

Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser
udgivet af
Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab
Bind **41**, nr. 4

Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. **41**, no. 4 (1966)

AN ANCIENT MISUNDERSTANDING

(Phil. 2,6 'robbery')

BY

L. L. HAMMERICH



København 1966

Kommissionær: Munksgaard

DET KONGELIGE DANSKE VIDENSKABERNES SELSKAB udgiver følgende publikationsrækker:

THE ROYAL DANISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND LETTERS *issues the following series of publications:*

	<i>Bibliographical Abbreviation</i>
Oversigt over Selskabets Virksomhed (8°) <i>(Annual in Danish)</i>	Overs. Dan. Vid. Selsk.
Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser (8°)	Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk.
Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter (4°) <i>(History, Philology, Philosophy, Archeology, Art History)</i>	Hist. Filos. Skr. Dan. Vid. Selsk.
Matematisk-fysiske Meddelelser (8°)	Mat. Fys. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk.
Matematisk-fysiske Skrifter (4°) <i>(Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology)</i>	Mat. Fys. Skr. Dan. Vid. Selsk.
Biologiske Meddelelser (8°)	Biol. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk.
Biologiske Skrifter (4°) <i>(Botany, Zoology, General Biology)</i>	Biol. Skr. Dan. Vid. Selsk.

Selskabets sekretariat og postadresse: Dantes Plads 5, København V.

The address of the secretariate of the Academy is:

*Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab,
Dantes Plads 5, Köbenhavn V, Denmark.*

Selskabets kommissionær: MUNKSGAARD's Forlag, Prags Boulevard 47,
København S.

The publications are sold by the agent of the Academy:

MUNKSGAARD, Publishers,
47 Prags Boulevard, Köbenhavn S, Denmark.

Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser
udgivet af
Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab
Bind **41**, nr. 4

Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. **41**, no. 4 (1966)

AN ANCIENT MISUNDERSTANDING

(Phil. 2,6 'robbery')

BY

L. L. HAMMERICH



København 1966

Kommissionær: Munksgaard

CONTENTS

	Page
I. Personal Background	3
II. Difficulties and Misunderstandings	6
III. Translators and Commentators	9
IV. A New Interpretation of ἀρπαγμός	14
V. The Mystical Experience	21
VI. New Translations Proposed	24
VII. Some Exegetic Remarks	27
Acknowledgements	33
Bibliography	34
Notes	35

I. Personal Background

The teens are among the most important years in the life of a man. During these years (exactly 1905–13) I lived mainly in Roskilde, then a small town of 8000 inhabitants, 18 miles west of Copenhagen. My father had the title of Burgomaster, but fulfilled a manysided function; he was Chairman of the Town Council, Leader of the Civil Administration, Chief Constable, and Judge, in criminal as well as civil cases. He was, in fact, the representative of the absolute King. Danish absolutism had been officially abolished in 1849, but died hard.

In Lutheran Denmark the King is the head of the State Church. The Cathedral of Roskilde, where the Danish kings are still buried, is one of the most important church buildings of the country. On the north side of the first floor at the upper side of the pulpit, well above the ground floor for the congregation, there is a richly ornamented enclosure for the King and the Royal Family. And on the right hand of that, there was the pew of the representative of the King, the Burgomaster and his house.

Since the King had no residence in Roskilde, the Royal Family appeared very seldom, but it would not have been convenient, if the pew of his representative had been empty at the morning service on Sundays: the Burgomaster and, if possible, his family were expected to attend this dignified service.

My parents were, indeed, all their life fervent church-goers, and to accompany them was for their children a filial duty, which was not too much resented. Church-going was one of the cherished parts of the rhythm of life; it was a pleasure, on these Sunday mornings, to meet the school mates of the week. From the Burgomaster's pew the view of the cathedral was splendid. The sermons were, as sermons are, boring for the boy, sometimes arousing interest in the adolescent, sometimes opposition. The

liturgical part of the service was fine: the organ-player was a well-known composer, and the leader of the choir, the cantor, was a gifted musician. It was always exciting what hymns were chosen; the song rolled majestically through the vaults; and a study of the hymns contributed highly to an understanding of poetry in general.

Very solemn parts of the service were the moments when the congregation rose to listen to the text of the Bible being read by the clergyman, either intoned from the altar or being pronounced in his ordinary voice from the pulpit. The words of the Gospel, at the same time so high and so human, never failed to make a deep impression.

Great parts of the Old Testament were even looked up voluntarily as favourite reading during the week.

But when these words were heard: 'Denne hellige Lektie skriver Apostelen Paulus': 'This holy lesson was written by Paul the Apostle', the boy, the young man, revolted. He did not understand it, the sense of the words was mostly obscure, sometimes seemed directly repulsive. Syntax and word-order were abominable, the style inflated.

E.g. Phil. 3, 12 'Ikke at jeg har allerede grebet det, eller er allerede fuldkommen; men jeg jager derefter, om jeg dog kan gribe det, efterdi jeg og er greben af Christus Jesus.' This is the Danish translation used in my youth; but it does not differ essentially from the modern one of 1948, nor from the English Authorized Version: 'Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus.' – Or take the passage which is to occupy us more intensely, Phil. 2, 5–8: 'Thi det samme Sindelag være i Eder, som og var i Christus Jesus, hvilken, der han var i Guds Skikkelse, ikke holdt det for et Rov at være Gud lig; men han forringede sig selv, idet han tog en Tjeners Skikkelse paa og blev Mennesker lig; og da han var funden i Skikkelse som et Menneske, fornødrede han sig selv, saa han blev lydige indtil Døden, ja Korsets Død.' In the Authorized Version: 'Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was

made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.'

Enigma upon enigma! I shall not expatiate on the whole series of riddles (which are not always the same in the English as in the Danish version): the worst one is indubitably: 'ikke holdt det for et *rov* at være Gud lig', 'thought it not *robbery* to be equal with God'. I remember very distinctly, how, as a big boy, I found it non-sensical, revolting, disgusting to assign to the Son of God the idea of thinking His equality with God robbery – even if this was expressed only to be denied. I ventured to ask one of my teachers, and the imposing Provost of the Cathedral himself, but I do not remember what they answered, for I could not for one moment believe in their artificial and distorted explanations.

I left it at that. And it was the same in the case of other sayings of Paul.¹ In a puerile way I took a deep dislike to this apostle. And it was a great satisfaction, when I heard the Headmaster of our school, the fine humanist Adam Gottlob Oehlen-schläger Hauch – son of a noble poet of the nineteenth century, godson of the prince of Danish classical poets – reporting that Leo X had warned his cardinals not to read too much of the writings of Paul, because his style was so bad. A. G. Ø. Hauch had himself imbued us with admiration of this Pope, who was of the art-loving family of the Medici. Even if the Headmaster seemed somewhat scandalized at the frivolous attitude of the *servus servorum dei*, I adhered enthusiastically to the opinion of Pope Leo, the adept of the ideals of Antiquity. For some years I did not voluntarily read a single line of Paul.

Those are personal remarks, of no reputation. But it is no use trying to conceal that, even if the style of Paul is sometimes easy, as in everyday letters, and sometimes borne by high enthusiasm, it is more often than not rather tortuous, in accordance with a knotty trend of thoughts. This is partly due to his being Jew and Greek more than a harmoniously Hellenized Jew. What a difference between on the one hand his Epistle to the Christianized Jews in Rome and on the other, his Epistle (II) to the Christianized Greeks of Corinth or his Epistle to Timothy!

Paul does not fare too well, if a classical philologist and lover

of Greek philosophy starts scrutinizing him.² And there is no doubt that he has been boring or, at best, perplexing to thousands of open-minded boys – and to very many adults, too.

II. Difficulties and Misunderstandings

If I had decided to let Paul alone, he did not let me alone, and he found three approaches. (1) In 1911 I started studying philology, especially German philology. After a couple of years I was rather fascinated by the personality of young Martin Luther – and impressed to see the strong influence which some of the Epistles of Paul had exerted upon him. In his early writings, Luther depended more upon the familiar Latin Bible than upon the new Greek text, prepared by Erasmus. I familiarized myself with a fair part of the Vulgate – no philologist should deprive himself of this pleasure – and in reading Paul, I often found it useful to compare the Greek and Latin texts, in order to arrive at an exact explanation of Luther's quotations. Such comparisons of texts became imperative when, in 1919, I started University teaching of German philology.

(2) There was another reason for reading the Bible in this way, viz. the duty to teach Gothic, and the fact that the great majority of the Gothic texts preserved consist of Wulfila's excellent translation of the New Testament from Greek into his mother tongue.

In most cases it is rather easy to grasp the meaning of the Gothic text, especially so in the Gospels. But sometimes it is difficult, namely – no wonder! – rather often in the Epistles of Paul, parts of which have come down to us in two slightly different Gothic versions. We should bear in mind that the Greek language which young Wulfila learned to use literarily in Constantinople in the circle of St. John Chrysostom, was a couple of centuries younger than the texts of the New Testament, and half a millennium younger than the classic prose of Athens. In doubtful cases it may be very hard to determine how Wulfila understood precisely the Greek language which he mastered so well, while, on the other hand, the literary Gothic language, into which he translated "his" Greek language, and which he had elaborated himself consistently, is several centuries older than

any longer text in the other Teutonic languages, and differs considerably in such basic structures as tense and aspect, so that a comparison of a Gothic text with a parallel text in one of the other Teutonic languages may be highly misleading.

Furthermore, Wulfila was a learned man, very well versed in the Constantinopolitan theology of his time, not without knowledge of the Itala and some Latin Fathers. – There is an example of that at the end of the passage which particularly interests us. Phil. 2, 8 the Authorized Version has ‘. . . and became obedient unto death’ corresponding to the Greek γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου; but Wulfila reads ‘waurþans ufhausjands *attin* und <daurþu>’. This is in accordance with an old Latin translation ‘factus obaudiens *patri* usque ad mortem’, and has a specific dogmatic explanation, with some bearing upon Gothic Arianism.³ – And we have in the same passage another curious example of the same sort. Phil. 2, 6 Wulfila reads ‘ni wulwa rahnida wisan sik *galeiko* [adverb!] guda’, exactly corresponding to the Greek οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ, whereas the Latin Bible (both the Itala and the Vulgate) has the adjective: ‘non rapinam arbitratus est, esse se *aequalem* Deo’; the English and German translations are not conclusive. The natural meaning of *aequalem* Deo ‘like God’ = ‘the equal of God’ would certainly meet the opposition of Wulfila, remonstrating against the ὁμοσιία instead of ὁμοιουσία. His *galeiko guda* ‘like God’ is = ‘in a similar way to that of God’. We may compare Skeireins (the Gothic commentary to the Gospel of John, of which we have not the Greek original); in Chapter V ‘ni ibnon ak *galeika* swerþa’ and ‘ni ibnaleika frijaþwa ak *galeika*’ would probably be in Greek: οὐ τῆν αὐτήν ἀλλὰ ὁμοίαν τιμήν and οὐχ ὁμοσίαν ἀγάπην ἀλλὰ ὁμοίαν.⁴

Thus in the Gothic Bible, and especially within the Epistles of Paul, delicate text-problems may arise, which are hard to cope with for us Germanists, whose knowledge of Latin and Greek may be rather Shakespearian, and who are no theologians. But if we are conscientious, we cannot evade these questions, thus cannot avoid reading Paul.

(3) A third way in which Paul forces himself upon us, is common to all students of European languages and literatures: his influence has been so enormous throughout the Christian

world that quotations from Paul may crop up everywhere, mostly, of course, quite correctly, but sometimes with a bad understanding – and these cases are the interesting ones.

An example is just the word ‘robbery’, German ‘Raub’ in Phil. 2, 6. In the translation by Luther the text runs thus: ‘Jhesus Christus, welcher, ob er wol in göttlicher gestalt war, hielt ers nicht für einen Raub, Gotte gleich sein.’ Goethe quotes this in *Faust* I, 2358 f. (Hexenküche), where Mephisto says:

Leb mit dem Vieh als Vieh, und acht’ es nicht für Raub,
Den Acker, den du erntest, selbst zu düngen.

This is not, as one might perhaps immediately assume, meant as an example of how the Devil reads the Bible. For in a letter from April 29, 1798, Goethe writes correspondingly to Schiller: ‘Freund Meyer wird es auch für keinen Raub achten, zu dieser barbarischen Komposition Zeichnungen zu verfertigen.’ – Meyer is the Swiss painter, of classical observance, whom Goethe called Kunschtmeier, and the barbaric composition is just Goethe’s *Faust*.⁵

It is evident that Goethe, in real earnest, uses the phrase ‘es nicht für Raub achten / es für keinen Raub achten’ in the sense of ‘not to regard as contemptible, not to despise, not to disdain’. And it is just as evident that this cannot be the meaning, when, in Phil. 2, 6, it is said of the Son of God: . . . ‘hielt ers nicht für einen Raub, Gotte gleich sein’. Goethe has misunderstood the passage in this translation – which may give a queer sort of satisfaction to anybody who has not himself been able to attach a proper meaning to ‘thought it not robbery’.

Professor Vilhelm Andersen, of the University of Copenhagen, was, in the first half of our century, the most gifted interpreter of Danish literature. He writes somewhere:⁶ ‘Topsøe (a Danish author of the nineteenth century) holder det ikke for et Rov at skrive, at en Ting hører til en af de ejendommeligste’ = ‘thinks it not robbery to write that something belongs to one of the most peculiar things’ – a turn of style which is generally proscribed as bad. Vilh. Andersen evidently takes ‘holder det ikke for et Rov’ in the sense of ‘does not consider it illicit’, that is, he misunderstands ‘Rov, robbery’ much in the same way as Goethe did.

In the great Swedish Dictionary, Svenska Akademiens Ord-

bok över Svenska Språket, Vol. 22 (1959), 2689, there are first many examples of the phrase corresponding to 'thought it not robbery': 'icke l. ej l. inte akta för rov' used as in Phil. 2, 6, but then also a whole series of examples from 1831 till 1936 of the phrase "i annan användning" = 'in another application': 'icke hålla sig för god l. ha försyn l. dra sig l. genera sig l. blygas för (att göra ngt) l. icke försmå' = 'not to be above, not to be ashamed to, not to evade, not to be shy of, not to disdain' – that is, all in all, in Swedish the same sort of misunderstandings as with Goethe in German and with Vilh. Andersen in Danish.

I have no corresponding examples of misconceptions of the same sort in other languages, which may be my fault. But this much is clear: the meaning of the phrase 'thought it not robbery' is not self-evident; misunderstandings may easily crop up. In accepting such an expression, the congregations have followed their shepherds too meekly.

III. Translators and Commentators

Among the old translators there is consensus omnium in using words corresponding to English 'robbery' (sometimes also in the rather obsolete sense 'prey') to render the original Greek ἀρπαγμόν, acc. sg. Thus – I have partly looked the word up myself, partly good colleagues have assisted me – in the Syrian Peshitta from the second century,⁷ the Coptic translation from the second-third centuries,⁸ *rapinam* in the Itala from the third as well as in the Vulgate from the fourth century,⁹ *wulwa* (from *wilwan* 'to rob') in the Gothic Bible from the fourth century, and in fact, in all West and East and North European translations from the Middle Ages. And then, consequently, in the translations into exotic languages which were made in connection with the gigantic missionary work starting with the great discoveries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and mostly coming to a painful stop after the Second World War. One example among many hundred is the Greenland Eskimo *paggatigissatut isumaqartingilá* 'does/did not consider it like a robbery', with a derivation from the verb *paggáput* 'they fight over it'.

The medieval German translations and Luther have *raub*, the older English translations and the Authorized Version *robbery*,

the old Dutch translations and the Statenbijbel *roof*. The Huguenot French translation reads *proie*, which is not fundamentally different from ‘robbery’.

On account of the impressive claim of an imitation of Christ and on account of the inspired description of His deed of expiation, Phil. 2 – and especially 2, 5–11 – has always, in the Church of Antiquity and down to the present time, received very full comments. But it is the “liberal” theology of the nineteenth century that first carries the problems into the translations and thus before the congregations.

In the revised Danish translation of 1871, Phil. 2, 6 exhibits one of the rare explanatory remarks: there is an asterisk after ‘Rov’ and the foot-note ‘ikke bar det til Skue’ = ‘did not display it’. The idea of the commentator is perhaps that you may make a display of what you have robbed openly, not of what you have stolen secretly, and in debasing himself Christ made no display of his equality with God. Starting from the same idea, another possibility is, that the foot-note ‘ikke bar det til Skue’ is meant to refer not to ‘ikke holdt det for et Rov’ = ‘thought it not robbery’, but only to ‘holdt det for et Rov’ = ‘thought it robbery’; then the meaning would be that Christ, even in debasing himself, did not omit to display his equality with God – in accordance with the opinion that even if Jesus appeared outwardly as a man, he was at the same time God, having the divine qualities of making miracles, etc. This may in itself seem to make more sense, but the whole idea of displaying or not displaying the equality with God leads nowhere in the account of the work of the expiator – and, and: the basic repulsiveness of the idea of Christ being or not being a robber or thief remains. Many other examples of commentaries could be adduced. The merit of this one is only to underline the desperate difficulty of understanding in starting from the consensus omnium ‘robbery’.

The revised Zwingli-translation of 1931 preserves ‘hielt es nicht für einen Raub,’ but adds the explanatory note “entweder etwas, was er an sich gerissen hatte und deshalb gern festhalten möchte, oder etwas, was er an sich reißen möchte.” This note corresponds to the above-mentioned Huguenot translation ‘*proie*’, and reports the theological discussion of the preceding decades of the question whether ἀρπαγμός should mean *res rapta* or *res*

rapienda. Neither solution seems acceptable. And one might add: (1) German *Raub* means neither “was man an sich gerissen hat” nor “was man an sich reißen möchte” – without involving disagreeable qualifications, (2) when bearing not upon an animal, a child, a criminal, but upon the Son of God, the “deshalb” can hardly fail to have a comic effect.

The revised Roman Catholic translation into Dutch of 1941 reads “heeft zich niet willen vastklampen aan de gelijkheid met God” = ‘would not cling to (or: clutch at) the equality with God’, i. e. a variety of *res rapienda*.

The Waldensian translation into Italian of 1957 remarks that the passage might perhaps mean “non riputò cosa da ritenere con avidità l’essere uguale a Dio” = ‘did not consider being equal to God something to be retained with avidity (or: greediness)’. This seems to be *res rapta* as in the first alternative of the comment in the revised Zwingli-translation.¹⁰

In Sweden the State has appointed a great committee of theologians, orientalisists, and classical philologists to prepare a new translation of the whole Bible. They have i. a. made a preliminary translation of the Epistle to the Philippians, which has not yet been printed. Here 2, 6 runs: “Ehuru hans skepnad var Guds egen, räknade han inte jämtlikheten med Gud såsom något han ville hålla fast”¹¹ = ‘although his form was that of God himself, he did not consider the equality with God as something he would cling to (or: hold on by)’. “Ehuru” = ‘although’ preserves an arbitrary interpretation of Luther’s (“obgleich”). The whole is again *res rapienda*.

I must confess that a couple of years ago I had myself, without much knowledge of the world-wide theological discussions, arrived at the same result as that in the new Dutch and Swedish translations just mentioned. Starting from the basic verb ἀρπάζειν, which may mean ‘to grasp, to seize powerfully’, I thought that οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ might mean ‘he did not consider his equality with God something to cling to’. In this way the disturbing, nay, repulsive “criminality” of translations like ‘robbery’ or ‘prey’ would be avoided. But I have had to give up the idea again. For two reasons: (1) It may be seriously doubted whether the derivation ἀρπαγμός can have the sense of *res rapienda*; (2) the involved train of thoughts seems to

become curiously insignificant, futile, even insipid. Why should the Son of God consider his equality with God something not to be retained, something of slight importance? And how could this purely negative consideration be the *causa efficiens* of his great deed of expiation, starting with his assuming the form of a servant? At best, this would be the *credo quia absurdum* of Tertullian – and then we should have to give up reasoning, because one absurdity may be as good as the other.

I dived into the sea of commentaries, exploring especially the most modern ones.¹² I also ventured to approach classical philologists and Doctors of Divinity, in Denmark and in other countries, and was most kindly and helpfully received.¹³ The books I read, and the letters I got, filled me with admiration of the learning displayed, the ability of associations, the reasoning genius, but they did not convince me of the justness of any of the opinions hitherto advanced and accepted.

It seemed obvious to ask whether the difficulty of understanding should not be due to a corrupt text. Several emendations have, in fact, been proposed. Thus, as late as 1933, A. Friedrichsen, Professor of Divinity in Oslo, maintained the ingenious proposal of altering ἀρπαγμὸν into ἄρπαγμαον 'otium, ein Bereitsein', i.e. 'leisure': 'Being in the form of God, he thought it not leisure to be equal to God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon himself the form of a servant'. Again we must ask: why should the idea of equality with God as a leisure enter the mind of the Son of God only to be rejected? If equality with God was a leisure, why should he alter it? And, on the other hand, if equality with God was no leisure, but a task to be performed, how could he give up this task, in order to assume a state of non-equality with God? The train of thoughts leads nowhere. – And, above all: no emendation is admissible, if we can understand the text as it is; we shall have to try to do that first.

Starting from the assumption of the correctness of the text, one of the very best experts of the present time, C. F. D. Moule, in a letter of March 8, 1965, resumed the possible meanings of ἀρπαγμός in Phil. 2, 6 thus: "(1) The issue is really a choice between ἀρπαγμός = *res rapienda* (something not previously possessed, but subsequently to be snatched at); *res rapta* (something already possessed or gained rather than surrendered);

raptus (the act of snatching, acquisition, annexation). (2) After entertaining other opinions for many years, I am, myself, beginning to think, that ἄρπαγμός = *raptus* is (in spite of its unpopularity with exegetes) the sense which is most appropriate in the passage and nearest to the true meaning of ἄρπαγμός itself. The sense would be: “Jesus did not think that equality with God consisted in (or was a matter of) acquisition (getting, snatching, acquiring), but, on the contrary, consisted in self-giving, self-emptying, etc.””

This is an extremely clear statement, cutting through many blurred commentaries.

I should like to add that the rejection of both *res rapienda* and *res rapta* has been advocated by F. E. Vokes in a paper read 1961, printed 1964.¹⁴

Originally there was the difference between the derivations in μός and those in μα that the former should indicate the action or process of the verb, those in μα the result of the process; but they are sometimes mixed up. Thus we have in the New Testament both the rare βαπτισμός and the common βάπτισμα, and the latter as a noun of action, or process both in the active sense, e.g. Luc. 20, 4 τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου and passively, e.g. Luke 12, 50 βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι. The general question has been treated rather often;¹⁵ but, on the basis of philological material and grammatical reasoning, F. E. Vokes now convincingly shows that there is no contamination, but a one-sided selection: “If there is an approach in meaning between the two forms, it is an approach of that in μα to that in μός, and not *vice versa*.” Thus the unique ἄρπαγμός does not denote result, but is simply “a verbal noun in μός in its proper sense of a process or action;” it has not the sense of ἄρπαγμα (which is found seventeen times in the Greek Bible).

This evident conclusion has the far-reaching consequence of abolishing all commentaries, starting from the meanings *res rapta* or *res rapienda* – and thus corresponds to the opinion at which C. F. D. Moule has arrived.

But I hope I may be forgiven for neither accepting the ensuing result of F. E. Vokes, who would like to preserve the translation ‘robbery’, nor the statement of C. F. D. Moule about the precise meaning of *raptus* as a translation of ἄρπαγμός.

Comparing the text οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, I am, without serious reserve, willing to accept that “Jesus did not think that equality with God *consisted in (or was a matter of) a raptus*”; but I don’t see that the text says that Jesus thought that equality with God “*consisted in self-giving, self-emptying, etc.*” It only states the fact that he did perform self-giving (or however we are to translate ἐκένωσεν). – And, as a philologist, I should like to ask why we should be obliged to take ἄρπαγμός in the active sense of ‘getting, snatching, acquiring’? Why not, at least, take also the passive sense ‘being snatched’ into consideration?

A parallel word like διωγμός means ‘persecution’ both actively from the standpoint of the persecutor and passively from that of those being persecuted. Correspondingly θερισμός means ‘harvest’, both denoting the ‘harvesting’, the activity of the harvesters, and ‘being harvested’ (e.g. ‘wheat-harvest’). Dozens of Greek words might be adduced to confirm this well-known grammatical fact. One may add that in very many languages it is a common feature of the nomina actionis, that they are neutral with regard to diathesis of the verb. There is no reason to assume that this should be excluded in the case of ἄρπαγμός.

IV. A New Interpretation of ἄρπαγμός

The great difficulty is that this word is extremely rare. In the whole of the Greek Bible – the New Testament, the originally Greek parts of the Old Testament, the Septuaginta translation of the Hebrew Bible – it is only found once, viz. here, Phil. 2, 6. And in the Greek Fathers it is never found without direct or indirect reference to this passage.

Even in Greek profane literature it is rare and late. In his book *On the Education of Children* (p. 12 a, Chapter 15 at the end), Plutarch is discussing the Greek love of boys. He is not attracted by it, but cannot wholly reject it, seeing that it was accepted by noble spirits like Socrates, Platon, Xenophon, etc. And a distinction should be made: “We ought to drive away those whose desire is for mere outward beauty, but to admit without reserve those who are lovers of the soul. And while the sort of love prevailing at Thebes and in Elis is to be avoided, as

well as the so-called *kidnapping* in Crete, that which is found at Athens and in Lacedaemon is to be emulated”: καὶ τοὺς μὲν Θήβησι καὶ τοὺς <ἐν> Ἡλίδι φευκτέον ἔρωτας καὶ τὸν ἐν Κρήτῃ καλούμενον ἀρπαγμὸν, τοὺς δ’ Ἀθήνησι καὶ τοὺς ἐν Λακεδαιμόνι ζηλωτέον.¹⁶

Since it is expressly stated that in Crete they *call* this sort of love ἀρπαγμός, we cannot, based solely on the testimony of this passage, know what was neither in the opinion of Plutarch, nor in reality the characteristic of the Cretan love of boys.

But one thing is evident: ἀρπαγμός must here – in contradiction to Phil. 2, 6! – mean something bad, immoral, unethical. This is, on the other hand, consistent with the generally bad fame of the Cretans, cp. the verse, quoted by Paul in his Epistle to Titus 1, 12 ‘One of themselves, a prophet of their own said: The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies’:

εἶπέν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης·
Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

The basis of this is, in a way, the famous ἀπορία, philosophical pun, of the *Cretan* Epimenides saying that all Cretans are liars:¹⁷ if accepted, it makes also himself a liar, and thus disintegrates his contention. But in the hexameter the dictum is extended to a wider blame of the bad morals of the Cretans: besides being voracious and lazy (γαστέρες ἀργαί), they are said to be κακὰ θηρία ‘evil beasts’, i.e. morally very bad people, beastly and bestial, acting in a manner unworthy of a human being, “tierischer als jedes Tier.” This is certainly to be understood as referring to sex. Paul is alluding to a common opinion of Antiquity.

In his Histories, Polybius (born in Achaea, lived 200–118 B.C.) towards the end of the 33rd book (Lib. XXXIII, 16f.) reports of a war between Rhodes and Crete. Both parties asked for help from the Achaeans. When they had exposed their views to the Council of Corinth, the majority of this assembly seemed to feel inclined to side with the Rhodesians. Then the Envoy of Crete, Antiphates, son of Telemnastus of Gortyna, asked permission from the *strategos* to speak a second time, and was allowed to do so. He now succeeded in winning over the majority of the Council to the cause of his country. He expressed himself, Polybius says, in terms more weighty and serious than is usual in a Cretan. For, as a matter of fact, this young man was not at

all Cretan in character, but had escaped the contagion of Cretan ill-breeding: ἀλλὰ πεφευγῶς τὴν Κρητικὴν ἀναγωγίαν.¹⁸

Polybius was a man of wide views and outstanding learning, even if being at the crucial time of Greece's war with Rome, a Quislingite protagonist of the Roman Empire. It might, however, happen that he tried, with more or less success, to make the Romans understand the advantages of Greek institutions. About 52 B.C. Cicero wrote his *De re publica*, and in the fourth book (of which only fragments have been preserved) he refers (IV, 3, 3) polemically to a now lost passage in Polybius: Cicero argues: 'Now, in the first place, our people have never wished to have any system of education for the free-born youth which is either definitely fixed by law, or officially established, or uniform in all cases, though the Greeks have expended much vain labour on this problem, and it is the only point which our guest Polybius finds neglected in our institutions': *in qua una Polybius noster hospes nostrorum institutorum negligentiam accusat.* – The word *hospes* is nice. Together with 1000 other Achaeans Polybius, in the year 166 B.C., had been brought to Rome as a hostage. But he became a friend of distinguished Romans, especially Scipio Africanus and C. Laelius.

Cicero couches his severe and sarcastic criticism of Polybius in the form of a dialogue between these two Romans, who were also mutual friends: . . . (IV, 4) . . . (*Scipio*) . . . 'How absurd the Greek system of exercise for young men in gymnasiums [entailing that they should go naked]! How far from appropriate strictness their system of military training for the ephēbi! How unbridled and licentious are their pettings and love relations! To say nothing of the Eleans and Thebans, among whom lust is lawful, permissible, unbridled in the relations of free men. The Spartans themselves give every freedom to love relations with young men except that of actual defilement – and protect only by a very thin wall this one exception: for providing merely that cloaks be interposed, they allow embracings and the sharing of the bed!' – Then *Laelius*: 'I see clearly, Scipio, that in regard to the Greek system of training which you criticize, you prefer to attack the most famous States rather than your beloved Plato, whom you do not even mention . . .'¹⁹

In a following section (only preserved by Servius; see below),

Cicero says that among the Cretans 'it was [considered] a disgrace to youths, if they did not have lovers': *obprobrio fuisse adolescentibus, si amatores non haberent*.

A generation later Virgil, in his *Aeneid* (completed shortly before his death in 19 B.C.) 10, 324 ff., alludes to the Cretan love of boys, in reporting the fate of Cydon (from Cydonia, on the north coast of Crete): 'Thou, too, hapless Cydon, while thou followest thy new delight, Clytius, whose cheeks are golden with early down – thou hadst fallen under the Dardan hand and Iain, O piteous sight, forgetful of all thy youthful loves, had not thy brethren's serried band met the foe.'²⁰

A few decades later still – hardly half a century before the Epistles of Paul – Strabo (63 B.C.–21 A.D.) in his *Geography* 10, 4, 21,²¹ gives the classical description of the Cretan love of boys, which was an institution like a regular "marriage by capture". He had literary sources,²² but had been able to check and supply these from personal information, partly from family tradition: there were Cretans among his ancestors.

The whole matter is most interesting, especially from a folkloristic point of view. The relations between the lover and the boy were, of course, no life-long affair, but it was meant to last for two months, and there were semi-juridical regulations to ensure payment to the boy or his family and offerings to the temple. In our connection, we only need to quote the beginning: 'They have a peculiar custom in regard to love affairs, for they win the object of their love, not by persuasion, but by *abduction*': Ἰδιον δ'αὐτοῖς τὸ περὶ τοὺς ἔρωτας νόμιμον, οὐ γὰρ πειθοῖ κατεργάζονται τοὺς ἐρωμένους, ἀλλ' ἄρπαγῆ.

The lover tells the boy's friends three or four days beforehand that he is going to make the abduction: τὴν ἄρπαγὴν; but for the friends to conceal the boy, or not to let him go forth by the appointed road, is indeed a most disgraceful thing: τῶν αἰσχίστων ἐστίν, a confession, as it were, that the boy is unworthy to obtain such a lover: ὅτι ἀνάξιος ὁ παῖς εἶη τοιοῦτου ἔραστοῦ τυγχάνειν.

The continuity appears once more, when Servius (about 400 A.D.)²³ remarks, on the *Aeneid* 10, 325 *Infelix nova gaudia Cydon*: 'of the Cretans we have heard that they were intemperate with regard to the love of boys. This was later transferred to Laconia and to the whole of Greece, so that Cicero even says, in

his work on the State, that it was a disgrace to youths, if they did not have lovers' *de Cretensibus accipimus quod in amores puerorum intemperantes fuerunt: quod postea in Laconas et in totam Graeciam translatum est, adeo ut et Cicero dicat in libris de re publica, obprobrio fuisse adulescentibus si amatores non haberent.*

It is evident, (1) that the phrase, as it occurs in Cicero's *De re publica*, is a quotation which goes back to a source corresponding to that of Strabo; (2) that the greater fragment of the work presupposes the same source as that of Plutarch (cp. p. 14 above), when he mentions the different Greek customs with regard to the love of boys, and uses the word ἀρπαγμός for the Cretan abduction.

There are a few other passages in the late profane literature where ἀρπαγμός really seems to mean 'snatching, grasping, etc.', but without any warrant that this should be the sole meaning possible.²⁴

The basic verb, corresponding to ἀρπαγμός and ἀρπαγή is ἀρπάζειν 'to grasp, grab, pull away, tear away, etc.'. This is a very common word from Homeric to Hellenistic times, also in the Greek Bible.

In the Epistles of Paul, we find it three times, in two passages.

At the end of 1 Thess. 4 Paul speaks of the second advent of the Lord and the general resurrection: v. 17 ἔπειτα ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς, ἀρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἄερα· καὶ οὕτως πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ ἔσόμεθα.: 'Then we which are alive and remain shall be *caught up* together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord' (A.V.).

In 2 Cor. 12 Paul gives his own account of his mystical experience: v. 2-4 οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, εἴτε ἐν σώματι οὐκ οἶδα, εἴτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν, ἀρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ. καὶ οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον, εἴτε ἐν σώματι εἴτε χωρὶς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν, ὅτι ἠρπάγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον καὶ ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι. 'I know [knew A.V.] a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one *caught up* to the third heaven. And I know [knew A.V.] such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) How that he *was caught up* into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter' (A.V.).

All the three times we have passive forms of ἀρπάζειν; there is no question of 'robbery', but of being 'caught up' by the Lord.

Outside the writings of Paul, we may compare Acts 8, where we learn, how the deacon Philip converted and baptized the Ethiopian eunuch: v. 39 ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, πνεῦμα κυρίου ἤρπασεν τὸν Φίλιππον, καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὸν οὐκέτι ὁ εὐνοῦχος. 'and when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord *caught away* Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing' (A.V.). We have thus here a corresponding active form of ἀρπάζειν in the same sense as in the passages in the Epistles of Paul, where we have the passive forms.

A further important passage is Revelation 12, 5, where we hear of the Child who is to rule all nations with an iron rod: the Woman brings it forth, but the Dragon is ready to devour it: 'And her child was *caught up* unto God, and to His throne' καὶ ἤρπασθη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θρόνον αὐτοῦ.

Here we have again, as in Paul, the passive form and, in a way, a corresponding meaning, which, on the other hand, fits into an ancient and well-established special use of ἀρπάζειν.²⁵

We hear Odys. 15, 250, how the goddess Eos *caught away* Kleitos, on account of his beauty, that he might live among the immortal:

ἀλλ' ἦ τοι Κλεῖτον χρυσόθρονος ἤρπασεν Ἥως
κάλλεος εἶνεκα οἴο, ἵν' ἀθανάτοισι μετείη.

And Pindar, Olymp. I, 40 recites how Poseidon, with his heart enthralled by love, *seized* (ἀρπάσσει) Pelops and took him on his chariot to the home of Zeus . . . 'that home to which, in after-time, Ganymede was also brought for the self-same service'.²⁶

Again Proklus, in his Chrestomathy, reports from the Aithiopide what happened after Achilles had killed Memnon and had himself been killed by Paris: Eos, the mother of Memnon, obtained from Zeus that she might give Memnon immortality: καὶ τούτω μὲν Ἥως παρὰ Διὸς αἰτήσαμένη ἀθανασίαν δίδωσι, – and then Thetis, the mother of Achilles, *caught away* her son from the pyre and carried him over to the White Isle (Elysium): καὶ, μετὰ ταῦτα ἐκ τῆς πυρᾶς ἠ Θέτις ἀναρπάσασα τὸν παῖδα εἰς τὴν Λευκὴν νῆσον διακομίζει.²⁷

Thus, in Greek poetry, ἀρπάζω is 'carry away', used of a

supernatural being (a god, goddess, spirit), snatching a man and carrying him away to heaven, to a blessed life with the immortal.

The Cretans, when calling their love of boys ἀρπαγμός (according to Plutarch), stand in this tradition: it was to them no 'kidnapping' after the fashion of modern gangsters, but 'divine abduction' or 'the being caught away to heaven.'

We have a corresponding meaning to that of Greek poetry in Rev. 12, 5 – and also Acts 8, 39; 2 Cor. 12, 2–4; 1 Thess. 4, 17, only with the difference that the catching away envisaged in these three passages is the special *mystical rapture*.

Two centuries later we find the same mystical sense with the pagan neoplatonic philosopher Plotinus: 'He (the god-man) was himself *one*, having in himself no difference towards himself, nor with regard to anything else: nothing moved at him; in ascending there was in him neither anger nor desire of anything else, neither reason nor thought; and he himself *was not*, so to speak: as if *caught away* or having become divine, he has come to exist in a peaceful emptiness, unquivering': ἄλλ' ὥσπερ ἀρπασθεῖς ἢ ἐν θουσιάσας ἡσυχῆ ἐν ἔρημῷ καταστάσει γεγένηται ἀτρεμεῖ.²⁸

Towards the end of the fourth century, the same idea is expressed by a corresponding substantive: St. Gregory of Nazianz calls the mystical rapture of Paul ἀρπαγή 'If Paul had been allowed to unveil to us what he got to know during his ascension or assumption to the third heaven, we should perhaps have known more of God, but if it was a secret of his *rapture* why they were ineffable words, we too have to keep silent'; εἴπερ τοῦτο ἦν τὸ τῆς ἀρπαγῆς μυστήριον, ἐπεὶ δε ἄρρήτα ἦν, καὶ ἡμῖν σιωπῆ τιμάσθω.²⁹

St. John Chrysostom, who was slightly younger, uses ἀρπαγή in the same way in a homily on 2. Cor. 12, 2–5: 'Paul says that he had been caught away, and he declares that he does not know whether this was in the body or outside the body. It would certainly have sufficed to stop speaking after having told of the *rapture*, but he now adds this out of modesty': καίτοι γε ἐξήρκει τὴν ἀρπαγὴν εἰπόντι σιγῆσαι · νυκτὶ δὲ μετριάζων καὶ τοῦτο προστίθησι.³⁰

And again, especially interesting, in a homily on Coloss. 1: 'The angels, on their side, are seen on earth, because man has also appeared in heaven. But I think that the *rapture* of Paul also happened, because it had to be shown that the Son, too, was

taken up there': Δοκεῖ δὲ μοι καὶ ἡ ἀρπαγὴ τοῦ Παύλου τούτου τε ἔνεκεν γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ τοῦ δεῖξαι, ὅτι καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐκεῖ ἀναλήφθη.³¹

We saw that it had to be given up to explain ἀρπαγμός as corresponding to ἄρπαγμα; but now we have a valid synonym of ἀρπαγμός, viz. ἀρπαγή.

If we keep in mind the live relations of both ἀρπαγμός and ἀρπαγή to ἀρπάζειν; *if* we observe how Paul uses this verb, viz. passively, of the being caught up to heaven; *if* we remember how in Greek poetry, from the oldest times onwards, ἀρπάζειν is used of snatching away human beings to co-existence with gods and, in later centuries, correspondingly, of the mystical rapture; and *if* we compare that, on the lower level of human love, the abduction in Crete is called by Strabo ἀρπαγή, by Plutarch ἀρπαγμός, and, on the higher level of theology, the mystical rapture is called by early Greek Fathers ἀρπαγή – then the probable (to a philologist the only justifiable) meaning of ἀρπαγμός in Phil. 2, 6 must be 'the being caught up/away' = 'rapture' (in a literal sense, and passively).

V. The Mystical Experience

In Acts 8 we have a brief description of the mystical rapture of the deacon Philip; in 2 Cor. 12, 2–4 Paul's own account of his mystical rapture or experience; and this is again the pre-condition of his peculiar image of the general resurrection, in 1 Thess. 4.

The mystical experience was the central event in the life of Paul.³⁴ The famous Damascus conversion is mentioned three times in the Acts; it is reported in Acts 9, 1–9, and twice the story is ascribed to Paul himself: Acts 22, 6–16, in his sermon to the Jewish congregation in Jerusalem, and Acts 26, 12–18, in his speech to King Agrippa at Caesarea.

Without entering into a discussion of details of no importance in this connection, the essential part of the descriptions in the three passages in the Acts and in 2 Cor. 12 (with due regard to 1 Thess. 4) is that a light from heaven was suddenly shining so intensely that it blinded Paul for three days, and that he saw the Lord and heard the voice of the Lord, speaking the famous words: 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? it is hard for thee

to kick against the pricks', exhorting him to reform, and giving him instructions, in plain words, and in unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter. Paul had no sense of time, but knew that he had been caught away, of a sudden, to the third heaven, to paradise, in order to see the Lord and be in His presence, so that he could receive, in no time, a new knowledge hitherto unknown to him, outside of what he had till then been able to apprehend. And of a sudden, without his having been able to do anything whatever about it, he was again brought back to earth, to his followers, who had to care for bringing the blinded man to town.

It was quite clear to Paul that he could not be disobedient to the heavenly vision, τῇ οὐρανόφῳ ὀπτασίῳ (Acts 26,19), and that he had been in a trance (ἐν ἔκστασει), which was repeated in Jerusalem (Acts 22,17).

The sensation of being caught away, by God, by the Spirit of God, or by an angel of God, into the presence of God, has, everywhere and at all times, been the way in which believers have explained the mystical experience.

It would lead too far – and take too much time and space – to enter into a general discussion of this most remarkable and strange psychical phenomenon.³³ We have impressive descriptions from the earliest times to our day, from Mesopotamia and Old India, from Greece and the world of Islam, from medieval Europe and modern America, from lofty philosophers and humble conventicles.

All of a sudden – uncontrollably, without your own will or power – a new state of mind imposes itself. You are, as it were, in another place or in two places at the same time. You hear and see, feel and think otherwise than hitherto, you are able to apprehend and comprehend in a way much superior to what you ordinarily do. You do not have to follow a chain of thought: you understand, so to speak, immediately, in a flash, as a unity. And at the same time, you are imbued with a feeling of beauty and a sense of delight, much stronger and even of a higher degree than any sensation you can have in ordinary life. This state of mind comes to an end, as it started, uncontrollably, without your own will or power: all of a sudden you are in your everyday surroundings, you hear and see, feel and think in the ordinary way.

He who has had this experience once, will never be the same

as before. He will be full of gratitude for the gift bestowed upon him. He will for years to come, day after day, but mostly without interference with his everyday duties and without revealing his secret, fervently hope that one day the miraculous state of mind may again be given to him. In many cases the phenomenon is not repeated; but the great mystics may experience it many times. Everywhere and at all times it has been interpreted, in accordance with the religion prevailing at the place and time in question, as coming from God, from Heaven, from the Spirits, from the Powers of another and higher world: you have been allowed to be like God.

But instead of more indirect descriptions, let me give an example: the careful and unsophisticated report by the German poet KARL IMMERMANN (1796–1840), who in practical life was a very sober judge and officer of the law:

‘Es war kurz nach meiner Herstellung. Ich ging gegen Mittag auf der Chaussee nach Hause. Da fühlte ich auf einmal, ohne vorher an Gott gedacht zu haben, seine unmittelbarste Gegenwart in mir, so dass ich ganz bestimmt wusste: Er ist. Und zwar nicht als Begriff, Idee, sondern sein Dasein ist ein ganz reelles. Diese Anschauung sass nicht im Kopfe, sondern mehr im Herzen, und ich wusste in jenem Augenblicke auch, dass wir niemals Gott schauen werden, sondern dass die Seligkeit darin bestehen werde, dass Gott in uns, wie ein ewiges Pulsieren der Güte, Unschuld und Schönheit, die Stelle unseres fleischlichen Herzens einnehmen werde. Alles dieses war keine Phantasie, keine Speculation, sondern eine fast sinnliche Gewissheit. Es dauerte nur wenige Sekunden, auch kann ich den Moment nicht näher beschreiben, denn es würde doch nur auf ausschmückende Trivialitäten hinauslaufen; aber es war ein wahres Gemütswunder.’³⁴

Paul had a corresponding experience. And on the basis of a common belief in his Greek-Oriental world, he was quite familiar with the idea that he had been (in a trance, ἐν ἑκστάσει) in the third heaven, in paradise, with God, to have a vision (ὄπτασίς), to know with the knowledge of God. He was afraid, he was overawed, but there was no doubt in his soul that he had been caught up (ἠρπάγη) to the presence of God – like Moses, Exodus 19 and 34 – to listen to divine commands that he should turn from the struggle against Jesus to a life in His service. And he obeyed as a matter of course: it was in his time, in his world a

natural thing to do for anybody receiving what was to be conceived as a direct mandate from God: καὶ εὐθέως ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ἐκήρυσσεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ 'and straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God' (Acts 9, 20). – Only Saul from Tharsus, who became Paul, did that with the energy of a genius, and with a supreme intellect, heightened for ever by just this mystical experience.

He understood, more deeply and truly than anybody else among the faithful, what it is, when Jesus speaks of being with the Father (Matthew 17, and many times in the Gospel of John) – because he himself had been with God. But he also understood the difference. He, Paul, had been caught away, without his own will or power, by the Spirit of God or an angel of God, in a *rapture* (ἄρπαγμός) to be for a short while with God, and to be taken down to earth again, without his own will or power. But for the Son of God, while He was in the form of God, the being with God was no *rapture*, no ἄρπαγμός, it was His nature. No spirit, no angel had brought Him into this state of being with God; nobody else would ever bring Him out of it. When the time had come for His work of expiation, He Himself, of His own will and power, gave up His nature, His being with God, and debased Himself: gave up the form of God the Lord, and took upon Him the form of a servant of God, let Himself be born like human beings are born, and appeared outwardly like a man, and finally, He humbled Himself furthermore obediently, unto the Death of the Cross.

This is consistent and beautiful. No wonder that Phil. 2. has always been felt as very central in the doctrine of Paul, in the doctrine of Christianity. Such is the strength of its inherent beauty and force of intellect that these have survived even the gross misunderstanding of ἄρπαγμός as 'robbery'.

VI. New Translations Proposed

Being fully aware of the rashness and impugnability of the project, I venture to propose some new translations of the passage in question, Phil. 2, 6–8. Τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἠγάπησατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν

ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.

Latin.

Hoc enim sentite in vobis quod et in Christo Jhesu, qui cum in forma Dei esset, non raptum arbitratus est, esse se aequalem Deo, sed semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens et in similitudinem hominum factus; et habitu apparens ut homo se humiliavit et fuit obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis.

English.

Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who, while he was in the form of God, considered that to be like God was no rapture; but he himself debased himself, took upon him the form of a servant and became a man like we are; and when he appeared like a man he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross.

French.

Ayez en vous les sentiments qui étaient en Jésus Christ, qui lors de son existence en forme de Dieu, a pensé que le fait d'être égal à Dieu n'était pas un ravissement, mais c'est lui-même qui s'est abaissé, en prenant la forme d'un serviteur et en devenant homme comme nous; et lorsqu'il apparut semblable à un homme, il s'est humilié, se rendant obéissant jusqu'à la mort, voire même jusqu'à la mort sur la croix.

German.

So seid in Euch gesinnt, wie Jesus Christus gewesen ist: solange er in der Form Gottes war, hielt er es nicht für ein Ent-rückt werden, Gott gleich zu sein, sondern er selbst hat sich erniedrigt, indem er die Form eines Knechtes annahm und Mensch wurde gleich wie ein anderer Mensch; und indem er im Äusseren als ein Mensch erschien, hat er sich gedemütigt und ward gehorsam bis zum Tode, ja bis zum Tode am Kreuz.

Dutch.

Laat die gezindheid in u zijn, welke ook in Christus Jesus was; zolang hij in de vorm Gods was, achtte hij het Gode

gelijk zijn niet als een weggerukt zijn, maar hij zelf vernederde zich door de vorm van een dienstknecht aan te nemen en mens te worden als wij; en daar hij in zijn uiterlijk als een mens verscheen, verootmoedigde hij zich in gehoorzaamheid tot in de dood, ja de dood des kruises.

Swedish.

Var så till sinnes som Kristus Jesus var. Han menade, att, när han var i Guds form, var det att vara Gud lik inte ett hänryckande. Men han förringade sig själv, antog en tjänares form, och blev människa som vi. Och då han i det yttre framträdde som en människa, ödmjukade han sig och blev lydig in till döden, ja in till döden på korset.

Danish.

Lad det samme sindelag være i Eder, som var i Christus Jesus; han mente, at så længe han var i Guds form, var det at være ligesom Gud ikke nogen bortrykkelse; men det var ham selv der fornædrede sig, idet han påtog sig en tjeners form og blev menneske som vi; og da han i det ydre fremtrådte som et menneske, ydmygede han sig og blev lydig indtil døden, ja døden på korset.

In rejecting the generally accepted meanings of ἀπραγμός Phil. 2, 6, it became inevitable to consider the connection in which it appears, the sense of the section of which the word at issue is the base. The most reliable, but also the most perilous way of obtaining lucidity of your own thought is to translate the passage yourself. Of course, you may – and must! – use, as far as possible, many of the existing translations. But you will not be allowed to hide behind tradition; you must be ready to defend each word in the “new” translation. You will have to stand up against what has been elaborated through the centuries by men of profound erudition and of high mastership of their language.

I can hardly feel entitled to do that in my mother tongue, let alone in other languages. But what is the use of a Danish translation to readers who do not know Danish? Writing in English, I am obliged to give also an English translation. Then it would be most unnatural to omit a translation into the language of Luther, whose version of the Bible has had such wide effects

throughout Europe (and hence also in many extra-European languages). That entails translations of our passage into French, Dutch, and Swedish. There are other "protestant" languages, into which a translation might be desirable, e.g. Czech, but I must limit myself to the living languages just indicated. In return, one 'dead' language demands representation, viz. Latin, the most important language of Bible translation.

I could not have done it wholly on my own hand. I am happy to have been able to consult kind colleagues and specialists.³⁵

But I have the responsibility. What is good in these translations, may be referred to my colleagues; I am to blame for what is bad.

And the purpose of these samples is solely to give the immediate background of the new interpretation of ἀπρoγμός. On the other hand, this interpretation should be able to stand, even in case parts of the new translations will not be accepted.

VII. Some Exegetic Remarks

It would be unjustifiably rash to tackle here all the problems aroused by a new interpretation of an important word in a passage which is central within the doctrine of Paul; specialists will have to see to that if they think it worth while. But a few remarks will be inevitable.

(1) It is a curious fact that language may be rather careless with the placing of the negation.³⁶ French is considered a very logical language, but one says *il ne faut pas que tu meures*, instead of *il faut que tu ne meures pas*. (In the German *du darfst nicht sterben* 'you are not allowed to die,' logic is impeachable; and in the English *you must not die*, the negation may perhaps be referred to the unity of the "modal verb" and the infinitive).

There is, indeed, a general tendency to place the negation with the superordinate rather than with the subordinate part of the construction. In a Low German text of the 17th century, the Cherub, in driving Adam and Eve out of the Garden of Eden, says *God hefft nicht bevahlen juw hir to blyven*, lit. 'God has not commanded you to stay here,'³⁷ that is 'God has commanded that you should not stay here.' – A modern Russian poetress, Anna Akhmatova, writes: *a u nas – svetlykh glaz – n'et prikaza*

podymat', lit. 'and with us [modest Russian women] it is not commanded to lift the clear eyes,' that is 'it is commanded not to lift the clear eyes.' – In Polish one says: *doktor nie kazał mi pić*, lit. 'the doctor did not order me to drink,' meaning 'he ordered me not to drink'; correspondingly in Russian: *doktor ne velel mne pit'*³⁸.

In our Greek text οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο το εἶναι ἴσα θεῶν it is perhaps *grammatically* not clear whether οὐκ belongs to the superordinate verb ἠγήσατο or to the subordinate infinitive-clause τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶν . . . ἀρπαγμὸν. The same grammatical uncertainty may be found in translations like *non rapinam arbitratus est esse se æqualem deo; hielt ers nicht für einen Raub Gotte gleich sein; and even thought it not robbery to be equal with God*. But in the French *n'a point regardé comme une proie l'égalité avec Dieu*, the negation belongs clearly to the superordinate part (like in *il ne faut pas que tu meures*).

I am afraid that most commentators, since the time of the Latin Fathers, have understood our text that way, but *logically* there is no doubt that Paul did not intend to tell us what Christ did not think, but what He considered was not the case.

(2) To defend 'robbery' or 'prey' as the sense of ἀρπαγμός, many commentators have adduced the Pauline comparison of Christ with Adam in his two vigorous rabbinical letters to Christianized Jews (Rom. 5, 12–21; 1 Cor. 15, 20–22. 45–49). "On peut songer à l'attitude opposée d'Adam" (La Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1551). Adam tried, in eating the apple against the command of God, to acquire unlawfully, as a robbery, "to be as gods" (Gen. 3, 5). Through his followers "the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force" (Mat. 11, 12). Not so Christ: "Denn er, der in Gottes Daseinsweise war, dachte die Gottesgleichheit nicht zum eigenen Nutzen zu gebrauchen, sondern er entäusserte sich . . ." (translation Otto Karrer, München 1959).³⁹ Lutheran, Calvinist, Anglican commentators may express similar opinions – even though the idea that the Son of God, in His divine state, should be tempted to use His equality with God to His own advantage, is manifestly absurd.

The philologist must simply shake his head: there is no textual evidence to support these theological speculations.

(3) We observe that, within the same chapter or within the

whole Epistle to the Philippians, some expressions are repeated, so as to give a special effect or to indicate stylistic or logical relations.

With 2, 6 οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ we have to compare 2, 3 ἀλλήλους ἠγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν 'let each think (consider, esteem) others to be better than themselves'.

With 2, 5–11 μορφῇ θεοῦ . . . μορφήν δούλου . . . σχήματι ὡς ἄνθρωπος . . . ἔταπεινώσεν . . . εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ we may compare Phil. 3, 21 ὃς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σῶματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ 'who shall change the appearance of our humble body into a form comparable to His glorious body.'

The theme of the imitatio Christi of Phil. 2, 5–11 is found rather often with regard to Paul himself, e.g. Phil. 4, 12 οἶδα . . . ταπεινοῦσθαι 'I know how to be humbled'; 2 Cor. 11, 7 ἐμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε 'in humbling myself that you might be exalted.'

(4) To understand properly 2, 6 ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ 'in the form of God', we have to compare v. 11 ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς 'that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father', viz. after He had returned to His existence in heaven, to His form of God, i.e. to His form of the Lord God – in contradistinction to v. 7 μορφήν δούλου 'the form of a servant', i.e. 'the form of a servant of God'.

But it should especially be observed that μορφή in vv. 6 and 7 stands in opposition to σχῆμα in v. 7. It is certainly neither defensible that the Danish translation of the nineteenth century in all three cases uses the same word 'skikkelse', nor that in the fourth century Wulfila made a difference between μορφή in v. 6 and in v. 7, translating ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ 'in gudaskaunein' = 'in the shape of (a) god', but μορφήν δούλου 'wlit skalkis' = 'the figure of a servant'. And it is no felicitous idea of Luther to translate μορφή (both in v. 6 and v. 7) with the vague word 'gestalt' = 'shape' – which is then imitated by the Dutchman ('gestaltenis') and the Dane ('skikkelse'): μορφή has the strict philosophical sense – expressed in Latin 'forma', French 'forme', English 'form' – of the frame in which a substance is contained, and especially μορφή θεοῦ 'divine form', 'the form of God (or a god)' has a fixed and definite place in philosophical discussions, ever

since Plato launched it in the Second book of *The Republic* (380 D, and 381 B and C).

In the same way we have to understand μορφή δούλου in v. 7 as 'the form of a servant'; and here 'servant' does not, of course, have the sociological sense of a slave, but means servant in relation to a master, more exactly to God as the Master and Lord. This is emphasized, when some Latin Fathers, in translating v. 8 ὑπήκοος write 'obediens patri', and Wulfila correspondingly has 'ufhausjands attin'; cp. above p. 7.

The meaning of vv. 6–7 is clearly that Jesus Christ, who had the form of God, who was the Lord God, gave up this form and took upon him the form of a servant, became a servant of God; cp. Rom. 12, 11 (in a discussion of the imitatio Christi) τῷ κερίῳ δουλεύοντες.

(5) When this action is called ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, this cannot mean 'emptied himself'; because you can empty a form of its contents, but you cannot call the exchange of one form for another, an emptying. It must mean – as many translators and commentators have seen – 'debased himself, made himself vile, of no reputation.' And we have to compare the corresponding use of the stem κενο- in other cases, esp. Phil. 2, 3 κενοδοξία 'vainglory' (or e.g. Col. 2, 8 διὰ . . . τῆς . . . κενῆς ἀπάτης 'of vain deceit').

There is perhaps no great difference of meaning between v. 7 ἐκένωσεν 'debased' and v. 8 ἐταπεινώσεν 'humbled'; some translators use one word for both. But it is certainly not without importance that in the first case we have an emphatic word-order: ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν 'he himself debased himself, semetipsum exinanivit', whereas ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτόν is simply 'se humiliavit'.

We observe again that the stem ταπεινο- of v. 8 is already used in v. 3 ταπεινοφροσύνη 'in lowliness of mind'.

(6) Some confusion has come from v. 8 ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος.

Both the Itala and the Vulgate translate literally 'humiliavit semetipsum factus obediens', and Wulfila correspondingly 'gahaunida sik silban waurþans ufhausjands', thus taking γενόμενος literally as a preterit participle. The Dutch translator of the Statenbijbel is here very clumsy in his desire to bring out quite clearly the same (dogmatically obscure) meaning that His be-

coming-obedient preceded His humbling-Himself: 'heeft Hij Zichzelven vernederd, gehoorzaam geworden zijnde.' – Inversely, the Danish translation of 1871 (the Danish authorized version till the first half of the 20th century), takes γενόμενος in a consecutive sense: 'fornedrede han sig selv, saa han blev lydig' = 'debased (= humbled) Himself, so that He became obedient' – Earlier Danish translations (and the Danish Authorized Version of 1948: 'ydmygede han sig og blev lydig') are nearer to Luther's 'erniedriget sich selv und ward gehorsam', and thus also to the English Authorized Version 'humbled himself, and became obedient'. Here the relation between γενόμενος ὑπήκοος and ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτόν is neither pluperfect nor consecutive; but the sense of simultaneity is not so clear as in the French Huguenot translation 's'est humilié lui-même, se rendant obéissant.'

(7) V. 7 εὑρεθεῖς is in most cases translated literally, as the passive of 'to find', e.g. the Itala 'adinventus est', the Vulgate 'inventus est', Wulfila 'bigitans', Luther 'erfunden', Dutch (Statenbijbel) 'gevonden', A.V. 'being found', Danish (1871) 'funden', (Rørdam 1906 and Danish A.V. 1948) 'fandtes'. But the idea of 'finding' is misleading: it is well-known that in later Greek the passive of εὐρίσκω – as correspondingly in several modern languages – is simply used in the sense of 'to appear' or even 'to be'. The French Huguenot translation has 'en se montrant'; I would propose to use the corresponding forms of 'apparaître', 'to appear', etc.

I beg the reader not to judge these remarks too severely; they are mainly made to ease the conscience of a non-theologian. It must, however, be confessed that the observations concerning Phil 2, 3 ἡγούμενοι, μορφῇ Θεοῦ and μορφὴν δούλου, ἐκένωσεν and ἐταπεινώσεν are also intended to illustrate lexical and logical relations between Phil. 2, 6–11, the beginning of the same chapter, and some passages in other writings of Paul.

(8) This might perhaps be a philological argument against the famous hypothesis of LOHMEYER, who assumed that in the passage Phil. 2, 6–11 – characterized by isolated words (like ἄρπαγμός!) and an elevated style – Paul was quoting a Christological hymn, which would have been famous among the congregations of Greece and Macedonia about 50–52, when he wrote his Epistle to the Philippians. This theory has been very widely

accepted by commentators – among those who are somewhat sceptical, we may mention EDWIN LARSSON, Uppsala 1962 – and by modern translators: the Danish version of 1948 even prints 2, 6–11 as verse-lines!

The main argument is based on the occurrence in Phil. 2, 6–11 of words which are never or rarely found elsewhere in the writings of Paul, and on the lofty sometimes perhaps rhythmical style.

But the new interpretation tries to show that the rarest word of all within this passage, ἄρπαγμός, is typically Pauline, denoting ‘rapture’, ‘the being-taken-away-into-the-presence-of-God’, in the way in which the mystics explain their astonishing psychological experience. Paul himself had been through this; it had even become decisive for his life and doctrine. Then the lofty style may be understood as a natural reaction, when his thoughts were turned to his own unforgettable rapture.

The style of Paul is not always so bad as Leo X. would make his cardinals believe. Was the Holy Father really deaf to the beauty of I Cor. 13, where Paul describes the ἀγάπη ‘caritas’ in a most inspired way? Or Ephes. 3, 14 ff., where Paul takes a survey of the new knowledge of the faithful, who are ‘rooted and grounded in love’ ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι. Or listen, in the fine Second Epistle to the Corinthians, to the end of the third chapter (v. 18): when we shall see God without veil: ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος. ‘Nos vero omnes revelata facie gloriam Domini speculantes, in eandem imaginem transformamur a claritate in claritatem, tamquam a Domini Spiritu.’ There are many other passages, even in the didactic Pastoral Epistles, e.g. 1 Tim. 1, 17 τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων, ἀφθάρτῳ ἀοράτῳ μόνῳ θεῷ, τιμῇ καὶ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Regi autem sæculorum, immortalī invisibili soli Deo, honor et gloria in sæcula sæculorum’. Or 6, 16 ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν, φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον, ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται· ὃς τιμῇ καὶ κράτος αἰώνιον ‘qui solus habet immortalitatem, et lucem inhabitat inaccessibilem; quem nullus homo vidit, nec videre potest; cui honor et imperium sempiternum.’ – The Latin Bible is prominent in the rendering of a more or less rhythmical style.

Where do we find such a lofty style in the writings of Paul? – Mostly when his thoughts are turned towards his own mystical experience: upon him the grace was bestowed of seeing (with blinded eyes) God in His glory, of hearing the unspeakable words of the Lord. And over and over again the remembrance heightens his style, purifies it of the everyday talk of the tent-maker, of the zealous arguing of the preacher – which may irritate others than a haughty Medici.

Phil. 2, 5–11 is no foreign substance in Paul the writer: it is flesh of his flesh, of his new body. And so ἀρπαγμός is a high rapture, no vile robbery.

Acknowledgements

During the last year, when the idea of a new interpretation of ἀρπαγμός Phil. 2, 6 was taking shape, I have incommoded many colleagues and friends with oral or written questions as to different aspects of a matter where I needed much information – and got it in the kindest way.

After the presentation before the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters on March 26, 1965, I have had the opportunity of talking on the subject: before members of the Faculty of Arts in the University of California, Los Angeles, on April 26; at an informal meeting in the Accademia Danese, Rome, on May 28; at a meeting of the Filologisk-historisk Samfund, Copenhagen, on September 22. The discussions after these lectures have been very fruitful to me.

I am extremely grateful for all the help, bestowed upon me, and would like to express special thanks to:

Dr. J. N. BAKHUIZEN VAN DEN BRINK (University of Leiden, Holland); Dr. FRANZ BLATT (University of Århus); Dr. JOHNNY CHRISTENSEN, University of Copenhagen); Dr. BØRGE DIDERICHSEN (University of Copenhagen); Dr. INGEMAR DÜRING (University of Gothenburg, Sweden); Dr. WOLJA ERICHSEN (University of Copenhagen); Dr. SØREN HOLM (University of Copenhagen); Dr. POV L JOHNS. JENSEN (University of Copenhagen); Dr. PER KRARUP (Accademia Danese, Rome); Dr. F. LØKKEGAARD (University of Copenhagen); Dr. C. F. D. MOULE (Clare College,

Cambridge, England); Dr. A. OTTO, S.J. (Copenhagen); Mr. J. RAASTED (Institute of Medieval Studies, Copenhagen); Dr. H. ROOS, S. J. (University of Copenhagen); Dr. F. E. VOKES (Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland).

Bibliography

General Remarks

I have used the encyclopedias, handbooks, grammars, dictionaries, and several monographies on New Testament interpretations, available in the rich Royal Library, Copenhagen, including e.g. the first fascicle of G.W.H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961.

Among the works on Greek, I should like to mention: P. CHANTRAINE, *La formation des noms en grec ancien* (= Collection linguistique. Vol. 38, Paris 1933); EDWIN MAYSEN, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. Bd. I, 3. Teil. Zweite Auflage. Berlin und Leipzig 1935; JENS HOLT, Die homerischen Nomina auf -μός (= Glotta 27 (1939), 182–198).

Selected Special Bibliography

ERNST LOHMEYER, *Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2, 5–11* (= Sitzungsberichte Heidelberg, Phil.hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 1927/28, 4. Abt.), Heidelberg 1928; A. FRIEDRICHSEN, *Epi-kureisches im Neuen Testament?* (= Symbolae Osloenses, Fasc. 12), Oslo 1933; E. KÄSEMANN, *Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2, 5–11* (= Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, Bd. 47), 1951; C. F. D. MOULE, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge (England) 1952; F.W. BEARE, *A Commentary on . . . Philippians*, London 1959; EDWIN LARSSON, *Christus als Vorbild*, Uppsala 1962; F. E. VOKES, Ἀππαγγμός in *Philippians 2, 5–11* (= Studia Evangelica. Vol. II. Papers presented to the Second International Congress on New Testament Studies, held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1961. Part I. The New Testament Scriptures. Ed. by F. L. CROSS (= Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Bd. 87) Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1964, pp. 670–675).

Notes on single passages

¹ A shocking, but very interesting example is Col. 2, with bulky constructions and hidden polemics—incomprehensible without rather extensive comments.

² It struck me first, when reading A. B. Drachmann, *Paulus som Forfatter og Tænker*, Copenhagen 1913.

³ Cp. Streitberg, *Die gotische Bibel I*, Heidelberg 1908, p. 370.

⁴ Greek translation kindly corrected by Povl Johs. Jensen.

⁵ Cp. Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* 8, 213 (s.v. *Raub*) and the special commentaries to "Faust".

⁶ Cp. *Ordbog over det danske Sprog* 17, 1310 (s.v. *Rov*), with references.

⁷ Kind information by Dr. F. Løkkegaard.

⁸ Kind information by Dr. Wolja Erichsen.

⁹ It is remarkable that the word *raptus* does not occur in the Vulgate.

¹⁰ Dr. J. N. Bakhuizen Van den Brink kindly called my attention to these three recent translations.

¹¹ Kind information by Dr. Ingemar Düring—as an introduction to a series of most instructive letters.

¹² Cp. Special Bibliography.

¹³ Cp. Acknowledgements.

¹⁴ Cp. Special Bibliography. I have been happy to have had very fruitful talks with Dr. Vokes in November 1965 in Dublin.

¹⁵ A few examples have been mentioned in the Bibliography. General Remarks.

¹⁶ Plutarch, *Moralia. De liberis educandis*, ed. trans. F. C. Babbitt, London and New York 1927.

¹⁷ Kind information by Dr. Per Krarup, who also called my attention to Servius-Cicero, and whose thesis *Rector rei publicae*, Copenhagen 1956, has been useful to me.

¹⁸ Polybius, *Histories*, Vol. IV, ed. trans. W. R. Paton, London–New York 1927, p. 285 (Book 33, 16 f.).

¹⁹ . . . ri nudari puberem. Ita sunt alte repetita quasi fundamenta quaedam verecundiae. Iuventutis vero exercitatio quam absurda in gymnasiis! quam levis ephedorum illa militia! quam contrectationes et amores soluti et liberi! mitto apud Eleos et Thebanos, apud quos in amore ingenuorum libido etiam permissam habet et solutam licentiam; Lacedaemonii ipsi, cum omnia concedunt in amore iuvenum praeter stuprum, tenui sane muro dissaepiunt id, quod excipiunt: complexus concubitusque permittunt palliis interiectis. — Hic Laelius: Praeclare intellego, Scipio, te in iis Graeciae disciplinis, quas reprehendis, cum populis nobilissimis malle quam cum tuo Platone luctari, quem ne attingis quidem, praesertim cum. . .

(M. Tulli Ciceronis De republica rec. L. Castiglioni, Torino 1960. In the text, I have used the translation by C. W. Keyes, 1928—with some abbreviations and small alterations.)

²⁰ Tu quoque, flaventem prima lanugine malas
dum sequeris Clytium, infelix, nova gaudia, Cydon,
Dardania stratus dextra, securus amorum,
qui iuvenum tibi semper erant, miserande iaceres,
ni fratrum stipata cohors foret obvia . . .

Virgil, *Aeneis* — ed. trans. H. Rushton Fairclough, 1918.

²¹ Strabo, *Geography*, ed. trans. Horace Leonard Jones, London–New York 1928; Book 10, 4, 21.

²² In the preceding chapters on Crete, Strabo refers to the historian Ephoros (400–334 B.C.).

²³ Servii Grammatici . . . in Vergilii carmina commentarii . . . rec. G. Thilo, Vol. 2, Leipzig 1884, p. 427 f.

²⁴ Cp. G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v.

²⁵ Dr. Johnny Christensen has kindly called my attention to this important fact.

²⁶ *The Odes of Pindar*, ed. trans. Sir John Sandys, London–New York 1915.

²⁷ Proclus' *Chrestomathy*, II (= Oxford Homer, Vol. V, p. 105 f.).

²⁸ Plotinus, *Enneades*, éd. trad. Emile Brehier, Paris 1938, p. 187.

²⁹ Gregorius Nazianzenus, *Orationes theologicae* 28, 30 (= Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 36, 52 C) — Jørgen Raasted kindly pointed out to me that this passage was mentioned in Lampe, *A Greek Patristic Greek Lexicon* (where also reference is found to the two Chrysostom passages).

³⁰ Ioannes Chrysostomus, In Epist. II ad Cor. (12, 2–5), Homilia 26 (= Migne, PG 61, 576).

³¹ Id., In Epist. ad Coloss., Cap. 1, Hom. 3 (= Migne, PG 62, 331).

³² The mystical experience as the central event in the life of Paul: cp. e.g. is proud questions 1. Cor. 9, 1 Οὐκ εἰμι ἐλεύθερος; οὐκ εἰμι ἀπόστολος; οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἔδρακα; (cp. v. 16). And further e.g. Gal. 1, 12–17 and 2, 12 (cp. the 'fourteen years' of 2. Cor. 12, 2); Ephes. 3, 3. Treatment above all in Albert Schweitzer, *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*, Tübingen 1930.

³³ The literature on mysticism is unfathomable. For more than one generation Evelyn Underhill, *Mysticism* (first printed in 1911) has been a very reliable introduction and, in a way, has never been superseded. But cp. e.g. F. W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, *Deutsche Mystik*, Tübingen 1947; J. Baruzi, *Création religieuse et pensée contemplative*, 1957; W. Thurston, *The Physical Phenomenon of Mysticism*, ed. J. H. Crehan, London 1952. — Easier than in plain or philosophical prose, the mystical experience may be expressed in art, sometimes in paintings, more often in poems, and above all in music.

³⁴ Karl Immermann, *Sein Leben und seine Werke aus Tagebüchern und Briefen an seine Familie zusammengestellt*, hg. von Gustav zu Putlitz, II, Berlin 1870, p. 68 f.

³⁵ Latin: Povl Johs. Jensen (University of Copenhagen) and Franz Blatt (University of Århus); English: Grethe Hjort (University of Århus); French: A. Blinkenberg (University of Århus); Dutch: Geerte de Vries (University of Copenhagen); Swedish: Ingemar Düring (University of Gothenburg).

³⁶ Cp. i.a. Otto Jespersen, *Negation in English and Other Languages*, Copenhagen 1917 (= Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser I, 5; reprint 1966); Holger Johansen, *Il ne faut pas que tu meures* (= Germanisch-Romanische Monatshefte 15, 11/12, 1927). As for Greek, see Ed. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik II* (1950), p. 593.

³⁷ Tönnies Fenne's *Low German Manual of Spoken Russian*. Pskov 1607, Vol. I, Facsimile Copy. Prefaced by Roman Jakobson and Elizabeth van Schooneveld. Published by the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. Copenhagen 1961, p. 501.

³⁸ The Russian examples have been given to me by Dr. Roman Jakobson, the Polish one by Mrs. Krisztyna Jakobson (both of Harvard University).

³⁹ Dr. H. Roos, S. J., has kindly given me the two examples. Anybody who has touched upon the subject, will know that the literature is boundless.

Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab
 Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser
 (Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk.)

Bind 38 (kr. 70,00)

kr. ø.

- | | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 1. | BLINKENBERG, ANDREAS: Le problème de la transitivité en français moderne. Essai syntacto-sémantique. 1960 | 40,00 |
| 2. | DIDERICHSEN, PAUL: Rasmus Rask og den grammatiske tradition. Studier over vendepunktet i sprogvidenskabens historie. Med tillæg fra Rasks og N. M. Petersens papirer. Mit einer deutschen Zusammenfassung. 1960 | 30,00 |

Bind 39 (kr. 97,00)

- | | | |
|----|--|-------|
| 1. | NEUGEBAUER, O.: A New Greek Astronomical Table (P. Heid. Inv. 4144 + P. Mich 151). 1960 | 3,00 |
| 2. | ASMUSSEN, JES PETER: The Khotanese Bhadracaryādeśanā. Text, Translation, and Glossary, together with the Buddhist Sanskrit Original. 1961 | 18,00 |
| 3. | HJELHOLT, HOLGER: On the Authenticity of F. F. Tillisch' Report of November 24th, 1849, Concerning Conditions in Slesvig under the Administrative Commission. 1961 | 3,00 |
| 4. | JOHANSEN, K. FRIIS: Ajas und Hektor. Ein vorhomerisches Heldenlied? 1961 | 11,00 |
| 5. | JØRGENSEN, SVEN-AAGE: Johann Georg Hamann »Fünf Hirtenbriefe das Schuldrama betreffend«. Einführung und Kommentar. 1962 | 26,00 |
| 6. | HAMMERICH, L. L.: Zwei kleine Goethestudien. I. Der frühe West-östliche Divan. - II. Grossherzogin Louise von Sachsen-Weimar - eine politische, keine schöne Seele. 1962 | 9,00 |
| 7. | HOLT-HANSEN, KRISTIAN: Oscillation Experienced in the Perception of Figures. 1962 | 9,00 |
| 8. | SØRENSEN, HANS CHRISTIAN: Ein russisches handschriftliches Gesprächsbuch aus dem 17. Jahrhundert. Mit Kommentar. 1962 | 18,00 |

Bind 40 (kr. 99,00)

- | | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 1. | HANNESTAD, KNUD: L'évolution des ressources agricoles de l'Italie du 4 ^{ème} au 6 ^{ème} siècle de notre ère. 1962 | 18,00 |
| 2. | BRØNDUM-NIELSEN, JOHS.: Viggo Stuckenberg-Sophus Claussen. En Brevvexling. Med Indledning og Noter. 1963 | 16,00 |
| 3. | MØRKHOLM, OTTO: Studies in the Coinage of Antiochus IV of Syria. 1963 | 20,00 |
| 4. | BECH, GUNNAR: Die Entstehung des schwachen Präteritums. 1963 | 8,00 |
| 5. | RIIS, P. J.: Temple, Church and Mosque. 1965 | 22,00 |
| 6. | GERLACH-NIELSEN, MERETE: Stendhal théoricien et romancier de l'amour. 1965 | 15,00 |

Bind 41

(uafsluttet/in preparation)

	kr. ø.
1. HJELHOLT, HOLGER: British Mediation in the Danish-German Conflict 1848-1850. Part One. From the March Revolution to the November Government. 1965	40,00
2. BUKDAHL, ELSE MARIE: Diderot est-il l'auteur du «Salon» de 1771? 1966	30,00
3. In preparation.	
4. HAMMERICH, L. L.: An Ancient Misunderstanding (Phil. 2,6 'robbery'). 1966	8,00

From Vol. 37, No. 1, 1957 the designation *Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser* is changed into *Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser*. The numbering of the volumes will continue regardless of the change of name. The publications will besides the subjects treated up till 1957, include papers on Philosophy, Archeology, and Art History.

On direct application to the agent of the Academy, MUNKSGAARD, Publishers, 47 Prags Boulevard, Köbenhavn S., a subscription may be taken out for the series of *Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser*. This subscription automatically includes the *Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter* in 4to as well, since the *Meddelelser* and the *Skrifter* differ only in size, not in subject matter. Papers with large formulae, tables, plates, etc., will as a rule be published in the *Skrifter*, in 4to.

For subscribers or others who wish to receive only those publications which deal with a single group of subjects, a special arrangement may be made with the agent of the Academy to obtain the published papers included under the head: *Archeology and Art History*, only.