

time, prefer the single state to marriage, from a conscientious regard to the law of self-denial, there the reward will come in the greater calm of a happy-married life later on; nor will such be troubled much by vain regrets if the boon is denied: theirs has been a noble discipline, which bears the fruits of peace, that follow all acts of self-conquest. On the other hand, where the married state has been entered into at an earlier period from high motives, under a sense of duty and without violation of the Divine laws, economic or social, and without religious compunction as to the step taken, there the evil results of which we have spoken above, arising from an imprudent following of early inclinations, are not likely to follow. But in all cases where selfish motives and inconsiderate wilfulness have led to improvident marriages, individual pains and penalties, social inconveniences, and ministerial inefficiency will follow as a matter of course, with all their attendant baleful consequences, extending far beyond the circle of those immediately concerned, and perhaps influencing for evil the life and conduct of those who are yet to follow through many generations.

M. KAUFMANN.



ART. II.—THREE EXEGETICAL QUESTIONS ON PASSAGES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I.—MEANING OF ἀνεπαίσχυτος IN 2 TIM. II. 15.

A GREAT deal has been done of late in the department of exegesis in the New Testament, but more yet remains to be done. Even the simple verification and closer examination of a reference, which has for a longer or shorter time gone the round of editors and commentators, will sometimes furnish us with an unexpected and gratifying result. This is actually the case with regard to the first of the questions, which I propose to consider in the following pages, viz., the true meaning of ἀνεπαίσχυτος in 2 Tim. ii. 15.

Here—adopting the rendering of the unjustly traduced Revised Version—Paul urges Timothy to “give diligence to present himself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed” (ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυτον). The Vulgate translates ἀνεπαίσχυτος by *inconfusibilis*, and the English fairly expresses the Latin, though I think it will be found that it is far from expressing the point of the original Greek.

Let us first consider the sense or senses of the verb ἐπαίσχυνομαι in the New Testament, where it occurs ten times.

In Mark viii. 38, and Luke ix. 26, we find it twice with an accusative case in almost the same formula in each Evangelist. In Mark we have: "Whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and My words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him, when He comes in the glory of His Father with the holy angels." In Luke: "Whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and My words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when He comes in His glory and that of His Father and of the holy angels." Note that here *ἑπαισχύνομαι* is not simply "to be ashamed," but "to be ashamed of."

In Rom. i. 16, Paul says: "I am not ashamed of the gospel." In Rom. vi. 21, *ἑπαισχύνομαι* is followed by the dative with *ἐπί*, but in the same sense of being ashamed of. Both versions translate: "What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death." I cannot forbear expressing my confidence that the right punctuation is that adopted by Tischendorf (ed. 1878), viz.: *τίνα οὖν κάρπον εἶχετε τότε; ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἑπαισχύνεσθε· τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος.* "What fruit had ye then? Things of which ye are now ashamed; for the end of those things is death." This variation of punctuation is, however, of no importance to my argument. Paul has the word again in 2 Tim. i. 8: "Be not ashamed therefore of the testimony of the Lord, nor of me His prisoner." And in 2 Tim. i. 12: "For the which cause I suffer these things, yet I am not ashamed," where nothing follows and the word appears to be used absolutely. But surely there is an implicit reference in the preposition *ἐπί* in *ἑπαισχύνομαι* here, which carries us back to the same word in verse 8 above, which might be indicated by the addition of *it*. "I am not ashamed of [it]." In 2 Tim. i. 16, we find: "He was not ashamed of my chain."

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the word occurs twice. First in Heb. ii. 11, where it is followed by an infinitive instead of an accusative, and the translation might just as well be: "He is not ashamed of calling them brethren," as what it is: "He is not ashamed to call them brethren." In Heb. xi. 16, we find both an accusative and an exegetical infinitive: "Wherefore God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God."

As to classical usage, if we open Liddell and Scott's Lexicon at the word *ἑπαισχύνομαι*, we find it at once rendered "to be ashamed at or of," and a mass of instances are given, which it is unnecessary to quote in detail. I will just give a remarkable one from Herodotus, i. 90: Here Cræsus, sending a reproachful message to Apollo at Delphi, orders his messengers to inquire, "whether he was not ashamed of inducing by his oracles Cræsus to make war against the Persians"?

(εἰ οὐ τι ἐπαισχύνεται τοῖσι μαντήοις ἑπάρας Κροῖσον στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ Πέρσας;)

Now what is the result of all this as regards *ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυντον*? Even this, that the words do not mean "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed," but, "a workman NOT TO BE ASHAMED OF," "a workman of whom HIS MASTER needeth not to be ashamed," a skilful and trusty workman who can be sent out anywhere to represent his Master in any important business. How mean and paltry does the ordinary rendering, "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed," appear in juxtaposition with that which I am advocating, "a workman not to be ashamed of," "a workman, a missionary, truly *δόκιμος*, who can stand any test, and of whom God, his Master, will have no reason to be ashamed"! And how exactly this corresponds, as a grand particular application, with our Lord's own general expression above quoted: "He that is ashamed of Me *now*, of him will the Son of Man be ashamed *then*."

I might rest my case on reasoning alone with a fair probability of acceptance, but I cannot look upon it as completely demonstrated, unless I produce an instance in which the word *ἀνεπαίσχυντος* actually has this signification, and cannot possibly have any other. And such an instance I find in the only one, in which the word is as yet known to occur, viz., Josephus's Antiquities, xviii. 7, 1. Here Herodias, envying her brother Agrippa's elevation to the royal dignity, is represented as using various arguments to induce Herod Antipas, a mere tetrarch, to go to Rome and spare no expense to obtain the title of king for himself. The last of her arguments is: *μηδὲ δευτερεύειν ἀνεπαίσχυντον ἡγοῦ τῶν χθῆς καὶ πρῶτ' ἰλέμ τῷ σὺ διαβεβιωκότῳ*. "And don't think it a thing *not to be ashamed of* to be playing second fiddle to those who have but lately preserved their lives through your compassion." [Herod Agrippa I. had been compelled to flee from Rome to escape his creditors, and Herodias had induced Herod Antipas to allow him to reside at Tiberias with the rank of ædile of the city and a small annual income.]

In the above passage it is impossible to translate *ἀνεπαίσχυντον* otherwise than as "a thing not to be ashamed of." If we take the words of the versions and place them in this passage, what do we have? "And don't think it a thing *that needeth not to be ashamed*, to be playing second fiddle to those who have preserved their lives through your compassion." This is simple nonsense. Let us therefore take the clear and undoubted sense of *ἀνεπαίσχυντον* in this passage of Josephus, and transfer it to its place in 2 Tim. ii. 15, and thus exhibit in its full dignity the idea of "a workman not to be ashamed of," "a workman of whom God, his Master, needeth not to be ashamed."

II.—WHY DID JOHN THE BAPTIST SEND DISCIPLES TO ASK JESUS: "ART THOU HE THAT COMETH, OR ARE WE TO LOOK FOR ANOTHER?" Matt. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19.

A great deal of discussion has taken place upon this subject, and various and very discrepant opinions have been held and maintained upon it. Was it for John's own satisfaction, or for that of his disciples, that he thus acted? Had his faith in Him, upon Whom he had seen the Spirit descending as a dove, and with regard to Whom he had heard the voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased," become impaired by his long imprisonment? Were his disciples ceasing to believe in him, that he must have recourse to this step to maintain his authority? These and cognate questions have been discussed to a very great extent, but no really satisfactory result has been arrived at; and in fact the data are so small, and conjecture must play so great a part in the discussion, that it is not to be wondered at that the point is still *sub judice* and just as much a matter of controversy as ever.

But if a reason can be found in the Gospels themselves for John's sending to ask the question, quite independent of any such considerations, and leaving John's psychological condition and that of his disciples entirely out of the question, it may perhaps be a real gain to the theological student and even to theology itself. And the Gospels themselves do afford hints that, after all, this may have been the case, and the entire controversy may be utterly and entirely beside the point.

In John i. 19, 21 we read, "This is the witness of John, when the Jews sent unto him from Jerusalem priests and Levites to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed and denied not; and he confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elijah? And he saith, I am not. Art thou the Prophet? And he answered, No."

Now here is a manifest distinction made between "the Christ" and "the Prophet." The Christ must, of course, be the Messiah, the Prince; the Prophet, the person mentioned in Deut. xviii. 15, "The Lord thy God will raise up to thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken"; and 18, 19, "I will raise thee up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my word, which he shall speak in my Name, I will require it of him."

Now, were the Messiah and the Prophet one person or two?

Were they separate individuals, each fulfilling his own portion of God's work, or were they one and the same person in a twofold character? In Acts iii. 22, this prophecy of Moses is clearly taken as referring to the Christ, and so also apparently in Acts vii. 37, in both which passages it is quoted. So, also, in John vi. 14 (R.V.), "When therefore the people saw the sign which he did, they said, This is of a truth the Prophet that cometh into the world." In these passages *one* person only appears to be referred to as expected. But in John vii. 40, 41 we find a distinct reference to a current opinion that the Christ and the Prophet were not to be one and the same, but two distinct persons: "Some of the multitude therefore, when they heard these words, said, This is of a truth *the Prophet*, others said, This is *the Christ*."

It is manifest, hence, that the views of the Jews were not uniform upon this point, but that it was a question still under discussion, although it is commonly stated by commentators, that the opinion of the identity of the Messiah and the Prophet was the prevalent one.

Now, if we are to resolve the question of the reason why John sent two of his disciples to inquire of Jesus, whether He was the Coming One, or whether they were to expect another (*ἄλλοι*), or a second (*ἕτερον*) as well, we have in this controverted point a complete solution for it at once. There may easily have been a doubt in John's mind, without derogation from his faith in Jesus, as One "greater than himself, whose shoes' latchet he was not worthy to unloose"—or possibly in the minds of his disciples only, which he could not remove—whether Jesus was the *One* coming Messiah *and* Prophet, or whether He was the Messiah *or* Prophet; while another was to be looked for as the Prophet *or* Messiah, whichever of the two Jesus was not, to complete or supplement his work. John knew a great deal by revelation, but it is not necessary to suppose that he knew *everything*. And upon a controverted point like this, we are surely not compelled to assume that he must have possessed full, certain, and precise information. Is it not at any rate more consistent with reasonable principles of exegesis to seek the solution of the question, why John sent two disciples to Jesus to make a certain inquiry, from hints given us in the Gospels themselves, than to wander in the realms of conjecture and imagination in search of the possible psychological condition of John's mind or the minds of his disciples?

Our Lord's reply was given after His usual fashion. A direct answer was not vouchsafed to the direct question; but an indirect reply was given by the performance of certain acts indicated in prophecy, from which John might easily infer

that Jesus was THE COMING ONE, and that they were NOT to look for another.

III.—IS IT CORRECT TO TRANSLATE $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ δὲ ἐκρύβη (Luke xix. 42) “BUT *now* THEY *are* HID”?

It makes little difference whether we translate the commencement of this passage as an unfulfilled wish: “Would that thou too hadst known, at least in this thy day, the things which belong to thy peace!” or adopt, with the English versions, an aposiopesis at the end of the protasis: “If thou too hadst known at least in this thy day the things which belong to thy peace”! . . . (I translate from Tischendorf’s text of 1878.) The difficulty lies in the following words: $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ δὲ ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου. These literally translated would run: “But *now* they *were* hid from thine eyes,” which is a contradiction in terms. It is a great liberty to take with the ordinary past tense of single action to translate it, “they *are* hid,” just to bring it into consistency with the $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ preceding. But is there any necessity for this, or even any excuse for so doing? $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ δὲ has not necessarily any reference to present time or even to time at all. It is frequently used in the sense, “But as the fact is,” “whereas.” Indeed “whereas” is, in nine cases out of ten, the best and most vivid rendering of this non-temporal $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ δὲ, although in the tenth instance it will not do at all; and we must content ourselves with, “But, as the fact is” or something of the kind. And I am happy to find that the very passage I am discussing is placed in Thayer’s new edition of Grimm’s Greek-Testament Lexicon among the passages, in which this meaning of $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ δὲ is exemplified.

Let us then boldly translate: “Would that thou hadst known at least in this thy day the things that belong to thy peace! WHEREAS they WERE hid from thine eyes.”

“This thy day” is considered as so close to its conclusion, that it is treated as practically over; and it is stated that, during the whole of it, the things which belonged to the peace of Jerusalem had been hid from her eyes. Surely this is more consistent with both sense and grammar than to render ἐκρύβη “*are* hid.”

A. H. WRATISLAW.

ART. III.—BISHOP CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH.

THE Memoir¹ of the late Bishop of Lincoln, the joint production of Canon Overton and the Bishop’s accomplished daughter, who presides over the Lady Margaret Hall at Oxford, is in many respects a remarkable book.

¹ Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln. Rivingtons.