with xvii. 5. “The divine nature had an  
infinite beauty in itself, even without any  
creature to look on it.” Bengel. See also  
Col.i.15; 2Cor.iv. 4. That the divine *nature* of Christ is not here meant, is clear:  
for He did not with reference to *this empty  
Himself,* ver. 7), **deemed not his equality  
with God a matter for grasping** (on the  
difficulty of the rendering, and the reasons  
for pressing that here adopted, see in my  
Greek Test. The *meaning* is plain enough.  
Our Lord possessed equality with God.  
In “the mind which was in Him, He  
regarded not this His equality a thing to  
be grasped at by Him, so as to hold it firm  
for Himself, but” &c. We have now to  
enquire, whether the opening of the passage  
will bear to be understood of our Lord  
*already incarnate.* De Wette and others  
have maintained that the name **Christ Jesus**cannot apply to *Him before His Incarnation.* But the answer to this is easy, viz.  
that that name applies to the *entire historical Person* of our Lord, of whom the  
whole passage is said, and not merely to  
Him in his pre-existent state. That one  
and the same person of the Son of God,  
*“existing in the form of God,”* afterwards  
*“became in the likeness of men,”* gathering  
to itself the humanity, in virtue of which  
Heis now designated in the concrete, Christ  
Jesus. The dispute seems to me to be  
satisfactorily settled by the contrast between the two clauses just quoted. These  
two cannot belong to Christ in the same incarnate state. Therefore the former of them  
must refer to his *præ-incarnate state*),

**7.] but emptied Himself** (*Himself* is the  
emphatic word, *not the verb.*—He not  
only did not *enrich* himself, but he  
*emptied* himself:—He used His equality  
with God as an opportunity, not for self-exaltation, but for self-abasement. And  
the word simply and literally means,  
**emptied.** He emptied Himself of the  
*form of God* [not His *essential* glory,  
but its manifested possession: see on the words above: the glory which He had  
with the Father before the world began,  
John xvii. 5, and which He resumed at  
His glorification]—He ceased, while in  
this state of exinanition, to reflect the  
glory which He had with the Father),  
**[by] taking the form of a servant** (specification of the *method in which* He emptied  
Himself. The term **servant** is contrasted  
with ‘equality with God’—and imports *‘a  
servant of God,’*—not *a servant generally,*  
nor a servant of man and God. And this  
state, of a *servant* of God, is further defined by what follows)**, being made** (by birth  
into the world,—*‘becoming’*) **in the likeness  
of men** (compare Rom. viii. 3. He was not  
*a man pure and simple, and nothing else,*but the Son of God manifest in the flesh  
and nature of men. The expression, *in  
the likeness,* is forcible, in giving another  
subordinate specification, viz. that He was  
made in *like form* to *men,* who *are servants of God)*.

**8.]** (the term, **being  
found,** serves to denote the taking up afresh  
of the subject, and introducing a new portion of the history. Hitherto of the act of  
laying aside the form of God, specified to  
have consisted in *taking the form of a  
servant,* and *being made in the likeness of  
men.* But now we take Him up again,  
this having past; we *find* Him in his human  
appearance—and what, then? we have further acts of self-humiliation to relate):

**and when He was** (having been) **found  
in habit** (guise, outward semblance; e.g.  
of look, and dress, and speech. The term  
is a more specific repetition of “*in the  
likeness*” above: and is here *emphatic*:  
‘being found in *habit*, &c.—He did not  
stop with this outward semblance, but.  
....) **as a man** (for He was not a man,  
but God [in Person], with the humanity  
taken on him: “**As** *a man:* for this  
was the nature which He took up into  
Him: He himself was not this, but He  
put this on.’ Theodoret), **He humbled  
himself** (in His humanity: a further act