

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

ON the afternoon of Thursday, 11th May, a meeting was held in New College, Oxford, 'to consider the possibility of a new departure in the study of the text of the New Testament.' Dr. Ince, the Regius Professor of Divinity, presided. The discussion was opened by Prebendary Miller. Professor Sanday followed. Mr. Gwilliam succeeded Dr. Sanday. And so speaker after speaker rose, one alternately from either side, till this 'interesting and well-attended' meeting closed.

The speeches were reported fully. By and by the full report will be published, and it is better to wait for it. Meantime, one short significant sentence may be quoted from Dr. Sanday. He said that he had practically applied the system of Westcott and Hort, with some modifications, for many years, and had never found it fail him.

That sentence will help to steady those, if there are those, who may have doubted the wisdom of Dr. Moulton and Professor Geden in resting their new *Concordance* on the text of Westcott and Hort. It is the text that most students work with now. But that was not enough. In the judgment of Professor Sanday it is the best text to work with.

Still, it is probable that Dr. Sanday would not have given his advice to rest the new *Concordance*

on Westcott and Hort entirely. It is not a perfect text. Dr. Sanday uses it 'with some modifications.' He even asserts that its preference for the two great manuscripts,  $\aleph$  and B, sometimes goes too far. It was, therefore, wisely resolved to add to Westcott and Hort the readings of Tischendorf and those of the English Revision.

Moulton and Geden's *Concordance* has been well received. Its rapid sale, for it is a costly volume, is one of the most encouraging symptoms we have seen for many a day. Its reception by scholars and reviewers has been equally encouraging to its editors. Among the rest there is a long responsible notice in *The Methodist Recorder*, of 13th May, by Professor Agar Beet.

Professor Agar Beet is a student of words. He knows the value of a *Concordance*. He has used it, and made a great reputation by means of it. And in this article he is not afraid to say that the use of a *Concordance*—a Greek *Concordance*—is the best way to learn the Greek New Testament.

Professor Beet holds that a *Concordance* is of more value than a *Lexicon*. The knowledge that is gained by the use of a *Lexicon* is second-hand. It is the *Concordance* that gives us the opportunity of seeing the words in actual use, in all the

variety of their meaning; and by it alone we can learn a language that is dead, in the same incomparable way as we learned our native speech.

Another volume has been issued of Professor Hort's posthumous works. It is called *The Christian Ecclesia* (Macmillan. 6s.). The title is Professor Hort's own. 'The reason why I have chosen the term *Ecclesia*,' he says, 'is simply to avoid ambiguity. The English term, *church*, now the most familiar representative of *ecclesia* to most of us, carries with it associations derived from the institutions and doctrines of later times, and thus cannot at present, without a constant mental effort, be made to convey the full and exact force which originally belonged to *ecclesia*.'

There are other English words. There is, especially, the word *congregation*. And 'congregation' was considered by Dr. Hort. It 'has the advantage of suggesting some of those elements of meaning which are least forcibly suggested by the word "church," according to our present use.' It has also the advantage of historical standing. "'Congregation,'" continues Professor Hort, 'was the only rendering of the Greek *ἐκκλησία* (*ecclesia*) in the English New Testament, as it stood throughout Henry VIII.'s reign, the substitution of "church" being due to the Genevan Revisers; and it held its ground in the Bishops' Bible in no less primary a passage than Matt. xvi. 18 till the Jacobean revision of 1611, which we call the Authorized Version.'

But 'congregation,' as well as 'church,' has 'disturbing associations.' And, besides, to use it now in what might seem a rivalry to so venerable, and rightly venerable, a word as 'church,' appeared to Professor Hort only to put a stumbling-block in the way of recovering for 'church' the full breadth of its meaning. So he chose 'ecclesia.' 'It is the only perfectly colourless word within our reach, carrying us back to the beginnings of Christian history, and enabling us in some degree to get behind words and names to the simple facts which they originally denoted.'

Professor Hort's book is briefly noticed on another page. We may be able to handle it more fully hereafter. In the meantime we wish to draw attention to the exposition it contains (on p. 110) of a difficult little sentence in the end of the Epistle to the Romans.

The sentence is: 'All the churches of Christ salute you' (Rom. xvi. 16). That is the Revised translation. The Authorized omits the 'all.' But it has irresistible evidence. And its omission in the later Syrian text, and some insignificant manuscripts, is accounted for by its difficulty. For it is hard enough to understand 'the churches of Christ salute you'; the addition of *all* 'clinches the difficulty,' says Professor Hort.

It is true that our popular commentaries for the most part find no difficulty. They say that St. Paul knew the mind of some of the churches of Christ towards the Christians of Rome, and guessed the mind of the rest. Or he had actually received the greetings of some of the churches, and concerning the rest, he knew their goodwill, and salutes the Romans in the name of all. So said Erasmus long ago; Meyer follows Erasmus, and the majority follow Meyer.

But there are those, and especially of the older commentators, who limit 'all' to the Greek churches, or even to the churches in Corinth and its ports, which is cutting the knot with a very sharp knife. So Godet is very bold. 'While the apostle in thought sees the Christians of Rome saluting one another by the kiss of brotherhood, a greater spectacle is presented to his mind, that of all the churches already composing Christendom, and which are likewise united by the bond of communion in Christ. He has just himself traversed the churches of Greece and Asia; he has spoken to them of his already formed plan of proceeding to Rome (Acts xix. 21, xx. 25), and they have all charged him with their salutations to their sister in the capital of the world. Now is the time for him to discharge this commission.'

But take 'all' away, and the difficulty is not removed. 'All' clinches the difficulty, it does not make it. There remains the phrase, 'the churches of Christ.' Familiar as that phrase is to us, it is absolutely unique in the New Testament. It occurs only here. And the still more familiar singular 'the Church of Christ,' does not occur even once. Several times St. Paul speaks of 'the Church of God.' Twice directly (1 Cor. xi. 16; 2 Thess. i. 4), and several times indirectly, he speaks of 'the churches of God.' But to the phrase before us he never comes nearer than Gal. i. 22, 'the churches of Judæa which were in Christ,' or 1 Thess. ii. 14, 'the churches of God which are in Judæa in Christ Jesus.' The unique phrase must surely have a unique meaning.

Professor Hort has interpreted our passage twice. In the volume entitled *Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians*, which was published in 1895, there will be found an exposition on p. 53. The unique phrase, we are there told, seems meant to mark the way in which the church of Rome was an object of love and respect to Jewish and Gentile Christians alike. The name 'Christ' has its primary signification for the Jew, but it is expounded so as to hold good for the believing Gentile also. It thus answers, he adds, to Rom. xv. 19, 'from Jerusalem, and round about even unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ,' and to Rom. xv. 29, 'I know that when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of Christ.'

That interpretation is hesitatingly accepted by Sanday and Headlam. It is not altogether satisfactory. It was not altogether satisfactory to Professor Hort. 'Seems,' he says. He was feeling his way to another interpretation beyond it. The lectures which contain that exposition were delivered in the Easter term of 1886. By the Michaelmas term of 1888 or 1889, when he delivered the lectures which make up the volume entitled *The Christian Ecclesia*, he had found a more precise interpretation.

St. Paul's favourite expression is 'the Ecclesia of God.' Once he uses it with peculiar effect. It is in his address to the Ephesian elders at Miletus. He quotes Ps. lxxiv. 2, 'Remember Thy congregation which thou didst purchase of old, didst redeem to be the tribe of Thine inheritance.' He does not quote it verbally. In the LXX the word for congregation is 'synagogue' (συναγωγή); St. Paul substitutes 'ecclesia'; and for the too colourless 'acquired' (ἐκτήσω) of the LXX he substitutes the more precise and pertinent 'purchased' (περιποιήσατο). Thus this passage, inconspicuous as it stands in the Psalter, becomes in the apostle's hands one of the channels through which the word 'ecclesia' came to denote God's people of the future. By the adaptation of that psalm St. Paul claimed the prerogatives of God's ancient ecclesia for the new community of Christians.

From this place we trace the steps by which the 'Ecclesia of God' becomes the 'Ecclesia of Christ.' We remember that the Lord Himself already led the way, when He said, 'On this rock I will build My Ecclesia' (Matt. xvi. 18). St. Paul first approaches it in the two passages already quoted, in which he speaks of the ecclesiæ of Judæa, still calling them 'the churches of God,' but adding, 'which are in Christ' or 'in Christ Jesus.' Whereupon we come to our passage in the Epistle to the Romans. The expression is not 'Christ,' but ὁ χριστός, 'the Christ' or 'the Messiah.' Throughout the Epistle this expression is used with some reference always to Messiahship. It therefore appears to Dr. Hort most probable that by 'the ecclesiæ of the Christ,' the Messiah, St. Paul means the ecclesiæ of those 'of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came.' In a word, Dr. Hort believes that by 'the ecclesiæ of the Christ' he means the ecclesiæ of Judæa. 'It might easily be that all these had been represented at some recent gathering at Jerusalem, and had there united in a message which some Jerusalem colleague and friend had since conveyed to him.'

*Macmillan's Magazine* for May contains an article on 'Sunday Observance.' *Macmillan's*

*Magazine* is not theological, and the writer of this article is unconcerned with any question of the obligation, or even the advisability, of observing Sunday. That aspect of the question is left to *The Quarterly Review* of last January, which contained an interesting and learned article on the observance of Sunday, in which the subject was treated almost wholly from the theological and scriptural point of view. This writer considers it in its social and legal aspect.

The Lord's Day (commonly called Sunday) Observance Act was passed in the year 1676, during the reign of Charles the Second, a period certainly not remarkable for austerity of morals or of manners. This is the first section of the Act: 'That all the laws enacted and in force concerning the observation of the Lord's Day, and repairing to the Church thereon, be carefully put into execution; and that all and every person or persons whatsoever shall on every Lord's Day apply themselves to the observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately; and that no tradesman, artificer, workman, labourer, or other person whatsoever shall do or exercise any worldly labour, business, or work of their ordinary callings upon the Lord's Day or any part thereof (works of necessity or charity only excepted); and that every person, being of the age of fourteen years of age or upwards, offending in the premises, shall for every such offence forfeit the sum of five shillings; and that no person or persons whatsoever shall publicly cry, show forth, or expose to sale any wares, merchandises, fruit, herbs, goods or chattels whatsoever upon the Lord's Day or any part thereof, upon pain that every person so offending shall forfeit the same goods so cried, or showed forth, or exposed to sale.'

The second section of the Act prohibits driving or travelling in the way of business, as by a drover, horse-courser, waggoner, butcher, higgler, or any of their servants, under a penalty of twenty shillings. 'And no person shall use, employ, or

travel on Sunday with any boat, wherry, lighter, or barge (except it be upon some extraordinary occasion) under a penalty of five shillings.' Any prosecution must be commenced within ten days after the offence has been committed. And if the penalties are unpaid, they may be levied by distress, and at last the offender may be 'set publicly in the stocks for the space of two hours.'

That Act is still in force. But in 1871 it was enacted that before any one could institute proceedings under it, he must obtain the consent of two justices of the peace, or a stipendiary magistrate, or the chief officer of police of the district where the offence was committed. Under this Act the Quiet Sunday Society recently made application to one of the London police magistrates to have a milk-seller punished for following his calling on Sunday. The Act, in its third section, provides for the selling of milk on Sunday before nine o'clock in the morning and after four in the afternoon. The milk-seller, who did not respect these hours, was convicted of illegally crying his wares, and his milk was declared forfeited; but the magistrate refused a warrant for the forfeiture, and declined to allow the costs of the prosecution.

In 1781 an Act was passed to do for Sunday amusements what the Act of Charles the Second had done for Sunday trading. It enacted 'that any house, room, or other place which shall be opened or used in public entertainment or amusement, or for publicly debating on any subject whatsoever upon any part of the Lord's Day called Sunday, and to which persons shall be admitted on the payment of money, shall be deemed a disorderly house or place.' In 1875 the proprietors of the Brighton Aquarium were convicted. They charged entrance money to the grounds of the Aquarium, and it was held to be an entertainment. That conviction, however, led to the passing of an Act the same year which gave the Crown the power to remit, in whole or in part,

any penalty, fine, or forfeiture imposed or recovered for any offence under the Act of 1781.

In 1894 the Lord's Day Observance Society sued the Leeds Sunday Lecture Society under the Act of 1781. The lectures were given on Sunday evenings in the Coliseum at Leeds, and the public were admitted on payment. It was proved that the lectures were partly of a humorous character, for Max O'Rell had lectured for one, and therefore they came under the designation of entertainment and amusement. In deciding for the plaintiffs, Lord Justice Lopes showed his sympathy with the defendants by saying that if the Society, instead of producing something amusing and entertaining, had produced something as dull as possible, they clearly would not have been liable. This judicial opinion caused the appointment, early in 1895, of a Select Committee of the House of Lords to consider what amendments it might be expedient to make in the Lord's Day Act of 1781. Many witnesses were examined, and from all ranks in society, including a literary cab-driver, 'who had written a prize essay on the roof of his hansom.' In July 1896 the Committee presented its report. 'We believe,' they said, 'that the law now in force is (apart from its phraseology) in general harmony with the sentiments and wishes of the English people.'

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol preached the Easter Day sermon in Gloucester Cathedral, 'as has been his custom for many years past.' A full report of the sermon has been kindly sent to us. Dr. Ellicott took for his text the words, 'We shall all be changed' (1 Cor. xv. 52). He said that the 'we' refers to Christians generally, and indeed, under proper limitations, to all mankind, and the real substance of the mystery is, that all of us, whether alive at the Lord's Coming or asleep, will pass through the change which is described as the corruptible putting on incorruption and the mortal putting on immortality.

What does that change amount to? Dr. Ellicott considers the whole narrative; he makes the light of other words of St. Paul to fall upon it; and he comes to the conclusion that we are justified in believing three propositions. Firstly, all believers will rise with bodies utterly different as regards appearance and substance from the bodies they wore upon earth; and, for the great mass of mankind, the time when this mighty change will be consummated will be at the Second Coming of our Lord. Secondly, they who will then be alive on earth will pass through the mighty change in a moment of time, and will be caught up, in company with the risen dead, to meet the Lord in the air. And thirdly, in the waiting and intermediate world the soul will not exist in a state wholly unclothed or bodiless.

Dr. Ellicott cannot tell us what relation the glorified body will bear to the body we now possess. 'Utterly different' is the utmost he can say on the one side. And on the other all he will venture to say is that, as the soul fashions for itself out of earthly elements an earthly body, so may the soul hereafter fashion for itself a body of glory out of the elements of the new and glorified realm into which it will be translated. But as to the time, he holds that Scripture is more explicit. We have warrant for the belief that *prior to the Advent* the elect will be clothed with the resurrection body, and form a part of the blessed and holy company that will reign with Christ till the end come.

'The diversity of opinion prevailing among interpreters in regard to the meaning of the principal passage bearing on the subject of Christ's humiliation, is enough to fill the student with despair, and to afflict him with intellectual paralysis.' So says Professor Bruce in his *Humiliation of Christ*. Nevertheless, Dr. E. H. Gifford, lately Archdeacon of London and Canon of St. Paul's, has come forward with another interpretation. He has published a book which deals entirely with this passage—*The Incarnation* (Hodder & Stoughton. Crown 8vo. pp. 161. 3s. 6d.). Dr.

Gifford has evidently been a student of the subject, but there is no sign of the dreadful result predicted by Dr. Bruce.

The passage is Philippians ii. 5-11. The translations of the Authorized and Revised Versions may be set down side by side :—

A.V.	R.V.
5. Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus :	5. Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus : who, <sup>2</sup> being in the form of God, counted it not <sup>3</sup> a prize to be on an equality with God,
6. Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God :	7. but emptied himself, taking the form of a <sup>4</sup> servant, <sup>5</sup> being made in the likeness of men ;
7. But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the <sup>1</sup> likeness of men :	8. and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient <i>even</i> unto death, yea, the death of the cross.
8. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.	9. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name ;
9. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name :	10. every name ; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of <i>things</i> in heaven and <i>things</i> on earth and <sup>6</sup> <i>things</i> under the earth,
10. That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of <i>things</i> in heaven, and <i>things</i> under the earth ;	11. and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.
11. And <i>that</i> every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.	

<sup>1</sup> Or *habit*.

<sup>2</sup> Gr. *being originally*.

<sup>3</sup> Gr. *a thing to be grasped*.

<sup>4</sup> Gr. *bond-servant*.

<sup>5</sup> Gr. *becoming in*.

<sup>6</sup> Or, *things of the world below*.

Now, whatever diversity of interpretation there may be, and the two great English versions reveal not a little, there is one point, as Dr. Gifford says, on which all interpreters are agreed, 'that the passage is of primary importance in relation to' what Dr. Gifford calls 'the fundamental truth of the Christian religion—the Incarnation of the Son of God.'

Dr. Gifford begins with the context. But the context does not detain him long. For there is no diversity of opinion that the apostle's intention is to encourage 'lowliness of mind' among his beloved converts at Philippi; and to that end he sets forth the Blessed Lord Himself as the supreme example of humility, self-sacrifice, and love. The one point to notice is that the last words of the context are 'not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others.' That is the special principle of which our Lord is set before them as the perfect example.

Coming to the passage itself, we notice that Dr. Gifford gives a translation which differs from the Revised Version only twice. The first difference is in the translation of the word *ὑπάρχων*, and that is the word which first calls for examination. The Authorized translators give 'being'—'being in the form of God'—the Revisers follow, but they add the marginal note that the Greek word means 'being originally.' That marginal note has been disputed. But Dr. Gifford puts its accuracy beyond doubt. He refers to 1 Cor. xi. 7, 'For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is (*ὑπάρχων*) the image and glory of God'—evidently what man is by his original creation. Again he quotes 2 Cor. viii. 17, 'Being himself (*ὑπάρχων*) very earnest, he went forth unto you of his own accord.' And he recalls Gal. ii. 14, 'If thou being a Jew livest as do the Gentiles,' of which Bishop Lightfoot says that 'being a Jew' (*Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων*) is very emphatic, 'born and bred a Jew'; and Dean Howson adds that the Greek means that he was a Jew by birth, a Jew *to begin with*. Well, then, whatever is said about Christ here, is said *not merely* of His sojourn upon the earth; 'being in the form of God' means being *originally* in the form of God, being in the form of God to begin with.

But it also means 'continuing to be in the form of God' after He emptied Himself. Whatever the emptying be, it is not emptying of Godhead. For

it is one of the merits of Dr. Gifford's exposition that it shows this word 'being' (*ὑπάρχων*) to refer both to the pre-incarnate and to the incarnate Christ. It means being and continuing to be. For it is the *imperfect* participle, which of itself implies an action that (in the time referred to) still went on. So in Luke xxiii. 50, 'Behold a man named Joseph, who was (*ὑπάρχων*) a councillor, . . . went to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus.' Joseph of Arimathea did not cease to be a councillor when he asked the body of Jesus. Nor did David cease to be a prophet, when (Acts ii. 30) he 'spake of the resurrection of the Christ.' And with this agree the earliest interpretations of the passage. Bishop Lightfoot, therefore, for once misses the point when he asks, 'Does the expression, "being in the form of God," refer to the pre-incarnate or the incarnate Christ?' It refers to both. And to express that fulness of reference, Dr. Gifford would prefer the translation, '*subsisting* in the form of God.' This is the first of his two departures from the Revised Version. It has the advantage of showing that the Greek word differs from that which is immediately afterwards translated, '*to be* on an equality' with God.

But the strength of Dr. Gifford's interpretation arises out of the word which follows. It is the word *form*. What does St. Paul mean by 'the form of God'? We are not to sow distraction here by quoting all the opinions which Dr. Gifford succeeds in refuting. It is enough to say that they may all be gathered into the one class of those that hold the form (*μορφή*) to be that of which Christ emptied Himself. Dr. Gifford refutes that opinion in all its variations. He shows that it was impossible for Christ to empty Himself of His 'form' and still be Christ.

For the *morphé* (let us hold by the Greek word for a moment) is that which makes the personality. This Bishop Lightfoot has shown. Tracing the distinction between *morphé* (form) and *schema* (*σχῆμα*, fashion), he proves that *schema*

suggests the idea of something changeable, fleeting, unsubstantial; but *morphé* denotes the one 'form' which is proper to the person or thing as such, and cannot change so long as the nature is the same. The *morphé* of a lion is always the same; by its *morphé* you recognise it to be this particular lion: its *schema* is constantly changing with its age and fortune in hunting. The *morphé* of the Lion of the Tribe of Judah is His inseparable nature, which is not laid aside even when He becomes the Lamb that was slain.

In St. Paul's day this proper sense of *morphé* was even accentuated by its use in the language of philosophy. And Dr. Gifford thinks that when the translators of the Authorized Version chose 'form' to express it, they knew the proper and philosophical value of that word also. Undoubtedly 'form' is an accurate translation. For Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Polity* (I. iii. 4) speaks of 'those forms which give things natural their being.' And Bacon, in his *Novum Organon* (II. iv.), says: 'The form is such, that if it be taken away, the nature infallibly vanishes.' But it is not certain that the Authorized translators were so well aware of its fitness. For Wyclif had already chosen this word, having found it in the Vulgate before him (*Qui cum in forma Dei esset*); and though Tindale adopted 'shape,' in which he was imitated by the Great (Cranmer's) Bible and the Geneva New Testament of 1557; yet the Geneva Bible of 1560 had already restored 'form,' and that is the word used in the Bishops' Bible and the Rhemish New Testament, which were the immediate predecessors of the Authorized Version. But, be that as it may, 'form' is an accurate and excellent rendering, and 'the form of God' means the Divine nature actually and inseparably subsisting in the Person of Christ.

Let it be said again, then, that whatever Christ emptied Himself of, it could not have been His 'form.' To empty Himself of that was to empty Himself of His personality, to empty Himself of Himself. And so let us pass to the next clause.

The next clause is: 'Counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God.' At least that is the next clause according to the Revised Version. The Authorized Version is different: 'Thought it not robbery to be equal with God.' Now the fatal error in the Authorized translation is to regard 'to be equal with God' as equivalent to 'being in the form of God.' The apostle goes on to say that He emptied Himself. When we ask, What of? the answer is either of 'the form of God,' which we have already seen to be impossible, or else of the being 'equal with God,' which therefore cannot be the same as 'the form of God.' In short, 'to be *equal* with God' is, in the Greek, an adverbial phrase (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ), which the Revisers have sought to express by, 'to be *on an equality* with God.' The reference is not to nature, but to state. Christ was, and continued to be, in the form of God, for that was and is His very nature. But Christ was also 'on an equality with God' as respects glory and majesty. He could divest Himself of that, and He did divest Himself of it. He emptied Himself and became obedient.

This point is second in importance only to the meaning of *morphé*, and is necessary to complete that meaning. Therefore Dr. Gifford justifies himself by the clear judgment of Professor Bruce, who says: 'Beyond all doubt, whatever "to be on an equality with God" may mean, it points to something which both the connexion of thought and the grammatical structure of the sentence require us to regard the Son of God as willing to give up.' He also fortifies himself by the judgment of Bishops Lightfoot, Westcott, and Ellicott. And to make the meaning less ambiguous, he proposes a slight departure from even the Revised Version, changing 'to be' into 'was.' Thus his rendering is: 'Counted it not a prize that He was on an equality with God.'

Now, ought we to say, with the Authorized Version, that Christ 'thought it not *robbery*' to be on an equality of glory and majesty with God, or that

He 'counted it not a *prize*,' as the Revisers have it? The difference in meaning is not considerable; and yet this has been the most keenly contested point in the whole interpretation. In the former case it means that, *since* Christ was by nature God, He did not consider it any usurpation to be on an equality of glory and majesty, *but yet* He emptied Himself of that coequal glory. In the other it means that *though* He was by nature God, He did not consider that an equality of glory and majesty was a thing to be held fast, *but* emptied Himself of that equality. In other words, Christ was in the form of God, therefore it was no robbery to retain the glory which He had with God, but yet for our sakes He emptied Himself of it. Or, Christ was in the form of God, and the outward glory of that form might have been to Him a thing to grasp at and hold fast; but He did not hold it fast, He gave it up for our sakes.

The difference in meaning is not great. And it is well. For the difficulty of decision is very great indeed. There is no doubt that *harpagmos* (ἄρπαγμός) should mean 'robbery,' as the Authorized Version has it. There is another word, *harpagma* (ἄρπαγμα), to express the thing robbed, the *prize* as the Revisers give it. And no perfectly satisfactory proof that *harpagmos* can be used in the sense of *harpagma* has ever yet been given. On the other hand, it weakens the emphasis of the apostle's appeal to take *harpagmos* in its ordinary meaning. He introduces our Lord as the supreme example of those who look not to their own things but to the things of others. He ought surely to say at once that He looked not to His own things. He says so after a little. But, if 'robbery' is right, what he says at first is just the opposite of that: 'He counted it no robbery or usurpation to be on an equality with God.' And so strong does that objection appear, that the majority of our English interpreters agree with the Revisers in preferring 'prize.' And Dr. Gifford is one of the number.

And now the difficulties are over. The next clause tells us that He emptied Himself, and we

know that that was of the glory, the outward manifestation of majesty, which He had with the Father. The clause which follows tells us how—'taking the form of a servant.' Not 'and took.' It is not an additional statement. It is the explanation of the statement that has just been made. It is what the emptying consisted in. 'Taking the form of a servant.' The same word *morphé* is used again, and its meaning must be the same. He had the form of God, He now adopted the form of a servant. That is to say, He was, and continued to be, God by nature; He now added the nature of man to that. And here is the place to notice how unmistakably this great passage asserts at once the true divinity and the true humanity of our Lord. He was originally, and He continued still to be by nature, God—that is the assertion of the divinity. He took upon Him the nature of man—that is the assertion of the

humanity. An accurate exegesis makes the one as emphatic and impregnable as the other.

It is true that the apostle does not say at once 'taking the form of a man.' He says 'taking the form a servant.' But the meaning is the same. As Bishop Bull has already explained it, he first tells us that Christ emptied Himself; if you ask how, he answers by 'taking the form of a servant'; and if, again, you ask how He took the form of a servant, he answers by 'being made in the likeness of man.' He chooses servant intentionally at the first. For he wishes to emphasise the depth of the humility. He even says a 'slave.' It is a bold word; almost offensively bold to feeling, but not too bold for the fact. For the slave is he who is absolutely obedient to the will of his master. And Christ was obedient—He was obedient even unto death; yea, to the death of the Cross.

## The Wisdom of Jesus the Messiah.

BY PROFESSOR C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., NEW YORK.

AMONG the apocryphal books of the Old Testament is the famous Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus. This book of wisdom was regarded as canonical by the Hellenistic Jews, and so was included in the Greek version of Holy Scripture. It was also quoted as canonical by many of the Palestinian and Babylonian Jews. The Roman Catholics follow the prevalent opinion of the ancient Church, and use it as a part of Holy Scripture. The Lutherans and Anglicans separate it from the canon of Scripture, but recommend its devout use. The Reformed Churches, and more especially the Puritans, abstain from using it, out of fear lest it should encroach upon the sacred enclosure of the canon. For this reason this precious book of ethical wisdom is little known among us.

The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirā belongs to a special type of Hebrew literature, which is called the literature of Wisdom. It is the nearest approach which the Hebrews made to the philosophy of the Greeks. It is not metaphysical or

speculative, but rather ethical and practical. This wisdom found little expression in the times of the prophets. It seems to have flourished after the decay of prophecy. In the Old Testament it is represented in the Book of Proverbs, the Book of Job, the Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes; in the Apocrypha, in the Book of Tobit, and the Wisdom of Ben Sirā, of the second century B.C., and the Wisdom of Solomon, of the early years of the first century of our era. This wisdom also appears in the earliest tract of the Mishna, in the Sayings of the Fathers, of the first and second centuries of our era. It is also found in the New Testament, in the Epistle of James, and, in a measure, also in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Prologue of the Gospel of John. It constitutes an important part of the teaching of Jesus the Messiah as reported in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. It is this Wisdom of Jesus the Messiah, our Saviour, that we are to consider.

The Wisdom of Jesus the Messiah has been put in its historical setting, in the development of the