

NO. 135.

P H I L I P P I A N S I I.

An Address by Mr. P. W. Heward, at 65, St. Mary Axe, E. C.
3rd May, 1913.

OUTLINE:-

1. Christ's Glory
 "BEING in the Form of God".
 2. "He Emptied Himself".
 3. "God Hath Highly Exalted Him".
 "The Name".
 4. Our Precious Example.
 5. An Awful Contrast and Warning.
-

P H I L I P P I A N S I I.

An Address by Mr. P. W. Heward

At 65, St. Mary Axe, E. C.

3rd May, 1913

OUTLINE:-

1. Christ's Glory.
"BEING in the Form of God".
2. "He Emptied Himself".
3. "God Hath Highly Exalted Him".
"The Name".
4. Our Precious Example.
5. An Awful Contrast and Warning.

We feel, beloved friends, at the outset, that God has given to us here, a chapter which is at once devotional, controversial and practical. A chapter which is remarkable for its repeated words, including the repetition of words from the same root. For example, we find the word "having" in verse 2, then we read "Having upon" or "Having aloft" in verse 16. We read of the "form of God" and the "form of a bondservant". We read of a "reckoning" in verse 3, and a "reckoning" in verse 6. We have an empty glory in verse 3, an emptying of oneself in verse 7, and a pressing forward not with a view to that which is empty in verse 16. We have "lowliness of mind" in verse 3, and the making oneself lowly in verse 8. We find a "having over" in verse 3, - reckoning one another - having a position OVER oneself. We note OVER-exaltation in verse 9, and the Name OVER every name in the same verse. We see the obedience up till death, of our beloved Lord; and then we read in verse 12 of the beloved ones who had always obeyed. We read of an empty glory in

verse 3, of a real glory in verse 11, and of the source of that glory (in a word from the same root) in verse 13, - the thinking well, or good pleasure of our gracious God. Thus we have word after word repeated, calling us to a definite verbal study with spiritual meditations. At the outset we would consider our beloved Lord's glory, as it is here characterised - "Being in the form of God". "Being equal with God". John 17 reminds us that He had a glory with the Father BEFORE the world was. It was not by any means that He became God. He Whose GOINGS FORTH were from of old, from days of everlasting, WAS indeed, in the beginning, the ^{See Hebrew} (Everlasting) Father, as Isa. 9 reveals. From the time that it was He was there, and possessed as the true wisdom in the days of old, before God's works of old, - The One anointed from everlasting, or ever the earth was, - That Wondrous Glorious Saviour Who was present as a Co-Worker. "Then I was with Him as an Artificer", as Prov. 8 puts it, - present as a Co-Worker when in the beginning Elohim, the Triune God, created the heavens and the earth. When we see something of heavenly glory in the book of Revelation, we realise in measure what our beloved Lord gave up when He came into this world that He might save His people from their sins. We behold there that display before which all of earth's glories pale in to nothingness. The sea of glass, and the streets of gold, and the precious stones beyond all human parallel, make small the treasures of an earthly monarch, and show the vanity of human seeking upon this earth. Christ's glory was transcendent, for He was the Centre of that grandeur, He was the Exalted One, the Worshipped One, the Honoured One, the One Who was in the bosom of the Father; - language inexpressibly glorious is used to show us that wondrous intimate fellowship between the Lord Jesus Christ and God the Father. No human words can describe it, no human thoughts can reach it, no human explanations can equal it, - we must pause and wonder.

There must be many a "Selah" in our consideration of what Christ was, and is, and will be. Beloved friends, He WAS so glorious, He had no need to save us, yet as we shall see in a moment or two He EMPTIED HIMSELF that He might save US.

But a few words are necessary concerning that Divine expression "Being in the form of God". The word used for "being" here is not the usual one. It may bring before us what He essentially was and also that this was His position, in contrast with those who BOAST of their earthly positions. But what means the word "Form"? It occurs twice in this passage. "The Form of God", and the "form of a bondservant". When He appeared in the form of a bondservant, was He truly a bondservant? Yes, verily. Isaiah says that He was the Righteous Servant. Then when He was in the form of God was He God? Yes, verily, - not simply called God, but actually God. When then is the word "Form" employed? I believe the reason is this, - God, the Holy Spirit, would not only direct our attention to what He was, but to the EXTERNALS of His glory, that we might see He emptied Himself of them. You will realise, I trust beloved friends, that an emphasis on the outward manifestation of glory is peculiarly important here. Not only because we can realise more what He gave up, but if we were to suggest that He emptied Himself of His Deity it would indeed be blasphemous. He did NOT cease to be HIMSELF: THE ONE WHO EMPTIED as well as the One Who was emptied. He emptied Himself as to the surroundings of glory, as to what might be called the outward form, if I might describe that which is beyond all human parallels. Hence the word "Form" is employed. This term occurs where our beloved Lord appeared to some in another form. A word from the same root is used for the form of knowledge in the law, and the form of godliness. The form of godliness is the outline of godliness, - The outward display of godliness without its inward

character. Now "form" does not always mean an opposition to an inward character, but it emphasizes that which is manifest and visible. Such a display therefore is the special thought here, and it becomes an important background for our second part of the subject.

"He emptied Himself". ("He made Himself of no reputation" says (our) version). Many books have been written upon what has been called from the Greek word, "The Kenosis Theory". The word "Kenosis" is simply a transliteration of the Greek term to "empty", which is here employed. "He emptied Himself". You have noticed, beloved friends, the stress on Himself, and the plural of it "ourselves" or "themselves" in verse 3, "Esteeming one another, having a position over oneselves" - there we find the plural. "Look not every one on the things of oneselves". Then in verse 7 "He emptied Himself", in verse 8 "He made Himself lowly". It is beautiful to notice that our beloved Lord did not simply give up things, He gave up all and emptied HIMSELF, and in this connection we realise that precious passage "He gave Himself for our sins", leading on to another equally precious passage "That He might present to Himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing". Beloved friends, it is well to realise that He put aside the glory of Himself, and offered Himself without spot, that He redeeming us from all iniquity might purify to HIMSELF a

people to be around Him. The "Himself's" of Christ are a precious study. *But what means the expression "He emptied Himself"? Man by nature is declared in Jas. 2 to be empty* Our beloved Lord was the full One. The word

"empty" suggests the fulness. You cannot empty that which is empty to start with. In Him all the fulness was pleased to dwell. We read in one of the Gospels that He was "Full of grace and truth". "In Him" are we told in Col. 2, of a fulness of the Godhead bodily. Beloved friends, Christ is all fulnesses, and man is all emptinesses. But He Who was absolute fulness

emptied Himself.

(Our friends, I know, will not mind my repetition of this point, for the benefit of those who have just arrived).

The second point of the subject this evening is from Phil. 2 "He emptied Himself", and I suggested that the word "Empty" implies that there was such a fulness, Christ being the Contrast with man who was empty, according to James 2. We think of the passages that speak of Christ as the Full One. "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily". "Full of grace and truth". All the fulness was pleased to dwell, there was no emptiness with Christ. But He Who was rich, for OUR SAKES became poor. He EMPTIED Himself that we might receive out from that fulness. It was necessary if we were to receive that He should empty Himself. He could have remained full, but we should have remained empty. And He was pleased to empty Himself that He might redeem us, and then give unto us of His fulness which is made in resurrection available to those for whom it would not have been available otherwise. "He emptied Himself". What meaneth this? Does it bring before us that He laid aside His outward glory? Undoubtedly He did. He Who was the Honoured One of angels, became the Despised One of men. He before Whom the great ones of heaven bowed down, before Whom seraphim veiled themselves, - (for John 12 tells us that Isa. 6 affords a view of Christ's glory) - before Whom the seraphim veiled themselves, He became the One Who hid not His face from shame and spitting. Our beloved Lord emptied Himself of glory. This is the more brought out when we realise the contrasted word "Empty glory", used in verse 3, "Not doing one thing according to strife or empty glory". Christ had a full glory and He gave it up. Man seeks after an empty glory. How unwise man is! But does the passage go further? I think it does. We remember that our translation puts it that our beloved Lord poured out His soul

unto death. More strictly the passage reads, "He made naked His soul for the death." Now that passage seems to bring before us that our beloved Lord was simply giving up all that He had for His people, putting on one side Himself for His people. Now I know this rather refers here to the incarnation than to the atonement. The order is clear. The incarnation is mentioned first with respect to taking the bondservant's form and becoming in likeness of MEN. Then having become ~~ix~~ ~~likewise~~ as a man He Humbled Himself a SECOND TIME and became obedient unto death. I know that incarnation is rather before us in verse 7. But, beloved friends, what we see revealed in atonement was surely illustrated in that which was a stepping stone to atonement. Our beloved Lord put aside everything (shall I say?) except Himself. You will follow what I mean. He did not cease to be God when He was manifest in the flesh. He did not empty Himself of Himself, the Himself remained; but all that He could empty He emptied. Human language falters. We accept the Divine revelation concerning Him Who was born a babe at Bethlehem, and Who grew up, and Whose growth and progress is described in such striking language that no man dare alter. We accept the Divine wisdom that wrote the words. No man can add to them, no man can take away from them, no man can vary them without risking a very serious and grievous sin against Him Who is beyond all human wisdom apart from Divine revelation. We accept the statement not that Christ ceased to be God, but that He emptied Himself. Himself remained, but all that He could He emptied. Such was His love to His own.

Next our outline reminds us that "God hath highly exalted Him". The intervening verse in Phil. 2 deals with Christ's wondrous death, how having been found in fashion as a man He humbled Himself, made Himself lowly, having become with a second becoming, obedient up till death. Like so many words in this context, the ^{word} "death" comes twice over with a

holy emphasis. **HERE** we have particularly stress on our beloved Lord's death as an example. We know that primarily His death was an atonement for us, but you will notice the special stress here is on the aspect of His perfect obedience and willingness to give up all, - a willingness unto death. His humbling Himself is before us to encourage His people's devotedness., and the added words "But a death of ~~the~~ ^a cross imply the shame that was associated with a cross. Here we see Him as the Rejected One, as the One Who laid aside everything, Who bore everything from the hands of men. Do not misunderstand me. This aspect does not, by any means, remove the thought of His dying FOR our sins, but it is well to realise what SHAME He went through from creatures, as Heb. 12 emphasizes it, "He for the joy that was set before Him, endured a cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of God". The cross was the despised Roman means of death. It was arranged for those who were viewed as valueless criminals, and He went through such disgrace. So low did He become Who was altogether high. And this argument gives a background to the added words "God hath highly exalted Him". Our beloved Lord was made very low. God has made Him very high. God reversed man's verdict. **THAT** is the first thought which comes into our mind. God has dealt with men's verdict, and repudiated their judgment. They gave Him up, they set Him on one side, they put Him to death. God hath highly exalted Him. Furthermore, there is a "Wherefore" in it. Wherefore? Because He was the obedient One. Wherefore? Because man is so out of harmony with God that God necessarily does that which is entirely contrasted with man. "God hath highly exalted Him". Who can tell His exaltation as the Man Christ Jesus? He is no longer only to be viewed as over all, as God blessed for ever, but as the Mediator between God and men, the MAN Christ Jesus. as a Man has ascended into the glory, - the pledge

that redeemed men, accepted in Him, the God-Man, will be brought near with an eternal and unalterable salvation. God hath highly exalted Him. Men did their worst, but God replied, and men's worst was broken and destroyed.

And God gave to Him THE Name that is above every name. There are two ways of reading this. It may be "THE Name, the name above every one", or "THE Name, the name over everything". Both thoughts are suggestive, and there is the reference to that which the Jews to this day call THE Name - Jehovah. God particularly said in Exod. 6 that He was made known to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, by the title of Almighty, but by His NAME Jehovah He was not made known to them. Here He is said to give THE Name to our beloved Lord in resurrection glory. Ah, dear friends, He has declared He will not give His glory to another. Then this One cannot be another. God will not share His Name with a creature. Christ must be more than a creature. John 17. 5 will help to explain how He was REinstated: He WAS the Mighty God from eternity. The word "Elohim" is sometimes applied to messengers of God, but never so is it with the word "Jehovah". No pronominal suffixes are appended to it. No plural is used. NEVER do we read of false Jehovahs - I almost shrink from the language - though we do read of false gods. The Name stands out alone, without parallel throughout the whole of the Hebrew Scriptures. And therefore when Christ is here declared to be Jehovah with the Name above every Name, and when it is added that it is with a view to the glory of God the Father, we realise that He was Jehovah Who became a Man, and was welcomed back to His position as Jehovah. He Himself desired that He might be glorified, not with a glory that was entirely fresh to Him, but with a glory which He had with the Father before the world was. We accept the statement that He was received back to that glory. Let it be repeated that there was, if we

might so word it, a reinstatement for He Who had emptied Himself was then manifested as the One in Whom the Father was pleased that all fulness should dwell. Beloved friends, I venture to say that we understand this mention of the Name Jehovah in the light of the words "He emptied Himself". If He emptied Himself of everything save Himself, is it surprising that He received back again the Name. We little realise how He Who became a Man was found in fashion as a MAN, humbled Himself that He might die a criminal's death. Sometimes we find a mocking Jew will remark, "Your God died". We answer, Nay, He Who was God died. Who can describe the way in which He Who was God was at once Priest and Sacrifice, was at once the Righteous One, and taking the place of the criminal, at once God and yet the One Who said "My God, My God, Why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Indeed He had emptied Himself. But He WAS the Mighty God. Indeed, He had emptied Himself so that He might receive again in resurrection the Name "Jehovah", even as He received that precious Name, "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee". He Who was the Priest had offered Himself as the Sacrifice, and the words sounded forth in resurrection, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. The word here used concerning God, and the giving of THE Name, is "giving in grace". Now that presents the greatest difficulty of the passage, but I am inclined to think greatest difficulties are greatest blessings. There is here the contrast, first of all, with His position when He took wrath. When He was upon Calvary there was no giving to Him of anything save judgment. He bare our sins in His own body on the tree. He took our position under the old covenant and died in our place, but in resurrection there was the manifestation of grace. But I am sure we realise that though this thought is precious it would not be sufficient warrant for the use of the word. It is suggestive, but it is hardly an interpretation, for our beloved Lord was raised again because of our justification. Therefore it is plain that it was not to be viewed

simply as an act of grace. It is grace to us, it was righteousness to Him. What then? This word "to give in grace" also seems to be employed as a legal term. You recollect the case of God's dear servant Paul when he was standing before the Roman governor. (Acts 25). He then declared that they had no right to deal with him as they were dealing with him, and made the striking statement, "If there is nothing of which these are accusing me, no one has power to have given me up in grace to them". I translate it literally. Evidently the term was a technical legal term. "I appeal to Caesar" he added. Then in the 16th verse we find the words of Festus "To whom I answered that it is not a custom for Romans to give any man IN GRACE up to destruction, before that the one accusing him have the accusers to his face, and receive space of defence concerning that for which he is called in question". The whole language here is legal. I recommend our brethren who are studying the legal phases of Scripture to look to the Greek of Acts 25, it will help them considerably. The word as to calling in question is the "enklema", and the contrast with "Ecclesia". The church of God is that which is NOT called in question. Here too we find the mention of the BEMA, and so forth. The passage is deeply important. Well then, beloved friends, Festus declared that it was not a Roman custom to give up any one in grace before that his accusers were brought face to face with him. Now surely this cannot mean that they did not give him up in grace before that, but AFTERWARDS gave him up "in grace". Such an expression would imply that they would not be unfair till they had met his accusers, and then that they would be unfair; for giving up a man to judgment IN GRACE is unfairness. Grace to deliver from judgment is blessedly beyond fairness. But to deliver up to judgment is not fair. The term, therefore, cannot mean to give up in grace, but must signify a legal bestowal. Here we have the way in which certain

words can have a specialised meaning. The word "grace" has even in English a legal meaning in certain contexts, and here we have brought before us in Phil. 2 that which is entirely legal. Our beloved Lord Who took the place of the criminal is released from man's judgment. The higher court reverses it. "And the Name is given to Him above every name". Men called Him mockingly the King of the Jews, they called Him by various names, but God called Him THE Name above every name. As it were, God gave up His Son for a while unto men, that they might do their worst, but then He stepped in and vindicated, and gave His Son the right Name which His Son possessed which they had sought to remove.

But, beloved friends, Phil. 2 is not merely argumentative. It is our precious example. I beg you to notice that this explains the secondary reference to the atonement in some verses. You do not have so much stress upon the atonement as on the exemplary suffering of our beloved Lord. The passage is PRACTICAL, and applies to those for whom He sacrificially died, and who knew acceptance thereby, and thereby alone. It begins with a practical exhortation as to minding the same thing, and ends off with a command to do all things without murmurings and disputings, to obey, not only in the presence of an apostle, but much more in his absence. Here then is the apostle's argument for holiness, argument for self-denial, argument for the laying aside of our own opinions, and of our natural own/wishes. Christ is here shown as the Example Who emptied Himself, aye, twice over brought Himself down, Who was willing to leave the glory to become a man, willing to take the lowest position a man could take, as if a crucified criminal. He Who was perfectly righteous was willing to take such a position, as though He was a malefactor. Oh what wondrous love, what a wondrous example to us. Beloved friends, He did not cease to be God, we cannot cease to be men. If this passage meant that He

gave up His Deity, it would imply that we are to give up our humanity, which would be an absurdity. We cannot be those who take an animal's status. But we ARE to give up our glory, our dignity, our position, our prominence, our rights. Believers have no rights, they are to suffer many wrongs, they are to realise that their rights are future. It is more important to have a righteousness than rights. When a person desires to stand up for himself it is a grave ^{failure} mistake, when a person is brought by grace to give up himself it is a blessed illustration of that which the Lord desires His people to do. You know how the first epistle of Peter brings before us that to be buffeted not for one's faults but when one is acting rightly, is GRACE in God's law court, and God wants grace before Him. Having received grace, we ought to be gracious. Such bearing of unkindness is "a grace" in God's law court. What meaneth that? Ah we are getting a further sidelight on the word here. God has given Him in grace the Name above every name. This means there is something that God will reward if we suffer unrighteously. If we are buffeted for our faults there is no encouragement, we are chastised, we are punished; but if when we do well and suffer for it, we bear it patiently, then we are like our beloved Lord, and shall receive a resurrection award. Here is our Example. Let us not exalt ourselves. If He Who had a fulness emptied Himself, how shall we, who only have an empty glory, seek after honours of earth? As the apostle puts it, Let not one thing be done according to strife or empty glory. Love is the opposite of strife, and a desire to have the glory of That Day, a contrast with man's empty glory.

"An Awful Contrast and Warning" must also be seen in the passage. He Who was in the form of God did not regard it a thing to be snatched at to be equal with God. Satan who was not in the form of God, but who was the highest created being, did think it a thing to be snatched at to be equal with

God, and Antichrist will continue the sin that Satan suggested to Adam and Eve, a sin that is brought throughout Scripture as Satan's object, the exaltation of man, to say "I will be like the Most High". The charge that the Jews brought against the Lord Jesus was that He though a Man made Himself God. We know the reverse was true; but that charge may be rightly brought against another who shall come in his own name, whom Israel will receive. Our beloved Lord Who came in His Father's Name received in resurrection the Name above every Name manifestly. Antichrist who will come in his own name and in the name of the devil will show himself that he is God and emphasize himself as God. He will think it a thing to be snatched at, and will grasp hold of this seeking to be equal with God. Antichrist is throughout the contrast of Christ. Antichrist is the hero of the world. Antichrist is the climax of civilisation. Antichrist is the one to whom earth's boasting is tending, and we are all like Antichrist OR like Christ. If we are in Christ let us be like Christ, marked by that humility and lowliness of Him Who was meek and lowly in heart and Who showed it in His life, Who never defended Himself, but when He was reviled, reviled not again, when He suffered He threatened not, Who was led as a Lamb to the slaughter and as a sheep before her shearers was dumb, so He opened not His mouth. Let this mind be in us which was in Christ Jesus. There was quarrelling at Philippi, there were murmurings and disputings. I do not mean there was quarrelling which the world could see, but which the Lord could see, and which caused grief to the Lord's servant. God, in mercy overruled that quarrelling to give us the epistle to the Philippians. Euódias and Syntyche had no right to differ as they did, but God, in mercy, worked above all their failures to give us this precious epistle. We find how the apostle merges doctrine and practice. If he would explain what we OUGHT TO DO he gives us deep teaching as to what Christ DID. There is not

in Scripture one book of doctrinal theology, and another of practical, - it is all ~~practical~~ ^{doctrinal}, it is all practical, it is all devotional, it is all controversial, when realised in the Holy Spirit, for All Scripture is (given by inspiration of) God-BREATHED and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for discipline that is in righteousness, that the man of God may be fit, having been outfitted with a view to every good work. May the Lord grant to us by the application of this passage in the Holy Spirit, a closer life of giving up, and of self-denial, to the praise of the glory of the grace of Him Who has made us accepted in the Beloved One, of Whom this chapter so precious speaks to our hearts,

Q. Did you suggest in Isa. 53 that "He made bare His Soul with a view to death"? Was the "soul" another name for Himself, and have we the emptying of Himself that He might take upon Himself the form of a servant? I was thinking of "He bear our sins in His own body on the tree".

H. Apparently the point was hardly clear. It is this - that in Isa. 53 there are two aspects of death. We read of death_S in the plural in that passage. Apart from His bearing of our sins in His own body, the passage from which 1 Pet. 2 quotes, Isa. 53. 10-12 declares He made naked His soul for death. The Scripture makes clear that the soul that sinneth it shall die. The Lord Jesus took His people's place, and this involved not only physical bodily death, but the realisation of wrath, and so in a mysterious way He made naked His soul for death, to fulfil Lev. 17, - "The soul of the flesh is in the blood, and I, I gave it to you upon the place of sacrifice to make an atonement for your souls, for THE soul it in the blood will make an atonement". That precious soul

of Christ made an atonement ~~to cover~~ ^{to cover} our souls. We read of His body, soul, and spirit in connection with "Calvary." As to the Spirit it is written, That He through an ETERNAL Spirit offered Himself, in that Spirit He was the Divine Offerer, and of that Spirit He said, Father into Thy hands I commit My Spirit. But His soul was made naked for the death, and His BODY bare our sins. Soul and body are connected with His incarnation. He laid down His soul that He might take IT again. He was the Layer-Down, for He WAS not only the soul, but HE the Glorious Saviour of sinners, had a soul that He laid down, as well as a body. "Calvary is indeed mysterious, but it is precious to realise how Christ there gave up as it were the whole of Himself for us. He Who had taken soul and body gave up soul and body. He bare our sins, and to make manifest a two-fold death on our behalf to meet those who deserved the second death as well as the first to the body. The second death is more related to the soul, and He dealt with both deaths, if I might so characterise it, on behalf of His beloved people. Hence Calvary gives an illustration of His willingness to give up everything, and that was the fruit of the incarnation. I suggested therefore a parallel in that when He emptied Himself, He put aside all He could possibly put aside, that He might become so utterly lowly in taking the place of men, becoming in the likeness of sinful flesh, and THEN dying for sinners. Is that clear?

Q. Yes, thank you.

Q. What is the NEW NAME in Revelation?

H. There we have the thought of reward in resurrection, but to Christ here the new name is not given, but THE Name which is above every Name, for He had an ancient Name, He was Jehovah from everlasting. There is a parallel in the reception, but a contrast in the Name.

Q. "My Father's Name", as if the Name is old there?

H. The end of the verse is "I will write upon him My

new name". Ch. 2. 17 or 3. 12? Ch. 2. 17 suggests a contrast. "I will write on to him the name of My God" is not "I will give him the Name". "I will write on to him". It is to be distinguished. We can never have the Name "Jehovah", we can have given to us in wondrous grace various names, but the name Jehovah cannot be given to us. Concerning the bride we may surely say in the words of Jer. 33. 16 (lit.) "This is the Name which shall be called to her, the Lord our Righteousness." "This is that which shall be called to her" (I should have said) but where Scripture speaks of Him, it is written, "This is HIS Name wherewith one shall call Him".

Q. When a man married, the wife takes the husband's name.

H. That is true, and is one of the points of Jer. 33. The Name is not given as a personal possession, but the name is called to her. So with us, it is called to us. The language in Rev. 3 is a contrast with Phil. 2, the "writing upon" being distinct from the "giving".

Q. Isa. 53. 10 - "When THOU shalt make His soul an offering for sin"?

H. There are two possible interpretations "When Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, or guilt" would mean, When Thou, that is Thou, God the Father, shall place His soul as a guilt-offering, and it would suggest that it pleased the Lord to bridle Him, and that the prophet turns round and addresses God in adoring worship; but it is equally possible to render it, "When His soul shall place a guilt-offering". You see the word "soul" is feminine, hence, as you knew, in the Hebrew Future, the 3rd person singular feminine is the same as the 2nd person singular masculine. "When His soul shall place a guilt-offering". There are certain difficulties in such a rendering. But it would imply our beloved Lord placing an absolute guilt offering, not simply outward, as men could do, but HIS SOUL placing a guilt offering.

Q. According to the Levitical arrangement, if one committed a sin, he would take of the flock for atonement for that particular sin, etc. ?

H. I cannot see that man's work is brought before us in Isa. 53 at all. The word "when" may be rendered "if". It is " וְיָשַׁם נַפְשׁוֹ " "If His soul shall place", and I think that brings out the force more clearly. The rendering that you suggest would refer to the concerned one and his appreciation of Christ's work making a guilt offering, but Christ will see His seed, and prolong His days. We must not make His glory contingent on our acceptance. If, on the other hand, we render, If His soul places the guilt-offering, He shall see His seed, - His glory is only contingent on His own work. "When" is rather unsatisfactory in English. It implies "At the same time as", but our beloved Lord did not receive the reward at the same time. The Hebrew is rather "if". In the same way we read, "When Christ shall appear" in 1 John 3, "We shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is" but the language is rather "If He shall be manifested we shall be like Him". The thought here is not a stress upon the time when, but upon the certainty of the consequence. "IF He shall be manifested, like ones to Him we shall be". There is no doubt about it. "If" is the strongest word that can possibly be used in such contexts. I know that looks a strange statement to make. The more contingent you make some statements the more definite they are as to the ^{fact} fruit. "IF he shall have been manifested, THEN, necessarily, like ones to Him shall we be, because we shall see Him according as He is." So if His Soul shall place a guilt offering, HE SHALL SEE a seed, He shall make long days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.

Q. In that sense then Jehovah is considered as the second and third Person in the same context, as in 23rd Psalm?

H. If the translation "Thou" we have God the Father addressed, and then God the Father mentioned. If on the other hand we take it "If His soul shall place a guilt offering" then we read "The pleasure of the Lord, the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in His hand". The grammar seems easier thus. Isa. 53 is inexhaustible. Oh that we may spiritually realise it more and more.