

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:



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



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

to be fulfilled by the opponent, we may compare our Lord's reply to the question in St Mark xi 27 and parallels, 'By what authority doest thou these things? And who gave thee this authority?' He answers by putting another question, 'The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men?'; which they cannot answer. Both these cases are instances of 'answering a fool according to his folly'.

If this explanation of St John ii 19 is correct, it is easy to account for the other passages. The words, ambiguous when separated from the occasion of their utterance, were taken up by Jewish opponents and suffered corruption in transmission. It seemed to make little difference whether he had said 'Destroy' or 'I will destroy': it was the claim to be able to rebuild in three days which impressed the memory. Hence the false witnesses brought forward at the trial a distorted version of the saying, which helped to secure the condemnation of Jesus: and the popular account of the saying and the hatred which it aroused are represented by the words of the mockers at the Cross. But, after the Resurrection, those who remembered the original words felt that they had a key to their mystical meaning, and produced the explanation which is given in the Fourth Gospel. Meanwhile, others who knew only the corrupt version, 'I will destroy' &c., had come to connect the saying with the expectation of the Parousia, when the Lord would return to destroy the old Temple and build the new Temple in His kingdom. This may be the explanation of the charge brought against St Stephen in Acts vi 13.

F. P. CHEETHAM.

NOTE ON 2 TIM. ii 15.

A.V. and R.V. both have 'a workman that needeth not to be ashamed' for *ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυντον*. The only other instance of *ἀνεπ.* quoted in the Lexicons is Josephus *Ant.* xviii 7. 1, where Herodias says to Herod, 'Do not esteem it *a thing not to be ashamed of* to be inferior to one who the other day lived upon thy charity'. This suggests that the meaning in 2 Tim. is 'a workman not to be ashamed of', and there must surely be a reminiscence of St Mark viii 38 (= St Luke ix 26) *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται αὐτόν*. This meaning accords better with the *ἐπί* of *ἀνεπ.*, and with the usually passive significance of verbal adjectives in *-τος*. The idea of Christ being ashamed of some of His workmen is parallel with that of His being proud of others, as in 2 Cor. viii 23 'they are the glory of Christ'. See also Heb. xi 16. The mistake (if it be one) seems to have arisen from the Vulgate *inconfusibilis*.

E. F. BROWN.