

# The Journal of Theological Studies

JULY, 1905

## THE LORD'S COMMAND TO BAPTIZE (ST MATTHEW XXVIII 19).

I PROPOSE in this article with necessary brevity to consider three points relating to the Lord's command to baptize as recorded in St Matthew xxviii 19. These three points are (1) the source of the last section of St Matthew (*vv.* 16-20), in which this command occurs; (2) the integrity of the text; (3) the interpretation of the command. The passage runs thus:

*Πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες (v. 1. βαπτισαντες) αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.*

(I) The source of the last section of St Matthew (xxviii 16-20).

One result of the study of the Synoptic problem, which during the last few years has been so vigorously pursued, seems now to be generally acknowledged and to be placed beyond the reach of reasonable doubt. It is the position that either St Mark's Gospel itself or else the story of our Lord's ministry, whether documentary or oral, which is embodied in St Mark, was used by the two other Synoptists. St Matthew follows very closely the account found in St Mark. He often expands the historical matter of St Mark, but very seldom does he omit anything important in it.

The authentic Gospel according to St Mark ends abruptly in the early part of the story of the day of the Resurrection, viz. at xvi 8. We may, I think, reasonably put aside as improbable the suggestion that some sudden emergency compelled the

Evangelist to break off a task which he was never to resume ; and we may take it for granted that St Mark wrote a conclusion to his Gospel which was accidentally torn off in that copy of the Gospel from which all later copies have been derived.

St Matthew, I believe, gives us the clue as to what were the contents of the lost conclusion of St Mark.

On the night of the betrayal, just after the Lord and His Apostles had left the upper room, St Mark records our Lord's words, 'Howbeit, after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee'. Again, on the morning of the Resurrection, St Mark represents the Angel as saying to the women who visited the tomb, 'Go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you'. Thus St Mark in two places records a promise of a meeting between the risen Lord and His disciples in Galilee. The Gospel which gives such prominence to the promise must have contained an account of its fulfilment. We infer then with confidence that the last section of St Mark was a record of the manifestation of the risen Lord to His disciples in Galilee.

We pass on to compare St Matthew and St Mark. St Matthew follows St Mark in recording the Lord's promise on the night of the betrayal, and (with some slight amplification and variation) the words of the Angel at the tomb. In regard then to the twice repeated promise the two Evangelists coincide. Further, when we compare the account of the visit of the women to the tomb given by St Matthew with that given by St Mark, we find the similarity between the two so close that we infer that St Matthew in this portion of the Gospel has for his source St Mark or the original of St Mark. When therefore we note that St Matthew in the closing section of his Gospel records that meeting in Galilee which, as we saw, must have had a place in St Mark's Gospel as originally written, we cannot but conclude that this section of St Matthew bears the same relation to the lost section of St Mark which generally an historical section of the former Evangelist bears to the corresponding section of the latter. In other words, we may affirm with a high degree of probability that this Matthaean section is derived from the primitive Petrine Gospel.

There is some further confirmatory evidence for the position

that St Matthew has, in this section, reproduced with substantial accuracy the words of our Lord as recorded in his source.

St Mark has been careful in his Gospel to preserve sayings which may well be thought to anticipate and to prepare the way for the two essential elements in the Lord's final commands. In the first place he preserves two sayings which foretold the catholic destination of the Gospel: 'The gospel must first be preached unto all the nations' (xiii 10); and again, 'Whosoever the gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world' (xiv 9). In the second place the first section of St Mark's Gospel gives an account of John's baptism, and includes John's prophecy of Christ's baptism as essentially spiritual. It would be wholly congruous that the last section of the Gospel should contain the fulfilment of that prophecy in Christ's final command to His disciples, that they should baptize 'all the nations' and bring them into a vital union with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Such a relation between the first and the last section would bind the whole Gospel together, and would constitute that command a fitting climax and close of the Gospel story.

Again, St Matthew's tendency is commonly to expand his source. The closing section however is brief. The record as contained in the lost section of St Mark can hardly have been briefer. One point, insignificant in itself, is of some interest. St Mark, in regard to the meeting in Galilee, records the promise 'There shall ye see him' (xvi 7). St Matthew, who reproduces these words (xxviii 7), and puts similar words into the mouth of the risen Lord Himself (xxviii 10)—'And there shall they see me'—tells us of the fulfilment of this promise (xxviii 17)—'And when they saw him (*ἰδόντες αὐτόν*), they worshipped him.' This *ἰδόντες αὐτόν* we should expect to find in the last page of St Mark were it ever restored to us. Beyond this we cannot go in regard to the question of verbal identity between the last section of St Matthew and the lost last section of St Mark.

(II) The integrity of the text in Matt. xxviii 19.

The integrity of the text in Matt. xxviii 19 has lately been called in question by Mr F. C. Conybeare, first in an article published in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1901, pp. 275 ff, and afterwards in the *Hibbert Journal* for

October, 1902, pp. 102 ff. Professor Lake in his Inaugural Lecture at the University of Leiden (Jan. 27, 1904) adopted Mr Conybeare's conclusions. They are controverted in an able and learned article ('Der Trinitarische Taufbefehl') by Professor Riggenbach of Basel, published in the *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, 1903. My investigation is independent of Professor Riggenbach's.

It is almost superfluous by way of preface to the discussion of this question to say that the matter is simply and solely a matter of evidence, and of the conscientious and dispassionate interpretation of evidence. Every scientific critic, whether he call himself a conservative theologian or not, is bound to take all possible care in scrutinizing the facts on which alone he bases his conclusion for or against the genuineness of any passage of the New Testament. If he is satisfied that a real case has been made out against any passage, he is bound to abide by the verdict of criticism. In regard to this particular passage, it should further be remembered that the doctrine of the Trinity does not depend upon any one 'proof-text'. No doubt, as purporting to be the words of Christ Himself, this text has played an important part in the history of the doctrine. But, if we put aside the philosophical aspects of the doctrine of the Trinity, Christian people hold that doctrine because they believe that it is implied in the general teaching of the Gospels and of the Apostolic writings. It is the formal statement of that conception of God which the writers of the New Testament express in informal and undogmatic language.

The position then of Mr Conybeare is this. He maintains that the clause *βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* was in early times (i. e. before the time of Tertullian) interpolated for dogmatic reasons in some copies of St Matthew, and that its place in the text was not fully assured till after the Council of Nicaea.

Mr Conybeare's chief argument for this conclusion lies in the fact that Eusebius, who was Bishop of Caesarea 313-339 A. D., and had access to the treasures of the great library at Caesarea, when he quotes or refers to Matt. xxviii 19 f, habitually omits, or stops short of, the words which refer to Baptism. The relevant passages of Eusebius fall under two heads. (1) In the *Demonstratio Evangelica* Eusebius cites the words which precede

and the words which follow the command to baptize, but does not cite the command itself. In i 3 he writes, 'After the resurrection from the dead, having said to His disciples, *Go and make disciples of all the nations*, He adds, *teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you*'. In i 4, i 6, iii 6, he quotes the Lord's words thus, *Go and make disciples of all the nations (+ in my name, iii 6), teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you*. (2) In some seventeen passages (e. g. *Hist. Eccles.* iii 5 2) Eusebius quotes the first clause of v. 19 in this form, *πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου* and (except in *Dem. Evan.* iii 6; see above) does not quote the subsequent words. In one of these passages (*Dem. Evan.* iii 7), he expressly comments on the words *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου*: 'For He did not simply and without definition bid them make disciples of all the nations, but with the necessary addition *in His name*. For inasmuch as the power belonging to His title was such that the Apostle said that *God gave to Him the name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things in heaven and things on the earth and things under the earth*, [the Lord] did rightly when He declared the virtue which is in His name but is unknown to the more part of men, and said to His disciples, *Go and make disciples of all the nations in my name*.'

Mr Conybeare thinks that the evidence of these passages in Eusebius points to the conclusion that Eusebius 'found in the codices of Caesarea the following form of text: *πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου, διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν*'.

The two groups of passages in which Eusebius quotes from Matt. xxviii 19 raise somewhat different questions, and it will be convenient to discuss them separately.

(1) We take the passages from the *Demonstratio Evangelica*, in which Eusebius quotes more than one clause of St Matthew. It will generally be allowed, I think, that theological and religious writers, whether ancient or modern, when they adduce a passage of Scripture, are in the habit of omitting a clause which is not relevant to the subject of which they are treating. They are probably all the more likely to do this if that clause is itself important and would serve therefore to draw away the attention

of their readers from the matter in hand. A writer of our own day would probably indicate the omission by inserting dots (. . .) in the proper place. If then we turn to the passages in the First Book of the *Demonstratio*, we find that in them Eusebius is dealing generally with the Christian rule of life. In chapter iv, for example, he says that we Christians receive the Sacred Books of the Hebrews, and that they contain prophecies about 'us Gentiles'. He then cites passages from the Psalms, among them those passages (Ps. xcvi 1 ff, xcvi 1 ff) which speak of the 'new song' which 'all the earth' should sing: This 'new song' Jeremiah (xxxix 31 ff) calls a 'new covenant'. Again, this 'new covenant' Isaiah calls a 'new law', saying (ii 3 f), 'Out of Zion shall go forth the law'. 'Now this law which has gone forth from Zion and is different from the law given through Moses on Mount Sinai, what can it be save the Evangelical word which through our Lord and His Apostles has gone forth from Zion and has reached all the nations? For it is manifest that from Jerusalem and from Mount Zion, which is nigh unto Jerusalem, where our Saviour gave most of His teachings, the law of His new covenant began, and that from thence it went forth and shined forth unto all men, in accordance with His own words which He spake to His disciples, saying, *Go and make disciples of all the nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you*. And what were these things save the lessons and the instructions of the new covenant (τὰ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης μαθήματα τε καὶ παιδεύματα)?'

Somewhat different is Eusebius's purpose when he quotes our Lord's words in iii 6. He is here dealing with those who alleged that Christ was a magician (γόης). I venture somewhat to abbreviate the passage. 'What magician ever conceived the idea of promulgating and making eternally victorious laws against idolatry, contrary to the edicts of kings and ancient lawgivers? But as to our Lord and Saviour, it is not the case that He conceived the purpose and then did not dare to make the attempt; nor did He make the attempt and then fail. But He spake but one word to His disciples, *Go and make disciples of all the nations in my name, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*; and then He added the deed to the word; for at once, in a short time, every race both

of Greeks and barbarians was made His disciples (*ἐμαθητεύετο*); and laws, contrary to the superstition of the ancients, were disseminated among all the nations.'

In both these passages then it is clear that Eusebius is concerned from somewhat different points of view with the new law of Christ and its dissemination among 'all the nations'. In both he quotes just those words of Christ which were relevant to his argument. In both it was absolutely natural that he should refrain from quoting the command to baptize in the Threefold Name; for it had no bearing on the argument. The case is precisely the same with the two remaining passages in the *Demonstratio* (i 3, i 6). In both of them Eusebius is contrasting the new law of Christ with the ancient law of Moses; and in both of them it was as absolutely natural as in the passages which I have fully considered that he should not include in his citation the words as to Baptism.

But facts are more convincing than any assertion as to *a priori* probabilities. I take a parallel case. No one can doubt that the Antiochene text of St Matthew, with which Chrysostom was familiar, contained the clause *βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ.* Chrysostom comments on the clause in his Homilies on St Matthew (see below) and he adduces the words in his exposition of Hebr. ii 18 (xii 54 B). 'For that it is He Himself who forgives the sins of all men He shewed both in the case of the paralytic, saying, *Thy sins have been forgiven*, and in the matter of Baptism, for He saith unto the disciples, *Go and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.*' But when Chrysostom is speaking of conduct and of Christ's commands, and in this connexion cites Matt. xxviii 19, his quotation no more includes the words about Baptism than do the quotations in Eusebius's *Demonstratio*. In his exposition of Eph. ii 10 Chrysostom (xi 29 A) insists on the need of 'good works'—'As we have five senses and must use them all, so must we use all the virtues. . . . For one virtue sufficeth not to present us with boldness before the judgement-seat of Christ, but we have need of much and manifold virtue, nay of all virtue. For listen to Him as He says to the disciples, *Go and make disciples of all the nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you*; and again, *Whosoever*

*shall break one of these least commandments*<sup>1</sup>, *he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven.*'

The fact then that Eusebius in the *Demonstratio* four times quotes the words which precede and the words which follow the command to baptize in Matt. xxviii 19, but does not quote the command itself, does not afford, when we take in account the context in each case, even the slightest presumption that he was ignorant of that command or that he did not regard it as having an assured place in the text of St Matthew.

(2) We next turn to the consideration of the reading *πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου*. Mr Conybeare believes that this was the original form of Matt. xxviii 19; and he finds traces of it in two early documents, in a passage of the Shepherd of Hermas and in a passage of Justin Martyr. To these two passages I shall return presently.

Another supposition however is possible, namely, that the words *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου* are an addition to the genuine text of the clause. On this hypothesis it is not difficult to account for the genesis of the reading. I venture to call attention to the following considerations. (1) The addition is in itself absolutely natural. (2) The 'Western' text of the N. T. is, I believe, an artificial text. We find in this text passages in which a reference to the name of Jesus is added. Thus in Acts vi 8, to the words *ἐποιοεῖ τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα ἐν τῷ λαῷ*, Cod. E adds *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου*: Cod. D (with some cursives) appends *διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. See also Tischendorf's *apparatus criticus* in Acts xiv 10; xviii 4, 8. (3) An 'impulse of scribes', and we may add of the Fathers also, 'abundantly exemplified in Western readings, is the fondness for assimilation' (Dr Hort *Introduction* p. 124). There is scarcely a page of Codex Bezae in the Gospels which does not afford instances of this tendency. Now there are three passages in the Gospels, recording words of the risen Lord, which are closely related and are often quoted together by the Fathers (see e.g. below p. 494), viz. Matt. xxviii 18-20; [Mark] xvi 15-18; Luke xxiv 46-49. It is sufficient to call attention to the fact that words from these three passages are intertwined in Tatian's *Diatessaron* (see Hamlyn Hill *The Earliest*

<sup>1</sup> It will be noted that the words *and shall teach men so* (Matt. v 19) are not relevant, and are therefore omitted in the quotation.

*Life of Christ* pp. 262 f, 376 f). Riggenbach (p. 27) suggests that the words ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου in the Eusebian form of Matt. xxviii 19 are probably derived from Luke xxiv 47 (καὶ κηρυχθήναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν κ.τ.λ.). It is even more significant, I venture to think, that the words ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου occur in the other parallel passage [Mark] xvi 17 (σημεῖα δὲ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἀκολουθήσει ταῦτα, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου δαιμόνια ἐκβαλοῦσιν). Those who have worked through any considerable portion of the 'Western' text of the Gospels and have seen how deep and wide is the effect of the tendency to harmonize will allow, I think, that this explanation of the Eusebian reading is highly probable.

On this theory as to the genesis of the Eusebian reading, it is open to us to choose between two alternatives.

(i) On the one hand the reading may be a 'Western' reading which Eusebius found in some codices of the library at Caesarea. This supposition is quite in accordance with facts. 'The same' [i. e. 'Western'] character of text is found . . . predominantly in Eusebius' (Dr Hort *Introduction* p. 113). Have we any evidence of this reading elsewhere? Mr Conybeare adduces two passages.

The first is from Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 39, p. 258 A : δὴ οὖν τρόπον διὰ τοὺς ἑπτακισχιλίους ἐκείνους τὴν ὀργὴν οὐκ ἐπέφερε τότε ὁ θεός, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ νῦν οὐδέπω τὴν κρίσιν ἐπήνεγκεν ἢ ἐπάγει, γινώσκων ἔτι καθ' ἡμέραν τινὰς μαθητεομένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπολείποντας τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς πλάνης, οἱ καὶ λαμβάνουσι δόματα ἕκαστος ὡς ἄξιοι εἰσι, φωτιζόμενοι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ τούτου. With this passage Mr Conybeare compares a later passage in the *Dialogue* (53, p. 272 C), in which he thinks that 'Justin glances at Matt. xxviii 19': καὶ τὸ Δεσμεύων . . . [Gen. xlix 11] τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης αὐτοῦ παρουσίας γενομένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ὁμοίως τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύει αὐτῷ προδηλώσας ἦν. οὗτοι γὰρ ὡς πῶλος ἀσαγῆς καὶ ζυγὸν ἐπὶ αὐχένα μὴ ἔχων τὸν ἑαυτοῦ, μέχρις ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἐλθὼν διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πέμψας ἐμαθήτευσεν αὐτούς. In the second passage, indeed, there is nothing directly bearing on the question of the reading in Matt. xxviii 19; but 'the very occurrence of the passage', Mr Conybeare urges, 'strengthens the surmise that Justin was acquainted with Matt. xxviii 19, and really glanced at it in p. 258'. The evidence of

the former passage (p. 258 A) seems to me, I confess, very slight. The word μαθητεύειν (-εσθαι) occurs in several contexts in Justin—*Ap. I* 15 (62 B) οἱ ἐκ παιδῶν ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, *Ap. II* 4 (43 D) μαθητευθῆναι εἰς τὰ θεῖα διδάγματα, *Dial.* 39 (258 C) οἱ ἐκ πάσης τῆς ἀληθείας μεμαθητευμένοι<sup>1</sup>. Thus the phrase μαθητευομένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ is quite in Justin's manner, and there is nothing in the context which recalls the language or the thought of Matt. xxviii 19 f.

'The second passage', to quote Mr Conybeare's words (*Zeitschrift* p. 283), 'is in the Pastor Hermae and is a less certain reference': Sim. ix 17 4 πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν κατοικοῦντα ἀκούσαντα καὶ πιστεύσαντα ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι ἐκλήθησαν [τοῦ υἱοῦ] τοῦ θεοῦ. λαβόντες οὖν τὴν σφραγίδα μίαν φρόνησιν ἔσχον καὶ ἓνα νοῦν, καὶ μία πίστις αὐτῶν ἐγένετο καὶ [μία] ἀγάπη. There is some doubt as to the reading ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι. The Ethiopic version apparently omits the words. Dr Harmer in the critical note in Dr Lightfoot's edition conjectures ἐνὶ ὀνόματι—a conjecture which certainly fits in admirably with the context. But in fact the passage appears to me to have no point of contact with Matt. xxviii 19 and may safely be set aside.

Thus the evidence outside Eusebius for the reading μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου consists of a single passage in Justin; and the reference to St Matthew in this passage seems to me exceedingly doubtful<sup>2</sup>. If the reference were clear and

<sup>1</sup> It is quite natural that, wholly apart from any remembrance of the language of the N.T., the word μαθητεύειν (-εσθαι) should have a conspicuous place in the vocabulary of the early Christians. It occurs e. g. in Ignatius *Eph.* iii (νῦν γὰρ ἀρχῆν ἔχω τοῦ μαθητεύεσθαι), x (ἐπιτρέψατε οὖν αὐτοῖς κἀν ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ὑμῖν μαθητευθῆναι), *Rom.* iii (ἃ μαθητεύοντες ἐντέλλεσθε), v (ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀδικήμασιν αὐτῶν μᾶλλον μαθητεύομαι).

<sup>2</sup> Mr Conybeare further appeals to the form in which Aphraates quotes Matt. xxviii 19 'Go forth, make disciples of all the peoples, and they shall believe in me' (ed. Wright, p. 12). Aphraates 'composed his works, as he himself tells us, in the years 337, 344 and 345' (Wright *Syriac Literature* p. 33). Mr Conybeare (*Hilbert Journal* p. 107) says that 'the last words [i. e. and they shall believe in me] appear to be a gloss on the Eusebian reading in my name'. I venture to point out that the meaning of in my name is essentially different from the meaning of and they shall believe in me, and that therefore the latter words are not a natural gloss on the former. It appears to me that and they shall believe in me is an addition quite independent of the addition in my name, but generated in the same way, i. e. due to assimilation. One MS of Aphraates' Homily *On Faith* reads 'Go forth, preach to . . .'. The word 'preach to' is the common Syriac word of this meaning. It is the word used in the Syriac Vulgate (neither the Curetonian nor the Sinaitic

decisive, I should point out (1) that Justin preserves very early 'Western' readings, and that therefore the reference would not justify any conclusion as to the original text of Matt. xxviii 19; (2) that in the immediately succeeding context we have an allusion to Baptism—*φωτιζόμενοι* (cf. *τὴν σφραγίδα* in *Hermas*)—and that therefore the passage would afford an indication that Justin found in the text of St Matthew the command to baptize. The absence of evidence, however, for the currency of this reading cannot be taken as a proof that it was not current. It has constantly happened in the past that a fresh investigation of Patristic texts or the discovery of a new document has brought to light independent attestation of a reading what had before been regarded as the 'singular' reading of some MS or of some Father.

(iii) On the other hand the addition of the words *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου* may be an eccentric reading peculiar to, and due to, Eusebius himself. That such readings occur in the writings of the Fathers and that such readings became more or less habitual to them is certain. It must suffice to refer to Dr Westcott's analysis of the quotations from the N. T. in Chrysostom's *Treatise on the Priesthood* (*Canon*, ed. 5, p. xxx). That Eusebius comments

is extant in this verse) in the parallel passage [Mark] xvi 15. I believe that the addition *and they shall believe in me* is drawn from [Mark] xvi 15-17. I call attention to four points: (1) In [Mark] xvi 15 'belief' follows 'preaching'. *Preach the gospel to all creation. He that believeth. . .* Hence the addition of *and they shall believe in me* is a most natural addition in the parallel, Matt. xxviii 19. (2) In [Mark] xvi 15 f 'belief' is the link between the 'preaching' and the 'baptizing'. *Preach the Gospel to all creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.* The well-known interpolation in Acts viii 37 (see below p. 499) is an indication how much stress was rightly laid in early times on the necessity of 'belief' in this connexion. Compare the following passage from the same Homily of Aphraates (p. 21), 'And when again our Lord gave the mystery of Baptism to His Apostles, thus He said to them *He that believeth and is baptized shall live and he that believeth not is judged.*' I submit therefore that Aphraates' form of quotation is a strong argument that in his text of Matthew the baptismal command followed the words which he quotes. (3) The phrase itself, *they shall believe in me*, is, I believe, an echo of [Mark] xvi 17, *These signs shall follow them that believe.* This suggestion is strongly confirmed by the fact that in the Curetonian (the Sinaitic is not extant here) we read in [Mark] xvi 17 *that believe in me*, though it should be added that when Aphraates quotes the verse (p. 21) he has simply *those that believe.* (4) The fragments of Tatian's *Diatessaron* preserved in Ephraem's Commentary shew that Matt. xxviii 19 and [Mark] xvi 15 were intertwined in the form of the Gospel chiefly known among Syriac Christians. The words are these, *Go ye into all the world. . . and baptize them in the name. &c.* (Hamlyn Hill *The Earliest Life of Christ* p. 376).

on the words ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου is no proof that they were not an addition of his own. To take one example, Chrysostom (vii 275 C) in place of ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ (Matt. vi 29) has a reading which has no other support, and is, I think, clearly his own invention—ἐν πάσῃ τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ. But he expounds it: 'Solomon was proved inferior to the flowers in splendour, not once or twice, but throughout his whole reign.'

Between these two alternatives which we have just considered it is not necessary to endeavour to make a choice. I do not think that the evidence at our disposal justifies an absolute decision. The really important point is that the inclusion of the words ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου in the text of Matt. xxviii 19 does not prove the absence from that same text of the Lord's command to baptize. The words πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη are very frequently quoted as a proof-text in regard to the extension of the Church to the Gentiles by writers who certainly looked on the command to baptize as part of the genuine text of the Gospel<sup>1</sup>; and I confess that it appears to me most probable that they were appended to the command to 'make disciples of all the nations' as a natural complement, in the light of the parallel passages [Mark] xvi 17 and Luke xxiv 47, when that command was quoted by itself apart from its context. But there is not anything unnatural, still less impossible, in the combination—'make disciples of all nations *in my name*, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' It is best, however, to appeal to facts. In the *Theophania* v 17, 46, 49 (ed. Lee pp. 298, 333, 336) Eusebius quotes and emphasizes the words 'in my name' as part of the Lord's command as to the Apostles' mission to 'all the nations', while in an earlier passage of the same treatise—iv 8 (ed. Lee p. 223 ff)—he unmistakably refers to the command to baptize (see below p. 494).

We are thus led in the next place to take note of the fact that in three of his writings Eusebius either explicitly quotes or clearly alludes to the words βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ.

(a) Eusebius's Letter to his Church at Caesarea, written just after the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325, is preserved in Socrates *H. E.* i 8. The Bishop's object is to justify to his flock his

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Chrysostom's works, e. g. Migne *P. G.* lvi 30; lviii 649; lix 368, 434 (*bis*).

proceedings at the great Council, and to defend himself against the aspersions made on him by representatives of both sides. He laid before the Council, he tells his diocese, a document which was read at the Council and approved. It runs thus: 'As we received from those who were Bishops before us both in our catechumenate, and when we received the washing [of Baptism], and as we have learned from the divine Scriptures, and as in the presbyterate and in the episcopate itself we have believed and taught, so now believing, we do lay before you this our statement of faith.' The Creed of Caesarea follows. Eusebius then continues, 'We believe that each of these Persons is and subsists, the Father truly Father, and the Son truly Son, and the Holy Ghost truly Holy Ghost; as also our Lord, when sending His disciples to preach, said *Go and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. As touching these matters we affirm that we so hold and so think, and have ever so held, and will so hold unto death, and that in this faith we are steadfast.'<sup>1</sup>

(b) In the Books *Against Marcellus* and in the continuation of

<sup>1</sup> In his article in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1903, p. 333, Mr Conybeare quotes the words of this passage ('We believe that each . . . Holy Ghost'). He then adds, 'The above passage has been foisted into the text from the *ἄλλη ἑθεσις πιστεως* produced at the council of Antioch in 341, in which it is found verbatim (Socrates II, Ch. 10, p. 87)'. The passage from the *ἄλλη ἑθεσις* is as follows: ' . . . and [we believe] in the Holy Ghost, who is given to those who believe unto comfort and sanctification and unto perfection; as also our Lord Jesus Christ commanded the disciples, saying *Go and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*, that is [into the name] of the Father truly Father, of the Son truly Son, of the Holy Ghost truly Holy Ghost; the names not being used loosely and idly, but precisely expressing the subsistence and order and glory of the Persons named.' Students can judge whether Mr Conybeare is correct in saying that the passage in Eusebius's Letter is found 'verbatim' in the *ἄλλη ἑθεσις*. No doubt the two passages are very similar in meaning. Nothing is more common than that one doctrinal document should contain a passage very similar to a passage in another doctrinal document. In this particular case the similarity may be explained in one of two ways. (1) The *ἄλλη ἑθεσις* was an old creed reputed to be that of the martyr Lucian of Antioch (Gwatkin *Studies of Arianism* p. 116). Nothing could possibly be more natural than that Eusebius should echo the words of so venerated a teacher, whose pupils were numerous among those who more or less sympathized with Arius. (2) If it is contended that the Lucianic Creed coincided only with that portion of the *ἄλλη ἑθεσις* which is a Creed proper, then we may say that it was completely natural that the Arianizers at the Council of Antioch, bidding for 'conservative' support, should echo the doctrinal statements of the learned Eusebius, who had died only a few years previously.

that treatise, viz. the treatise *On the Theology of the Church*, written at the end of his life, Eusebius quotes or refers to the Lord's command to baptize, in two passages—*Contra Marcellum II* (Migne P. G. xxiv 716 B), *De Eccles. Theol.* iii 5 (Migne P. G. xxiv 1013 A). I have considered in a separate note at the end of this article the objections which Mr Conybeare has urged against the Eusebian authorship of these two treatises.

(c) The treatise on the Incarnation, called *Θεοφάνεια*, is preserved in a Syriac version, an English translation of which was published in 1843 by Professor Samuel Lee. A collection of Greek fragments of this treatise was in 1847 published by Mai in his *Bibliotheca nova Patrum* iv; these fragments are reprinted in Migne P. G. xxiv 609–690. The *Theophania* was perhaps left unfinished by Eusebius at his death; at any rate it appears to have been his last literary work (Bp. Lightfoot, art. Eusebius of Caesarea, in the *Dict. Chr. Biography* ii p. 333). In the Syriac version of the *Theophania* iv 8 (ed. Lee pp. 223 ff) Matt. xxviii 18–20 ('all power . . . the end of the world') is quoted in full and an explicit reference to the command to baptize occurs in the subsequent context. The passage in question is found among the Greek fragments (Migne P. G. xxiv 629). Here the command to baptize is not quoted but clearly implied. I give the substance of the passage and the important words in full. Eusebius adduces the words of Ps. ii 8 ('Ask of me and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance'). 'Wherefore, as if the prophetic testimony had now been fulfilled in deed, the Lord saith to His disciples—according to Matthew ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, and according to Luke ὅτι δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. . . . Not on any former occasion but only now at length did He command His disciples to go about and make disciples of all the nations. Ἀναγκαίως δὲ προστίθησι τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀποκαθάρσεως ἕχρην γὰρ τοὺς ἐξ ἔθνων ἐπιστρεφέντας πάντος μολυσμοῦ καὶ μιάσματος διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως ἀποκαθαίρεσθαι ἐκ τῆς δαιμονικῆς καὶ εἰδωλολάτρου πλάνης . . . τούτους δὲ καὶ διδάσκειν παραινεί μετὰ τὴν ἀποκάθαρσιν τὴν διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ μυστικῆς διδασκαλίας οὐ τὰ Ἰουδαϊκὰ παραγγέλματα . . . ἀλλὰ ὅσα αὐτοῖς ἐνετείλατο φυλάττειν.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Here it will be noted (1) that Matt. xxviii 18 and Luke xxiv 47 are quoted side by side; (2) that Matt. xxviii 18 is welded together with Matt. vi 10 (the Lord's

In this passage it will be noticed that Eusebius definitely refers to the passage as from St Matthew's Gospel. I believe that I am correct in asserting that he does not do so in any of the passages belonging to the two groups considered above (p. 485). He says that after the command *μαθητεύσατε κ.τ.λ.* our Lord added *τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀποκαθάρσεως*, and that 'after the cleansing' He commanded the disciples 'to teach' converts from heathenism. Thus 'the cleansing' has the same place in the series of commands here which the Baptismal command has in St Matthew. 'The cleansing' is defined as *ἡ διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ μυστικῆς διδασκαλίας*, i. e. which comes to us through the Lord's teaching on the sacrament of Baptism. The habitual language of the Fathers leaves no doubt that the words *μυστήριον* and *μυστικός* refer to Baptism (see Sophocles' *Lexicon sub vocibus*<sup>1</sup>).

But Mr Conybeare pleads (*Zeitschrift* p. 282) that these three passages 'belong to the last period of [Eusebius's] literary activity which fell after the council of Nice'. Again, 'it is evident', he says (*Hibbert Journal* p. 105), 'that this [i. e. *μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου*] was the text found by Eusebius in the very ancient codices collected fifty to a hundred and fifty years before his birth by his great predecessors. Of any other form of text he had never heard, and knew nothing until he had visited Constantinople and attended the Council of Nice'. On this position, over and above what has been already said as to the real significance of the words *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου* (p. 492), I venture to call attention to two considerations.

(1) In the first place we turn to Eusebius's letter to his Church at Caesarea, quoted above (p. 493). 'Perhaps', writes Mr Conybeare (*Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wissenschaft*, 1903, p. 334), 'the Epistle is after all wrongly ascribed by Socrates to Eusebius Pamphili.' Against this 'perhaps' must be set evidence both internal and external. The position which the writer of the Letter takes up, and the story which he tells, correspond with

Prayer); (3) that Luke xxiv 47 is welded together with verse 44; (4) *φυλάττειν* takes the place of *τηρεῖν*. These points are of importance in considering how far Eusebius is in the habit of quoting the N. T. accurately.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Eus. *Vita Constant.* iv 71 *μυστικῆς λειτουργίας ἀξιόμορον*. Riggenbach (p. 20) refers to *Demons. Ευαν.* i 10 (Migne P. G. xxii 88 C) *οὐ διὰ τῆς ἐνθέου καὶ μυστικῆς διδασκαλίας πάντες ἡμεῖς οἱ ἐξ ἔθνων τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν προτέρων ἀμαρτημάτων εἰράμεθα*.

what we know of the position of Eusebius of Caesarea and of his relation to the various parties at the Council of Nicaea. Again, the Letter is not given by Socrates alone. It is alluded to by Athanasius in the tract *de Decret. Nic. Syn.* (Migne *P. G.* xxv 428); it is given in full as an appendix to that tract, and by Theodoret *H. E.* i 12 and Gelasius *Hist. Conc. Nic.* ii 34 (Mansi *Conc. Nov. Coll.* ii 913). Nor is there the smallest ground for thinking that Matt. xxviii 19 is an interpolation in the text of the Letter; for that text is given by all the authorities for the Letter, and the words 'as we have learned from the divine Scriptures' prepared the way for this *testimonium*. Eusebius expressly asserts that what he insists on in his Letter he had learned in his earliest days. To suppose that in the midst of protestations so public and so solemn, Eusebius appealed to a passage of St Matthew which he knew to be no part of the genuine text is entirely to misunderstand his character. He was an honest as well as a learned man. In emphatic language he bears his witness that 'nearly all the copies of the Gospel according to Mark' break off at xvi 8 (see Dr Hort *Notes on Select Readings* p. 31).

(2) The real question seems to me to be not the date but the character of the Eusebian writings in which our Lord's command to baptize is adduced. The Letter to the Church of Caesarea is intended only for 'the faithful'. The *Theophania* and the treatises against Marcellus are distinctly theological treatises. Riggenbach (p. 29) finds an explanation of the silence of Eusebius elsewhere as to the Baptismal command in the *disciplina arcani*.<sup>1</sup> Professor Lake, in his Inaugural Lecture (p. 10), dismisses the suggestion in a somewhat contemptuous footnote: 'The suggestion that it is due to the *Disciplina Arcani* seems a counsel of despair.' I cannot agree with him. What are the facts? Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* vi 29, Migne *P. G.* xxxiii 589) says, 'To a heathen (ἔθνηκῶ) we do not expound the mysteries concerning Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, nor do we speak plainly of the things touching the mysteries in the presence of catechumens; but we often say many things in a hidden fashion, in order that the faithful who know may understand, and that those who know

<sup>1</sup> Riggenbach (p. 30) refers to the very remarkable way in which the Eucharistic words are referred to by Epiphanius (*Anc.* 57) ἀνάστη ἐν τῷ δεῖνῳ καὶ ἔλαβε τῶδε καὶ εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε, τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τῶδε.

not may not suffer harm.' Chrysostom (x 379 A) will not, in explaining the words *οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν* (1 Cor. xv 29), refer explicitly to the baptismal rite—*οὐ τολμῶ διὰ τοὺς ἀμύητους*. This is only one out of many similar passages in his Homilies. No doubt this rule of silence was not consistently observed. That probably would have been impossible. But at any rate, in treatises which were apologetic, or which were likely to come into the hands of other than 'the faithful', a Christian teacher would refrain from bringing into prominence Scriptural passages dealing with Baptism or with the Trinity. The baptismal command in Matt. xxviii 19 deals with both. None of the Fathers quotes Scripture more incessantly than Chrysostom. But I can find no reference to the baptismal command in the Homilies on St Matthew's Gospel (except of course the comment on xxviii 19), nor in the Homilies on St John's Gospel. Twice only does he quote the words in the Homilies on St Paul's Epistles, viz. in his comments on 2 Thess. iii 17 f, and on Heb. ii 18 (see above p. 487). Even more significant than these facts is the brevity and restraint of Chrysostom's comment on the text itself when he comes to it in his exposition of St Matthew. After quoting the words (*πορευθέντες . . . ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν*) he proceeds thus: 'He gives them orders partly about doctrines and partly about commandments. And of the Jews He says not a word, nor does He make mention of the things which had happened, nor does He upbraid Peter with his denial nor any of the others with their flight; but He commands them to spread themselves over the whole world, entrusting them with a brief teaching, even that teaching which is by Baptism (*σύντομον διδασκαλίαν ἐγχειρίσας, τὴν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος*). Then, when He had laid great commands upon them, raising their thoughts, He saith, *Lo I am with you all the days unto the consummation of the age*.' I submit then that, when we take facts into account, we find in the *disciplina arcani* an amply sufficient explanation of Eusebius's general reticence as to the baptismal command of Christ.

Lastly, we must review the textual evidence. Mr Conybeare (*Zeitschrift* p. 288) writes thus: 'Did it [i. e. Matt. xxviii 19] not arise, like the text of the three witnesses, in the African old Latin texts first of all, then creep into the Greek texts at Rome, and finally establish itself in the East during the Nicene epoch,

in time to figure in all surviving Greek codices?' He expresses (*Hibbert Journal* p. 103 f) the belief that he has 'been able to substantiate these doubts of the authenticity of the text, Matt. xxviii 19, by adducing patristic evidence against it so weighty that in future the most conservative of divines will shrink from resting on it any dogmatic fabric at all, while the more enlightened will discard it as completely as they have done its fellow text of the three witnesses'. I have endeavoured above to test the weight of the patristic evidence which Mr Conybeare adduces. Scholars will judge whether it is such as to 'substantiate these doubts of the authenticity of the text' in question. In regard to the comparison between Matt. xxviii 19 and the interpolation of the words about the Three Witnesses in 1 John v 7 I refrain from making any comment save an appeal to facts. The text as to the Three Witnesses is found in certain Latin authorities, viz. the Speculum (m), in one old Latin MS (r), in most of the MSS of the Latin Vulgate (but not in the best, such as *am. fuld.*), in some African Latin Fathers of the fifth and sixth centuries (Vigilius of Thapsus, Fulgentius of Ruspe, Victor Vitensis) and in the Spanish writer Priscillian (died 385). The only authorities for the Greek text are two cursive MSS, Codd. 162, 34, belonging respectively to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. On the other hand, the command to baptize in Matt. xxviii 19 is found in every known MS (uncial and cursive) in which this portion of St Matthew is extant, and in every known Version in which this portion of St Matthew is extant. The Curetonian Old Syriac breaks off in St Matthew at xxiii 25, and the Sinaitic at xxvii 7; but it should be observed that the text in question is contained in Tatian's *Diatessaron* (Hamlyn Hill *The Earliest Life of Christ* pp. 263, 376). Again, Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae (k), the oldest representative among MSS of the African text, has nothing in St Matthew after xv 36. But Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae has some clear affinity with Codex Palatinus (e) and a still greater affinity with the text used by Cyprian. 'The text which the two MSS present is really Cyprianic' (Dr Sanday in *Old Latin Biblical Texts* II p. lxxvii). The Baptismal command is found in e and in many passages of Cyprian (e.g. *Epp.* xxvii, lxxiii 5). Passing on from the consideration of MSS and Versions, we note that Matt.

xxviii 19 is quoted by writers so early as Irenaeus iii 171 (Lat. version), by Hippolytus *Contra Noetum* 14, and by Tertullian (see below p. 502). The reference in the *Didache* (see below p. 506) may reasonably be regarded as a quotation. Thus the attestation of Matt. xxviii 19 can only be described as overwhelming.

But in spite of this attestation is it possible to suppose that it arose, 'like the text of the three witnesses, in the African old Latin texts first of all, then [crept] into the Greek texts at Rome, and finally [established] itself in the East during the Nicene epoch, in time to figure in all surviving Greek codices'? The answer, I believe, is simple and decisive. All the 'surviving Greek codices' were not produced by a band of conspirators. They grew up naturally in different portions of the Greek-speaking Church. An interpolation could not be thus foisted into the text of the Gospels, and all evidence of its true character be obliterated. We appeal to facts. The comparison between Matt. xxviii 19 and 'the text of the three witnesses' is, I venture to think, singularly unfortunate. That text does not 'figure in all surviving Greek codices'. Or take the twelve verses which form an Appendix to St Mark's Gospel. They are attested by Irenaeus, Tatian (*Diatessaron*), perhaps by Justin Martyr. The evidence for their inclusion in the Gospel goes back to the second century. But in MSS and in statements of certain Fathers we have evidence, manifold and clear, that they are an unauthentic addition. Or again, take the passage—Acts viii 37—in which a question and answer such as became usual in the Baptismal rite of later times are inserted in the story of the Baptism of the Eunuch. Here is an interpolation which goes back to the time of Irenaeus. But a glance at an *apparatus criticus* shews how slight is the support which it has in MSS and Versions. I believe that it is only when we shut our eyes to facts that we can persuade ourselves, or allow ourselves to be persuaded, that it was possible for words to have been interpolated in the text of the Gospels without a trace of their true character surviving in MSS, Versions, and in statements of the Fathers.

The whole evidence—such I believe must be the verdict of scientific criticism—establishes without a shadow of doubt or uncertainty the genuineness of Matt. xxviii 19.

(III) We now pass on to consider the interpretation of the words which form part of the great commission—*βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*. What is the meaning of the phrase *βαπτίζω εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*? The A. V., following the earlier English versions, renders 'baptizing them *in* the name'. The R. V. has 'baptizing them *into* the name'. Some may remember how Bishop Westcott used to say in regard to this passage that he would gladly have given ten years of his life to the work of the revision had it resulted in no other change save this one. 'How few readers of the Authorized Version', he writes in his book on *Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testament* (p. 62), 'could enter into the meaning of the baptismal formula, the charter of our life; but now when we reflect on the words, *make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into* (not *in*) *the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*, we come to know what is the mystery of our incorporation into the body of Christ.' This position, which probably a few years ago was almost universally accepted, has lately been challenged by one who would eagerly acknowledge his debt to the Cambridge scholars who took a foremost part in the Revision. The Dean of Westminster, in his article on Baptism in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (i 473), upholds the familiar rendering of the A. V. '*In the Name*, not "into the name"'. Although *εἰς* is the preposition most frequently used, we find *ἐν* in Acts ii 38, x 48; and the interchangeability of the two prepositions in late Greek may be plentifully illustrated from the N. T. Moreover the expression is a Hebraism; cp. *ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου* Matt. xxi 9 (= Ps. cxviii 26 *בְּשֵׁם*); so in the baptismal formula of Matt. xxviii 19 the Syr. version has *ܡܫܘܡ* (Lat. *in nomine*). I must say at once that I believe that the R. V. represents the meaning of the words far better than the A. V.; for I do not doubt that the Greek phrase connotes the idea of incorporation. But I venture to question whether all the conditions of the problem have been fully taken into account.

It cannot be denied that the N. T. supplies instances of the preposition *εἰς* being thinned down in meaning and differing little from *ἐν*. But to speak of the interchangeability of the two prepositions is surely to overstate the case. The passages from

Inscriptions and Papyri collected by Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, Eng. Trans., pp. 146 ff, 196 ff; *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1900, p. 73 f) suggest caution. We have the formula τὰ ὑπάρχοντα εἰς τὸ ὄνομά τινος, meaning 'the property belonging to a person'. Again, a Greek inscription, apparently of the early imperial period, contains the following words: γενομένης δὲ τῆς ἀνῆς τῶν προγεγραμμένων τοῖς κτηματίωναις εἰς τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄνομα ('when the sale of the aforementioned articles had been effected to the purchasers into the name of the god', i. e. so that they became the property of the god). If then we went no further, we should be justified in the conclusion that St Matthew's phrase means 'baptizing them into the possession of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost'. It is worth while to note in passing that the same signification attaches to the formula ἐπ' ὀνόματός τινος (Deissmann, *ib.* p. 197). Hence we get light on the paraphrase by which Justin Martyr, using common current terms, tries to explain Christian Baptism to those outside the Church—ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς . . . καὶ τοῦ σωτήρος . . . καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται (Ap. i 61).

But whatever interest may belong to illustrations from Inscriptions and Papyri, it is far more important for us to enquire what interpretation of the phrase βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα was current in the Apostolic Church. The Epistles of St Paul are our earliest evidence. In them we find the phrase βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα (1 Cor. i 13, 15). But in two passages, in complete accordance with the Hebrew mode of speech whereby 'the Name' was used as a reverential synonym for God Himself, for the expression 'into (in) the name of' the Apostle substitutes the quite unambiguous expression 'into the Person Himself'—Gal. iii 27 ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Rom. vi 3 ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν [Ἰησοῦν]: comp. 1 Cor. x 2 πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο (v. l. ἐβαπτίσθησαν). Now it may be plausibly argued that βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ means 'to baptize in the name, i. e. by the authority, of Christ'. But such an interpretation is out of the question with the phrase βαπτίζειν εἰς Χριστόν. The latter necessarily expresses the ideas of incorporation and union. There can be no doubt then that to St Paul's mind εἰς τὸ ὄνομα in connexion with Baptism signified not 'in the name of' (i. e. by the authority of) but 'into the name of'.

In this connexion it is of special interest to notice that Tertulian, the earliest Latin writer of Christendom, in referring to the words of St Matthew gives *to them* this strictly personal form. When he quotes the passage itself (*de Bapt.* 13) he has 'Ite, docete nationes, tingentes eas in nomen Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti'. But his paraphrase of it in another treatise (*adv. Prax.* 26; comp. *de Praescr.* 20) runs thus, 'Novissime mandans ut tingerent in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum'. Compare Jerome *Dial. c. Lucifer.* 6 (Migne *P. L.* xxiii 161) 'Cum in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto baptizatus homo templum Domini fiat'.

But a secure interpretation of St Matthew's words must be based on the consideration not of the preposition *eis* only, but of the whole phrase—the preposition and the verb itself.

The Greek verb βαπτίζειν, found in Greek literature from Plato onward, need not detain us long. It means 'to plunge in or into', 'to immerse'. The historian Polybius uses it several times of men or boats being submerged and of men sinking in bogs; e.g. iii 72. 4 μόλις ἕως τῶν μαστῶν οἱ περὶ βαπτιζόμενοι διέβαινον: v 47. 2 αὐτοὶ δ' ὑπ' αὐτῶν βαπτιζόμενοι καὶ καταδύνοντες ἐν τοῖς τέλμασι. So Plutarch *de Supers.* 3 (166 A) βάπτισον σεαυτὸν εἰς θάλασσαν. The word occurs several times in the LXX and in other Greek translations of the O. T. Thus in Isaiah xxi 4 the LXX (going wide of the Hebrew) has ἡ ἀνομία με βαπτίζει, 'My iniquity overwhelms me'. Aquila in Job ix 31 ('Yet wilt thou plunge me in the ditch') translates thus, τότε ἐν διαφθορᾷ βαπτίσεις με: and Symmachus in Jerem. xxxviii 22 ('thy feet have sunk in the mire') ἐβάπτισαν εἰς τέλμα τοὺς πόδας σου. The prepositions (*eis*, *ἐν*) following the verb will be noticed.

But we cannot doubt that our Lord conversed with His disciples in Aramaic. The command to baptize, if uttered by our Lord, must have been clothed in an Aramaic dress. Prof. Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, Eng. Trans., p. 141) shews that the Aramaic word meaning 'to baptize' is the causative of the verb ܒܬܒ, which exactly answers to the Greek βαπτίζειν. Thus the word is used in the Hebrew Bible in e.g. 2 Kings v 14 'Then went he down and dipped himself (LXX ἐβαπτίσατο) seven times in Jordan'; 2 Kings viii 15 'He took the coverlet and dipped it (LXX ἐβαψεν) in water and spread it on his face'. The corre-

sponding substantive מְבִילָה was used in a quasi-technical sense of the Baptism of Proselytes.

Thus the meaning and the associations of the Aramaic and of the Greek word, as they entered into the Christian vocabulary, were clear and well defined.

Now the point to which I desire to call attention is this. In English we transliterate the Greek word βαπτίζω. When we use the word 'baptize' we think at once and we think only of the religious rite. Apart from that rite the word has no meaning for us. It is simply and solely a religious technical term. But the Aramaic Christian when he used the Aramaic word, and the Greek Christian when he used the Greek word, would never in this particular application of the term lose sight of its primary and proper signification 'to immerse', 'to plunge in or into'. An illustration will make my meaning plain. The words 'Communion' and 'Confirmation', when used in certain contexts, have the force of quasi-technical religious terms. But in that application they yet retain for us their proper meaning. The former necessarily suggests the ideas of union and participation; the latter the idea of strengthening.

In their versions of the New Testament the Syriac and the Egyptian Christians translated the word βαπτίζω. Latin-speaking Christians, though like ourselves they commonly transliterated it (*baptizare*), yet sometimes, as in the passages quoted above from Tertullian<sup>1</sup>, used as its equivalent the Latin verb *tingere*. What if we dare to follow their example and, instead of transliterating it, venture to translate it—βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, 'immersing them into the Name'? So surely a Greek-speaking Christian would understand the words. He would regard the divine Name as the element, so to speak, into which the baptized is plunged. Thus the outward rite is seen to be an immediate parable of a great spiritual reality. As in the Eucharist the Bread and Wine are effectual symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, so in Baptism the water which cleanses the body is a type of nothing less than God Himself, as the one true and perfect power of cleansing. The natural man being brought into union with God, being made incorporate with God, is purified. He

<sup>1</sup> So Cyprian e. g. *Ep.* xxvii 3 'Cum Dominus dixerit in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti gentes tingi'.

rises from the water; spiritually he is born of God; he becomes 'a new creation'.

Does this interpretation of the familiar words seem strained and over-bold? It can, I think, be justified by other passages of the New Testament.

Consider first Mk. i 8 *ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* (comp. Matt. iii 11; Lk. iii 16). Water and Spirit are here strictly correlative. The *πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* stands in exactly the same relation to *βαπτίσει* in regard to Christ's work as the *ὕδατι* stands to *ἐβάπτισα* in reference to John's work. The forerunner 'immerses in water', the Lord Himself 'immerses in the Holy Ghost'.

Again, we turn to the words of the great interpretative discourse in St John<sup>1</sup>, *ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῆ ἔξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ*

<sup>1</sup> I quote this passage without doubt or hesitation. I am, however, aware that Prof Lake in his Inaugural Lecture at Leiden (pp. 14 ff) has questioned the integrity of the text. His contention is that the words *ὕδατος καὶ* are a later interpolation. His chief arguments are as follows: (1) He maintains (p. 16) that 'the passage would be easier and would yield a more consistent sense if the words of *water and* could be omitted from v. 5'. Surely in this criticism Prof Lake forgets the Baptism of John and the Jewish custom of the Baptism of Proselytes (see Schürer *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes* iii pp. 129 ff, Edersheim *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* iii pp. 745 ff). The proselyte after his baptism was regarded, in the language of the Rabbis, as 'a little child just born', as 'a child of one day'. It is true that these expressions are found in Jewish literature of a date far later than our Lord's life on earth. But it is wholly improbable that the Jews borrowed such language from the hated Christians. It seems to point back to a mode of speech current among the Jews of which the Christian phraseology is an adaptation. At any rate the Baptism of Proselytes would render the mention of *water* in such a context intelligible and not unnatural to Jewish readers of the Gospel. (2) Prof Lake appeals to Justin *Ap.* i 61, 'Then are they brought by us to a place where there is water, and by that mode of regeneration (*ἀναγεννήσεως*) whereby we ourselves were regenerated (*ἀναγεννήθημεν*), so are they regenerated (*ἀναγεννώμεθα*). For in the name (*τῆς δόξης*) of God, Father of all things and Lord, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then perform the washing in the water. For indeed Christ said, "Unless ye be regenerated (*ἀν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε*) ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven". The reference in the last words is to John iii 3. Prof Lake (p. 20) argues thus, 'If he [Justin] had known v. 5 in the traditional form it would have been exactly what he needed to prove the connexion of baptism with regeneration; whereas if he knew it only in a form which omitted the reference to baptism, it added nothing to v. 3, of which it is in the Gospel the explanation.' I answer that Justin quotes v. 3 rather than v. 5, for the simple reason that v. 3 justifies his insistence on 'regeneration'—'by that mode of regeneration whereby we ourselves were regenerated, so are they regenerated.' But I go further. I find in Justin's use of v. 3 a strong reason for believing that he read v. 5 as we read it now, 'born of water and of the spirit'. For if he did not know

δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (iii 5). Here clearly the thought is of the man being plunged into the water and rising out of the water born into a new and divine life. But no less clearly is the water regarded as symbolizing spirit, into which the man is immersed, and assimilated to which he rises a spiritual being. 'The image suggested', writes Bishop Westcott on this passage, 'is that of rising, reborn, out of the water and out of that spiritual element, so to speak, to which the water outwardly corresponds.'

From the Gospels we turn to passages from St Paul's Epistles.

I Cor. x 2 πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωυσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο (v. l. ἐβαπτίσθησαν) ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ. If we recall the use of the word βαπτίζεσθαι in Polybius, it becomes at once clear, I think, that we lose the full force of the Apostle's bold metaphor if we do not translate rather than transliterate. 'Our fathers were all under the cloud and did all pass through the sea, and did all immerse themselves (v. l. were all immersed) into Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' Instead of being immersed in the waters and dying, the sons of Israel were brought into a close and living union with the messenger of God.

Gal. iii 27. Again we *translate*: 'All ye who were immersed into Christ (ὑσοι . . . εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε) did put on Christ.' The former metaphor, which is lost if we transliterate 'baptized into Christ', prepares the way for the latter. As the neophyte is immersed into the water, so is he immersed into Christ. As the water wraps him round, so Christ wraps him round. Henceforth he is 'in Christ'.

Rom. vi 3 'Are ye ignorant that all we who were immersed into Christ Jesus (ὑσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν) were immersed into his death. We were buried therefore with Him by means of that immersion into death.' Here again there are two metaphors which strictly correspond to each other. The thought

of any mention of water in v. 5, how should he connect the term 'regenerated' 'born again' in v. 3 with baptism in water? In other words the citation of v. 3 in this context implies a knowledge on the part of the writer of the words 'born of water and of the spirit' in v. 5.

It appears to me then that the slight evidence which Prof Lake produces in support of the theory that the words ὕδατος καὶ are not part of the true text of John iii 5 does not bear examination. I am constrained to add that in my judgement it is a theory which a scientific critic ought never to have put forward.

of immersion into Christ leads on to the thought of burial with Christ. Compare the closely parallel passage, Col. ii 12.

Reverting now to the words of the great commission, I submit that (1) the passages of the New Testament justify the position that the word βαπτίζοντες should be translated rather than transliterated; (2) that the whole phrase βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, 'immersing them into the Name', necessarily implies the idea of incorporation into the divine Name. So regarded Baptism is seen to be γεννηθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν.

An important result in exegesis follows. If we are right in translating St Matthew's words 'Immersing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost', the risen Lord is plainly revealing the spiritual meaning of the outward and visible rite, which was already in use among His disciples (John iv 1 f<sup>1</sup>). He is not prescribing the use of a formula. The words might rightly, as time went on, suggest the use of a formula. So only perhaps could the Church emphasize their application to each person baptized. Themselves they belong to a far higher sphere of spiritual and eternal truth.

I venture to suggest, though to some the suggestion may appear fanciful, that the very formula itself used in the Greek Church preserves the larger and more living interpretation of the words of the Gospel. The formula used in the Western Church—'I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost'—lays stress on the act of the minister and on the authority by which he acts. In contrast to this Western formula is that of the Greek Church—βαπτίζεται ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος<sup>2</sup>. Here, as it seems to me, is an announcement of the spiritual fact involved in the act of baptism. The new relation of the baptized to God is proclaimed. Traces of this view in the early church are further, I believe, to be found (1) in the very ancient custom of trine immersion or affusion (see e.g. the *Didaché* vii); (2) in the ἐπίκλησις, the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the water of Baptism (e.g. Tert. *de Bapt.* 4), parallel to the invocation of

<sup>1</sup> Note the words μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει as a comment on μαθητεύσατε . . . βαπτίζοντες (Matt. xxviii 19).

<sup>2</sup> The former formula was also used in the Egyptian Church, the latter also in the Syrian (*Dict. Chr. Antiq.*, art. Baptism, i pp. 162 f).

the Holy Spirit upon the Eucharistic elements (cf. Cyril *Catech.* **xxi** 3, Migne *P. G.* xxxiii 1089).

There are several important questions to which our interpretation of the words of St Matthew, if it is correct, supplies an answer.

1. There is a question of phraseology. What is the relation of the two phrases, βαπτίζω εἰς τὸ ὄνομα and βαπτίζω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι? Now in regard to the physical act we have two constructions of βαπτίζω (cf. above pp. 500 ff.). In Mark i 5 we read ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, 'they were immersed by him *in* the river Jordan'. The idea is of the stream encompassing those who submitted to the rite. Four verses lower down St Mark describes our Lord's baptism thus: ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαλῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος κ.τ.λ. Here the thought is of the Lord's entrance into the submerging water, followed by emergence. So in the *Didaché* (ch. vii) we have ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι followed immediately by εἰς ἄλλο ὕδωρ and that again by ἐν ψυχρῷ, ἐν θερμῷ. Exactly corresponding to these two constructions of βαπτίζω in reference to the physical act we have two corresponding constructions in reference to the spiritual reality—βαπτίζω εἰς τὸ ὄνομα ('to immerse into the Name'), βαπτίζω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι ('to immerse in the Name'). The two phrases are synonymous. They both represent the divine name as the element into which or in which the person baptized is plunged. At the same time, of course, it is always possible to interpret the phrase βαπτίζω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι as pointing to the divine authority in which the act of Baptism is done. Thus whether εἰς or ἐν is the preposition used the idea of incorporation is equally implied. It is involved in the whole phrase βαπτίζω εἰς τὸ ὄνομα and βαπτίζω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι and does not depend, as Bishop Westcott used to urge, on the use of the preposition εἰς only.

In this connexion it is worth while to point out that the Syriac Vulgate translates Rom. vi 3 thus: 'Those of us who were baptized (immersed) *in* Jesus Christ were baptized (immersed) *in* his death'; so Gal. iii 27. In these passages the notion of incorporation is necessarily involved. Thus the argument of the Dean of Westminster drawn from the Syriac '*in* the name' of (Matt. xxviii 19) is robbed of all its force.

2. Again, it is often urged that, whereas St Matthew represents our Lord as commanding His disciples to baptize in the name of the Three Persons of the Trinity, the evidence of the Acts and of the Pauline Epistles leads us to the conclusion that as a matter of fact they baptized their converts in the name of the Lord Jesus. So long as we regard the words of St Matthew as laying down the express terms of a baptismal formula, the difference between the alleged command of Christ and the practice of His first followers must give rise to serious difficulties. But when we consider the words of Christ recorded by St Matthew as revealing a spiritual fact about Baptism, then the question ceases to be one of rival formulas and becomes one of Christian theology. The writer of the *Didaché* gives the explicit direction (ch. vii): βαπτισατε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. But when later on (ch. ix) he refers to the baptized he uses the phrase οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα Κυρίου. St Paul is not inconsistent when he ends one Epistle with the words 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit' (Gal. vi 18; cf. Phil. iv 23), and in another Epistle expands the benediction into 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with you all' (2 Cor. xiii 14).

3. Again, there is the question, Have we here a true saying of Jesus Christ? The Dean of Westminster (*Encyclopaedia Biblica* i 474) suggests, as a possible explanation of the divergence between the Lord's alleged command and the practice of the Apostolic Church, that 'Matthew does not here report the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, but transfers to Him the familiar language of the Church of the evangelist's own time and locality'. He adds that 'in favour of' this suggestion 'it may be stated that the language of the First Gospel, where it does not reproduce an earlier document, shews traces of modification of a later kind'. It is indeed true—and it is well that we should remind ourselves of the fact—that our Lord's words have come down to us through the media of human memories, human translators, human editors. It is very seldom that we can say with confidence, 'This is a precise representation of the words which Jesus spoke'. Now if the words which St Matthew puts into our Lord's mouth are regarded as laying down 'a baptismal formula',

then everything depends on their being the *ipsissima verba* of the Lord. But if on the other hand the words are intended to describe what Baptism essentially is, then we may be entirely satisfied if we have reasonable grounds for thinking that they give us the substance, possibly in a condensed form, of what the Lord actually said. We have already seen that we may with considerable confidence conclude that St Matthew is here depending on St Mark or on St Mark's original. The degree of closeness with which St Matthew, in recording solemn words of the Lord Jesus, would be likely to follow his source will be best estimated by any one who will compare the record in the two Evangelists of the words spoken by our Lord at the Institution of the Eucharist.

I proceed now to consider the question whether there are any indications in the New Testament that St Matthew records our Lord's words about Baptism with substantial accuracy.

(a) We find in St Luke (xxiv 43-49) an account of another discourse of the risen Lord which has points of contact with that contained in the last section of St Matthew. As in St Matthew so in St Luke 'all the nations' (*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*) are spoken of as the appointed sphere of the Church's work. Again, in St Luke the Gospel preached by the Apostles is to deal with 'repentance' and 'remission of sins'. But we have only to turn to the same writer's account of St Peter preaching on the day of Pentecost—'Repent and be baptized every one of you . . . unto remission of your sins' (Acts ii 38)—to see how closely 'repentance' and 'remission of sins' are related to Baptism. In fact in St Luke's record of the risen Lord's words the term 'Baptism' or 'baptize' seems to be implied but for some reason withheld. Once more, the reference to a proclamation of 'repentance' and 'remission of sins' to 'all the nations' is immediately followed by an allusion to the Lord Jesus, the Father, the Holy Spirit: 'And behold, I, even I, send the promise of my Father upon you'. Thus amid all differences in regard both to phraseology and to the presentation of ideas there is a substantial resemblance between the post-Resurrection discourse recorded by St Matthew and the post-Resurrection discourse recorded by St Luke.

(b) There is a series of passages in the Apostolic writings which contain a devotional reference to the Three Persons of the Trinity:

(1) Pauline, 2 Thess. ii 13 ff; 1 Cor. xii 4 ff; 2 Cor. xiii 14; Eph. ii 18; iii 14 ff; iv 3 f; cp. Acts xx 28; (2) Petrine, 1 Pet. i 2; (3) Johannine, Apoc. i 4; 1 John iii 23 f; iv 2; (4) other writings, Hebr. vi 4 ff; Jude 20 f. The writers speak without hesitation or misgiving. They assume that their friends to whom they write will at once understand their words about the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Yet on the other hand to a Jew such language must have seemed revolutionary. How then should such an idea on the most awful of all subjects have arisen in the mind of a Jewish Apostle, much more in the minds of a group of Jewish Apostles? Such unanimity seems to postulate a word, or words, of Christ sanctioning the belief. A word of Christ, connected with a rite universally practised in the Church, at once explains a phenomenon for which it is not easy otherwise to account (see Dr Hort on the First Epistle of St Peter pp. 17 f).

(c) Lastly, have we in the New Testament traces of that doctrine of Baptism which is expressed in St Matthew's report of our Lord's words? Such apostolic language as that of St Paul in Eph. ii 18—'Through him [i. e. Christ] we both [i. e. Jews and Gentiles] have our access in one Spirit unto the Father'—sets forth that conception of the Christian's relation to God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, which, in reference to the initiation of the Christian life, is contained in Matt. xxviii 19. No student of apostolic thought will feel any difficulty as to the doctrine that incorporation into Jesus Christ necessarily implies incorporation into the Father (cp. e. g. Mark ix 37; Rom. v 1 f; 1 Pet. iii 18; Heb. x 19 ff). It is of the essence of the work of the Mediator to 'bring' those who believe in Him to the Father Himself. But, though it may be said generally that there cannot be union with Christ without union with the Spirit of Christ (Rom. viii 9), some hesitation may be felt by some in regard to the doctrine that in Baptism the believer is united to the Spirit in the same sense in which he is united to the Father. In two passages, however, of the New Testament this thought is explicitly recognized. Consider in the first place the dialogue between St Paul and the disciples whom he found at Ephesus as reported in the Acts (xix 2 ff). In answer to the Apostle's enquiry whether they had received the Holy Ghost when they became

believers they replied, 'We have not so much as heard whether there be a Holy Ghost'. His answer is the further question, 'Into what then were ye baptized (immersed)?' (*εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε;*) St Paul's question appears to be wholly irrelevant except on the assumption that he believed that those who were baptized were baptized (immersed) into the Spirit. In other words the dialogue seems to imply a knowledge of that conception of Baptism which is contained in Matt. xxviii 19. If we put aside the thought of a baptismal formula, no adverse inference can be drawn from the historical notice which follows, 'They were baptized (immersed) into the name of the Lord Jesus'. In the second place there are the words of St Paul in 1 Cor. xii 13, 'For indeed in one Spirit we were all immersed so as to form one body (*ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν*) . . . and were all made to drink of one Spirit'. Here too Baptism and incorporation into the Spirit are connected together. The metaphor of 'immersion in the Spirit' prepares the way for the second metaphor of Christian men drinking of one Spirit.

It is not, then, too much to say that the teaching contained in our Lord's words in Matt. xxviii 19 is presupposed in the thought and language of the Apostolic age. It is a fountain from which many streams flowed.

We have now reviewed the evidence on which an answer can be based as to the historical genuineness of the Baptismal Command which St Matthew records as the command of Christ. While we have no right to assume that in Matt. xxviii 19 we have the *ipsissima verba* of the Lord, we have, as I believe, no reason for thinking that the Evangelist is simply putting into our Lord's mouth a Church formula current when the Gospel was composed. When we compare the record of our Lord's sayings in St Matthew with the record of our Lord's sayings in St Mark, in my judgement we are justified in the belief that St Matthew records the command of Christ substantially in the form in which He uttered it.

It may be convenient that, in closing this article, I should recapitulate the main conclusions at which I have arrived and which I desire to commend to the consideration of students. They are these:

(1) There are grounds for thinking that the lost last section of St Mark, or its original (whether documentary or oral) was the source of the last section of St Matthew.

(2) There is not the slightest reason for questioning the integrity of the text in Matt. xxviii 19.

(3) We should translate rather than transliterate the word βαπτίζειν. The phrase 'to immerse into, or in the Name' necessarily connotes incorporation.

(4) Our Lord's words in Matt. xxviii 19 do not prescribe the use of a baptismal formula. They unfold the spiritual meaning of the rite. Baptism is the sacrament of incorporation.

(5) There is no reason to question that in Matt. xxviii 19 we have the substance of words actually spoken by the risen Lord.

F. H. CHASE.

NOTE ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE *CONTRA MARCELLUM*  
AND THE *DE ECCLESIASTICA THEOLOGIA*.

MR CONYBEARE has contributed an article to the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, iv 4, 1903, pp. 330 ff, in which he maintains that the two books of the *contra Marcellum* and the three books of the *de Ecclesiastica Theologia* are the work not of Eusebius of Caesarea but of Eusebius of Emesa. His arguments are briefly as follows: (1) The writer of the *contra Marcellum* (ii 4, Migne *P. G.* xiv 752) quotes a Letter of Marcellus. Epiphanius also, *Haer.* lxxii 2 (ed. Oehler ii pp. 50 f), quotes a Letter of Marcellus addressed to Julius, Bishop of Rome. When we compare the account of the one Letter with the account of the other Letter, we discover that they are not two Letters but one and the same. (2) At the beginning of the second book the writer of the *contra Marcellum* says that 'the times now call him to lay bare the impiety which for a long time had lurked in the man [i. e. Marcellus] and to strip it of the disguise of the Letter'. 'We know from other sources', Mr Conybeare argues (p. 331), 'that Julius was imposed upon by this Epistle in which Marcellus paraded the Roman Symbol as his own in order to obtain from the Pope a *testamur* of orthodoxy.' (3) 'In Rome', he adds, 'they thought that Marcellus had been unjustly condemned in the Arian Synod of Antioch, and to this feeling reference is made in the second book of the *ἐλεγχοί* p. 56 a [= Migne *P. G.* xxiv 824]: διὰ τοὺς ἠδικῆσθαι τὸν ἄνδρα νενομικῶς.' (4) Lastly (p. 332), the author of the *contra Marcellum* 'repeatedly refers

to Eus. P. in the third person, and in the same context to himself in the first'.<sup>1</sup>

Now the date of the Epistle to Julius is 340. A knowledge of this Letter, it is said, and of the results of this Letter is implied in the *contra Marcellum*. Hence, Mr Conybeare concludes, the *contra Marcellum* and the treatise which followed it, the *de Ecclesiastica Theologia*, cannot be the works of Eusebius of Caesarea; for he died 'at the very end of 338 or in the early days of 339'. Moreover, 'the dedication of the three last books to Flakillus indicates Eusebius of Emesa as their author' (p. 332).

I will consider these arguments in order. I desire to add that the object of this Note is not to endeavour to collect and review all the evidence in support of the common view as to the authorship of the two treatises in question, but simply to justify, in view of Mr Conybeare's arguments, my reference in the body of the article to the treatises against Marcellus as the work of Eusebius of Caesarea.

(1) Are we justified in identifying the Letter of Marcellus mentioned in the *contra Marcellum* with the Letter of Marcellus to Julius given in full by Epiphanius? It is true that in both Letters Marcellus protests that 'he had learned his faith out of the Divine Scriptures'. But such an assertion is the merest commonplace, and its presence in two documents is not the slightest proof that they are in truth one and the same document. Further, the Creed given in the Letter to Julius is, as is well known, our form of the Apostles' Creed save for some omissions and some slight variations. The only words which it is necessary to quote from the Creed in the Letter to Julius are these: *πιστεύω εἰς θεὸν παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν*. The Creed quoted as from Marcellus's Letter in the *contra Marcellum* (Migne P. G. xxiv 752) is as follows: *γράφει πιστεύειν εἰς*

<sup>1</sup> Mr Conybeare would, I believe, consider these the chief arguments in favour of his position. But he adduces other arguments also. (1) 'The style of the Elenchi [i. e. the *contra Marcellum*] is in every way different from that of Eusebius Pamphili.' My impression is different from that of Mr Conybeare. The laudatory passage from the *contra Marcellum* which I have quoted (p. 514), for example, seems to me exactly in the style of Eusebius. There is naturally a certain difference between a writer's style in a treatise of controversial theology and the same writer's style in a history or a laudatory biography. (2) Mr Conybeare thinks that the doctrinal position of the *contra Marcellum* is different from that of Eusebius. 'Eusebius belongs dogmatically to the pre-Trinitarian age,' he says. I will only say that (1) I think that Mr Conybeare exaggerates the importance of the Nicene epoch in the history of the doctrine of the Trinity; (2) I am quite ready to admit that there is a development, under the stress of controversy, in the doctrinal language of Eusebius and in the proportion of his dogmatic statements. On the theological opinions of Eusebius see Bishop Lightfoot's article on Eusebius of Caesarea in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* ii p. 347.

πατέρα θεὸν παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ θεόν, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. When we compare this Creed with the Creed presented to Julius we notice (1) that in this Creed *πατέρα* is inserted; (2) that the titles of the Son in this Creed are different, and are given in a different order, from the titles of the Son in the Creed presented to Julius. The *εἰς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ* standing first corresponds to the *πατέρα* of the first clause. Above all, there is the notable phrase *τὸν μονογενῆ θεόν*. That is a distinctive phrase and seems at once to negative the possible suggestion that in the *contra Marcellum* we have an abbreviated and inaccurate version of the Creed presented to Julius. The case therefore for the identification of the Letter referred to in the *contra Marcellum* with the Letter to Julius preserved by Epiphanius breaks down on examination. I must go further and say that the evidence shews that the two Letters are distinct and independent documents. No reasonable being will feel any difficulty in thinking that Marcellus wrote two Letters at two different times in both of which he (1) affirmed that he 'had learned his faith out of the Divine Scriptures', and (2) quoted a Creed, the Creed in the one case being different from the Creed in the other case.

There is therefore no chronological reason for refusing to accept the assertion of Socrates (*H. E.* i 36) and the evidence afforded by the title of the Treatise itself that Eusebius of Caesarea wrote the three books of the *de Ecclesiastica Theologia* and consequently (since the opening words of this treatise refer to the earlier treatise) the *contra Marcellum* also.

It is now needless to examine at length those arguments which I have denoted as (2) (3). It must be remembered that from the time of the Council of Nicaea till his death Marcellus was in the thick of the Arian controversy. It is not likely that Julius was the only person whom his enemies alleged that he had deceived. As we shall see presently, he was not condemned for the first time at the Arian Synod of Antioch. And whenever he was condemned by a Synod, he and his friends would inevitably maintain that he had been condemned unjustly.

The argument (4) derived from the fact that the writer of the *contra Marcellum*, speaking in the first person, alludes to Eusebius by name is of some interest. Mr Conybeare gives the key-words of one typical passage (*contra Marcellum* i 4; Migne *P. G.* xxiv 749 f). I quote it in a slightly abbreviated form. 'I will set down (*θήσω*) first of all the words in which he essays to controvert that which has been written in accordance with the Church's faith, slandering the writers. For now he controverts Asterius. Now he turns against the great Eusebius, and next against that man of God, truly thrice happy, Paulinus, a man who was honoured by the presidency of the Church of the Antiochenes and

magnificently ruled the Church of the Tyrians as Bishop, and who was so illustrious in his episcopate that the Church of the Antiochenes claimed him as a blessing essentially their own. And yet at Paulinus, who so happily lived and so happily went to his rest, who long since [πάλαι—in A. D. 329] fell asleep, who never did him any harm—even at him this wonderful author jeers. Passing from Paulinus he makes war on Origen, who likewise long ago went to his rest. Next he assaults Narcissus; and he persecutes the other Eusebius (τὸν ἕτερον Εὐσέβιον διώκει); and in a word he does despite to all the Fathers of the Church, and is pleased only with himself.' In regard to this passage I would call attention to three points. (i) If Eusebius of Caesarea wrote the *contra Marcellum*, the elaborate panegyric of Paulinus is quite natural. Eusebius (*H. E.* x 1) dedicated his *Ecclesiastical History* to Paulinus; and the very rhetorical sermon on the occasion of the dedication of the great church at Tyre, which Eusebius has preserved (*H. E.* x 4), and of which it seems certain that he was the author<sup>1</sup>, contains a passage of enthusiastic eulogy addressed to Paulinus. (ii) The author of the *contra Marcellum* calls Eusebius of Nicomedia 'the great Eusebius'. He praises the memory of Paulinus. If Eusebius of Emesa, a pupil of Eusebius of Caesarea, wrote the treatise within two or three years of the death of Eusebius of Caesarea, he would surely have added some words of laudation in the case of the dead Eusebius, the most distinguished ecclesiastic of his time, the favourite of the great Emperor, as in the case of the dead Paulinus. (iii) 'It is a literary impossibility', writes Mr Conybeare (p. 333), 'that the ἕτερος Εὐσέβιος should be the Eusebius who wrote these *Elenchi*.' I venture to appeal to facts. The history of Thucydides opens thus: Θεουκιδῆς Ἀθηναῖος ἐξῆγεγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων. Lower down in the same short chapter we find the words ἐκ δὲ τεκμηρίων ὧν, ἐπὶ μακρότατον σκοποῦντί μοι πιστεῦσαι ἐμβραίνει, οὐ μεγάλα νομίζω γένεσθαι. So v 26 (the third person gives place to the first person). Thucydides writes of himself in the first person in ii 48; he writes of himself as Thucydides in iv 104-107. Xenophon in the *Anabasis* (iii 1 4 and onwards) habitually refers to himself as Xenophon. The fact then that Eusebius of Caesarea is spoken of in the Treatise as ὁ ἕτερος Εὐσέβιος or as ὁ Εὐσέβιος, in a context where the first person is used, is no proof at all that Eusebius of Caesarea was not the author of the Treatise. There can be little doubt that he adopts the phrase used in each case by Marcellus; a modern writer would have used inverted commas.

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius introduces the sermon thus, καὶ τις ἐν μέσῳ παρελθὼν τῶν μετρίως ἐπεικῶν, λόγου σύνταξιν πεποιημένος . . . τοῦνδε παρέσχε λόγον. There can be no doubt that Eusebius means himself. His method of introducing himself as the preacher is instructive.

So far I have considered the argument which Mr Conybeare urges against the traditional view (which is in agreement with, and is perhaps based upon, the positive assertion of Socrates as to the *de Ecclesiastica Theologia*), that Eusebius of Caesarea is the author of the two treatises against Marcellus. These arguments seem to me to melt away under examination.

I now proceed to discuss a positive argument in favour of the traditional view. It is remarkable that Mr Conybeare omits to notice a passage near the end of the second book of the *contra Marcellum* (Migne *P. G.* xxiv 821 ff), which gives an account of the occasion of the composition of the treatise. I give the passage at length. 'It was but reasonable then that these doctrines should move the truly religious and thrice happy Emperor against the man, though he had flattered him in countless ways and in his treatise had expatiated on the praises of the Emperor. These doctrines also even against its will forced the holy Synod which met in the Imperial City and was gathered from divers Provinces, from Pontus and Cappadocia, from Asia and Phrygia, and from Bithynia and Thrace and from the regions beyond, in a document condemnatory of the man, publicly to brand him. These doctrines compelled ourselves also to embark on the present disquisition, that on the one hand we might thereby uphold the decision of the sacred Synod, and might on the other hand obey the injunctions of our fellow bishops that we should do this thing. And I think it especially needful that this document should be published for the sake of those who have imagined that the man has been unjustly treated. For we must needs soothe the suspicions of our brethren by proclaiming the man's impiety against the Son of God, which has long skulked in secret but has now been proved by means of his own tract, which of his own accord he presented to the Emperor, requesting him to peruse the contents thereof, hoping that he would himself obtain the Emperor's protection, and that the Bishops whom he traduced would be punished. But he did not attain what he hoped for. Pluming himself on his treatise, he approached the Emperor. But the Emperor entrusted the decision as to the contents thereof to the Synod. And the holy Synod of God condemned the treatise.'

The origin of the *contra Marcellum* is thus made clear. The author was asked to undertake the work by the members of a Synod which met in 'the Imperial City' and which condemned Marcellus's tractate. 'The Imperial City' where the Council met is clearly Constantinople. The Council of Constantinople in question must be that one which was held there in February 336. Proceedings against Marcellus had already commenced at the Council of Jerusalem, whence the Bishops were summoned by the Emperor to appear before him at

Constantinople (Gwatkin *Studies of Arianism* p. 87). It is very natural that Eusebius should dedicate a treatise against Marcellus (the *de Eccles. Theol.*) to Flacillus, Bishop of Antioch. For it appears probable that Flacillus presided over the Council of Tyre held in August 335 (Athanasius *Apol. c. Ari.* 81; comp. Gwatkin *Studies* p. 86 n.), and possibly also at the subsequent Council of Jerusalem.

The account given in the *contra Marcellum* has independent support. We learn from Socrates *H. E.* i 36 (comp. Sozomen *ii* 33) that Marcellus and his book were condemned at the Council of Constantinople, and from Athanasius (*Apol. c. Ari.* 87) that Eusebius of Caesarea (*Ἐρεπος Εὐσέβιος*) was present at that Council.

The treatise against Marcellus, which the Bishops assembled at Constantinople requested Eusebius to compose, was doubtless taken in hand at once—i. e. shortly after February 336. There was abundant time for so practised a writer as Eusebius to finish this treatise, and the treatise on the same subject which followed it, before his death at the end of 338 or early in 339.

F. H. C.

[DR CHASE'S argument seems to me to be complete and unanswerable from the standpoint which he has taken,—viz. meeting Mr Conybeare on his own ground, and accepting for the moment, without discussion, Mr Conybeare's assumption that the letter referred to in the *contra Marcellum* 19 b is at all events a letter of Marcellus. Granting that it is a letter of Marcellus, it seems quite certain that it is not the letter to Julius.

Also, it must, no doubt, be admitted that Eusebius might withhold his approval from Marcellus when he said that 'the Father was Father', and 'the Son Son', on account of the special use which Marcellus may have made of the phrases, although Eusebius himself and those who thought with him adopted the same form of words in order to safeguard the distinction of Persons (and perhaps to cover at least a modified subordinationism). Marcellus might well have insisted on the phrase 'the Son Son' in connexion with the theory attributed to him that the Logos was the title that corresponded to the eternal relation within the Godhead, whereas the Son (the historic person Jesus Christ) had only a limited and 'oeconomic' part to play (cf. *de Eccles. Theol.* i 5 p. 63 c).

But the passage does not read easily; and since Dr Chase's note was in type, further consideration has convinced me that the words which seem strange from the pen of Eusebius are not his words at all. They are just the words which we should expect from Marcellus himself about the opinions of Eusebius or of one of his school of thought. I was coming to this conclusion when I turned to Rettberg's *Marcelliana*. That admirable edition of the fragments of the writings of Marcellus,

published at Göttingen in 1794, which Zahn commended in 1867 (*Marcellus von Ancyra* p. 5) while he lamented that later writers on the subject made so little use of it, seems still to be neglected. We naturally read the *contra Marcellum* in the excellent print of the Oxford Press (ed. Gaisford 1852); and as a different type is used for the passages quoted from Marcellus, we can easily read there Marcellus too by himself. But of course we are at the mercy of the Editor, or even the compositor; and though Gaisford placed in the margin references to Rettberg's collection of the fragments, in this case either he did not read him correctly, or he deliberately (though without noting the fact) departed from his arrangement.

Rettberg prints the whole of the passage in question, "Ἀρξομαι τοίνυν ἀπ' αὐτῆς . . . καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ὡσαύτως, as a quotation from Marcellus. Reference to the context shews that he is right. Eusebius says of Marcellus γράφει δ' οὖν ὀνομαστὶ κακῶς μνημονεύειν ἀπάντων τούτων τὸν τρόπον. Then follows the passage, τούτων τὸν τρόπον introducing the words which are cited (the same form of citation occurs just after). Then, at the end of the passage, come the words of Eusebius himself: ταῦτα ὁ Μάρκελλος πρὸς Ἀστέριον, οὐκ ἀρεσκόμενος τῷ τὸν πατέρα δεῦ ἀληθῶς πατέρα ὁμολογεῖν, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἀληθῶς υἱόν, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ὡσαύτως. It is not Eusebius who finds fault with such expressions: it is Marcellus whom they do not please.

Eusebius has said just before that Marcellus set himself up as the single champion of the truth against the world and maligned by name a number of writers who had expressed themselves correctly and in accordance with the teaching of the Church. Then he gives a list of them (they are all men of the 'Arianizing' school). The first name in the list is that of Asterius, and—if I may borrow the method of positive assertion—the first quotation from Marcellus (the passage under discussion) deals with Asterius, ending with the words ταῦτα ὁ Μάρκελλος πρὸς Ἀστέριον. Then Eusebius goes on to cite and refute the attack of Marcellus on the others, in the order in which he has named them. References to Origen come in incidentally, and a good deal of space is devoted to the justification of Origen's expressions. (This is just what we should expect from Eusebius of Caesarea, and is an incidental confirmation of his authorship.) But the order of names is preserved all through, though there are repeated back-shots at those who have been already dealt with. (Marcellus was primarily concerned with the living—the insidious subverters of the Nicene faith, who had dared to pass through, as he says, his own diocese preaching heretical sermons. But they appealed to the authority of Origen; and so Origen comes in for his share of attention by the way, as the *fons et origo* of the whole mischief, just as Paulinus is attacked as 'the father' of Asterius.)

We see, then, that the words with which Marcellus finds fault are the words of Asterius ; words which Eusebius himself had used in his letter to his diocese, as he uses them earlier in this treatise (p. 4 c) ; words which were afterwards adopted in the Creed of the Dedication. This Creed, if not actually *the* Creed of Lucian, no doubt has a creed of Lucian as its basis (for summary of the discussion see Hahn *Symbole* \* p. 184 note 60, and p. 187 note 90), and it is probable that these phrases were among the catchwords of the Lucianic School to which Asterius and so many of the Arianizing party belonged, and as such were adopted by Eusebius in his letter.

The Creed, too, which is quoted with approval, is not the Creed of Marcellus approved by Eusebius, but the Creed of Asterius, approved—so far as it goes—by Marcellus. (So it is probably the Creed of Lucian, and the passage furnishes incidental confirmation of the traditional view, based on Sozomen *H. E.* iii 5, that the Creed of the Dedication was actually Lucian's Creed. Other phrases, some of them going back to Origen, which were attacked by Marcellus and are defended in the *contra Marcellum*, are characteristic phrases of this Creed. Probably all the Lucianic writers who are attacked derived them from it.)

To sum up: the whole passage belongs to Marcellus ; the letter is the letter of Asterius ; the creed is the creed of Asterius (*rep. si vis* Lucian); the phrases criticized are those of the writers maligned by Marcellus, and approved by the author.

I do not think there is much left—if I may say so with all respect—of Mr Conybeare's argument. Among the rest the contrast τὸν ἱερεὸν Εὐσέβιον . . . ἐγὼ δὲ . . . disappears. The passage in Athanasius *Apol. c. Ar.* 87, referred to by Dr Chase, may indicate that ὁ ἱερεὸς Εὐσέβιος was a common way of designating Eusebius of Caesarea. He and Eusebius of Nicomedia were, of course, two of the leading figures in the Arian controversy ; but though to us the heir of the library of Pamphilus is so immeasurably the more important of the two, he was not so in the eyes of his contemporaries. The designation ὁ μέγας Εὐσέβιος in the *contra Marcellum* is, I believe, the phrase of Marcellus himself, but anyhow it reflects contemporary opinion. In the writings of Athanasius ὁ Εὐσέβιος is always the Bishop of Nicomedia, the recognized head of the party with which the real battle for the Nicene faith was fought (οἱ περὶ Εὐσέβιον is Athanasius's regular phrase) : whereas the Bishop of Caesarea is always distinguished as such, or in the one passage cited as ἱερεὸς Εὐσέβιος. This latter Eusebius, writing against Marcellus in the third person, might well adopt both the current designations ; more particularly as his tract was intended to express the collective sentiments of the synod of Constantinople, and so he would naturally assume as impersonal a tone as he could—even to the extent of appealing, in his

own defence, to the evidence of his other writings, and describing them as 'circulated *κατὰ πάντα τόπον*' (p. 29 *d*), and so implying that there was no excuse for ignorance of his real opinions. (In the *Apol. c. Ar.* Athanasius, though usually writing in the first person, twice at least alludes to himself as 'Athanasius', §§ 36, 87, where he is referring no doubt to what was said about himself, but is not giving an actual quotation.)

I would only add:—(1) This tract was originally written anonymously, as we have seen; apparently as an amplification of the letter (*ἡ κειρ' αὐτοῦ γραφή* p. 55 *d*) which was sent at once by the synod to the districts in which the writing of Marcellus might be expected to be best known, with the description of which letter given by Sozomen it closely corresponds (see Sozomen *H. E.* ii 33). It would thus be associated rather with the synod than with Eusebius himself, and may have had only a limited circulation for a long time as an anonymous tract. And so the silence of Socrates about it, while he quotes from our *de Eccles. Theol.* as a work of Eusebius in three books 'against Marcellus' (*Socr. H. E.* i 36; ii 20, 21), would be explained. The *contra Marcellum* was a fugitive tract, written *currente calamo*, to serve the purpose of the moment. The *de Ecclesiastica Theologia* is a more solid work, composed at leisure, to supplement an earlier one in which the author thought, he says, he had already done enough for the refutation of Marcellus by simply quoting his own expressions (*de Eccles. Theol.* preface). The later and calmer statement of the case superseded the earlier and more personal diatribe and defence. (No one, I suppose, who has read them, doubts that the five books are by the same hand, and that the *contra Marcellum* is the work alluded to in the dedication and the preface to the *de Eccles. Theol.* For the reference to *ἡ πρὸ τούτου γραφή*, imbedded in the text of the *de Eccles. Theol.* p. 176 *a*, see the *contra Marcellum* pp. 6 *b, c*; 7 *c, d*; 24–25; 32 *c*; 35 *d*; 36 *ff*; 43 *ff*.) (2) There is no doubt, as Mr Conybeare says, that the author of the *contra Marcellum* declares that Marcellus had written only one writing. But there is also no doubt that this writing had been composed, in opposition to a writing of Asterius, before the synod of Jerusalem, and that it was made the reason for his deposition at Constantinople. It was after this that Marcellus went to Rome. Clearly, therefore, this writing of Marcellus was not the letter to Julius. The fact is that Eusebius in this treatise calls the book of Marcellus a *γραφή*, a *σβγγραμμα*, and an *ἐπιστολή*. Just as the writing of Asterius (and probably others of the writings which were criticized by Marcellus) was in the form of a letter, so the writing of Marcellus himself may well have been in the form of a letter, perhaps a pastoral addressed to his own diocese, where the synod that condemned him ordered search to be made for

copies of it, that they might be destroyed (Soz. *loc. cit.*). And if it was a letter, Eusebius's rather peevish complaint of its length would be explained. Marcellus's writing would thus be an Epistle to the Galatians, and the references in it to St Paul's Epistle have special point. Eusebius's reply, like the synod's letter, was intended to serve as yet another Epistle to the Galatians, to convince the men who thought that their distinguished bishop had been wronged. Jerome (*de Vir. Ill.* 86) says Marcellus wrote 'many volumes', chiefly against the Arians. He was not the man to keep silence when attacked, and we may be sure that he would lose no time in replying to the synod's letter. Eusebius's amplification of it must, therefore, have been written before he had had time to compose a reply. (3) The curious and very unusual order of the words in the first article of the Creed πιστεύειν εἰς πατέρα Θεόν, of which I know no other instance, was probably Lucian's own order. It certainly could be used to support a strongly subordinationist doctrine, and one that made the three distinct Persons its starting-point; and it may well have been altered in the Creed accepted at Antioch in 341 as being strange and perhaps suspicious. (At the same time the more usual order κύριον Ἰησοῦν . . . υἱόν was adopted in the second article.) (4) On the passage before us Gaisford prints the note of Montacutius, who took it correctly as a quotation from Marcellus. I am sure, from my cursory reading, that a close examination of Gaisford's edition would expose other passages in which the type ought to be rearranged. (I have noted pp. 21 *d*-22 *d*, p. 25 *d*, p. 29 *b*—Gaisford pp. 44-46, 53, 60-61; and the type used for quotations from Scripture is in the earlier part of tract the same as that used for quotations from Marcellus, whereas in the latter part it is the type of the rest of the text, inverted commas being used to mark the quotation.) (5) Reference to Professor Gwatkin's *Studies in Arianism* (see 2nd edition pp. 42 n. 4, 44 n. 2, 120 n. 6, 173 n. 3) will shew that, before the question of the authorship of the *contra Marcellum* was raised, he took substantially the view of the passage under discussion which I have expressed, as regards its relation to the Creeds and the Lucianic school. Mr Gwatkin had read Marcellus in Rettberg's edition.—J. F. B-B.]