

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

text or with what we have fair ground for expecting in itself? I do not ask for evidence to be forced in this behalf, but do let there be an end made to that untoward system of seeking for whatever tends most violently the other way. For there does exist, in respect of such investigations, an innate feeling on the part of most of us which recoils from submitting the words that have brought blessings to many to the repulsive testings of mere diplomatic criticism. Can we not witness, indeed, how each time that such discussions have come before us—

like a man in wrath, the heart  
Stood up and answered, "I have felt" ?

Let this sentiment, then, receive its proper recognition, and, under the control of a matured judgment, it may be trusted to point often to the result which will yield the truest ultimate satisfaction.

ALFRED WATTS.

---

### ON PHILIPPIANS i. 22.

THE interesting remarks made by Canon Evans, in the February number of the EXPOSITOR, on the *μισθός* which St. Paul was anticipating, suggest to me to crave a little space in order to state briefly what seems to me a probable interpretation of the difficult words which form the first half of Philippians i. 22.

Verses 21 to 24 stands thus in the Greek: (21) Ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος. (22) εἰ δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί, τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου καὶ τί αἰρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω. (23) συνέχομαι δὲ ἐκ τῶν δύο, τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τὸ ἀναλύσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι. (24) πολλῶ [γὰρ] μᾶλλον κρείσσον· 24 τὸ δὲ ἐπιμένειν [ἐν] τῇ σαρκὶ ἀναγκαϊότερον δι' ὑμᾶς.

The first two of these verses—it suffices to quote those two in the English—are given in the Authorized Version thus: "For to me to live *is* Christ, and to die *is* gain. But if I live in the flesh, this *is* the fruit of my labour; yet what I shall choose I wot not."

The Revised Version keeps the same rendering of ver. 21, but translates ver. 22 in the text as follows: "But if to live in the flesh,—*if* this is the fruit of my work, then what I shall choose I wot not;" with this alternative in the margin: "But if to live in the flesh *be my lot*, this is the fruit of my work: and what I shall choose I wot not." A further alternative, agreeing with Westcott and Hort's marginal punctuation, καὶ τί αἰρήσομαι; is, "What shall I choose?"

It is unnecessary to discuss all the other interpretations that have been proposed, involving also other varieties of punctuation. They are sufficiently familiar to the readers of the EXPOSITOR, or can easily be found by turning to Lightfoot and to the commentators cited by Alford.

The suggestion I have to make is twofold. First, the "is" supplied before "fruit" may have some light thrown upon it by the "is" similarly supplied twice in ver. 21; in all three clauses there is no ἐστὶ in the Greek. Secondly, it may help if we translate more literally.

1. As to this "is." It is obvious that in "to live is Christ" and "to die is gain" (just as in the Old Testament apophthegm, "The fear of the Lord *is* to hate evil") the "is" is not a copula connecting two simply equivalent terms, as if I say "Sodium Chloride is Common Salt," or "The Exile of St. Helena is Napoleon," the terms being what the logicians call *singular*. Nor do we hit the true sense—at any rate not in the first of these two clauses—if we attempt to take the predicate as *undistributed*: we may say "to die is *a* gain," but no such turn can be given to the other clause. It is clear that we must look for assistance to rhetoric rather than to logic. The "is" means more than "is," and each proposition is pregnant with a fathomless depth of meaning. It is as though the Apostle should say, "If I live, that *implies* that my whole life, every power of my being, all I am and all I have, is consecrated to the service of Christ and hallowed by his love; and if I die, that *means* not death, but entering into the joy of my Lord and sharing all that wealth of love and bliss and holiness with which He rewards his faithful servants—losing my life, as some might judge, but with a loss that brings infinite gain." I propose a similar interpretation of τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου.

2. But, moreover, it may fairly be questioned whether anything is gained by the repetition of "if," as in the Revised Version; and,

still more, whether the meaning is not seriously obscured by the imported "the" and "my." Is there not a good and consistent sense in the simpler form—taking the understood *ἐστὶ* as *means* or *implies*, as in the two clauses preceding—"This means fruit of work."

"To live," says the Apostle, "means to be devoted to Christ and to enjoy his companionship and love: to die means to go into his more immediate presence and to be enriched with incalculable wealth. Aye, but even now if I live, to live even thus in the flesh means enjoyment—coupled with and springing from work. Fruit, exquisite fruit, sweetening the toil. Toil, but I add no epithet; hard and weary toil I may deem it at times, but in comparison with the harvest He permits me to reap that is as nothing; call it work merely: fruit—abundant, delicious, fragrant, reviving—that comes to sustain and comfort me, if still it be his will that I live in the flesh. The joy is so intense, I know not which to choose, the joy of such work on earth or the joy of rest in heaven. My desire and longing is to be with Christ. That is very far better for *me*, but what of *you*? For your sake I shall remain—remain to enjoy communion with you and carry on Christ's work in your midst."

Believing this to be the true sense of the passage, I would render: "But if to live in the flesh (be my lot), this implies fruit for me of work." This appears to me to be perfectly in harmony with the context, and simpler than any other interpretation I have met with. We are now no longer obliged to recognize, with Lightfoot, "abrupt and disjointed sentences," or to consider that "the grammar of the passage reflects the conflict of feeling in the Apostle's mind." Nor are we now distressed with such a notion as the Revised Version seems to convey, that the fruit of his labour which the Apostle desired or anticipated was simply prolonged life on earth. With all my admiration for the Revised Version as a whole, its rendering of this passage seems to me eminently unsatisfactory.

R. F. WEYMOUTH.