

Christian Arab who, like this one, was translating the Diatessaron as late as the ninth century, would have guarded against such an error, which, moreover, cannot be paralleled in the rest of his version? Taken in conjunction with the reading of the Sinaitic palimpsest, this evidence of the Arabic Diatessaron is of importance.

II. MATTHEW, ch. xxviii. verse 19.

No other text has counted for so much in the dogmatic development of the Church as the text at the end of Matthew, ch. xxviii. verse 19:

"Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you."

Prof. Swete, in the work already referred to, p. 18, points out that the triple formula "forms the framework" of the so-called Apostles' creed. He writes: "Thus the Baptismal creed is seen to rest on the Baptismal words. It was the answer of the Church to the Lord's final revelation of the Name of God."

And Prof. Moberly of Oxford in a recent work refers to this verse as 'a solemn precept to baptise in the name of the holy Trinity, which fell from the divine lips of the newly risen Lord.' I quote his words from memory.

Until the middle of the nineteenth century the text of the three witnesses 1 John v. 7, 8, shared with Matthew xxviii. 19 the onerous task of furnishing scriptural evidence of the doctrine of the Trinity. This text ran thus: "Three there are that bear witness in *Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the holy Spirit. And these three are one. And three are there that bear witness on earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood, and the three are in the one.*"

The words italicised are now abandoned by all authorities except the Pope of Rome, and are not admitted even margin-

ally into the English revised version. By consequence the entire weight of proving the Trinity has of late come to rest on Matthew xxviii. 19. This is also the sole saying of the Lord in which the duty of baptising is enforced; and divines have also found in it scriptural authority for the innovation of infant baptism.

Thus the late Dean Alford wrote in his Commentary as follows:

"It will be observed that in our Lord's words, as in the church, the process of ordinary discipleship is *from baptism to instruction*—i.e. is, *admission in infancy to the covenant and growing up into* τηρεῖν πάντα κ.τ.λ.—the *exception* being, what circumstances rendered so frequent in the early church, *instruction before baptism* in the case of *adults*."

There has been no general inclination on the part of divines to inquire soberly into the authenticity of a text on which they builded superstructures so huge. Nevertheless, an enlightened minority had their doubts. Prof. Gardner, in his *Exploratio Evangelica*, ch. 35, wrote that they were "little in the manner of Jesus." James Martineau, in his *Seat of Authority*, remarks that "the very account which tells us that at last, after His resurrection, He commissioned His apostles to go and baptise among all nations, betrays itself by speaking in the Trinitarian language of the next century, and compels us to see in it the ecclesiastical editor, and not the evangelist, much less the founder himself."

Harnack, in his *History of Dogma* (German edit., i. 68), dismisses the text almost contemptuously as being "no word of the Lord." Lastly, Canon Armitage Robinson, a cautious critic, in his article on Baptism in the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, inclines to the view 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."

In the course of my reading I have been able to substantiate these doubts of the authenticity of the text, Matthew 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 its fellow-text of the three witnesses.

Of the patristic witnesses to the text of the New Testament as it stood in the Greek MSS. from about 300–340, none is so important as Eusebius of Cæsarea, for he lived in the greatest Christian library of that age, that namely which Origen and Pamphilus had collected. It is no exaggeration to say that from this single collection of manuscripts at Cæsarea derives the larger part of the surviving ante-Nicene literature. In his library, Eusebius must have habitually handled codices of the gospels older by two hundred years than the earliest of the great uncials that we have now in our libraries. He was also familiar with the exegesis of Origen, of Clement of Alexandria, of Pantaenus, and of many another ancient exegete whose works have only come down to us in fragments or in uncertain Latin versions.

It therefore imports to ask how Eusebius read this text. He cites it again and again in works written between 300 and 336, namely in his long commentaries on the Psalms, on Isaiah, his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, his *Theophany* only preserved in an old Syriac version in a Nitrian codex in the British Museum written in A.D. 411, in his famous history of the Church, and in his panegyric of the emperor Constantine. I have, after a moderate search in these works of Eusebius, found eighteen citations of Matthew xxviii. 19, and always in the following form:

“Go ye and make disciples of all the nations *in my name*, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I commanded you.”

I have collected all these passages except one which is in a catena published by Mai in a German magazine, the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, edited by Dr Erwin Preuschen in Darmstadt in 1901.

And Eusebius is not content merely to cite the verse in this

form, but he more than once comments on it in such a way as to show how much he set store by the words “in my name.” Thus in his *Demonstratio Evangelica* he writes thus (col. 240, p. 136):

“For he (*i.e.* J. C.) did not enjoin them ‘to make disciples of all the nations’ simply and without qualification, but with the essential addition ‘in his name.’ For so great was the virtue attaching to his appellation that the Apostle says, God bestowed on him the name above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow of things in heaven and on earth and under the earth. It was right therefore that he should emphasise the virtue of the power residing in his name but hidden from the many, and therefore say to his Apostles, Go ye and make disciples of all the nations in my name.”

The Greek words are: *πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου.*

It is evident that this 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. Then in two controversial works written in his extreme old age, and entitled, the one “Against Marcellus of Ancyra,” the other “About the Theology of the Church,” he used the common reading. One other writing of his also contains it, namely a letter written after the Council of Nicea was over to his see of Cæsarea. Socrates the historian preserves this letter, but the portion of it in which the citation of Matthew xxviii. 19 is made does not seem above suspicion.

In the writings of Origen and Clement of Alexandria there is no certain instance of Matthew xxviii. 19 being cited in its usual form. In Origen’s works, as preserved in Greek, the first part of the verse is thrice adduced, but his citation always stops short at the words *τὰ ἔθνη*, “the nations”; and that in itself suggests that his text has been censured, and the words which followed “in my name” struck out. In the pages of

Clement of Alexandria a text somewhat similar to Matthew xxviii. 19 is once cited; but as from a gnostic heretic named Theodotus, and not as from the canonical text, as follows (Excerpta, cap. 76, ed. Sylb. p. 987):

"And to the apostles he gives the command. Going around preach ye and baptise those who believe in the name of father and son and holy spirit."

In Eusebius' citations there is also some trace of περιόντες "going around" having been read for πορευθέντες. And the word explains the title given to the early gnostic romances in which the lives and activity of the Apostles was decked out with miracles and absurd legends. For these romances were called the περιόδοι or "periods," i.e. "goings around" of the Apostles, or "circuits."

In Justin Martyr, who wrote between A.D. 130 and 140, there is a passage which has been regarded as a citation or echo of Matthew xxviii. 19 by various scholars, e.g. Resch in his *Ausser canonische Parallelstellen*, who sees in it an abridgment of the ordinary text. The passage is in Justin's dialogue with Trypho 39, p. 258:

"God hath not yet inflicted nor inflicts the judgment, as knowing of some that still even to-day *are being made disciples in the name of his Christ*, and are abandoning the path of error, who also do receive gifts each as they be worthy, being illumined by the name of this Christ."

The words italicised are in the Greek:

μαθητευομένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ χριστοῦ.

The objection hitherto to these words being recognised as a citation of our text was that they ignored the formula "baptising them in the name of the Father and Son and holy Spirit." But the discovery of the Eusebian form of text removes this difficulty; and Justin is seen to have had the same text as early as the year 140, which Eusebius regularly found in his manuscripts from 300-340.

That the ordinary text is of great antiquity no one will

deny. We find it twice in Tertullian, in slightly divergent forms, in the treatise on Baptism, ch. xiii., thus:

"Ite, inquit, docete nationes, tinguentes eas in nomen Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti."

And in the *De Praescriptione haereticorum*, ch. xx., thus:

"Undecim digrediens ad patrem post resurrectionem iussit ire et docere nationes tinguendas in patrem et in filium et in Spiritum Sanctum."

Here he omits the words *in nomen*, as also in his work against Praxeas, ch. xxvi.:

"Novissime mandans ut tingerent in Patrem et filium et Spiritum Sanctum."

We may infer that the text was not quite fixed when Tertullian was writing early in the third century. In the middle of that century Cyprian could insist on the use of the triple formula as essential in the baptism even of the orthodox. The pope Stephen answered him that the baptisms even of heretics were valid, if the name of Jesus alone was invoked. However, this decision did not prevent the popes of the seventh century from excommunicating the entire Celtic Church for its adhesion to the old use of invoking the one name.

In the last half of the fourth century the text "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the holy Ghost" was used as a battle-cry by the orthodox against the adherents of Macedonius, who were called *pneumato-machi* or fighters against the Holy Spirit, because they declined to include the Spirit in a trinity of persons as co-equal, consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father and Son. They also stoutly denied that any text in the N.T. authorised such a co-ordination of the Spirit with the Father and Son. Whence we infer that their texts agreed with that of Eusebius.

There is one other witness whose testimony we must consider. He is Aphraates the Syriac father who wrote between 337 and 345. He cites our text in a formal manner as follows:

"Make disciples of all nations, *and they shall believe in me.*"

The last words appear to be a gloss on the Eusebian reading

"in my name." But in any case they preclude the *textus receptus* with its injunction to baptise in the triune name. Were the reading of Aphraates an isolated fact, we might regard it as a loose citation, but in presence of the Eusebian and Justinian texts this is impossible. It is worth considering, however, whether the original text of the gospel did not end at the word "nations," and whether the three rival endings of the text were not developed independently, viz.:

- (i.) "in my name," in Justin, Eusebius, and perhaps Pope Stephen of Rome and the Pneumato-machi.
- (ii.) "and they shall believe in me," in Aphraates, representing the older Syriac version.
- (iii.) "baptising them in the name of the Father, the Son and the holy Ghost," or similar in the Greek gnostic Theodotus, Tertullian, Latin version of Irenaeus, and the surviving Greek MSS.

The exclusive survival of (iii.) in all MSS., both Greek and Latin, need not cause surprise. In the only codices which would be even likely to preserve an older reading, namely the Sinaitic Syriac and the oldest Latin MS., the pages are gone which contained the end of Matthew. But in any case the conversion of Eusebius to the longer text after the Council of Nice indicates that it was at that time being introduced as a Shibboleth of orthodoxy into all codices. We have no codex older than the year 400, if so old; and long before that time the question of the inclusion of the holy Spirit on equal terms in the Trinity had been threshed out, and a text so invaluable to the dominant party could not but make its way into every codex, irrespectively of its textual affinities.

III. MATTHEW XIX. 17 = MARK X. 18 = LUKE XVIII. 19.

Matthew xix. 17, "And he said unto him, Why askest thou me concerning that (*or him*) which is good? One there is, who is good."

Mark x. 18 = Luke xviii. 19, "And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? None is good save one only, God."

Here Matthew's text challenges reflection.

An ancient corrector who could not bear even the shadow of an insinuation that the Lord was other than "without sin" is caught *flagrante delicto*; and it is the parallel texts of Mark and Luke that convict him. And the bit of botching here revealed to us is very ancient, for it is in the best and oldest manuscripts. It must therefore have been perpetrated before Matthew was joined in one book with the other two gospels; since so bold and radical a corrector would have gone on to Mark and Luke, and have physicked them as well, had he found them in the same volume.

But even Mark and Luke have here been tampered with. For we have it recorded by Epiphanius in two places, p. 315 and p. 339, that at Luke xviii. 19 Marcion, the early second century heresiarch, read:

"Call thou me not good. There is one only good, God the father."

In Greek: μή με λέγε αγαθόν· εἰς ἐστὶν αγαθὸς ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατήρ.

Marcion's evidence goes back far behind any other. Did he then alter the reading, "Why callest thou me good?" into "Call thou me not good," or "Do not call me good"? And did he add *de suo* the qualification "the Father" after the word "God"?

It is unlikely beforehand that he would introduce the first change, because the whole drift of his dogmatic system was to deny that Jesus Christ was a human being at all except in seeming, and to assert his Godhood at the expense of his manhood. He was therefore not likely to go out of his way to change the gospel text, in order to represent the God-man as peremptorily rejecting the attribute of goodness.

But the question is settled from other sources in favour of Marcion.