

the story of God in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. The instinct that seized the quotation was sound ; but how came the thought to Jeremiah ? Surely by obedience to God's call.

God has many ways of calling men, but when side by side we are conscious of the love of God in Christ, [with all its means of freedom and peace, and of the darkness of the heathen world, given over to gods that are no-gods, and all they involve of falsity, cruelty and lust—a contrast acuter and more urgent than Jeremiah saw—is it not legitimate to suggest that in such a contrast there lies a call for us also, and that, if we obey, we too shall enter into new knowledge of the love of God and of God's purposes ?

T. R. GLOVER.

ON TWO POINTS IN 1 TIMOTHY I.

IN the EXPOSITOR for November 1913 appeared a new translation, by Professor A. Souter, of St. Paul's two Epistles to Timothy. In a prefatory note the translator expresses the hope that "the precise meaning of certain passages is now made clearer than has hitherto been the case in an English rendering."

It is not the object of the present paper to offer a general criticism of Professor Souter's translation of the Pastoral Epistles, but to direct attention to two points which, as it seems to me, have been missed by him in his rendering of 1 Timothy i.

I will take first *vv.* 11 and 12, in which the kindred words *ἐπιστεύθην* and *πιστόν* occur. The logical connexion between the two verses is lost entirely unless in the translation the idea common to these two words is clearly brought out.

Let us begin by quoting the original Greek :—

κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου θεοῦ, ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ. Χάριν ἔχω τῷ ἐνδυναμώσαντί με Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, ὅτι πιστόν με ἠγήσατο θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν κ.τ.λ.

These words Professor Souter translates thus :—

“in accordance with the gospel of the glory of the happy god (*sic*) with which I have been entrusted. Gratitude is what I feel towards him who has filled me with power, (the) Messiah Jesus, our Lord, because he considered me faithful, putting me into service.”

I will not dwell on his rendering of *μακάριος* by “happy,” though objection might reasonably be taken to this, seeing that “blessedness” rather than “happiness” is usually predicated of the Deity. My objection here is rather to the rendering of *πιστόν* as “faithful” just after *ἐπιστεύθην* has been translated “I have been entrusted.” Surely if the true connexion between the two verses is to be understood it is of the first importance to preserve the thought common to *ἐπιστεύθην* and *πιστόν*. And this can easily be done. If we translate *ὃ ἐπιστεύθην* by “wherewith I was entrusted,” or, as in R.V., “which was committed to my trust,” then let *πιστόν* be translated “trustworthy,” “worthy of trust,” or “fit to be trusted.”

It is remarkable that even the R.V. has missed this point, and, missing it, has missed too the true connexion between v. 11 and v. 12, and indeed has begun a new paragraph at v. 12, as if an entirely new subject had been introduced. There is seen to be a clear train of thought from the one verse to the other, if the close kinship of *ἐπιστεύθην* and *πιστόν* be kept in mind. St. Paul has been led to speak of the gospel of the glory of the blessed God with which he has been entrusted, and this carries him on to emphasise the fact that the trust, committed to him, proceeds entirely from grace. So he expresses his gratitude to Christ Jesus,

who had accounted him worthy of the trust and enlisted him in service, though he had aforetime been a blasphemer and a persecutor and injurious (*or insolent, ὑβριστήν*). Mercy was shewn him because he had acted ignorantly in unbelief, and it was entirely Divine grace that had made him other than he once had been.

It may, of course, be said that in translating *πιστόν* by the word "faithful" the Revisers were using the term in the sense of "trustworthy." But it is unfortunate that the word chosen by them does not more easily carry the reader back to the thought of the entrustment spoken of in v. 11. The Apostle had been put in trust with the gospel before he had been proved faithful. Christ had accounted him worthy to be trusted even before he had been tried. The word "faithful" is more appropriately used of one who has *proved* himself deserving of trust. This St. Paul had not done when he was entrusted with the gospel. He had not yet been found faithful, but Christ counted him fit to be trusted, and it is for this that the Apostle gives Him thanks.

We come now to the second point which I must criticise in Professor Souter's translation of 1 Timothy i. In this chapter we have the word *παραγγελία* (charge) used twice, and the kindred verb *παραγγέλλειν* (to charge) once. Thus in verse 3 we have:—

"As I exhorted thee to tarry at Ephesus when I was going into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge (*παραγγείλῃς*) certain men not to teach a different doctrine (*ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*)," etc.

And then in verse 5 we read:—

"The end of the charge (*τὸ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας*) is love out of a pure heart and a good conscience and faith unfeigned."

One would naturally suppose that "the charge" spoken of in this last quoted verse had reference to the purpose of Timothy's being left at Ephesus that he might *charge* certain men not *ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*, and this point is brought out in the R.V., though missed in the A.V., where we have in *v. 3*, "that thou mightest charge," and in *v. 5* "the end of the commandment." The Apostle had laid it upon Timothy to give a certain charge. This charge he speaks of in *v. 3*, where he uses the verb *παραγγέλλειν*, and in *v. 5*, where he employs the noun *παραγγελία*. The same charge is again referred to, I take it, in *v. 18* much lower down, where the noun *παραγγελία* occurs again: "This charge I commit unto thee, my child Timothy." Nor must these last quoted words be understood as equivalent to "This I charge thee."

Now let us look at Professor Souter's translation. Verse 3 he translates thus:—

"Even as I warned you to prolong your stay at Ephesus, when I was travelling into Macedonia, that you might inform (*παραγγείλης*) certain people not to teach other matters."

Verse 5 he renders as follows:—

"But the goal (*τέλος*) of exhortation (*τῆς παραγγελίας*) is love (which springs) from a clean mind and a good consciousness and an unfeigned faith."

When Professor Souter comes to *παραγγελία* in *v. 18*, he consistently translates it again into "exhortation," but it is to be observed that in translating *ἵνα παραγγείλης* by "that you might *inform*" he has missed a point, and the meaning of *τὸ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας* in *v. 5* is lost.

The Apostle says to Timothy in effect: I left you behind to give a certain charge. Well, I want you to understand that the end, the purpose, of this charge is so and so.

It seems to me that Professor Souter practically ignores the article before *παραγγελίας* in verse 5. He translates "the goal of exhortation." But it is the goal, the end of

the exhortation, or charge, that is the charge already implied in παραγγείλης in verse 3. It is, of course, open to Professor Souter to say that he has not really ignored the article. Understanding παραγγελία to be exhortation in general, he has taken ἡ παραγγελία to mean "the thing called exhortation," abstract nouns taking the article in Greek but not in English. But then exhortation in general may have other ends besides that of which the Apostle here speaks. What he sets forward as the end is the end of the particular charge which he had left Timothy behind to give to those who were losing themselves in unimportant things, or in things mischievous. It was all-important that emphasis should be laid on the great issues of Christian life—love out of a pure heart, and a good conscience and faith unfeigned. These are the things on which Timothy is to lay stress. These are the τέλος of the charge the Apostle has ordered him to give. This charge, he says in verse 18, he commits to him according to the prophecies which led the way to him.

Of this last quoted phrase it is no part of my present purpose to write. The object of this paper has been to draw attention to what seem to me blemishes in Professor Souter's rendering, whether it be called a translation or "a crib." A crib should, as he says, partake largely of the characteristics of its original. But I have tried to shew that certain characteristics of the original have in the present case been lost.

In conclusion I would say a few words on the anakoluthon of verse 5. In the A.V. this is got over by the insertion of the words "so do" and in the R.V. by the words "so do I now." But is it necessary to insert any words at all? Is it not better to preserve the anakoluthon of the original? The principal sentence which should follow on verses 3 and 4 is wanting. The Apostle has, as it were, lost himself in the maze of his subordinate sentences, but he sets out very

forcibly the leading idea in his mind when he writes : " The end of the charge is love out of a pure heart, and a good conscience and faith unfeigned." The δὲ belonging to this sentence may be appropriately rendered by our English " well," which we use sometimes to recover ourselves after a maze of sentences. So I would venture to translate something after this manner :—

As I exhorted thee to tarry at Ephesus, when I was going into Macedonia, that thou mightest teach certain men not to teach a different doctrine, neither to give heed to fables, etc., etc. Well, the end of the charge is love out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned.

E. H. ASKWITH.

*FURTHER REMARKS IN RESPONSE TO DR.
ABBOTT'S " MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA."*

IT was not of any set purpose that I neglected to offer the explanation called for by Dr. Abbott, as regards the silence of the Synoptists in reference to John's being found in company with Peter at the palace of the high priest. It would have been a very different thing if they had said nothing of Peter's presence, or of Peter's denial, in accordance with the warning of our Lord ; above all, of Peter's repentance. To omit this would have been equivalent to the omission of David's sin and David's repentance in the story of the Old Testament ; but no such great issue depended on the presence of John. Supposing the door had been opened to Peter by a friendly servant of Caiaphas, what difference would it have made ? Bishop Lightfoot seems to me to have very well handled the argument from silence, in his article on Eusebius contained in his *Essays on Supernatural Religion*. Dr. Abbott has himself done much to prove the trustworthiness of the latest Gospel by the manner in which the writer has