hermeneutics of suspicion. It accuses Paul of a conscious alteration of the traditional message to conform to his own theological ends. Were this the case, it would leave unexplained why Paul chose to use a traditional formulation in the first place. In most cases, the later exegetical choice is fueled by a faith-based assumption that perceives creedal development as a gradual mythologizing of the facts of the man Jesus from Nazareth, with Paul being the first digressor.³⁰

In view of the evidence just surveyed, it can be concluded that within the typical form of Greek epistolary greeting (A to B, *χαίρειν*), Paul included an older creedal formulation alongside other universally accepted titles for Jesus. Why would he use such a dense Christological rhetoric at the beginning of a letter in which he was later to present the full Pauline gospel? Here it is useful to remember that Paul's relationship to the Romans was unlike he had with any other church to which he wrote. The community in Rome was the only addressee which neither he nor any of his associates had founded.³¹ Yet, Paul did not write to the Romans as though they were an un-catechized group of recent converts. Romans 4:1,12; 6:17; and 7:1 presuppose that the audience in Rome was informed in both Jewish law and some form of Christian teaching. Moreover, the Romans, on their part, must have had some knowledge of Paul's ministry and teaching. Rom. 3:8 indicates quite explicitly that the Romans knew of the far-resounding controversial reaction to

³⁰ An idea first articulated by R. Bultmann.

³¹ A commonly agreed hypothesis. For an exhaustive presentation see the Introduction in J. D.G. Dunn, *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 38a: Romans 1-8* (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1998), xxxix- lviii.

Pauline teaching concerning the Law. As a result, when writing to the Romans, Paul had at least a two-fold goal in mind. He intended to express clearly the Gospel of Jesus Christ, but prior to that he intended to undo the damage of slanderous rumors about the alleged “unorthodoxy” of his own teaching and doubts about his apostolic authority. It is not surprising that Paul’s shadow-boxing with his adversaries starts already at the beginning of the epistle. Rhetorically, the beginning of an epistle is strategically important; to a great extent determines whether or not the readers will give Paul a sympathetic hearing. Therefore one should not dismiss too lightly the fact that the great apostle, who in Gal. 1:16 proudly denied any instruction from the authorities in Jerusalem, at this critical moment chose to identify himself and his message with a traditional formula.

It is hard to determine the precise use and function of this formula in the life of the early Church. The willingness to stress Jewish Messianic ties is apparent both from the formula itself, which identifies Jesus with messianic titles (the descendant of David, Son of God),³² and from Paul’s affirmation of Jesus’ place in the prophetic tradition of Jewish sacred writings (“promised beforehand through the prophets in the Holy Scriptures”). Yet the formula conveys a peculiar Christian understanding of messiahship. The Messiah reached his full destiny (Son-of-God-in-power) only after the historical fact of his resurrection from the dead. Dunn takes this phrase to signify the universality of Jesus the (Jewish) Messiah, who, after his coming into power, should now be revered as

³² Jewett proposed that initially the formula was Jewish Christian, but then it received a “Hellenistic” redaction by adding flesh/spirit dualism. Based on this assumption Jewett is able to make a conclusion that, when quoting this dual creedal formula, Paul is showing inclusiveness and an affirmative character, which is suggested as an example for the contemporary church. However, attributing flesh/spirit dualism merely to a Hellenistic origin seems to underestimate evidence from the extra-Pauline corpus as well as from the Dead Sea scrolls (for evidences see Dunn, *Commentary*, lviii).

Lord with obedience from both Jews and Gentiles. It is plausible to assume that the formula may be a part of an early apologetic and evangelization kerygma of the Palestinian Christian church, which sought to explain the Jesus-event to a predominately Jewish audience (hence also the Semitism πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης). However, the elaboration on the two-fold nature of Jesus (κατὰ σάρκα... κατὰ πνεῦμα), the use of the resurrection as the decisive point in between those two realms, as well as Paul's willingness to place the formula in the context of bringing the Gentiles (and Jews) into the obedience of faith in Jesus as Lord, might hint at a baptismal use of the formula. Many commentators have observed that the text speaks of "the resurrection of the dead," not particularly designating it as Jesus' resurrection. This peculiarity is traditionally linked³³ with the explanation that the resurrection of Jesus led to the general resurrection and "election as sons" of all the faithful in the image of Christ. The easily recognizable "redemptive" and "re-identification" character of the passage might indeed suggest its baptismal use in the early Palestinian church.

³³ This exegetical tradition started already as early as Ambrosiaster, Cyril of Alexandria, Pelagius etc. See quotations in Gerald Bray, *Romans, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture*, vol. 6 (Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1998), 9-11.

1 Corinthians 11:23-25

Despite the absence of scholarly consensus concerning the sacramental meaning of the “Last Supper” or the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus which were spoken on that occasion, 1 Cor. 11:23-25 is unanimously accepted as a genuine pre-Pauline tradition. In this case one can recognize that *paradosis* refers not only to the preservation of certain sayings of Jesus and the *kerygma* of the Church (Jesus as Savior, Jesus as Lord), but also to the maintaining of the Church’s liturgical tradition in its proper form and content.

The evidence for the traditional, pre-Pauline character of 1 Cor. 11:23-25 may be summarized as follows.

First, the phraseology παρέλαβον + παρέδωκα + ὅτι clearly reflects the technical terminology for the transmission of teaching and tradition. This construction occurs in both Jewish and Hellenic contexts.³⁴ This can also be regarded as an indication that Paul was not thinking of the event on the road to Damascus as the source of this tradition. Rather, one should interpret the reference to the Lord as identifying Him as the “ultimate source” of the tradition and not as “the unmediated source” of the tradition.³⁵

The fact that Paul adduces a quotation from a saying of Jesus is an evident indication that the passage contains traditional material. That the independent witness of Matt. 26:26-29 and Mark 14:22-26 also contains this material merely confirms this fact. It is less likely that Luke 22:14-23 represents an independent witness, for Luke seems to

³⁴The *locus classicus* in the Jewish corpus is *Abot*. 1.1: “Moses *received* the Law from Sinai and *committed* it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the Prophets, and the Prophets *committed* it to the men of the Great Synagogue.” Also *Wisd.* 14:15; *Josephus, Ap.* 1.60. For the Greek sources see Plato, *Phileb.* 16c; *Ep.* 12.359d. For other Greek references, see Conzelmann, 195-96.

³⁵The phrase ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου has been variously interpreted. There have been attempts to render the preposition ἀπὸ as an indicator that Paul indeed means “the Lord” as the ultimate source of the tradition (instead of more usual παρά as in Gal. 1:12; 1 Thess. 2:13; 2 Thess. 3:6). However, it is within the context and language where one can find the most certain indications for the mediated transmission.

represent the same eucharistic tradition as does Paul and perhaps even used the text of Paul as a source. In any case, the presence of these words of Jesus in Matthew and Mark, as well as in Paul, clearly demonstrates that Paul uses material which is traditional and already in use in the church.

The traditional, non-Pauline character of this passage is also suggested by the presence of a number of unusual, uncommon syntactical combinations. Notable is the use of the preposition *μετὰ* with substantized infinitive (*μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι*) and the use of *ἔκλασεν* without an object. Such constructions do not appear elsewhere in Paul.

The passage is structured according to multiple parallelisms, which signals the formulaic character of the passage and indicates the probable liturgical use of these verses. The parallelisms can be grouped as follows:³⁶

<i>Verse</i>	<i>v. 23b-24</i>	<i>v. 25</i>
Subject	ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς	
Circumstances	ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο	[μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι]
Action #1	ἔλαβεν	[ὡσαύτως καὶ]
Object	ἄρτον	τὸ ποτήριον
Action #2 and #3	καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν	[ὡσαύτως καὶ] [μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι]
Interpretation: (Action #4)	καὶ εἶπεν·	λέγων·
Subject – predicate verb	τοῦτό ... ἐστίν	τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ... ἐστίν
Predicate noun	τὸ σῶμα	Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη [ἐν τῷ ... αἵματι]
Possessive pronoun	Μοῦ	τῷ ἐμῷ
Salvific effect	τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν	
Command	τοῦτο ποιεῖτε	τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, [ὁσάκις ἂν πίνητε,]
Purpose-goal	εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.	εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

³⁶ Cf. J Jeremias, *The Eucharistic words of Jesus*, trans. N. Perrin, 3rd ed. (London: SCM Press, 1960).

One can discern the presence of a double tradition. The first “layer” of tradition relates Jesus’ words of his interpretation/institution which were spoken over the bread and the cup. The second “layer” represents the Church’s account of the *Sitz im Leben* and by the narrative explains the course of action that took place at the table. H. Schürmann suggested that the phrase τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν might be a Pauline addition, for it does not fit into the parallel structure and, in general, is a characteristic Pauline idiom.³⁷ Jeremias noticed that the phrase, for grammatical reasons, could not have its origin in the Aramaic or in Hebrew.³⁸ However, after careful examination of all the Biblical accounts of the institution narrative, Jeremias was not so categorical as to dismiss the phrase altogether from the tradition. He concluded that the phrase indeed had a place in the Church’s transmission, but he favored the more Semitic Markan version and judged this version to be the most authentic. Contrary to Schürmann, the presence of the phrase in *all* the canonical witnesses (Mark/Matthew, Paul/Luke and John), even if it is not positioned in the same place, is evidence too significant to dismiss as a mere Pauline gloss. It is not unreasonable to suggest that the original tradition of Jesus’ words indeed did include the phrase “for you,” and Paul simply translated the phrase from the original Aramaic into his own characteristic style.

Another explanation of the obvious lack of Semitisms in the Pauline account³⁹ could be that Paul received the institution tradition from a church that originally spoke Greek (e.g., Hellenistic converts in Antioch) and had successfully appropriated the tradition within their own language. This hypothesis also can be supported by evidence that instead of the Semitic ὑπὲρ πολλῶν in Mark, Paul prefers ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. Similarly, the

³⁷ The suggestion is quoted and partially supported by Jeremias, 104, 166ff.; cf. 2 Cor. 7:12 and 9:3.

³⁸ Jeremias, p. 167.

³⁹ In contrast to the heavily Semitic Markan Greek version.

more Hebraic εὐλογήσας is rendered exclusively with εὐχαριστήσας.⁴⁰ Such “improvements” of the text as re-phrasing the formula of distribution (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν), a tendency towards clarification of the terminology (εὐχαριστήσας), and the significant emphasis on the Lord’s command (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε) have led scholars to hypothesize that the Pauline version of the institution words indeed represent transformations due to the liturgical use of the tradition.⁴¹

Another certain indication that Paul has used traditional material is the occurrence of a relatively dense cluster of *hapax legomena*. These are ἑκλασεν (used only here and in 1Cor. 10:16, which also is a reference to the Lord’s Supper), ἀνάμνησις, δσάκις, and δειπνέω.

Finally, the immediate context refers to a liturgical setting. Paul is addressing a problem of the misuse of the Eucharistic meal in the Corinthian congregation. He opposes this abuse by calling the Corinthians back to the origins of the Eucharist. He contrasts the Corinthian practice with the true meaning of the Eucharist by quoting the liturgical formula of the institution narrative. It would have been both rhetorically and theologically powerful for Paul to use traditional material for his admonition to the Corinthian congregation. Thus not only Paul, but the Lord and the whole Church stood against the Corinthian abuse.

There is, of course, scholarship which is skeptical of whether the *ipsissima verba* were in fact used in the liturgical recitation over bread and cup, or whether they were merely an “external text” used for establishing the tradition of the Eucharist while the

⁴⁰ Cf. Jeremias, 185.

⁴¹ Jeremias, 186; R. Otto, *Kingdom of God and Son of Man*, 326; G. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 545.

words of the thanksgiving prayers actually used in the meal varied.⁴² The concern that the earliest Eucharistic rituals might not have included the recitation of the words of institution is based upon the apparent omission of such words in the second century accounts of Justin Martyr, 1 *Apol.* 65 and of the *Didache* 9-10. These texts present only lengthy thanksgiving prayers which are possibly modeled after the forms of the Jewish בִּרְכָּה prayers. They do not, however, present the words of institution in a form such as we find them in 1 Corinthians 11. The relevant text of Justin Martyr is as follows:

There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at his hands. And when he has concluded the prayers of thanksgiving, all the people present express their assent by saying Amen. ... And when the president has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent, those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine mixed with water over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and to those who are absent they carry away a portion. And this food is called among us εὐχαριστία, of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Savior, having been made flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word (ὁτι εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ), and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, said, "This do ye in remembrance of Me, this is my Body;" and that, after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, "This is my Blood;" and gave to them alone.⁴³

The account of Justin does not pass on the exact description of "the prayer of a word from him" that was said over the food. This silence in Justin is applied by some scholars

⁴² For example, A. B. McGowan, "Is There a Liturgical Text in This Gospel?": The Institution Narratives and Their Early Interpretive Communities." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999):73-87.

⁴³ Justin Martyr, 1. *Apol.* 65-66 (*Ante-Nicene Fathers* 1.185).

to the context of 1 Cor. 11:23-25 with the conclusion that the presence of the institution narrative in the immediate context is meant only to function as an interpretation of the meal. This narrative in Paul is not a *via mimesis* but a *via catechesis*.⁴⁴ The result of such an interpretation, although still asserting the pre-Pauline character of the text, is to deny any liturgical significance of the Pauline passage. Thus words used by Paul do not necessarily reflect liturgical *usage*.

Before attempting to resolve this issue on the basis of 1 Cor. 11:23-25 alone, let us first make some observations on the account of Justin Martyr. First of all, we note that in his account of the baptismal rite Justin does not quote the baptismal formulae although he alludes to them in the very next sentence. This is a pattern similar to the Eucharistic account.

Then they are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we ourselves are regenerated. For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water.⁴⁵

Moreover, scholars are divided concerning the exact meaning of Justin's phrase δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ.⁴⁶ Especially controversial is the question whether the person signified by the personal pronoun αὐτοῦ is Jesus or the celebrant. The conclusion often seems to be reached according to the particular bias of the scholar. However, since Jesus Christ is really the only explicit referent in the context of Justin's passage, and since there is clearly meant to be a parallel drawn between the Word becoming flesh and the bread and wine through the word becoming flesh and blood, it is difficult for us to conclude

⁴⁴ See McGowan, 79.

⁴⁵ Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 61 (*Ante-Nicene Fathers* 1.183).

⁴⁶ Cf. G. J. Cuming, "δι' εὐχῆς λόγου (Justin, *1 Apol.* 66.2)," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 31 (1980): 80-82, and A. Gelston, "δι' εὐχῆς λόγου (Justin, *1 Apol.* 66.2)," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 33 (1982): 172-75.

anything other than that the personal pronoun αὐτοῦ refers to Jesus and the phrase to the words spoken by him at the Last Supper.

The evidence from the *Didache* is easier to interpret on an exclusively textual basis. The account starts with the words, “Now, concerning the Thanksgiving (Eucharist), thus *give thanks*.”⁴⁷ There follows the precise wording of the thanksgiving prayer. The text does not give *any* indication, either through additional explanatory passages (as in Justin) or through “liturgical excerpts,” of the traditional *meaning* of the event. That is, nowhere is there evidence of linking the cup with the blood or connecting the bread with the body of Jesus. It can therefore be reasonably argued that the *Didache*’s intent was quite limited -- namely, to describe merely one section from the entire liturgy of the Lord’s Supper, that of the thanksgiving prayer. Any further significant sacramental information concerning this ecclesiastical ceremony (which indeed might be reflected in additional liturgical texts, such as the institution narrative) clearly is left to be explained by a different source.⁴⁸

Once it has been established that the relevant second century accounts do not exclude the possibility that Paul was using a formula from an actual liturgical text, one can return to the interpretation of 1 Cor. 11:23. Although in the immediate context Paul is using the institution narrative as a tool for instruction concerning the *meaning* of the liturgy (*catechesis*) rather than the ceremonial *form* (*mimesis*), it does not follow that this excludes the possibility of instruction through drawing attention to a textual part of the liturgy. Likewise, the limitation of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε exclusively to such actions as the thanksgiving, taking the cup and breaking the bread, while the interpretative speech (“this

⁴⁷*Didache* 9-10 (*Ante-Nicene Fathers* 1. 379-380).

⁴⁸ Such a silence concerning essentials of Lord’s Supper has traditionally been attributed to the “*disciplina arcana*.”

is my body”) is excluded from the meaning of this phrase, seems to have no sufficient grounds. This is especially so since τοῦτο ποιεῖτε stands at the conclusion of the entire narrative. Moreover, we must remember that this is the only instance in Paul’s writings where he renders traditional words of Jesus not merely by allusion, as is usually the case, but by a rather extensive quotation. This peculiarity could be interpreted as another evidence for the compact formulaic (liturgical) structure of the tradition, which Paul felt compelled to retain unaltered. The aforementioned evidence, together with the structural and linguistic observations (cf. #3 earlier), forms a strong case for affirming the liturgical *Sitz im Leben* of the institution narrative in the Pauline churches.

This is a proper place to make a few observations about the rhetorical genius of Paul. Throughout the entire first letter of Paul to the church at Corinth he is compelled to address hard issues of party spirit, abuse of Christian liberty, mismanagement of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, moral and ethical disorders, and schismatic tendencies within the congregation. In his admonitions to the Christians at Corinth Paul uses his entire arsenal of rhetorical techniques of persuasion. He points to the example of his own humble conduct (2:1-5); he asserts his apostolic authority (9:1-2; 7:40); he pleads both with affection (4:14-16) and with harsh rebuke (5:1-2; 11:22); he warns of God’s wrath and recalls the divine punishments in Israel’s history (10:1-10); and he encourages through reminding of God’s victory over the death and power of sin (15:54-58). Paul’s speech concerning the abuse of the Lord’s Supper represents one of the harshest Pauline scoldings and implies the most terrifying consequences for disobedience. In 1 Cor 11:22, Paul confronts the Corinthians with a series of rhetorical questions which leave no room for self-justifying defenses. These rhetorical questions allow only a categorical

disapproval (ἐπαινέσω ὑμᾶς; ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ἐπαινῶ). Moreover, the consequences of the abuse, as listed in vv. 27-32, include immediate physical punishment from God. The seriousness of the consequence arises out of their cardinal guilt for sinning against the very foundation of the Christian's communion with God, the body and blood of Christ. The weight and persuasive force of Paul's argument for what is right must correspond to the seriousness of their abuse. For that reason, Paul appeals to a *threefold* authority: the Lord Himself (παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου), Paul's own apostolic authority, and the Church's own liturgical tradition. Paul incorporates this tradition with word-by-word accuracy, handing over to the Corinthians the truth he has received from the Lord through the mediation of the Church's liturgical tradition and practice. With the emphatic Ἐγὼ γὰρ, Paul affirms that his preaching is consonant with the words of the Lord and with the Church's liturgical tradition which preserves them. Christ, the apostle Paul, and the Church's liturgical tradition coincide. The apostle is both a messenger from the Lord and a reflection of the Church's own faith.

1 Corinthians 15:3b-5

1 Corinthians 15:3b-5 is another passage which is unanimously accepted as a confession formula of the primitive church. A summary of the evidence which indicates the traditional, pre-Pauline character of the passage follows.

As in 1 Cor. 11:23-25, again we notice the introductory formula of παρέδωκα... παρέλαβον + ὅτι which is the technical terminology for the transmission of tradition.⁴⁹

Secondly, there is the apparent difference in emphasis between Paul's argument in chapter 15 that emphasizes the reality of the resurrection and Paul's emphasis on the death of Jesus in 1 Cor. 15: 3-5.⁵⁰ However, the theme of death is not alien to or incongruent with the dominant theme of resurrection in chapter 15, for in order to explain the reality of "resurrection," one must obviously first mention the preceding reality of death. What some have regarded as a thematic inconsistency could merely signify the coherent relationship between the death and resurrection of Jesus, which Paul acknowledges many times. Therefore, with regards to 1 Corinthians 15, the argument from an assumed thematic inconsistency cannot with confidence be adduced as evidence for the pre-Pauline character of vv. 3-5.

A significant indication of the traditional character of 1 Cor. 15:3-5 is the dense concentration of non-Pauline vocabulary and phraseology: (1) ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, where "sins" stands in the plural; (2) κατὰ τὰς γραφάς; (3) θάπτω; (4) ἐγήγερται; (5) τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ; (6) ὥφθη + dative; (7) δώδεκα.

⁴⁹ See above the explanation on 1 Cor 11:23-25. The rabbinic terminology is *gibbēl minmāsar lē*. Cf. 'Abot 1:1; *Pe'a* 2:6; also 'Abot 1:3; *Zebah* 1:3.

⁵⁰ J. Kloppenborg, "An Analysis of the Pre-Pauline Formula 1 Cor 15:3b-5 in Light of Some Recent Literature," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 351-367.

Another indication that Paul has incorporated a traditional formula into his text is the appearance of parallelisms. The passage is traditionally divided into four lines:

1. *That* Christ died + for our sins + in accordance with the Scriptures;
2. and *that* he was buried;
3. and *that* He was raised + on the third day + in accordance with the Scriptures;
4. and *that* He appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve.

Each clause begins with the formula (καὶ) ὅτι + verb. Joachim Jeremias attributed such a structure to the Semitic origins of the formula.⁵¹ However, Hans Conzelmann has challenged this position by demonstrating that what appeared to Jeremias as a semitic construction might just as well represent a declaratory style in Greek.

In addition to any literary parallelism, one can observe also a thematic parallelism. The first and third lines are thematically supported by the lines immediately following them. The truth that Christ truly died is demonstrated by the fact that He was buried; likewise, the fact that Christ truly rose is demonstrated by his appearance. Consequently, the first and the third lines which express the “primary” actions, which form an antithetical pair,⁵² are supported by Paul’s appeal to the Scriptural authority.

It has, moreover, been argued that this pre-Pauline creedal formula was originally constructed in Aramaic. J. Jeremias, who defends the theory of a Semitic origin of this formula, supports his theory with the following evidence:

- a) Each clause begins with the formula (καὶ) ὅτι + verb;
- b) The use of the adversative καί instead of δέ at the beginning of the third line;

⁵¹ J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. N. Perrin (London: SCM Press LTD, 1966), 101-103.

⁵² This is a usual characteristic in early creedal formulas. See Rom 8:34; 2 Cor 13:4; 1 Thes 4:14; Rom 4:24-25; Rom 14:9. Longer chronological summaries as in 1 Cor 15:3-4 and Phil 2:5-11 are basically expansions on this twofold faith in the Lordship of Jesus.

- c) The positioning of the ordinal number after the noun in the phrase τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ . This is the only possible order in Semitic languages;
- d) The use of the word ὥφθη instead of more natural ἐφάνη. Jeremias believes this renders Hebrew הִשָּׁתָּהַל or Aramaic *'ithame*);
- e) Paul uses the passive verb ὥφθη + dat. instead of more common Greek construction ὑπὸ + gen.;
- f) The passage is not dependent upon the LXX text of Isaiah 53 where ὑπέρ in the phrase “for our sins” is not found.

However, there is no scholarly consensus on whether this passage was originally constructed in Aramaic or in Greek. Even Jeremias admitted that the text contains certain Graecisms which could not have had Semitic origins. For example, there is no Semitic equivalent of κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς or of ἡγέρθη. This led Jeremias to propose a compromise solution, that the formula must have had its origins in an Aramaic--speaking community but that, through interaction with Greek-speaking Christian influence over a period of time, it “must have taken the shape”⁵³ adequate to certain expressions in the Greek language.

The evidence of Graecisms, which Jeremias discarded as mere secondary developments, was appropriated as a foundation stone by Conzelmann, who believed that the formula must indeed have originated in Greek. Conzelmann responded to Jeremias' evidence point by point. Thus he argued that the καί at the beginning of the third line need not be interpreted as an adversative. The phrases τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ and ὥφθη +

⁵³ J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. N. Perrin (London: SCM Press LTD, 1966), p 103. This conclusion is favored also by F. Hahn, Bammel, Deichgräber, Lohse and others.

dat. could be demonstrated to be fairly common “vulgar Greek” expressions.⁵⁴

Moreover, the links with Hebrew text of Isaiah 53 were found to be even more obscure than those with the same text in the LXX, since ὑπέρ and περί are usually interchangeable. On the basis of the fact that the only entirely unchallenged evidence involves Graecisms, many scholars have sided with Conzelmann and accepted his theory of a Greek origin.⁵⁵

The *Sitz im Leben* of this formula is clearly discernible within the immediate context of the chapter. Verses 3-5 present τὸ εὐαγγέλιον which Paul preached to Corinthians as “the first/the most important” (ἐν πρώτοις) axiom of the Christian message. Hence, commentators agree that the formula represents a compressed form of the most essential *kerygma* of the Church (cf. v.12, οὕτως κηρύσσομεν). At the same time, as naturally as a coin with two sides, the *kerygma* formula functions also as a Christian creed. Considering 1 Corinthians 15 as a whole proves that it was of the utmost importance that the Corinthians received (παρελάβετε) this *kerygma*, believed in it (ἐπιστεύσατε v.11), and continued to stand in it (ind. perf. act. ἐστήκατε). Attempts have been made to limit the function of the formula to a certain ecclesiastical rite such as catechetical instruction (Käsemann⁵⁶) or baptism (Kloppenborg). However, the impressive “apologetic” character of the formula (references to the Scriptures and the appearances to Cephas/Peter and the Twelve) would hardly fit in a baptismal setting. As for the relation of the formula to a catechetical creed (presumably to be recited by catechumens at the end of their instruction), the degree of possibility is significantly

⁵⁴ Existent as early as LXX, Hos. 6:2, Lev. 23:11.

⁵⁵ Kloppenborg, Dibelius, Stuhlmacher, Kramer, Vielhauer.

⁵⁶ E. Käsemann, “Is the Gospel Objective?” in *Essays on the New Testament Themes*, (SBT 41; London: SCM, 1964), 49.

higher, although some reservations might still be in order. Even though the formula expresses the core message of Christianity, it would be natural to expect that the *complete* catechetical creed would also include references to the oneness of God (especially if the Greek origin of the formula is upheld) and to the sonship of Jesus.

Scholarly opinion is also divided concerning the account of the appearances. It is clear that Paul himself did not invent them. They must have been part of a tradition transmitted in the Church. However, the question of whether an entire account of the appearances belonged to the original formula is widely debated. Since Peter is called “Cephas” earlier in the epistle, some have suggested that the formula ends at v. 4. Others have terminated it immediately after the verb ὡφθῆ.⁵⁷ Most of the scholars agree that the formula ends after “the Twelve,” regarding the rest as Paul’s own interpretative and supplemental enumeration of witnesses, acquired from other sources. Such an enumeration would seem to correspond to Paul’s concern in the immediate context. The greater the number of eyewitnesses, the higher the credibility of Jesus’ resurrection. In addition, the enumeration of witnesses at this point allows Paul to form a bridge between the Twelve and himself.

This pre-Pauline formula appears to serve a unique function in the overall discussion. First, we can see how Paul, when confronted with someone’s skepticism of certain claims of the Church, appeals to the *kerygma* of the Church as an authority external to himself, even though it is also *proclaimed* by himself. Moreover, Paul uses this basic “abc” of the Christian faith to construct a rational theological argument, a method widely appropriated by early Church fathers and scholastic theologians. The

⁵⁷ Cf. P. Winter, “1 Corinthians 15:3b-7,” *Novum Testamentum* 2 (1957): 142-150. However, these hypotheses have not gained wide acceptance.

Corinthian theological misconception is evidenced in v. 12: “But if Christ is preached to have been raised from the dead, how do some of you say that there is no resurrection from the dead?” The Corinthian problem was not their unbelief in the resurrection of Jesus, for they have received and believed in Paul’s Gospel (cf. v. 1-- τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε [aor.], ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐστήκατε [perf.]). Their problem was that they did not believe in *their own* bodily resurrection. So Paul proceeds with a rational argument: if the fact of Jesus’ resurrection is taken as the axiom (*regula fidei*), then it is reasonable to conclude the possibility of a general resurrection from the dead, hence also the resurrection of all those who are in Jesus. And, on the contrary, if resurrection from the dead is intrinsically impossible, then even Jesus could not have been raised, which is contrary to what the Church believes and is contrary to what the Corinthians themselves have received and upon which they have built their own conviction and religious life. Again, it is important to note that here one observes Paul drawing his argument neither from the Scriptures (even though he could do so) nor by cross-examining the narratives about Jesus’ appearances, but rather deriving his arguments from *the pre-formulated basics of the Church’s tradition*, or, to use other words, from the *regula fidei* of the Church.

Philippians 2:6-11

The significance of this passage is indicated by the extensive and continuous commentary and use it has received throughout the centuries of the Church's history. Yet the interpretations of this passage have been various and even discordant. According to A. B. Bruce, the diversity of interpretations is "enough to fill the student with despair, and to afflict him with intellectual paralysis."⁵⁸ Nevertheless, despite the numerous variations in the interpretation of the meaning of the text as a whole, a scholarly consensus has come to exist on one important point. During the last century, it has come to be almost unanimously acknowledged that this passage is an ancient Christian text which pre-dates the composition of the epistle itself. According to Ralph Martin, it is "a piece of early Christian kerygmatic confession, which found place in the liturgical cult of the primitive Church."⁵⁹ According to Joachim Jeremias, it is "the oldest evidence for the teaching concerning three states of Christ's existence which underlies and delimits the whole Christology of later times."⁶⁰ Unfortunately, this is just about as far as the scholarly agreement goes. The issues still in dispute concerning this passage may be summarized as two in number: 1) the structure of the passage, 2) the hymn's significance in the immediate context of the epistle.

The evidence that the Christological hymn of Philippians 2 is traditional and pre-Pauline may be summarized in the following points:⁶¹

⁵⁸ A. B. Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ* (Edinburgh: 1876, reprinted 1955), p.8, quoted in R. P. Martin, *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in The Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1997).

⁵⁹ Martin, *A Hymn of Christ*, 21.

⁶⁰ Joachim Jeremias, *Studia Paulina in Honorem J. de Zwaan*, ed. J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik, (1953), 154.

⁶¹ Especially helpful are the following works: Martin, *A Hymn of Christ*; G. F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 43 (Waco, Texas: Word Books Publisher, 1983); J. T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Backgrounds* (Cambridge: University Press,

First of all, verse 6 begins with the personal pronoun ὃς. Such a pattern or structure is evidence of hymnic material, as one can discern also in other hymnic passages (Col.1:15; 1 Tim. 3:16; Heb.1:3).

Secondly, the thematic character of the hymn does not seem at every point to be relevant to the context in which it stands. Of the entire hymn, only verses 6-8 are clearly relevant to the issues of the immediate context. Some interpreters have argued that verses 9-11 do not really function thematically in the context and were included in the text only for the sake of completeness of the extra-Pauline text. In the context, the sole intended function of the formula was to give a foundation to the ethical exhortation that the Philippians ought to imitate Christ's humility.⁶² If the Philippians were to be persuaded of the necessity of Christian humility through the *imitatio Christi*, then the reference to Christ's exaltation seems irrelevant to that interest. Withholding more detailed explanation of how this pre-Pauline hymn serves in the immediate context, one may perhaps dismiss the argument that detects an apparent thematic break between the context and the hymn. If the exaltation of Christ was unhelpful to Paul's argument, he could have presumably truncated the last stanza of hymn. The usual coherence of Paul's writing gives us confidence that he had his reasons for including the entire hymn as we have it.

The traditional character of this passage is suggested also by the occurrence of several *hapax legomena*. Nowhere else in the Pauline corpus is there reference to the μορφῇ θεοῦ

1971); C.F. D. Moule, "Further Reflections on Philippians 2:5-11," in *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, ed. W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970); P. O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991) et alii quoted.

⁶² This is a traditional position defended also by certain contemporary scholars, such as Hawthorne, *Philippians*; Moule, "Further Reflections of Philippians 2:5-11;" and O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians*.

/μορφὴν δούλου. In fact, this hymn is the only place where noun μορφή occurs in the letters of Paul. The same can be said of the words ἀρπαγμὸς, ἴσος, ὑπερυψώ, and καταχθόνιος. Moreover, although Paul speaks of the person and work of Christ throughout his epistles, nowhere else does Paul attribute the words ὑπήκοος, ταπεινός, κενός and δούλος to Christ. The ascription of these terms to Christ, unique to this context, suggests that Paul has adopted traditional material.

Finally, there are syntactical features of this passage which evince its formulaic, creedal, or hymnic nature. There is, for example, the use of *homoeptoton*, that is, the similarity of sounds in the final syllables of words in parallel lines. This occurs in verse 7 in the words ὁμοιώματι and σχήματι. There is also the use of participial clauses to explain the precise meaning of the principal verb. This is an especially characteristic feature of creedal and hymnic style. Note the following instances of this feature:

ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ.....μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων
 ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν.....μορφὴν δούλου λαβών
ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος·
καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος
 ἐταπείνωσεν ἐαυτὸν.....γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου
 δὲ σταυροῦ.

Although there is a consensus among scholars that this text presents a poetic-rhythmic structure, the precise arrangement of text has still to elicit a scholarly consensus. More than a dozen possibilities have been suggested. M. Hooker has even conceded that “the fact that different scholars produce different poetic structures makes one slightly hesitant about the value of this exercise; I myself have produced six or seven

different analyses – and found each of them convincing.”⁶³ Generally speaking, it can be observed that the different structures suggested by scholars are influenced by their different perspectives concerning the context from which the hymn might have borrowed. It will be helpful to summarize the most important and influential aspects of the debate about the structure of this text. We will, however, not report on those theories which propose radical truncations of the text, nor will we ally ourselves to any single solution.

The question of the literary structure of this passage was of little concern to the ancient commentators. However, in an 1899 article, Johannes Weiss argued for an underlying poetic structure to the passage.⁶⁴ Weiss’ view of the hymnic character of Phil. 2:5-11 was followed by scholars such as A. Deissmann, A. T. Robertson, and H. Lietzmann. However, it was Ernst Lohmeyer who offered the first detailed study of this issue in 1928 in his important book, *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2,5-11*.⁶⁵ Lohmeyer argued that Phil. 2:5-11 was a pre-Pauline “Christological hymn” which evinced an evenly balanced rhythmical composition of six strophes, each with three lines. However, Lohmeyer assumed that the original arrangement of this hymn would have included a perfect balance in the length of the lines. To reconstruct the original hymn with this symmetry, Lohmeyer was constrained to “sacrifice” the phrase *θανάτου δὲ σταυρου*. He argued that these words were a later gloss to the original hymn inserted by Paul to advance the theme of the immediate context, namely, the exhortation to imitate Christ in humility. This attempt initiated a long scholarly quest to re-construct the hymn

⁶³ M. D. Hooker, “Philippians 2:6-11,” in *Jesus und Paulus. Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. E. E. Ellis and E. Grasser (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 157.

⁶⁴ Johannes Weiss, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1899).

⁶⁵ Lohmeyer, E., *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2, 5-11*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissensch., Phil.-hist. Kl., Jahr. 1927-28, 4. Abh. (Heidelberg: 1928, 1961).

according to a balanced rhythmic and theological structure. Scholarly speculation on possible exclusions and additions was characteristic of much of this quest. On the basis of the thematic unity and the “drama” of the verses, Lohmeyer himself believed that the text was not merely an ad hoc composition but a quotation from some liturgical formula (or a complete section of that formula). Moreover, Lohmeyer was the first to draw attention to the semiticisms of the hymn, which reveal themselves in infelicitous constructions in the Greek text, and he concluded that behind this text there lies a Semitic original. Finally, Lohmeyer assumed that the hymn is an ode to Christ sung at the Eucharistic liturgy of the Jewish-Christian church in Jerusalem. Although this conclusion of Lohmeyer has not received much support from the scholarly community, his work on Philippians 2:5-11 has “erected landmarks, which subsequent study has largely confirmed.”⁶⁶

Martin Dibelius was especially critical of Lohmeyer’s arrangement of Phil. 2:7-8.⁶⁷ He argued that the end of verse 7 and the opening of verse 8 should not be placed apart; these verses are joined both exegetically (incarnation theme) and stylistically (*homoeptoton*, similarity of sounds in the final syllables) in the words ὁμοιώματι and σχήματι. Dibelius proposed an arrangement which places verses 6-8a in seven three-accented lines in the first stanza, leaving the rest of the text as four stanzas of three lines each. Such a construction allowed Dibelius to retain the phrase θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ as a genuine element of the original hymn, placing it in the third line of a strophe. He furthered attempted to defend the authenticity of this phrase on exegetical grounds by asserting that an expression of the terrible manner of the death of Jesus would be a logical

⁶⁶ Martin, *A Hymn of Christ*, 28.

⁶⁷ Martin Dibelius, *An die Thessalonicher; An die Philipper* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 1929, 1937).

conclusion to the emphasis on the humiliation of Jesus.⁶⁸ The problem with Dibelius' arrangement of the lines lies in the disproportion of the first stanza in relation to the rest of the body of the hymn. Even if his observation of the unity between verses 7 and 8 be admitted, the overall arrangement of Dibelius creates more difficulties than it solves.

Although he acknowledged Lohmeyer's work, Joachim Jeremias proposed yet another arrangement of strophes.⁶⁹ It was based on Jeremias' sensitivity to the literary form called *parallelismus membrorum*. According to Jeremias, the hymn is built in couplets, with lines fitting together in thematic pairs. The clearest example of this is seen in verses 9-11:

- 1 διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν
- 2 καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα,
- 3 ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ (ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων)
- 4 καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσῃται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς (εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς).

As a result, Jeremias creates a perfectly balanced structure of three stanzas, each with four lines. However, he accomplishes this at a high cost, for he is forced to exclude two phrases as not original: (a) ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων and (b) εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς. Jeremias justifies the omission of these phrases because he considers their position at the end of their sentences to be unusual. The phrase ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων cannot be original, for it interrupts the *parallelismus membrorum* and merely repeats the idea of the universality of the praise already expressed in "every knee -- every tongue."⁷⁰ The phrase εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς, if

⁶⁸ Other commentators supporting the inclusion of the phrase θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ as an authentic part of the hymn are L. Cerfaux, W. Michaelis and E. Stauffer.

⁶⁹ J. Jeremias, "Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen," in *Studia Paulina in honorem J. de Zwaan*, ed. J. W. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik (Haarlem: 1953).

⁷⁰ Also G. Friedrich, *Der Brief an die Philipper. Das Neue Testament Deutsch* (Göttingen: 1962), 111.

original, should not be added to the line ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς. Rather, it should stand as the only object to ἐξομολογήσεται. In addition, Jeremias observed that the phrases he chose to exclude are typically Pauline in style and are “in contrast to the rest of the hymn which is linguistically un-Pauline.” Thus the conclusion of Jeremias’ work is the reconstruction of a perfect three stanza hymn, in which each stanza describes one of three levels of Christ’s existence – his preexistence in glory, his humiliation in the body, and his exaltation in power through the resurrection.

Ralph Martin perceived problems in Jeremias’ neat construction, for Jeremias could not explain how “the first strophe which is said to deal with Christ’s pre-temporal existence can jump in thought straight to the Cross (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν).”⁷¹ Instead Martin proposed an entirely new construction. He was influenced by the account of Pliny, Roman governor of Bithynia-Pontus, who in A.D. 110 informed the Emperor Trajan of the Christian practice of coming together before the dawn and singing a hymn to Christ *secum inuicem*, .i.e. antiphonally or alternately.⁷² With this report in mind, Martin proposed to arrange Phil. 2:5-11 into a series of six couplets and to arrange them “in such way that they could have been chanted in an antiphonal manner,”⁷³ so that the thought of the first member of the couplet is complemented or expanded by the second member, or else contrasted to it. In the process Martin omits as Pauline glosses the phrases which were first suggested by both Lohmeyer and Jeremias, namely, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ, ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχthonίων, and εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός.

G. F. Hawthorne is especially critical of the fact that scholars have achieved virtually no agreement on any aspect of the structure of the hymn except the fact that the

⁷¹ Martin, *A Hymn of Christ*, 35.

⁷² Martin, *A Hymn of Christ*, 1.

⁷³ Martin, *A Hymn of Christ*, 36.

passage is an example of a very early hymn of Christian Church.⁷⁴ Arguments about the correct structure which involve the “necessity of omitting words and phrases, altering expressions to make the strophes come out right according to some preconceived notion what they should be, makes one suspicious of the whole procedure and causes one to ask whether this is not just some sort of game that scholars play.”⁷⁵ Therefore, Hawthorne does not even attempt to determine the structure of the hymn’s composition since it does not contribute to the correct interpretation of the meaning of the passage. He accepts the text as it stands with no omissions, although he does detect that the hymn “naturally falls in two parts,” the self-humiliation of Jesus and the exaltation of Jesus by God.⁷⁶ On the basis of this descent-ascent motif Hawthorne sees parallels between this *carmen Christi* and the story of Jesus’ washing the feet of his disciples in John 13:3-17. Nevertheless, Hawthorne refuses to make any concrete conclusion concerning any dependence of John on Paul, or of Paul on John.⁷⁷

J. T. Sanders essentially accepts the arrangement proposed by Jeremias, especially the division of the passage into three stanzas referring to the three states of Christ (pre-existence in glory, humiliation on the cross, and exaltation through the resurrection). He retains, however, the omitted phrases of v.10 and v.11. He notes that the first two stanzas contain not only four parallel lines but also that they are built upon the same pattern. The first line begins and ends with a participle, which gives the state or “place” of the

⁷⁴ G. F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 43 (Waco, Texas: 1983).

⁷⁵ Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 77.

⁷⁶ This conclusion is based on four independent verbs, the first pair having Jesus as subject, the second pair having God as subject.

⁷⁷ Others have tried to answer the question about the sources also, but with no agreement. The hymn may have originated in Orthodox Judaism (Lohmeyer), in the Iranian myth of the Heavenly Redeemer (Beare), in Hellenistic Gnosticism (Käsemann), in Jewish Gnosticism (Sanders), in Old Testament servant passages (Coppens), in Old Testament story of Adam, or in speculations about Hellenistic Jewish Wisdom (D. Georgi).

Redeemer in either case, while the second line explicates what was said in the first line.⁷⁸ Sanders especially notes the doxological allusion at the end of this hymn, which enables him to determine the liturgical setting as a “hymnic expansion of a thanksgiving.” Nevertheless, the stylistic differences between vv.6-8 and vv.9-11 (the first section omitting the article and displaying a wealth of participles, while the second section is directly opposite in this regard) forces Sanders to the conclusion that “the original has been enough changed in these verses, by Paul or by the congregation from which he learned the hymn, to prevent a thoroughly accurate reconstruction of the original.”⁷⁹ Sanders criticizes the view that the hymn is parallel to Isa.52:13 – 53:12 and that the phrase “every knee may bow” is borrowed from Isa. 45:23. Any attempts to identify New Testament concepts as direct interpretations of Old Testament concepts are based, in his view, on “a particular theological bias” which does not account for the long period of development and modification of those concepts in the thought of Judaism.

Finally, Reginald Fuller denies Pauline authorship “both on linguistic and on theological grounds.”⁸⁰ The hymn contains “a striking number” of non-Pauline terms and it concentrates on a different *kerygma* than does Paul. Instead of the Pauline emphasis on the cross and resurrection, the hymn’s emphasis is on the incarnation and exultation.

Irrespective of the various theories of structure, the evidence indicates that Paul is indeed quoting a traditional hymn. What remains to be investigated is the significance of the presence of the hymn in the immediate context of the letter to Philippians. There

⁷⁸ J. T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Backgrounds* (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), 10.

⁷⁹ Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns*, 12.

⁸⁰ R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1965), 204.

have been two major interpretive approaches to the meaning of the pre-Pauline hymn in the context of Philippians. One is the ethical approach. According to this interpretation, Christ is to be imitated in his humility. The other approach, frequently labeled as the kerygmatic approach, was formulated by E. Käsemann: "Paul did not understand the hymn as though Christ were held up to the community as an ethical example. The technical formula "in Christ," whatever else might be said about it, unquestionably points to the salvation event.... The salvation event is indivisible and serves as the basis for the Christian condition either altogether or not at all."⁸¹ Paul makes appeal to the Philippians to act in the way which is befitting to those who are "in Christ," a position won by the self-emptying humiliation *and exaltation* of Christ. The exaltation of Christ, therefore, is necessary for the complete representation of the salvific event. Christ became what the Philippians were in order that the Philippians might become what Christ is now. However, one must acknowledge the boundaries of Käsemann's suggestion. His interpretation assumes too great a link between Christ's exaltation (present in the hymn) and Christ's resurrection (the usual event for the affirmation of ἐν Χριστῷ; cf. 1 Cor 15:22; Rom. 6:8; 8:1; 12:5; Col. 3:3). Christ's resurrection must indeed be logically prior to his exaltation, but the pre-Pauline hymn seems to be concerned exclusively with the later.

When both interpretations are laid side by side, it becomes evident that both suggestions recognize the same purpose of the Pauline intention, namely, to change the manner of life of the Philippians (either by Jesus' example or by reminding the Philippians of their true identity). In fact, one could argue that the adherents of the first

⁸¹ E. Käsemann, "A Critical Analysis of Philippians 2:5-11," in *God and Christ: Existence and Province* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), 84. He is followed by Martin, *A Hymn of Christ*.

approach have unduly overlooked the dual “exhortation” which Paul develops from the formula. When the hymn mentions the exaltation of Jesus, it describes it in terms of the extreme lordship of Jesus (v.10-11, “every knee shall bow”). Paul advises the Philippians that they should “*therefore* (v. 12, immediately following reference to Christ’s exaltation) work out [their] salvation with fear and trembling.” If not quickened by the good example of the humility of Jesus, as described in the first part of the hymn, then they should, at least, be persuaded by the fear and awe proper to the exalted Lord who now exercises the utmost authority in the universe (emphatic ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων). The Church’s hymn (proposed by Martin to be of baptismal origin) has been chosen by Paul as a powerful call to sanctification according to the example of the humble Lord, as a call to servanthood in submission and reverence to the exalted Lord, and as call to one’s true identity “in Christ,” which makes the previous two states possible.

Conceptual Implications

Apostleship and the Church

As we have demonstrated, Paul adopts and uses creedal and liturgical material which is not of his making but lies ready-to-hand for his use in the life of the Church.⁸² Whenever the apostle adopts this material and incorporates it into his argument or exhortation, he bestows upon it the full weight of his apostolic authority. The traditional material becomes integral to his argument and to his exhortation. When Paul battles the sacramental malpractice and theological confusion of certain congregations, he cites a traditional formula of the Church. When Paul rejects the heretical opinions and divisive tendencies of certain persons, he recalls a formula of the Church. When Paul builds his theological arguments, he does so on the foundation of a formula of the Church. The Church's formulae function, as it were, like apostolic "trump-cards," that Paul plays when he reaches the thematically and rhetorically crucial places in his discussion. That Paul proceeds in this way has very important implications concerning the nature of the Biblical text, Paul's apostleship, the Church, and the interrelations between these. Concerning this point, we wish to make following important observations.

First, when Paul quotes traditional formulaic material, he clearly is assuming that his readers in fact *know* and *recognize* this material. In none of his epistles does Paul

⁸² In the light of the present discussion a question may arise as to what was Paul intending by passages that stress his dependence on a special theophany (Gal. 1:12, 16 etc.). Should they be interpreted as implying that Paul *has no other source* for Christian "information" apart from his revelation? The majority of scholars have concluded that Paul invokes his theophany as the proof of his genuine apostleship and the reliability of his message as not merely a "self-originated" phantasm. There is no possibility or need to speculate as to what was the exact content of the revelation on the road to Damascus (or his later "raptures") – was it only the basic kerygma, calling forth Paul's personal existential response, or was it a thorough catechetical instruction? One fact is clear: by the time Paul writes his epistles, he *already has been exposed to the reality of Christian church* through corporate worship, liturgy, proclamation etc. Even if the Church's life it is not his *first* source of Christian information, is it still *a* source, which Paul masterfully utilizes in his arguments.

write as though his readers were ignorant of the Christian message. He does not have to start, as it were, “from scratch,” because the recipients of his letters already possess a preliminary knowledge and understanding of the Christian faith. They possess, so to speak, a Christian matrix within which to understand the address of the apostle.⁸³ In other words, Paul is writing to audiences which already possess the necessary set of presuppositions to receive his text’s intended meaning.⁸⁴

Second, Paul identifies with the Christian matrix of the congregations and demonstrates that he shares that matrix in that he adopts the traditional formulae of the Church and makes them his own by incorporating them into his text. The creedal and liturgical formulae of the Pauline letters function as a unifying factor between Paul and his readers, and this is so even if there are disagreements existing between them. Paul is writing to “implied readers” who share the same paradigm as he does. Therefore, he is himself familiar with and can appeal to the well-known formulations that express this shared paradigm.

Third, it would be and ineffective for Paul to quote the traditional confessional and liturgical formulae of the Church at crucial points of his argument unless the readers of the text recognized the formulae as carrying authoritative weight. Paul employs the Church’s confessional and liturgical material at theologically and rhetorically significant points exactly *because* they are to be regarded by his readers (and, likewise, by the writer) as authoritative statements. Paul’s use of this material is in no way merely illustrative (a “nice” recognizable text, such as quotes from Cicero or Euripides); he does

⁸³ This fact can be illustrated by Paul’s numerous references to previous teaching events, to common people known, to the obvious references to congregations having already received the gospel. See for example, Rom. 8:15; 1 Cor. 4:7; 2 Cor. 11:4; Gal. 1:6,9; Phil. 4:9; 2 Thess. 2:15.

⁸⁴ For an extended discussion concerning the crucial importance of the readers’ presuppositions when interpreting a text, see Voelz, *What Does It Mean*, chapters 10 and 11.

not include this material as though it was an abstractly imposed authority (such as an imperial decree). Paul adopts and uses this material as authoritative because it speaks of the Christ event and the determinative *regula fidei* of the Church; hence it is the property of a Christian community. The formulae are regarded as an authoritative within the community because they express the very foundational axioms of that community, without which the community would cease to exist, or, even more, would never have come to exist.

We might summarize the above three observations in the following, more traditional ecclesiastical terminology. Paul performs his apostolic ministry on the basis of and in relation to the formulations of Church's deposit of faith. The *regula fidei* expressed in the Church's creedal and liturgical material and the *regula fidei* which governs Paul's own preaching coincide. Paul makes the Church's authoritative material his own, and, in sending his text to the church, causes his own text to become that of the Church.

As an apostle, Paul arises from within the Church and his mission is directed back to the Church. Neither Paul, nor any other Apostle, is "a lone ranger," disconnected from the *kerygma* they themselves proclaim and from the community of faith to which they speak. This pattern is pervasive throughout the Scriptures. God raises up speakers from within His people, whom He then sends to speak to His people. The prophets are called from within Israel, to speak to Israel.⁸⁵ Classic of this pattern, however, is the promise of a prophet like Moses: "I will raise up for them a prophet like you *from among their brethren*; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak *to them* all that I

⁸⁵ Typical is a formula like this: "The words of Jeremiah, the son of Hilkiah, of the priests who were in Anathoth in the land of Benjamin, to whom the word of the Lord came" (Jer. 1:1).

command you.” (Deut. 18:18). The community allegiance of the prophet, his being *of* Israel, is constitutive of his mission *to* Israel. Paul, too, knows himself to be “of all the saints” (Eph. 3:8). Just as the prophet is sent by God to the churches, so is the apostle is sent by God to the churches even though he is a member of the Church.⁸⁶

In what ways, then, does the apostle differ from the community of faith? In terms of the substance of the faith, of the preaching of the gospel, the apostle and the community of faith are the same. He is, as it were, the first fruits of the Church through whom the Church’s own *kerygma* (the core message of the faith) is spoken and given for the benefit of the Church’s growth and edification. The apostles are not the authors of the core message of faith. God in Christ is the author of it. “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself” (2 Cor. 5:18f). Yet it was to the “ministry of reconciliation” that the apostle was appointed, in whose ministry the “day of salvation” comes (2 Cor. 5:18; 6:2). Apostles are the faithful witnesses to the Jesus event. They are the authoritative, “canonical” transmitters of the interpretation which Jesus himself attached to it (see Luke 24:27). The *kerygma* is never the personal property of a single follower of Jesus, even if he is an apostle, for there was never a time when the Church consisted only of a solitary, independent follower of Jesus. From the beginning, the Church has always been a community. Therefore the *message of the Church* --the message in its formulation, in its transmission, in its reception, and its preservation—has always been bound to the Church and not apart from the Church.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ This pattern is true also of Christ. He comes from the Jews to the Jews, or, if one prefers, as the new Adam to the world of mankind.

⁸⁷ Note 1 John 1:1: “That which was *from the beginning*, which *we* have heard, which *we* have seen with *our* eyes, which *we* have looked upon and touched with *our* hands, concerning the word of life...that *we* proclaim also to you, so that you may have fellowship with us.”

We might summarize our reflections in the following manner. From its very inception the Christian message has been a community-bound phenomenon in its formulation, its content, and in its application. The Christian paradigm revolves around two referents: the Lord Christ Jesus and His followers, the Church. There is no παραδίδωμι without a παραλαμβάνω. Through the apostle the Church therefore performs a dual function. It proclaims the Christian message (secondary author) which has been instituted and given by Jesus (primary author) and at the same time receives the proclamation and lives by it (intended audience).

Scripture and the Church

For centuries it has been Church's affirmation that the authority of Scripture is secured on the basis of the inspiration of God and apostolic authorship. God inspired the writers of the text to produce *verbatim* an authoritative account of the Jesus event, and those writers were for the most part apostles of Jesus or their close associates. However, there were other accounts concerning the coming of the Christ; and they also claimed to be written either by apostles themselves or by their close associates.⁸⁸ On what basis, then, did the Church determine to accept some disputed writings as canonical authority and to reject the others? The history of Church affirms that the scriptural canon was established on the basis of *known universality of the use of the scriptures in the (liturgical) life of the Church and on recognizable apostolic kerygma expressed within the text*. An interesting piece of evidence for this is the so-called *Muratorian Canon* which is usually dated to c. 200 A.D. This text presents a listing of New Testament

⁸⁸ For example, the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Peter, the Acts of Paul and Thecla and the Revelation of Peter.

writings acknowledged as Scripture in Rome. In this listing of canonical texts we are informed that only those texts *which are accepted* may “be read publicly in the Church to the people either among the prophets, whose number is settled, or among the apostles.” This seems to reflect a liturgical practice of reading both the prophetic texts of the Old Testament and the apostolic texts of the New Testament. In any case, the liturgical reading of a text is the action which reveals *the already pre-determined choice* for the canonical status of a text. Furthermore, when enumerating the fourfold gospels, the *Muratorian Canon* presents a summary of the second article of the creed as the common substance of all the gospels. In addition, it is said that Paul taught that “Christ is the rule (*regula*) and principle (*principium*) of the Scriptures.” The text of the Scriptures was not an unknown quantity nor was their content merely the result of deduction of a first reading. Their content was known and could be summarized either as foundational *kerygma* (Christ as rule and principle⁸⁹) or as creed.

The fact that there were certain universally recognized books (homologoumena) and others which were in dispute (antilegomena) also affirms in its own way that the Scripture is inseparably linked with the life, worship and proclamation of the Church. This distinction is meaningful only if it is a distinction between those texts which are used and those which are not. Again, the canonical authority of texts and their recognized authority in the use of the texts in the life of the Church cannot be separated.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ By *regula* is meant that which governs the meaning and significance of a text; by *principium* is meant that to which all in the text relates. Together, this is close to Luther’s *was Christum treibet* as the hermeneutical determinate.

⁹⁰ To be sure, as a logical abstraction there is a logical priority of the canonical *reality* of a text and its *use* as canonical text. However, the production of texts and their appropriation through use is not, in reality, a logical but rather a historical fact. As such we must say that the canonical authority of a text exists only in its use, and that use assumes the recognition of that authority by the community which uses it. Or, in other words, the *regula fidei* operative in the community is the ultimate ground for the recognition of a text as canon.

As we have noted throughout, the presence of the pre-Pauline material in the apostle's letters has stamped the Church's image within the text itself. The presence of such material evinces the fact that whosoever from within the Church community read the letter, could also recognize the text as their own on the basis of the unity of the traditional material and the letter (Paul's preaching) in which it was now located. When the text of the apostle itself began to become a liturgical text on its own right (during the readings or homilies), the Church testified that the apostolic text was consonant with the *regula fidei* already operating in the Church. Ultimately, of course, by way of the Scripture's own self-testimony and by way of the conviction of the Church, it was the one and self-same Holy Spirit who was the author of the Scriptural text. However, the Spirit who inspired the writers to write was the very Spirit promised and given by Jesus the Christ to his followers by means of baptism, preaching, and the Lord's Supper. The Spirit who dwells in the Church, as it were, enables those of the *ecclesia* to understand and to recognize the apostolic texts *as of the same Spirit*. To this Paul himself testifies:

When I came to you, brethren, I did not come proclaiming to you the testimony of God in lofty words or wisdom. For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified.... But we impart a secret and hidden wisdom of God, which God decreed before the ages for our glorification.... But it is written, "What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him," [this] God has revealed to us through the Spirit.... And we impart this in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual truths to those who possess the Spirit (1 Cor. 2:1-13).

Paul is clearly writing about the event of his preaching to the Corinthians. He is taught of the Spirit and now speaks to those who possess the Spirit. Where there is unity of the Spirit, there is agreement between the speaker and his hearers. He speaks what they

know, and they hear in faith what he speaks.⁹¹ This is the Spirit “whom the world does not see nor know,” but who abides in the Church and is *known* by it (John 14:17), and whose voice is heard in the teaching of the Christ (John 3:8).

To rephrase this in postmodern linguistic terms, the Scripture as text is intrinsically linked with the Christian community that bears it, receives it, preserves it, and interprets it as its own. Through this interaction with the text, as it were, the community itself becomes regenerated. Since the Christian community must have preceded its own text, it can be concluded that there was a set of pre-understandings as the foundation for that community *before* the written authoritative apostolic witness. In other words, there was an operative *regula fidei* before the creation of an apostolic text. When the texts were created, they shared in the same, already existing *regula*, on the basis of which the community recognized the text to be theirs. Hence, when the texts are interpreted back to the community, if the interpreter operates with the same set of understandings, the interpretation can reproduce the initial intended meaning of the text.

Indeed, one might even say that *the continuity of the Church exists in the continuity of the right proclamation and the right reception of the message of apostolic text.*⁹² Or, to put it provocatively, the continuity of the intended meaning of the text is interdependent with the continuity of the unchanged and unchanging kerygma of the Church, for *the text is faith spoken to faith* (cf. Rom. 1:17). This means that the author and the recipient of the text are sharing the same matrix of presuppositions, referents and

⁹¹ Paul goes on to say that the Corinthians were not “spiritual men” but “men of the flesh,” for they were full of strife. This lack of spiritual unanimity hindered the hearing of Paul’s preaching. The view of some, that Paul is alluding to a revelation “higher” than his usual preaching is mistaken. Paul knows only the crucified Christ. That message was not being “heard” in the midst of their party-spirit (compare with Phil. 2:5-11 which also exhorts believers to have the “mind of Christ”).

⁹² Cf. Lutheran affirmation that the Church is where the Gospel is *rightly* proclaimed and the sacraments are *rightly* administered. This statement, however, is not meant to disregard God’s providential action.

attitudes. In the second century, Irenaeus came to speak of the right interpretation of the text as safeguarded in the continuity of the Church's proclamation.⁹³ This is as much as to say that the apostles continue to speak only when their texts are rightly preached, and that the apostles continue to be rightly "heard" only when such preaching is rightly "heard." What is "heard" is and was summarized in the creeds and the liturgies of the Church, and for this reason Irenaeus can summarize as the "canon of truth" what "the Church, though dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples."⁹⁴ This "canon of truth" is the creed "received by means of baptism."⁹⁵ Church—apostle—Church is the same pattern which we discerned in the prophetic formulas, such as that reflected in Deut. 18:18. The prophet is from the brethren to speak to the brethren. We can understand now, too, why false interpretation of the text was regarded as heresy and excluded from the Church. To misinterpret the text was to misinterpret the underlying *regula fidei* of the text, which, in the final analysis, was nothing other than to disbelieve the underlying *regula fidei* of the Church's confession.

⁹³ Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 3.2-3 (Ante-Nicene Fathers, 1.415f).

⁹⁴ Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.10.1 (Ante-Nicene Fathers, 1.330).

⁹⁵ Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.9.4 (Ante-Nicene Fathers, 1.330).

Hermeneutical Implications

We have enumerated the main observations concerning interdependency and organic unity between the apostleship, the Scripture and the Church, as can be inferred from the presence of pre-Pauline formulae in the Pauline letters. However, there are more than merely historical conclusions that can be made besides the aforesaid aspects of Scripture's authorship, reception and transmission, the core kerygma and others. One can observe significant hermeneutical suggestions that triggered by the very nature of the text itself.

1. Pre-Pauline texts cannot be "played against" Paul's interpretation.

The critical scholarship of the last century has provided interpreters with very useful and valuable data concerning the text of Scripture and its origins. It has shed light on the possibility that the biblical texts may have gone through various stages of composition and may have incorporated various sources into the "final redaction." However, these findings have at times been obscured by tendentious interpretations and have sometimes led to quite destructive conclusions which have regarded the text as little more than a patchwork of materials. Certain scholars have sought to affirm that because they are older than Paul's own text, pre-Pauline texts exhibit an expression of Christian faith which is closer to that of Jesus and is therefore more faithful to Jesus' original teachings. Our confidence that Paul is faithfully transmitting and commenting on primitive, original Jesus material is called into question. Now we must fear that Paul may be doing nothing other than investing the originally authentic teachings of Jesus with the new meaning of his own proclamation.

This assumption has been employed to construct different “histories of Christianity.” For example, Jesus may be interpreted essentially according to the categories of first century Judaism. Where the teachings and the words of Jesus correspond to what is known of common first century Judaism, those teachings and words are declared to possess a high probability of authenticity (criterion of similarity). On the other hand, where the teachings and the words of Jesus do not correspond to the common beliefs of first century Judaism, they are regarded as possessing a lesser probability of authenticity (criterion of dissimilarity). This perspective emphasizes the discontinuity between the original source and the use or proclamation of that source in later witness and preaching. The authentic Jesus, in the minds of readers and hearers, is made less clear, for example, in the preaching of Paul.⁹⁶ The proponents of such a perspective may contrast the Jewish milieu of Jesus with the more cosmopolitan, Gentile environment of Paul. Paul has appropriated the original *didache* of Jesus only to incorporate it into his own proclamation for the Gentiles. In the process, what was once original and primitive has lost its authenticity and original meaning.

Neither the retrospective approach which regards pre-Pauline formulae as exhibiting a more authentic Christianity, nor the future oriented approach which regards pre-Pauline formulae as a launching point for a substantially different hybrid which came to be regarded as orthodox Christianity has taken seriously the rhetorical and compositional analysis of the Pauline text. Our study indicates that, both in the explicit text and in his rhetorical composition Paul affirms that the pre-Pauline traditions which

⁹⁶Rudolph Bultmann is a classic example of this perspective. His *Theology of the New Testament* did not even contain a section on the teaching of Jesus, because Bultmann was methodologically skeptical of the possibility of recovering the authentic teaching of Jesus. The disjunction between Jesus and Paul was also advocated by Ethelbert Stauffer. The basis problem is illustrated by the general distinction made within redaction-criticism, that is, between the *Sitz im Leben Jesu* and the *Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae*.

he appropriates hold authority over the recipients of the texts and over Paul himself as the author of the text. Were one to adopt the position that authentic pre-Pauline material and the use of it made by Paul in his letters involved Paul in the more or less radical re-interpretation of the original material, one would have to honestly admit that this position properly functions only as a presupposition in one's approach. It is not a conclusion demanded by the evidence, and it is inherently improbable that Paul would have borrowed material which was intrinsically different and discordant to his own intentions.

2. The kerygmatic referents and concepts which are signified by the signifiers in the Scriptures are to be drawn from the Church's reality.

Scripture is not a free-floating text which has no location or context to which it refers. The Scripture itself acknowledges this to be the case. By its own explicit claims and by the nature of its composition Scripture affirms its existential link with two determinative realities – the reality of God, and His people the Church.⁹⁷ It does not suffice to say that the subject of Scripture is God's reality alone. If Jesus is confessed Lord, then He is Lord over someone. If Jesus is Savior, then He is the Savior of someone who is in need of salvation. God has revealed Himself in Christ to the world by speaking to the Church, and through the Church's confession and preaching He is to be known. Therefore, when interpreting the Scripture, the referents of the kerygma to which the text points are to be searched for within the boundaries of and in relation to the Church's reality. It is a serious mistake to search for God in the Scriptures by circumventing the Church's reality, or by regarding the Church merely as an accessory external to the

⁹⁷ The passages dealing with those "outside" represent merely the rejection of the revelation, and hence, the rejection of being "the Church." It describes as it were "the anti-Church," a negative integer.

message. Similarly, it is against Scripture's own nature for one to read behind its intended "kerygma-bearing-signifiers" referents, namely, the ones which are outside the reality proclaimed by the Church. The referents for allegory, typology and symbolic and prophetic language are of the major concern here. One has to know Christ as "Israel-reduced-to-one" in order to be able to see the ante-type references to Him in the Old Testament. The history of exegesis is full of failed attempts to read the eschatological prophecies of the Church as referring to contemporary political events or to extract some hidden cosmological or fortune-telling message via numerology or misguided allegory.⁹⁸ The best guard against such erroneous interpretations is to be familiar and attentive to the reality of the community of faith which was the cradle for the text, which possessed and still possesses the right presuppositions that are coherent with the message of the text, and whose own face is mirrored in every page of its Scripture.

3. *The proper interpreter of the Scripture must be an "implied reader"⁹⁹, "that is, a member of the Church.*

Our study has demonstrated the intrinsic inseparability of the meaning of Scripture and its "cradle-community" the Church. We have emphasized that the Church in Scripture is not merely a "cultural context" merely a background for the proclamation of the Gospel. Nor is the Church simply the addressee. Rather, it is the active force receiving, transmitting, preserving, interpreting and living out the message entrusted to it.

⁹⁸ See for example the Valentinian heresy and the Mormons.

⁹⁹ For the definition of "implied reader" see Voelz, *What Does It Mean?* "This implied reader is a person, a receptor, with that knowledge, those abilities, that competency, which enables him to "actualize" the text. He is a conception of the author – it is for him which the author writes (though he in no actual fact corresponds to any actual reader of the text). Who then is a valid interpreter of a text? It is he who conforms to the expectations of the author" (219).

To use the terminology of Irenaeus, the Church knows the Scripture's *hypothesis*, because the Church herself is part of it.

However, through the centuries many have claimed the Church's canonical texts and have attempted to interpret them apart from the Church's reality. Already in the second century, Irenaeus laments the Valentinian misrepresentations of the Scripture's *hypothesis* or *argumentum*:

Their manner of acting is just as if one, when a beautiful image of a king has been constructed by some skilful artist out of precious jewels, should then take this likeness of the man all to pieces, should rearrange the gems, and so fit them together as to make them into the form of a dog or of a fox, and even that but poorly executed; and should then maintain and declare that this was the beautiful image of the king which the skilful artist constructed, pointing to the jewels which had been admirably fitted together by the first artist to form the image of the king, but have been with bad effect transferred by the latter one to the shape of a dog, and by thus exhibiting the jewels, *should deceive the ignorant who had no conception what a king's form was like* (emphasis added), and persuade them that that miserable likeness of the fox was, in fact, the beautiful image of the king. (*Adv. Haer.* 1:3.1)

It matters *who* interprets the Scripture and *why*. If the Scripture is the Church's book, it should be interpreted by the Church for the Church. The *dianoia* (Athanasius' term) of Scripture perceives Christ the Crucified *as the Lord* and it refers to the community where Christ is proclaimed as Lord. In other words, the Scripture is a Christian faith-bound text and should be interpreted from the standpoint of faith and as bearing faith-bound implications. The Scripture is not merely a historical account, although the actions described took place in time; the Scripture is not merely a study in ancient sociology, although it reflects an ancient society's customs. Scripture is intended to bring its readers under the headship of Jesus and into union with his body, the Church, *no matter which period of history one is in*. In the reading, exposition, and "hearing" of the text by the

implied reader within the proper context, the text receives its proper actualization. The apostolic writer, as it were, speaks once again and is heard. The text is read again, recapitulating its first reading. Neither Jesus Christ, nor the Church, nor the text of the Church talks solely about the realities past. To be sure, Jesus died in first century Palestine, but he “is the door to the Father” *right now* just as much as He was in the past. To be sure, it was the ancient, first century Christian community in Corinth (and elsewhere) that was advised to extinguish the spirit of partisanship, but the spirit of partisanship is to be avoided in *today’s Church* as much as it was in the past. Even as the first writing of the text was “for us,” so the ongoing reading and hearing of the text must be regarded as also “for us.” Or, to phrase it in another way, one and the same Church claims “for herself” one and the same Lord Jesus, “as it was in the beginning, is now and will be forever.”

How then can an interpreter who distances himself from the “for us” aspect of the Scripture – the essential ingredient of Scripture’s own identity claim to render the meaning intended by the text? How can those who openly profess, for example, an attitude of “suspicion” towards the faith community and its text still claim to construct a coherent representation of the intended meaning of the text? Apart from the evident ethical problems of such an “interpretation” one can further demonstrate, through utilization of self-reflective tools of post-modern linguistic findings, the conceptual inadequacy of such an interpretation.

The Church community not only directs the reader to the right referents signified in the text, but also helps to create *a right system of hierarchy of Scriptural data* based on the relevance of the referents as perceived in that community. For example, for a

community of secular philosophers or sociologists, Jesus as Teacher will be of more interest than Jesus as Lord. If the community were to construct a coherent system from the data provided in Scripture, the heart of the system would revolve around the Sermon on the Mount, relegating the vicarious death and resurrection of Jesus to the periphery, and thus, using Irenaeus' analogy, they would be distorting the "picture of King" by presenting it as "a fox." One's presuppositions guide the roles, which the concepts and the themes of Scripture are allowed to play in the unified picture. Therefore it is imperative to adhere to the right presuppositions based on *regula fidei*. Thus the Christian Church has unanimously affirmed the Christocentricity of the Scripture. Without this "key," the Old Testament remains merely a text of Judaism while the apocalyptic utterances of the New Testament lose their meaning.

It is possible, however, to find a diversity of interpretations even within the Church's community that adhere to the Christocentric principle. One can observe that Calvin for example, in the overall picture drawn from the Scriptures, placed strong emphasis on the sovereignty of God; consequently, his "system" would bring into the spotlight certain texts (for example, Rom. 9:21) which others would find challenging in their systems. On the other hand, John Chrysostom placed a strong emphasis on the sanctification and imitation of Christ; hence, his "picture" of the Scripture championed passages describing Christian ethics and "costly discipleship" (1 Cor. 13:13 or Mat. 13:46 – passages slightly bothersome to Lutheran ears). Luther, probably on the basis of his personal struggle, emphasized total depravity of humanity, and "discovered" the Law-Gospel dichotomy of the Scriptures. Whatever the differences between the various Christian denominations may be, they cannot be solved by presenting an arsenal of proof-

texts from Scripture, because these “*proof texts*” *gain their specific relevance only when positioned in a specific system of interpretation*. The differences between the interpretations within the different Christian denominations or groups can be properly addressed *only* when one brings to light and encounters straightforwardly the presuppositions underlying their system of interpretation.

Confessional Lutheran Hermeneutical approach and the *Regula Fidei*

The Lutheran hermeneutical approach, unfortunately, has often been misconstrued in various ways. This may be partially explained by the fact that several important exegetes have claimed Lutheran background “*de jure*” while not faithfully upholding the Lutheran principles in their work “*de facto*.” This is not the place to examine these miscues in detail, and therefore, a general statement of the most evident problem will have to suffice. The “Lutheran problem” can be summarized in the following manner. It has sometimes been claimed that the Scriptures possess in themselves an exclusive objectivity that is evidenced by apparent clarity and sufficiency of the text. In addition, the reader of the text is thought to be, as it were, a *tabula rasa*. As such, the reading of Scripture is perceived to be a communication of revelation *by way of a transposition of subject matter*. The reader learns what he did not know, nor could previously have known. In other words, the Lutheran exegete is said to demand a presupposition-free and tradition-free position when it comes to the encounter with Scripture. Were it otherwise, the nature of Scripture as sufficient and clear would be compromised.

However, we wish to suggest that the Scriptures are, by their very nature, a “presupposition bound” text. That is, the Scriptures are conditioned in every way by the

regula fidei which functions as the “substance” of the text, and which, *when recognized by the reader*, gives the text its proper meaning and governs the discourse of the text (*principium*).

The following observations will help to clarify and refute the misconception of the *tabula rasa*.

First, the *Lutheran Confessions were written by baptized, catechized and communed members of the Church*. This observation by itself erodes any contrary view that Lutheran interpretive activity was guided by or was coherent with a “modern (rational) objectivity.”¹⁰⁰ Every one of the Lutheran confessors, *before* he could clarify his theological position as “Lutheran,” had first adhered to the basics of the Christian *regula fidei*. This implied the existential, nurturing link between the confessors and the *already existing* reality of the Church: baptism with the reception of the Holy Spirit, the confession of and life with Jesus as *their* Lord and *their* Savior, adherence to the *Shema* (the Unity and Oneness of God), the sustained nurturing and forgiveness of the Lord’s Supper, and fellowship with other members of the Church. Hence, it is historically and logically coherent to assume (and, indeed, to insist) that the Lutheran confessors encountered the prophetic, apostolic witness of the Holy Scriptures through the “informed eyes” of a paedagogy which was fully formed by the teaching and practice of the Church. Consequently, what they read in the Scriptures, they read as Christians *sharing in the mind of the Scriptures, even as they shared in the mind of the Church and the mind of Christ*.

¹⁰⁰ The “objectivity” here is meant to describe the attitude that exists when the subject is “distant and impartial” to the object it encounters, has no value-laden position towards the object, and exercises unrestrained freedom in “naming the object” according to the object’s intrinsic nature, which is “discovered” during a series of rationally verifiable and repeatable experiments.

Second, the *Lutheran confessors consciously understood themselves to be united with the faith of the Christian Church*. Each of the confessional documents that were included in the Book of Concord includes explicit quotations or mentions at least one of the three ecumenical creeds.¹⁰¹ The Augsburg Confession even follows the general order of the Creed, beginning with an article on God and creation, leading to Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the Church.¹⁰² The Lutheran confessors saw themselves as legitimate heirs to the legacy of the faith of the Apostles and the early Church. In his voluminous *Examination of the Council of Trent*, Martin Chemnitz enumerates eight “types” of tradition of the Church, and he confesses that Lutherans uphold all but one (the tradition which is attested in the history of the Church but is *contrary* to the explicit statements in Scripture).

Third, *only as those who are members of the Christian community and share in its basic presuppositions can Lutheran confessors claim the right to judge and to reform the existing Church’s practices and teachings*. Nowhere can one attest to the Lutheran confessors taking a position “from without the Church” and then pronouncing critical statements “over” the Church. However, to be within a community and to be “informed” by its basic presuppositions does not mean to be hopelessly blinded by them, leading one’s life, as it were, in captivity to whatever “axiom” one first encounters. Human beings have a certain self-reflective capacity which is most frequently triggered by a crisis in paradigm to which one adheres.¹⁰³ The capacity for self-reflection is a

¹⁰¹ See Ep. Rule and Norm, 4; *Solid Declaration*, Rule and Norm, 5 and others.

¹⁰² Cf. *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, ed. R. Kolb and T. J. Wengert (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 19.

¹⁰³ Cf. Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1970, 2nd ed.); especially the following chapters: “The Priority of Paradigms,” “Anomaly and the Emergence of Scientific Discoveries,” “Crisis and the Emergence of Scientific Theories,” “The Response to Crisis”.

necessary component for *any* conversion, *any* reformation or *any* advancement. Crisis and active self-reflection can lead to a mild change *within* the paradigm, or to a drastic change *of* the paradigm. The Lutheran confessors were vocal about the fact that they did not consider themselves as introducing anything new into the proclamation of the Church. They believed that they remained within the unity of the Church and faithfully confessed the Church's *regula fidei*. That is why as collaborative witnesses to their witness to the evangelical message of the Scriptures, they could and did adduce testimony from the fathers. Their reading of the text was the Church's reading of the text, and this was demonstrated through the collaborative testimony of the fathers.

One might wonder whether the Lutheran "crisis" was triggered by a genuine problem within the Christian paradigm. One might wonder whether Lutheran reforms solved this problem adequately. One might wonder whether Lutheran reforms really changed the way the Scriptures were read. But it cannot be doubted that the Lutheran confessors willfully and consciously remained within the determinative parameters of the creedal paradigm from which they started -- the *regula fidei* of the Church.

Conclusions

This study has demonstrated that the Holy Scripture is a text bound to a certain community, the Christian Church, and that it reflects a certain set of presuppositions which are those of the Christian Church.

We located within select epistles of Paul the presence of generally acknowledged pre-Pauline creedal and liturgical formulae, and we noted that Paul used this material in strategically significant places, suggesting that both for Paul as well as for the recipients of his letters, this material possessed authoritative weight. In view of this, the following inferences were advanced:

1. The human author (apostle or his close associate) of the text of the Scripture used, shared and confessed the *regula fidei* that was already used, shared and confessed in the Christian Community to which the text was addressed;
2. The receiving church recognized in the letters of Paul the presence of the self-same *regula fidei* which it itself also maintained, and so came to acknowledge and use the Scripture which they had received as their own canonical, authoritative text;
3. The Church, its faith and life can be established as the proper intended referents of the text of the Scripture;
4. The Church is the “implied reader” of the Scripture and possesses the (pre-) understanding necessary to discern the intended meaning;

5. Therefore, through the creation,¹⁰⁴ faithful reception and appropriation, faithful interpretation and faithful transmission of the Scriptures, by the gracious providence of God, the Church can sustain and reconstitute its proper identity.

The above stated conclusions about the interdependence of the Scripture and the community which is its matrix have the following hermeneutical implications:

1. Any interpretation that aims to arrive at the intended meaning of the Scripture cannot regard the pre-Scriptural formulae as contradictory in any manner to the rest of the apostolic text into which the author placed them. Similarly, and vice versa, the text of the Scripture cannot be regarded as contradictory in any manner to the pre-Scriptural formulae it quotes.
2. Any interpretation that aims to arrive at the intended meaning of the Scripture should draw for the kerygma-bearing signifiers of the Scripture the referents and concepts from the Church's own reality.
3. Any interpretation that aims to arrive at the intended meaning of the Scripture should be performed by a person who believes and participates in the reality of the Church.¹⁰⁵

Concerns that the above hermeneutical conclusions might compromise Lutheran hermeneutical principles were showed to be unsubstantiated on the grounds that the Lutheran confessors themselves worked along similar lines. Lutheran hermeneutical principles do not oppose the idea of presupposition-driven exegesis, as long as the presuppositions are congruent with the prophetic and apostolic *regula fidei*.

¹⁰⁴ We recall here our discussion of the fact that the apostle comes from the Church. He is not an alien intrusion into the Church ("from amongst your brethren," Deut. 18:18).

¹⁰⁵ We are reminded of the fact that both orthodoxy and holiness were regarded by the Church Fathers as essential postures for any right reading of the Scriptures. See Christopher Hall, *Reading Scriptures with the Church Fathers* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1998).

Selected Bibliography

- Adam, A. K. M. *What is Postmodern Biblical Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).
- Arand, C. P. *That I May Be His Own: An Overview of Luther's Catechisms*. (St. Louis: Concordia Academic Press, 2000).
- Baughner, L. "Interpretation of Philippians 2:6-7," *Lutheran Quarterly* 8 (1878):119-24.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. *Baptism in the New Testament*. (Grand Rapids: W.B.Erdmans, 1974) 101.
- Blair, H.A. *A Creed Before the Creeds*, (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955).
- Bohlmsann, R.A. *Principles of Biblical Interpretation in the Lutheran Confessions*. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968).
- Bornkamm, G. *The New Testament: A Guide to Its Writings*. Trans. R. H. and I. Fuller, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973).
- Bruce, F. F. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. NCB. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/ London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1971).
- Bultmann, R. *Theology of the New Testament*, vol. 1, tr. K. Grobel, (London: SCM, 1952).
- Carrington, P. *The Primitive Christian Catechism*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940),
- Chemnitz, M. *Examination of the Council of Trent*, tr. Kramer, F., (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971).
- Chrehan, J. H. *Early Christian Baptism and the Creed*, (London: Burns, Oates, and Washburn, 1950).
- Clayton N. Jefford. ed., *Perspectives on Witness and Translation: Essays in Honor of John E. Steely* (N.Y. : Published for the National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion by E. Mellen Press, 1993).
- Conzelmann, On the Analysis of the Confessional Formula in 1 Corinthians 15:3-5," *Interpretation* 20 (1966): 15-25.
- Cullmann, O. "The Tradition," *The Early Church*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (London: SCM, 1956), 59-99.

- Cullmann, O. "Paradosis et Kyrios", *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 30, 12-30, and *The Early Church* (E.T. 1956)
- Cullmann, O. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Trans. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962).
- Cullmann, O. *The Earliest Christian Confessions*. Trans. J.K.S. Reid, (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949).
- Cullmann, O. *The New Testament: An Introduction*. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968).
- Danker, F.W. *Creeds in the Bible*. (St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1966).
- Dibelius, M. *An die Thessalonicher: an die Philipper*. (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 1929, 1937).
- Dodd, C. H. *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*. (New York: Harper and Row, 1964).
- Dunn, J. D. G. "Jesus—Flesh and Spirit: An Exposition of Romans 1:3–4." *Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1973):40–68.
- Dunn, J. D. G. *Christology in the Making*. (London: SCM, 1980).
- Dunn, J.D.G. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1998).
- Dunn, James D.G. *Romans 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary, Vol.38a (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher, 1998).
- Ellis, E. E. "A Note on Pauline Hermeneutics." *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955–56): 127–33.
- Enslin, M. S. *Christian Beginnings: The Literature of the Christian Movement*. (New York: Harper, 1956).
- Friedrich, G. ed., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. IX (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1974).
- Fuller, R. H. *The Christology of the New Testament*. (London, William Collins Sons and Co. Ltd. 1965).
- Fuller, R. H. *The foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965):23. Friedrich, G., ed., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. IX, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1974), 504.

- Fuller, R.H. *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965).
- Furness, J. M. "The Authorship of Phil 2, 6–11." *Expository Times* 70 (1958–59): 240–43.
- Furness, J. M. "Behind the Philippians Hymn." *Expository Times* 79 (1967–68): 178–82.
- Friedrich, G. "Der Brief an die Philipper", in *Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, (Göttingen, 1962).
- Gerhardsson, B. *Memory and Manuscript: Oral tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Trans. E.J. Sharpe, (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1961).
- Gloer W. H. "Homologies and Hymns in the New Testament: Form, Content and criteria for identification," in *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, v. 11 (1984), 115–132.
- Grant R. O. *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*, (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1991):7.
- Grech, P.S. "The *regula fidei* as a Hermeneutical Principle in Patristic Exegesis," *The Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. Krasovec, J., (Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts; England: Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 1998), 589–601.
- Hanson, A. T. *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, (London: SPCK, 1974).
- Hanson, R.P.C. *Tradition in the Early Church*, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962).
- Hawthorne, Gerald F., *Philippians*, Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 43, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher, 1998).
- Hays, R. B. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*. SBL Dissertation Series 56 (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983).
- Holland, D. "The Earliest Text of the Old Roman Symbol: A Debate with Hans Lietzmann and J.N.D. Kelly", *Church History* 34, No.3, (Sept.1965): 262–281.
- Hooker, M. D. "Philippians 2, 6–11," *Jesus und Paulus, Festschrift für W. G. Kümmel*, eds. E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975).
- Horan, B. W. "The Apostolic Kerygma in Philippians 2:6–9." *Expository Times* 62 (1950–51):60–61.
- Hunter, A. M. *Paul and His Predecessors*. 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 1961).

- Jeremias, J. *Studia Paulina in Honorem J. de Zwaan*, ed. J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik, (1953), p.154
- Jewett, R. "The Redaction and Use of an Early Christian Confession in Romans 1:3-4," in *The Living Text*, FS E. W. Saunders, ed. D. E. Groh and R. Jewett. (Lanham/New York: University Press of America, 1985), 99-122.
- Käsemann, E. "A Primitive Christian Baptismal Liturgy," *Essays on New Testament Themes*, tr. W. J. Montague (London: SCM, 1964), American edition (SBT 41; Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1964).
- Käsemann, E. *Perspectives on Paul*, tr. M. Kohl, (ET London: SCM/Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971).
- Keegan, T.J. *Interpreting the Bible: A Popular Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics*, (New York: Paulist Press, 1985).
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Creeds*. (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1972).
- Kelsey, D.H. *Proving Doctrine: The Uses of Scripture in Modern Theology*. (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999).
- Kloppenborg, J. S. "Analysis of the Pre-Pauline formula 1 Cor 15:3b-5 in light of some recent literature," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (Jl 1978): 351-367.
- Kolb, R. and Wengert, T.J., eds. *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).
- Leith, J.H., ed. *Creeds of the Churches: a Reader in Christian Doctrine from Bible to the Present*, (Louisville: John Knox Press, 3rd ed., 1982).
- Lietzmann, H. "Creeds", *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1957.
- Lohmeyer, E. *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2, 5-11*, (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissench: Heidelberg, 1928, 1961).
- Longenecker, R. N. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*, (London: SCM Press LTD, 1970), 74.
- Martimort, A.G., ed. *The Church at Prayer*. (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992).
- Martin, R. P. *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in recent interpretation and in the setting of early Christian worship*. (InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, USA, 1997).

- Martin, R. P. *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. (Cambridge: University Press, 1967/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).
- Martin, R. P. *The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12–15*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1984).
- Martin, R. P. *Worship in the Early Church*. (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, Grand Rapids, 2nd ed, 1974).
- McDonald, J.I.H. *Kerygma and Didache: the Articulation and Structure of the Earliest Christian Message*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
- McKnight, E. *Postmodern Use of the Bible: the Emergence of Reader – Oriented Criticism*. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1988).
- Mounce, R. H. “Continuity of the primitive tradition : some pre-Pauline elements in 1 Corinthians”, *Interpretation* 13 (O 1959): 417-424.
- Neufeld, V. H., “*The Earliest Christian Confessions*”, *New Testament Tools and Studies* 5, (Leiden: Brill, 1963).
- Norden, E. *Agnostos Theos*. (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1956).
- O’Brien, P. T. *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*. Supplement to *Novum Testamentum* 49, (Leiden: Brill, 1977).
- Poythress, V, S. “Is Romans 1:3-4 a Pauline Confession After All”, *Expository times* 87 (Mr 1976): 180-183.
- Quasten, J. *Patrology*. (Westminster: Newman Press, 1950).
- Rander, E., Sumner, G., eds, *The Rule of Faith: Scripture, Canon and Creed in a Critical Age*. (Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1998).
- Reicke, B. “Paul’s Understanding of Righteousness.” in *Soli Deo Gloria*, FS W. C. Robinson, ed. J. M. Richards, (Richmond: John Knox, 1968), 37–49.
- Riesenfeld, H. *The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings: a Study in the Limits of “Formgeschichte.”* (London: A.R.Mowbray and Co., 1957).
- Riggs, J, W. “From gracious table to sacramental elements : the tradition-history of Didache 9 and 10.” *Second Century*. 4 No 2 (Sum 1984), p. 83-101.
- Sanders, J. T. *The New Testament Christological Hymns, Their Historical Religious Backgrounds*. (Cambridge: University Press, 1971)

- Schlink, E. *Theology of the Lutheran Confessions*. (Philadelphia: Myhlenberg Press, 1961).
- Schmithals, W. "The Pre-Pauline Tradition in 1 Corinthians 15:20-28," in *Essays in honor of John E. Steely*, ed. by Jefford, C. N., Perspectives-in-Religious-Studies, 20 (Wint 1993).
- Schmithals, W. *The theology of the first Christians*, tr. O.C. Dean, Jr., (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, c1997).
- Schneider, B. "κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης" (Romans 1:4)." *Biblica* 48 (1967) 359–87.
- Schweizer, E., "Worship in the NT", *The Reformed and Presbyterian World*, xxiv, 5, (1957):295
- Schweizer, E. *Lord's Supper according to the New Testament*. (Fortress Press, 1967).
- Skillrud, H.C., Stafford J.F., and Martensen D.F., ed.. *Scripture and Tradition: Lutherans and catholics in Dialogue IX*, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995).
- Stauffer, E., *New Testament Theology*, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955):138-139
- Turner, H.E.W. *The Pattern of Christian Truth*. (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd., 1954).
- Turner, N. *Grammar of the NT Greek*. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark 1976).
- Veron N. *The earliest Christian Confession*. (Grand Rapids: W.B. Erdmans, 1963).
- Voelz, J.W. "Reading Scripture as Lutherans in the Post-Modern Era." *Lutheran Quarterly* 14, (Autumn, 2000).
- Voelz, J.W. *What does this Mean? Principles of Biblical interpretation in the Post-modern World*. 2nd ed., (Saint Louis, CPH, 1997).
- Walker, W. O. Jr. "1 Corinthians 2:6-16 : a Non-Pauline Interpolation?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 47 (S 1992): 75-94.
- Walker, W. O. Jr. "Is First Corinthians 13 a Non-Pauline Interpolation", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60 (Jl 1998): 484-499.

- Walker, W. O. Jr. "Romans 1.18-2.29: A Non-Pauline Interpolation?" *New Testament Studies* 45, no 4 (O 1999): 533-552.
- Waller, E. "The rhetorical structure of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 : is the so-called "non-Pauline" a clue to the redactor of 2 Corinthians?" in *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* vol. 10, (Cincinnati : Eastern Great Lakes & Midwest Biblical Societies, 1990), 151-165.
- Warson, F. *Text, Church and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).
- Whitaker, E.C. *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*. (London: S.P.C.K., 2nd ed., 1970).
- Wilson, O. R. B. "A study of the early Christian Creedal Hymn of 1 Tim. 3:16." (Th.D. Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1954), 85.
- Young, F. *The Making of the Creeds*. (London: SCM, 1991).