Reading the Christ Hymn in Philippians in Light of Paul's Letter to the Romans

Andries G. van Aarde

University of Pretoria

Abstract

From a rhetorical perspective, the article argues that, for Paul, the figure of Adam serves as both a *paradeigma* (in a positive sense) and a *contrarium* (in a negative "epideictic" sense). This rhetorical technique occurs not only in Romans 5:12–14, but also in Paul's "Christ Hymn" in Philippians 2:6–11. In metaphorical terms, Adam as *contrarium* is depicted as the "old" humankind, the pre-converted "sinner" who lives "according to the flesh" (κατὰ σάρκα), and Adam as *paradeigma* is depicted as the "new" humankind, the regenerated "righteous" one who lives "according to the spirit" (κατὰ πνεῦμα). The oxymoron that the *paradeigma-contrarium* rhetorical technique refers to the same person is explained in this article in terms of Paul's emphasis on a spirituality of "transcendence in everydayness."

Key Terms

rhetorical criticism; *encomium*; *exordium*; *inventio*; *dispositio*; first Adam; second Adam; Romans 5:12–13; Philippians 2:6–11; Isaiah 45:21b–23[LXX]

1 *Encomium*

Encomium is the Latin word for the classical Greek *encomion*, meaning the praise of a person.[1] An *encomium* can also serve as a prologue to a hero's meritorious acts. In terms of classical rhetorical categories, an

---

[1] This essay is an *encomium* to Andrie B. du Toit, who died on 21 July 2018. The article represents a reworked version of an unpublished paper that was presented at a seminar hosted by the Faculty of Theology and Religion at the University of Pretoria, commemorating Andrie's 80th birthday on 19 November 2011. In 1972, Andrie appointed me, a young student, as his first research assistant at the University of Pretoria. Later, we both chaired the Departments of New Testament Studies in the respective sections of the then Faculty of Theology at the University of Pretoria.

encomium consists of an *exordium* (in Greek: προοίμιον), an *inventio* and a *dispositio*. The *encomium* establishes goodwill. The *exordium* (προοίμιον) makes the case,[2] the *inventio* arranges the arguments and the *dispositio* arrives at a conclusion. The prologue of this article is the commendation. The case made by the article is that of transcendence in everydayness—in other words, a divinely inspired spirituality.[3] In ancient Greek rhetoric, matters of "everydayness"—that is, subjects related to daily life, which in a discourse "have a loose or even arbitrary connection" (Brunt 1985, 495) with the case of the argument—are called *topoi* (see Bradley 1953, 238–246). *Topoi* contain advice that is typically given on issues such as friendship, sex, money, food, marriage or kinship; in other words, issues that have "general, if not universal, applicability" (Brunt 1985, 495; Bradley 1953, 244). The argumentation of this article takes the form of an appeal for loyalty to the only living God, the father of Christ Jesus, the *Kyrios*. The *inventio*, how the argument is structured, is in terms of metaphysical thinking rather than adhering to the anti-metaphysical trends in theology today.

2   *Exordium*

However, reading the Pauline letters strategically, one should be cautious not to overstate Paul's rhetorical techniques. In 1989, Andrie du Toit wrote that "important elements of the rhetorical tradition had become popularized in Paul's time and probably constituted an integral part of the

---

[2] Vos (1994, 5) puts it as follows: "According to the rhetorical handbooks, the *exordium* has the function of making the readers well-disposed, attentive, and ready to receive instruction. As such the function of the *exordium* is preparatory. The accent lies on the psychological aspect: the purpose of the *exordium* is to make the hearts of the hearers well disposed. The manner in which Paul used psychological means, to dispose the hearts of his readers is familiar from his other letters [excluding Galatians], in which the introductory thanksgiving serves as a *captatio benevolentiae* and thus has the function of the proem of a discourse."

[3] Schleiermacher ([1821–1822; 1830–1831] 1999, 397) refers to such a spirituality as a "God-consciousness amidst humanness" and indicates this aspect through the descriptive strategy of the "supernatural-becoming-natural" (*Naturwerden des Übernatürlichen*) (Vander Schel 2013, 11). In this regard, Schleiermacher sees Jesus as both an *Urbild* and a *Vorbild* (cf. Resch 2012, 27). "God is present in all other human beings," though "to a far greater degree" in Jesus (Schleiermacher 1999, 364). This means that Jesus had the ability to impart God-consciousness to others. Christ-followers can participate in his God-consciousness (Clements 1987, 57; Resch 2012, 26). Paul's view on such an *imitatio Christi* (Phil 2:5) constitutes his introduction to his Christ Hymn.

competence of the better educated in the Greco-Roman world" (see republication in Breytenbach and Du Toit 2007). According to Du Toit, if Paul "makes use of techniques usually associated with rhetoric, it does not *per se* indicate that he had a formal education in classical rhetoric, or even that the specific usage necessarily derived from that quarter" (Du Toit [1989] 2007, 219–237; cf. Vorster 2009, 578).

With regard to Paul's rhetoric in the "thanksgiving-section" (*captatio benevolentiae*) of the Letter to the Romans, Du Toit (2007, 236) is of the opinion that the apostle "is careful to avoid the impression of self-commendation and self-praise (*periautologia*),"[4] but not in the "concluding section" (Rom 15:17ff.). More examples of his use of the rhetorical strategy of *exemplum* can be found in Paul's letters. He refers to himself and other notable persons as those who exemplify the *Kyrios* (e.g., 1 Thess 1:6), the model *par excellence*. One such *paradeigma* is Abraham (see Vorster 2009, 525; cf. Lawton 2011; Hansen 1989, 57).[5] The opposite of an *exemplum* is a *contrarium* (Vorster 2009, 525). For example, in Rom 5:12–14 Adam serves as both a *paradeigma* (in a positive sense) and as a *contrarium* (in a negative "epideictic" sense). From the perspective of Adam typology as rhetorical device, this article aims at elaborating on Paul's use of the Adam motif. It investigates the possibility that the use of this motif in Romans could also be interpreted in light of Paul's Christology expressed in the Christ Hymn in his Letter to the Philippians and vice versa.

---

[4] Du Toit (1992, 282–283) refers to this rhetorical device in Paul's thanksgiving sections as "positive politeness": "For a successful *captatio benevolentiae* different devices . . . can be applied, some of the most popular being that the speaker should present his own person as acceptable to the audience, display a positive attitude towards them, assure them of his appreciation of and concern for them. Another device was to point out identity markers to stress common ground that is to affirm that they belong to the same in-group. All these devices can be illustrated from Pauline letter-opening and thanksgiving sections elsewhere [except in Galatians]."

[5] Lawton (2011) describes Hansen's (1989, 57) insights as follows: "Paul could draw from three general categories of Greco-Roman rhetoric which existed in the classical tradition: forensic, epideictic, and deliberative. Forensic rhetoric is often imagined as a courtroom address intending to defend or accuse someone concerning previous actions. Epideictic rhetoric is a spectator address intending to reinforce communal values through praise or blame. Deliberative rhetoric is a public address intending to exhort or dissuade the hearers concerning future actions . . . The ascription of genres to specific locations is best seen as illustrative rather than literal. The genres occur in a variety of settings, but the ideal models are presented here" (Lawton 2011, n.p., n. 38).

In his discussion of the figure Adam in Rom 5 and 1 Cor 15, which was used by Paul with the intent of an "ethical and social reconfiguration," Legarreta-Castillo (2014) demonstrates that many "Jewish" authors from the first century CE utilised Adam parallels with ethical implications. However, Ralph Martin and Brian Dodd (1998) point out that

> . . . the case for seeing Philippians 2:6-11 as an expression of Adam Christology is not immediately obvious. No mention is made of Adam. The case depends on the recognition of allusions to Adam and the pattern of Adam Christology as more clearly evidenced elsewhere [e.g., in Romans]. In other words, it depends on an awareness of how allusions function. (p. 75; cf. Steenburg 1990, 99; Martin 1983, 108)

In my view, such an "allusion" could be Paul's rhetorical device to "take the life of Christ as a unifying rather than a divisive example to both imitate and propose imitation" (Bryce 2012, 359). The death of Christ is an example. According to Bryce (2012, 359), Phil 2:6–11 "helps us [to see] that Christ came as the Second Adam." It "provides us one perspective of the way in which Christ's life served as a *counterpoint* to that of his *predecessor-in-the flesh*" (Bryce 2012, 359; my emphasis). For Paul, the "first Adam" metaphorically denotes the "human condition"; that is, humanness "in the condition of the *sarx*" (Cooper 1973, 246). Grundmann and Stählin (1933, 313) describe Paul's use of the Adam motif as a reference to the "Todesschicksal der Menschheit und der allgemeinen sündigen Zuständlichkeit."

The two expressions κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα highlight two ways of existence according to two aeons: the perishable human existence and the sphere of divine existence (see Jewett 2007, 103–106),[6] or, according to Friedrich Schleiermacher's aforementioned "descriptive strategy" (see footnote 3), the "supernatural-becoming-natural" (*Naturwerden des Übernatürlichen*) (see Vander Schel 2013, 11 n. 25 and his explanation of Schleiermacher's heuristic intention). This does not mean that the expression κατὰ σάρκα cannot elsewhere have the "neutral" referential meaning of "carnal(-ly)" or "flesh(-ly)" (cf. Cooper 1973, 248–249). However, in Pauline theology the κατὰ σάρκα-κατὰ πνεῦμα dialectic has a pregnant connotation, in that "[i]n Christ the divine sphere has

---

[6]   For the relevance of the dichotomy "flesh-spirit" for Paul's dichotomy "letter-spirit," see Hays (1989, 130); Boyarin (1993, 17); Holladay (2002, 165–166).

invaded the human" (Schweitzer 1985, 1004). Eduard Schweitzer (1985) formulates it as follows:

> In Rom. 1:3–4 Paul contrasts the sphere of *sárx* with that of heaven or *pneuma*. In this limited and provisional sphere Jesus is the Davidic Messiah, but the decisive thing comes in the sphere of the *pneuma* . . . [I]t indicates sphere rather than origin . . . The present aeon or cosmos may be equivalent to *sárx* (cf. 1 Cor. 2:6), but the real antithesis is between God and humanity . . . [Yet,] God's promise is the opposite of *sárx* (Rom. 9:8). In Christ the divine sphere has invaded the human. (p. 1004)

Concurring with these insights, this study aims at arguing from the perspective of rhetorical criticism that Paul's use of the "Christ Hymn" in Phil 2:6–11 can also be interpreted against the background of Adam as both *exemplum* and *contrarium*.

Already in 1946, my predecessor, Professor A. S. Geyser, in the then Faculty of Theology (Section A) at the University of Pretoria, had the insight that Pauline dialectical antinomian categories can be found in both Phil 2:6–10 and Rom 1:3–4 (see also du Toit [1992] 2007, 342). Examples are "flesh-spirit," "incarnation-resurrection," and "humiliation-elevation" (see Van Aarde 1992, 159–182; Geyser 1946, 186–190).[7] Others, like Oscar Cullmann, share this insight. In his work, *Christologie des Neuen Testaments* ([1957] 1963a), Cullmann said (my English translation): "All the statements of Phil 2:6ff. are to be understood from the standpoint of the Old Testament history of Adam" (Cullmann 1963b, 181; cf. Schaudarff 1988, 112).[8]

Recently, in October 2010, I discovered that members of the "Paul Seminar" of the Westar Institute also read the "Christ Hymn" in Philippians in light of the Letter to the Romans.[9] Jesus Seminar colleagues, such as Arthur Dewey, Roy Hoover, Lane McGaughy and Daryl Schmidt

---

[7] For this exegesis, Geyser faced a heresy charge and had to vacate his position at the University of Pretoria in 1961. It was alleged that Geyser denied the two-natures Christology of orthodox creedal Christianity (see Van Aarde, De Villiers and Buitendag 2014).

[8] Héring (1936, 196–209), even before Cullmann's *Christologie*, held a similar opinion in terms of Philonic Judaism. So did Dunn ([1980] 1996, 114–121) and O'Brien (1991, 196), among others, after Cullmann.

[9] Although it could be "anachronistic to consider the letter [Romans] as Paul's final word on his work" (Dewey et al. 2010, 201), given his future mission to Spain, Romans remains, according to me, chronologically the last letter of Paul that we have.

(2010), were informed about the Adam motif in Phil 2 by colleagues in the Context Group, such as John Elliott (unpublished chart, quoted by Bruce Malina and John Pilch 1999, 307). With regard to the "Christ Hymn" in Phil 2:6–11, Dewey et al. (2010, 194–195) point to similar terminology in the Hymn and the stories in Genesis of the creation and the fall of Adam. Adam, created in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26–27), succumbs to the serpent's suggestion that, "if he asserted himself, he would become equal to God (Gen 3:5)" (Dewey et al. 2010, 194). This study would like to demonstrate that if the similarity in language between the Hymn and the Genesis passages is taken into account, the "Christ Hymn" can also be read as contrasting the first and second Adams. Paul emphasises this contrast in Rom 5:12–14 and 1 Cor 15:21–23, 45–50.

The similarities and contrasts between the first and second Adams reflected in the "Christ Hymn" can be outlined as follows (Dewey et al. 2010, 195):[10]

First Adam	**Second Adam**
▪ bearing the image of God	▪ bearing the image of God
▪ regarded as being like God	▪ not regarded as being like God
▪ a position used for his own advantage	▪ a position not used for his own advantage
▪ asserted himself with vain pretension	▪ rid himself of vain pretension
▪ rejected his lot as a servant	▪ accepted his lot as a servant
▪ exalted himself	▪ humbled himself
▪ disobedience led to his death	▪ obedience to death, even death by crucifixion [[11]]
▪ being condemned by God	▪ being exalted by God
▪ being cast out of paradise	▪ being named lord of all

In the publication of the Westar Institute, *The Authentic Letters of Paul: A New Reading of Paul's Rhetoric and Meaning*, Dewey et al. (2010, 196) conclude that the structure and language of the passage show that the "author did not intend to speak about the descent and ascent of a

---

[10] The outline is cited from Dewey et al. (2010, 195), and taken over from J. H. Elliott in Malina and Pilch (1999, 307).

[11] Although the "Christ Hymn" is pre-Pauline, the words "even death by crucifixion" are Paul's addition to a hymn that originally consisted of six strophes of three lines each (see Lohmeyer 1927–1928).

divine being, but about the exemplary earthly life of Jesus as a human being." God exalted Jesus as the second Adam because his exemplary life was a remedy for the failure of the first Adam.

My contribution in this article is to read Paul's Letter to the Romans in conjunction with Phil 2:6–11 (a section in the so-called letter fragment 2)[12] because of the quote from Isa 45 in the LXX that appears in both of these letters.[13] With regard to the "Christ Hymn" in Phil 2:6–11, the Isaiah quote represents Paul's addition to the Hymn, together with his use of Christ Jesus's "cruciform exemplary obedience." The example relates to the conquering of death by "transforming" the "first Adam" into the "second Adam." The attachment of the quote to the Hymn endorses Paul's use of the Adam motif, similarly to his use of the motif in Rom 5:12–14 and 1 Cor 15:21–23, 45–50.

3   The *Inventio*

The *inventio*, according to Johannes Vorster (2009), is

> . . . the archaeological phase . . . the foundational phase, considering how the issue at stake (the *res*) can be given expression (the *verba*) . . . This process does not lie at hand readily . . . [but is] concealed, not only by centuries of copied editions, of printing, of collecting in volumes, but also because the finished product . . . hides this initial phase. (p. 519)

In this section, I aim to explore the use of Isa 45:21b–23[LXX] (my translation) in both the "Christ Hymn" (Phil 2:10–11) and in the Letter to the Romans (14:11):

> I am just;
> Only I bring salvation;
> Out of my mouth comes divine justice;
> Before me every knee will bow;
> By me every tongue will swear.

---

[12] The "Letter" to the Philippians consists of different fragments that originated in different rhetorical situations: Letter 1: 4:10–20; Letter 2: 1:1–3:1a; 4:4–9, 21–23; Letter 3: 3:1b–4:3 (see Dewey et al. 2010, 171–173).

[13] In Philippians, Isa 45:23b[LXX] appears: ". . . with only a slight transition (πᾶσα γλῶσσα appearing before ἐξομολογήσεται, as also in Phil 2:11). In Phil 2:11 the allusion is to the submission of the entire cosmos to God's acknowledgment of the Lordship of Christ" (Byrne 1966, 414 n. 11).

In both the Letter to the Philippians and the Letter to the Romans, Paul uses highly sophisticated rhetoric to portray the "first Adam"-"second Adam" contrast as both an *exemplum* and a *contrarium* in order to address everyday *topoi*. In Philippians, it is about relationships with one another. Paul is concerned about the disunity in the *ecclēsia,* especially between the two women, Euodia and Syntyche (Phil 4:2). In Rom 14, he addresses everyday issues like diet and the calendar, which are also mentioned in 1 Cor 8 and 10:23–32. He provides two arguments: (1) that, as long as the glory of the Lord is not compromised (Rom 14:1–12), believers are not judged on what they eat or do not eat; and (2) that believers should not offend fellow believers and cause them to stumble (Rom 12:22). The golden rule is that anything that does not originate in faith is unacceptable (Rom 12:23).

Such virtue politics presume a "manner [of life]" (πολιτεύω) worthy of the gospel of Christ (Phil 1:27) (NIV, in Aland et al. 2015, 1307). It is a "Christ-like life," a "cruciform life" (cf. Rosell Nebrada 2011, 230). It presupposes the sharing of values even if these values, paradoxically, seem to imply a loss of honour.

Paul therefore creates a parallel between his own "mature mindset" (ὅσοι οὖν τέλειοι, τοῦτο φρονῶμεν, Phil 3:15), which should be imitated (καθὼς ἔχετε τύπον ἡμᾶς, Phil 3:17),[14] and the "cruciform life" described in the "Christ Hymn" (cf. Holloway 2001, 29): "have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus" (Phil 2:5, ESV; τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Aland et al. [2012] 2014, 606). Such a cruciform life manifests in everydayness, also in cultural matters such as diet. It is a life that takes the presence of sacredness amidst everydayness for granted. It presupposes confidence in what is transcendent and not immanent. A non-cruciform life implies confidence in what is a loss without existential gain (Phil 3:7). In such an inauthentic life, "minds are set on earthly things" and "their god is the belly" (ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία, Phil 3:19)—similar to those who fought a futile war because their confidence was built upon a self-created god (Isa 45:20–25). Such a life makes people "enemies of the cross of Christ" (Phil 3:18). They should rather want to be

---

[14] To regard those things "from the flesh" (ἐν σαρκί) in which he once had confidence (ἔχων πεποίθησιν) (Phil 3:4)—because they are allegedly in accordance to a righteousness that comes from the law (ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου) (Phil 3:9), such as circumcision as a social-religious identity marker, calendar requirements or ethnic tribalism (Phil 3:5)—as "garbage" (σκύβαλα) (Phil 3:8), is to think maturely, because this is the way God wants it (Phil 3:15).

part of a "commonwealth" (τὸ πολίτευμα), which "is constituted in heaven" (ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει, Phil 3:20).[15]

According to Grieb (2007, 263), "we can see how Christian [*sic*] beliefs in God and God's relationship to the world become embedded for Paul in specific social attitudes and political actions." In other words, we are shown the socio-political consequences implied by a "theology of the cross" (Rosell Nebrada 2011, 250–251 nn. 89, 94). To seek earthly things in order to gain a good life, without seeking justice towards others and devoid of a divinely inspired spirituality, is tantamount to not seeking the living God. Such an ethos can be regarded as a form of idolatry, because it is not based on the righteousness of God (see, e.g., Rom 10:3; cf. 1 Thess 1:9; Phil 2:11; Rom 14:11; see Van Aarde 2014, 133–150).

Teresa J. Hornsby (2001, 219–232, 225, 231), in an essay titled "Paul and the Remedies of Idolatry: Reading Romans 1:18–24 with Romans 7," sees the sacrifice of the crucifixion as the remedy to the idolatry that is constituted by people's failure to connect with God. Access to God is gained by means of the sacrifice of the crucifixion. In this way, the sacred and the flesh can connect.

For Paul, to seek a good life in things that are of creation, to seek happiness in what is human, in human behaviour and human rules, constitutes idolatry. It is a selfish life. It is about self-preservation. The "I" is at the centre of such an existence, which Paul calls self-righteousness (Rom 10:3) and a futile existence. This is an existence reigned by "the law"; that is, a manner of life governed by the "Jewish" law's "exclusivist, national tendencies"[16]—however, not in an essentialist way, as if cultural conventions ended on account of Jesus's death (cf. Eisenbaum 2005, 235). Yet, if immanent cultural conventions rule one's life, such a life is destined to death (Elliott 2006, 232). Immanence ought to be transcended by an ethos that is ruled by the Spirit of God. Donald Goercen (1995, 68) puts it this way (emphasis original): "This is to say that, for Paul, death is largely, if not basically, an *ethical* problem, a matter of setting one's mind on the things of the flesh so as to walk (i.e., live, *peripatousin*) *kata sarka*" (cf. Bryce 2012, 366; Black 1984, 426–427). In Phil 2:11 and Rom 14:11, Paul builds his argument on Isa 45:23–25[LXX].

---

[15] Perkins (1991, 89–104) interprets Paul's understanding of the "politics of God in heaven" as an apology against the emperor cult.

[16] However, it does not mean that the Torah *in toto* advocates exclusivism or nationalism—to use rather anachronistic social-cultural categories.

With regard to the expression in Isa 45^LXX, "saying that justice and honour will be his" (λέγων δικαιοσύνη καὶ δόξα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἥξουσιν), and its application by Paul in Romans, Byrne (1966, 410–411) comments: "The all-determining relationship to the Lord means that, as 'slaves', we are accountable to him and to him alone." With regard to the issues of tolerance of the "weak in faith," "eating and non-eating," "judging one day more significant than others" (Rom 14:10–12) and "resolving conflict among fellow-believers" (Phil 1:27–30), Byrne (1966, 410–411) states: "Paul reinforces [Christology stated in eschatological form] with a quotation from Isa 45:23. The text triumphantly proclaims the coming submission of all creation to the rule of Israel's God. It appears, with a more explicitly christological reference, in the final stanza of the Hymn in Phil 2:6–11."

Referring to the quotation of the Hebrew text of Isa 45:23 in Rom 14:11 and Phil 2:10–11, Westermann ([1966] 1969, 176) says: "No violence is done to the subject-matter and both citations strictly adhere to the sense of the original."[17] The Hebrew version (Elliger and Rudolph [1967; 1977] 1984, 747) is as follows (my English paraphrase):

- "and they pray to a god who cannot save" (Isa 45:20c);
- "and there are no other gods because of my sovereignty" (v. 21c);
- "there is no just and saving [god] besides me" (v. 21d);
- "there is no other" (v. 22c);
- "because all knees will bow before me" (v. 23c);
- "each tongue will confess" (v. 23c);
- "in Yahweh, all of Israel's seed enjoy justice and joy" (v. 25).

The Septuagint version (Hatch and Redpath [1897] 1954, 185–186) reads as follows (my translation):

- "I am the God, and no one else" (ἐγὼ ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος, Isa 45:21);
- "I swear by myself" (κατ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ὀμνύω, v. 23);

---

[17] The setting of Isa 45:20–25 is that of a court scene. The assembled Babylonians, as the so-called "survivors of the nations" (פְּלִיטֵי הַגּוֹיִם), are belittled, because they fought a futile war. They trusted their own human power and relied on the self-made idols created from wood by themselves. Instead, they should have known that there is no other god besides the God of Israel to whom every tongue swears and to whom every knee bows (cf. Westermann [1966] 1969, 174–176).

- "righteousness shall ensue from my mouth" (ἦ μὴν ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου δικαιοσύνη, v. 23);
- "my word will not be revoked" (οἱ λόγοι μου οὐκ ἀποστραφήσονται, v. 23);
- "for every knee will bow before me" (ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ, v. 23);
- "and every tongue will confess to God" (καὶ ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα τῷ θεῷ, v. 23);
- "saying that justice and honour will be his" (λέγων δικαιοσύνη καὶ δόξα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἥξουσι, v. 24);
- "this means: all who separated themselves [from God] will be ashamed" (καὶ[18] αἰσχυνθήσονται πάντες οἱ ἀφορίζοντες,[19] v. 24);
- "They will be justified by the Lord, and in God the whole generation of Israel will be glorified" (ἀπὸ κυρίου δικαιωθήσονται, καὶ ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἐνδοξασθήσονται πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ).

The Septuagint rendition of the text emphasises absolute loyalty to the only true living God. Against this background, Paul remarks in Rom 14:12: "so each of us will give an account of ourselves to God."[20] According to Jewett (2007, 852), the "clause λόγον δώσει ('give account') is a technical expression from the administrative realm of accounting books for audit" (Bauer and Danker [BAGD] [1949–1952], 1957, 478). In this way, Paul blends good theology with everyday matters. This kind of spirituality can be described as *transcendence in everydayness*.

In the Letter to the Romans and in the "Christ Hymn" in Philippians, the application of the "first Adam" and the "second Adam" as *paradeigma-contrarium* is a rhetorical device that is used to serve as an *exemplum* of the "death/resurrection of the old/new human being." According to O'Brien (1991, 196), the *first Adam-second Adam contrast* is a familiar one (cf. Rom 5:18–19; 1 Cor 15:45–47): whereas the *first Adam* was created in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26–27), Christ, the *second Adam*, existed in the image of God (Phil 2:6). However, the

---

[18] The grammatical construction should be understood as a *kai epexegeticus*.

[19] The Greek word ἀφορίζω is translated as "separate" (cf. Arndt and Gingrich ([1952] 1957, 126). The word used in Hebrew refers to "ransom pay" (cf. Koehler and Baumgartner 1958, 751), but can also have the connotation of "all who rage against him" (cf. Elliger and Rudolph [1967; 1977] 1984, 747). רחז refers to "snorting like a horse"; i.e., metaphorically, "being against" him (cf. Koehler and Baumgartner 1958, 609).

[20] NIV, in Aland et al. (2015, 1079).

intention of the creators of the *Carmen Christi* ("the Hymn of Christ") was not to formulate ontological propositions about the relationship between God and Christ. Dewey et al. (2010) put it as follows:

> The structure of the passage together with its idiomatic, allusive, and celebrative (not literal) language indicate that its author did not intend to speak about the descent and ascent of a divine being, but about the exemplary earthly life of Jesus as a human being. God endorsed that exemplary life by raising Jesus on high as the Second Adam, who represents the remedy for the failure of the First Adam. (p. 196)

4   The *Dispositio*

The *dispositio* is about the arrangement of arguments. Vorster (2009, 525–526) points out that sometimes "the arrangement of material was seen as part of the *inventio*, since each section of the speech requires its own discovery of arguments or tactical aids." In this concluding section of the article, I would like to elucidate the motif "first Adam" and "second Adam" in light of Paul's usage of the expressions κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα. The "first Adam" was about being a slave of sin; that is, to exist κατὰ σάρκα, destined to failure, corruption and transiency (Kuss 1963, 507–508). Jesus himself cast off his κατὰ σάρκα existence, and put on and passed on his κατὰ πνεῦμα existence (Rom 1:1–5).

The core of this "Pauline Christology" is to be found in the "Christ Hymn" and in the apotheosis declaration of Rom 1:3–4:

> The gospel is about God's son, who, as a mortal human being (κατὰ σάρκα), was born from the seed of David; at the same time, he was destined to be the son of God Jesus Christ, our Kyrios— and this by virtue of God's power in the spirit of holiness (κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης), as a result of his resurrection from the dead. (my own "interpretative" paraphrase)

In Phil 2, Paul quotes the "pre-Pauline Adamic tradition" in the Christ Hymn (Marcus 2003, 51) and uses Isa 45[LXX] to refine his theology. Deutero-Isaiah stresses that gods made by human beings are but images. The images are dead and can accomplish nothing, but God is alive and can save people. Those who are true remain close to God and depend on God. To bow before God implies loyalty. Paul's addition to the pre-Pauline

"Christ Hymn" is the aspect of the "cruciform life" of Christ, which, in terms of the Isaiah quotation, consists of a life of absolute obedience to God, a tongue that confesses God and a knee that bows before God and before no one else. Christ transformed himself from a "first Adam" into a "second Adam." Rhetorically seen, the "first Adam" lives κατὰ σάρκα, and the "second Adam" κατὰ πνεῦμα. In this way, Jesus paved the way for human beings to God. The "first Adam" died, and the "second Adam" was resurrected. According to Stott (1996), what was crucified along with Christ was

> . . . not my lower self, but my former self . . . not a part of us called our old nature, but the whole of us as we were before we were converted. My "old self" is my pre-conversion life, my unregenerate self. This should be plain because in this chapter the phrase "our old self was crucified" (verse 6) is equivalent to "we . . . died to sin (verse 2)." (p. 45)[21]

For Greg Herrick (1999), in his article, "'Old Man' and 'New Man' in Paul," the "old man" is a web of relationships that were part of the old life "in Adam." According to him, Rom 5:12–21 anticipates 6:1–14, where Paul connects the sin of Adam to that of human beings.[22] The crucifixion of the "old man" means death to sin and the end of the old life in Adam.

This *exemplum-contrarium* argument in Rom 5 is linked to the ethics implied in Rom 6. The paragraph begins with a rhetorical but very practical question: "Should we continue in sin?" (Rom 6:1, my translation). The use of the subjunctive mode of ἐπιμένωμεν ("remain in sin") expresses a rhetorical "ought not." With regard to Rom 1:3–4, Andrie du Toit ([1992] 2007, 239–248) points out that it should not be read "in terms of a two-nature Christology." That would be anachronistic. To me, the parallelism, with the resurrection of Jesus mentioned in the second member, indicates a kind of "self-transformation," a dynamic spiritual transition from one state to another. According to Paul's conception, the resurrection of Jesus could be seen as an act of obedience being "recompensed" by God. This includes the "seating" of Christ Jesus honourably in the presence of God—as if "lost paradise" is regained.

---

[21] With regard to expressions such as "old nature" and "new nature," see Dockery (1992, 628).

[22] Cf. Kreitzer (1992, 11): "we could even summarize Paul's understanding of Christian redemption as the transition from being 'in Adam' to being 'in Christ' as the saving movement from one sphere of life, one realm of existence, to another."

Isaiah 45:20–25 provides the "spiritual language" of a "heavenly court scene," where righteousness triumphs over unrighteousness.

In the *ecclēsia* of "Christ-followers," the "politics of the heavenly πολίτευμα" should be modelled after the values of Jesus, which are the values of God. The implication of not being the image of God is to be a worshipper of idols. According to Isa 45, an idolater cannot be a bearer of the image of God.

5   Resumé

Rhetorically, for Paul, the figure Adam serves as both a *paradeigma* and as a *contrarium*. This article argues that this rhetorical technique occurs not only in Rom 5:12–14—the *locus classicus* for Paul's usage of the Adam-motif (see inter alia Legarreta-Castillo 2014)—but also in the "Christ Hymn" in Phil 2:6–11. In metaphorical terms, the "old" humankind depicted in Adam as *contrarium* is the pre-converted "sinner" who lives κατὰ σάρκα. The "new" humankind depicted in the Adam metaphor as *paradeigma* is the regenerated or resurrected "righteous" one who lives κατὰ πνεῦμα. This rhetorical oxymoron is explained in terms of Paul's emphasis on a spirituality of "transcendence in everydayness."

Bibliography

Aland, B., K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini and B. M. Metzger, eds. [2012] 2014. *Novum Testamentum Graece, Based on the Work of Eberhard and Erwin Nestle*, 28th ed., 3d corrected printing. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

_____, eds. 2015. *The Greek-English New Testament.* UBS 5th rev. ed. and NIV. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Arndt, W. F., and F. W. Gingrich. [1952] 1957. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 4th rev. ed., amended 1952. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bauer, W., and F. W. Danker, eds. [1949–1952] 1957. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [BAGD].

Black, C. 1984. Pauline Perspectives on Death in Romans 5–8. *JBL* 103(3):413–433.

Boyarin, D. 1993. Review Article: The Subversion of the Jews: Moses's Veil and the Hermeneutics of Supersession. *Diacritics* 23(2):16–35. Online: http://www.jstor .org/stable/465314.

Bradley, D. G. 1953. The *Topos* as a Form in the Pauline Paraenesis. *JBL* 72:238–246.

Breytenbach, C., and D. S. du Toit, eds. 2007. *Focusing on Paul: Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians*. Berlin: de Gruyter [BZNW 51].

Brunt, J. C. 1985. More on the *Topos* as a New Testament Form. *JBL* 104(3):495–500.

Bryce, R. 2012. Christ as Second Adam: Girardian Mimesis Redeemed. *New Blackfriars* 93(1045):358–370. Online: http://www.jstor.org/stable/43251628.

Byrne, B. 1966. *Romans*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press [SP 6].

Clements, K. 1987. *Friedrich Schleiermacher: Pioneer of Modern Theology*. London: Collins.

Cooper, E. J. 1973. Sarx and Sin in Pauline Theology. *Laval théologique et philosophique* 29(3):243–255.

Cullmann, O. [1957] 1963a. *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*. 3d ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

_____. 1963b. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Translated by S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall. Revised version. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Dewey, A. J., R. W. Hoover, L. C. McGaughy and D. D. Schmidt. 2010. *The Authentic Letters of Paul: A New Reading of Paul's Rhetoric and Meaning*. Salem: Polebridge.

Dockery, D. S. 1992. New Nature and Old Nature. Pages 628–629 in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Edited by G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin and D. G. Reid. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Dunn, J. D. G. [1980] 1996. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Du Toit, A. B. 1992. Alienation and Re-Identification as Pragmatic Strategies in Galatians. *Neot* 26(2):279–295.

_____. [1992] 2007. Romans 1:3–4 and the Gospel Tradition: A Reassessment of the Phrase κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης. Pages 239–248 in *Focusing on Paul: Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians*. Edited by C. Breytenbach and D. S. du Toit. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Eisenbaum, P. 2005. Paul, Polemics, and the Problem of Essentialism. *BibInt* 13(2):224–238.

Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph [1967; 1977] 1984. *Biblica Herbraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Elliott, N. 2006. *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Geyser, A. S. 1946. Teksverbeteringe van die Afrikaanse Bybel. *HvTSt* 29(4):186–190.

Goercen, D. 1995. *Jesus, Son of God, Son of Mary, Immanuel*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Grieb, A. K. 2007. Philippians and the Politics of God. *Int* 61(3):256–269.

Grundmann, W., and G. Stählin. 1933. ἁμαρτία. Pages 267–320 in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Volume 1. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Hansen, G. W. 1989. *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts*. Sheffield: JSOT Press [JSNTSup 29].

Hatch, E., and H. A. Redpath, assisted by other scholars. [1897] 1954. *Concordance to the Septuagint and other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, Volume 1: A-I. Graz: Akademische Druck- U. Verlagsanstalt.

Hays, R. B. 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Héring, J. 1936. Kyrios Anthropos. *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 16:196–209.

Herrick, G. 1999. "Old Man" and "New Man" in Paul. Cited 9 September 2011. Online: http://www.bible.org/article/"old-man"-and-"new-man"-paul. Biblical Studies Press.

Holladay, C. R. 2002. Authentic Ministry: 2 Corinthians 2.14–6.10. *Leaven* 10(4/3). Cited 21 July 2018. Online: http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/leaven/vol10/iss4/3.

Holloway, P. A. 2001. *Consolation in Philippians: Philosophical Sources and Rhetorical Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [SNTSMS 112].

Hornsby, T. J. 2001. Paul and the Remedies of Idolatry: Reading Romans 1:18–24 with Romans 7. Pages 219–232 in *Postmodern Interpretations of the Bible: A Reader*. Edited by A. K. M. Adam. St. Louis: Chalice.

Jewett, R. 2007. *Romans: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress [Hermeneia].

Koehler, L., and W. Baumgartner, eds. 1958. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Leiden: Brill.

Kreitzer, L. J. 1992. Adam and Christ. Pages 524–526 in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Edited by G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin and D. G. Reid. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Kuss, O. 1963. *Der Römerbrief*, 1. Lieferung. Regensburg: Pustet.

Lawton, A. M. 2011. Toward Placing Galatians 2:11–14 within Its Forensic Rhetorical Context. *Encounter* 4(1). Cited 4 September 2011. Online: https://www.agts.edu/encounter/articles/2007_fall/lawton.htm.

Legarreta-Castillo, F. De Jesus. 2014. *The Figure of Adam in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15: The New Creation and Its Ethical and Social Reconfigurations*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Lohmeyer, E. 1927–1928. *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2:5–11*. Heidelberg: Sitzungberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaft.

Malina, B. J., and J. J. Pilch. 1999. *Social Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Marcus, J. 2003. Son of Man as Son of Adam. *Revue Biblique* 110(1):38–61.

Martin, P., and B. J. Dodd. 1998. *Where Christology Began: Essays on Philippians 2*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Martin, R. 1983. *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2.5–11 in Recent Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

O'Brien, P. T. 1991. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Perkins, P. 1991. Philippians: Theology for the Heavenly Politeuma. Pages 89–104 In *Pauline Theology, Volume 1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon*. Edited by I. M. Bassler. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Resch, D. 2012. *Barth's Interpretation of the Virgin Birth: A Sign of Mystery*. Burlington: Ashgate [Barth Studies].

Rosell Nebrada, S. 2011. *Christ Identity: A Social-Scientific Reading of Philippians 2.5–11*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht [FRLANT 240].

Schaudarff, K.-H. 1988. *"Heil als Geschichte": Die Frage nach dem heilsgeschichtliche Denken, dargestellt an Hand der Konzeption Oscar Cullmanns*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Schleiermacher, F. D. E. [1821–1822; 1830–1831] 1999. *The Christian Faith*. Translated by H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Schweitzer, E. [1964] 1985. *Sárx* [flesh, body], *sarkikós* [fleshly, earthly], *sárkinos* [fleshly, fleshy]: The Greek World. Pages 1001–1007 in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament: Abridged in One Volume*. Edited by G. F. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Steenburg, D. 1990. The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God. *JSNT* 39:95–109.

Stott, J. R. W. 1996. *Men Made New: An Exposition of Romans 5–8*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Van Aarde, A. G. 1992. A S Geyser: Teologiese dosent 1946–1961. *HvThS* 48(1&2):159–182.

———. 2014. Righteousness*: Paul and Matthew. Pages 133–150 in *Sensitivity towards Outsiders: Exploring the Dynamic Relationship between Mission and Ethics in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. Edited by J. Kok, T. Nicklas, D. T. Roth and C. M. Hays. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck [WUNT 2.364].

Van Aarde, A. G., P. G. R. de Villiers and J. Buitendag. 2014. The Forgotten Struggle of Albert Geyser against Racism and Apartheid. *HvThS* 70(1): 10 pages. Online: http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v70i1.2820.

Vander Schel, K. M. 2013. *Embedded Grace: Christ, History, and the Reign of God in Schleiermacher's Dogmatics*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Vorster, J. N. 2009. *Rhetorical Criticism*. Pages 505–578 in *Focusing on the Message: New Testament Hermeneutics, Exegesis and Methods*. Edited by A. B. du Toit. Pretoria: Protea.

Vos, J. S. 1994. Paul's Argumentation in Galatians 1–2. *HTR* 87(1):1–16.

Westermann, C. [1966] 1969. *Isaiah 40–66: A Commentary*. London: SCM [OTL].

andries.vanaarde@up.ac.za
Private Bag X20, Hatfield 0028, Pretoria, South Africa