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The Eusebian form of the Text Matth. 28, 19.

By Fred. C. Conybeare, Oxford.

Tischendorf in his eighth edition of the Greek N. T. prints Mt 28, 19, 20 thus:

(19) πορεύεσθε μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτούς εἰς τὸ δύομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ὅλου καὶ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος, (20) διδάσκοντες αὐτούς τηρεῖν πάντα δια ἐνετέλημαν ὕμων, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐνεσθέ ὑμῖν εἰμὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἡς τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰώνος.

His *apparatus criticus* suggests that verse 19 stands in all patristic quotations in the form given above. In all MSS and versions the passage is so read, though it may be remarked that in the oldest Syriac MS the folio which contained the end of Matthew has disappeared. Others besides Tischendorf have assumed that the patristic citations of Mt 28, 19 endorse, with no exception, the received text. Thus Dr. A. Plummer in Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible (Art. on Baptism, p. 252) writes: “The baptismal formula in Mat. 28, 19 is in all authorities without exception.” And Renan in his work *Les Evangiles* ch. X writes of this text as follows: “La formule du baptême s’est élargie et comprend sous une forme assez syncrétique les trois mots sacramentels de la théologie du temps, le Père, le Fils, le Saint-Esprit. Le germe du dogme de la Trinité est ainsi déposé dans un coin de la page sacrée, et deviendra fécond.”

The following *testimonia* from works of Eusebius imply another form of text:

Είτε με έκεινους προσέπτετε τοὺς ἀναμφότεροι, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ θόρυβῳ αὐτοῦ.

2. Ibid. col. 416: αὐτοῖς (sc. ἀπόστολοι) προσταθήσετε ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τὸν εὐαγγελίζεσθαι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἵνα τοῦ αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως ἔμπνευσθεῖ, τὴν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πορείαν στείλαμεν, διήλθεν καὶ τὸ βάρβαρα φύλα καὶ τὴν οἰκομοῦν διδραμονὶ σῶσαμεν.


Διὸ κατὰ μὲν τὸν Ἀκολοῦθον εἴρηται: "τῷ δεσπόζονι ἐν τῷ δυνατεὶ αὐτοῦ δὲ αἰῶνος".


7. Comment. in Isaiah, 18; P. G. tom. 24, col. 213: "πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ θόρυβῷ μου." Πορευθέσθεν ὁι κραυγῶν γίνεται κατὰ κτ. λ.


9. Demonstr. Evang. I, 4, p. 8: Τὸς δ’ ἔνει δὲ ἐν Σιῶν προεληριφθο-

* Read περίπλοντες καὶ δείτε τις παρ. p. 283f.
The above occurs in the Syriac Theophania v, 49, without any difference.


14 (= 10). Mt 28, 19. 20 is cited three times in the fifth book of the Theophania of Eusebius, published and translated by Dr. Samuel Lee in 1842 and 1843. Lee took his text from the Nitrian Codex of the British museum written A. D. 411. The first citation is made in V, 17, as follows (cp. Lee Theoph. in English p. 298): "He (the Saviour) in one single word and in one single oracle, said to his disciples, Go ye and make disciples of all the peoples in my name, and teach them every thing which I have commanded you. And the deed, he made to follow the word. And forthwith (lit. ad instar eius) were "made disciples in a brief time all the races of the Greeks together and of the barbarians. But the law was not in a book of the Saviour, but "unwritten was by his command sown among all peoples".

15 (= 11). Theophania V, 46: "But he who used nothing "human or mortal, see how in truth he again conceded the oracle of "God, in the word which he spake to his disciples, the weak ones, saying, Go ye and make disciples of all the peoples .... These things "then (sci. How can we do this? How preach to the Romans etc.) "his disciples of our saviour would either have said or thought, so "by a single addition of a word, he resolved the sum of those things "of which they doubted, the sum of them he committed to them in that he "said, ye conquer in my name". For it was not that he ordered them "simply and without discriminating, to go and make disciples of all "peoples, but with this important addition, that he said, In my name". "For because of the power of his name did all this come about, even "as the Apostle said, God has given him a name more excellent than "all names, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, which is "in heaven and in earth and under the earth. Accordingly therefore "he displayed the excellency of the hidden power which he hid from "the many, In his name, and he added the oracle, In my name".

16 (= 12). Theophania V, 49, p. 336: "I am again compelled "to recur to the question of cause, and to confess that they (the "Disciples) could not otherwise have undertaken this enterprise than by "a divine power which exceeds that of man, and by the assistance of "Him who said to them: "Go and make disciples of all nations in my "name." And when he had said this to them, He attached to it the "promise, by which they should be so encouraged as readily to give "themselves up to the things commanded. For he said to them Behold "I am with you always, even to the end of the world."

We now give those passages of the earlier books of the Theophania in which Mt 28, 19—20 is cited. The first of these is in III, 4, in Lee's version p. 159:

17. "Who, of those who ever existed, is the mortal man, ... who "bore all this preeminence ... and could effect so much, that he should "be preached throughout the whole earth? and, that his name should "fill the hearing and tongues of every people upon the face of the whole "earth? But this no man has done excepting our Saviour alone, who "said to his disciples by word and fulfilled it by deed: "Go1 and teach "all peoples". — and after a little (Lee p. 160): —

"And, Who is that other (person) who, since the life of man was "set up, ever sought to constitute a people after his name — a thing "never yet heard of — and this not in a corner or obscurely in some "part of the earth, but in the whole earth under the sun?"

18. The next passage is in IV, 8, Lee p. 223: "That at the "outset he said that he would make them fishers of men, and in "the end openly after his example they should make disciples of all "peoples, together with his peculiar aid (or power). From the Gospel "of Matthew: —

"After his resurrection from the dead, all of them together, as was "commanded them, went to Galilee, as he told them. But when they "saw him some of them worshiped him, but others doubted. But he drew "near, gazed on them and said, All power in heaven and on earth is "given to me of my father. Go ye and make disciples of all peoples, "and baptise them in the name of Father and Son and Holy Ghost. "And teach them to observe all that I have commanded you. And, be "hold, I am with you always even to the end of the world."
And after a little p. 225 he continues thus: —

"And on this account, he commanded his disciples, not from the "first, but now, that they should go around and make disciples of all "nations. But of necessity be added the mystery of cleansing. For it "was right, that those who should be converted from among the heathen, "should he cleansed by his power from all pollution and uncleanness; "because they had been defiled by the error of demons, and had been "holy by the worship of idols, and by uncleanness of all sorts but "had now first been changed from that life of abomination and lawless "practices. These very persons then, did he admonish to teach, — after "this cleansing which is by the mystery of his doctrine, — not, that "they should observe the precepts of the Jews, nor yet the law of Moses, "but all those things which he commanded them to observe. ... He "necessarily therefore stirred them up, and made them readily to con-
"side, — to undertake the circuit of all peoples and to make disciples "of all races of men, through the promise by which he counselled them, "saying: Behold I myself am with you.


20 (= 17). Oratio de Laudibus Constantini 16, 8 (p. 294 sq. H): Τις πώποτε ἢ τοσοῦτον ἄρετης ἀπηνεγκατο ὡς πάντων τῶν ἐν τῆς ἀνθρώπων ἄκουν καὶ λάθως ἐμπλήρη τῆς αὐτοῦ προσεγγίσεως; ἀλλὰ τούτο τε οὐδεὶς ἢ μόνος εἰς ὁ δὲ ἡμέτερος εὐπόρῳ μετὰ τὴν κατὰ τὸν θανάτον νίκην διεπράζετο τοῖς αὐτοῦ γνωρίσισι λόγων εἰπὼν καὶ ἑρμῆ τελέσας πορευθέντες τὸν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ θήνη ἐν τῷ ονό-

ματί μου, φήσας αὐτοῦ, προεπιο ἐς τε καὶ ἀποφημώνονς, ὡς δρα δὲ τὸ αὐτο谷爱凌ν ἀνωτέρων κηρυχθῆναι ἐν δή τῃ ἀκουστῇ εἰς μαρτυρίαν πάντος τῆς θεώσεως, ἐμα λόγῳ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐπιτυγχάνει.

21. 22. In the Greek controversial works of Eusebius Mat 28, 19 is cited fully twice, viz. in the Contra Marcellum Ancyranum, p. 3, C; and De Ecclesiastica Theologia 5, p. 174, a. In both passages we have the textus receptus, and the context also implies it.

23. In a third passage, De Eccles. Theol. 3, p. 159 d, it is cited, but only as far as the word θηνή. The author of these treatises which were written sometime after 336, and before 340, had the textus receptus before him, at least in the two passages.

24. The only evidence which remains is that of the letter, addressed

by Eusebius after the council of Nicea, to his church of Caesarea. In this at the end of his baptismal creed, after the words πιστεύωμεν καὶ εἰς ἐν πνεύμα ἔρως, is introduced a citation of Mt 28, 19 in its usual form. This letter has only come down to us through the medium of Socrates the historian (I, 8, 38 p. 23), who perhaps took it from the work of Sabinus. There is hardly reason to suspect an inter-

polation.

23. The evidence of these later writings of Eusebius emphasizes by contrast the form of text preserved in the rest of his works. He seems to have found in the codices of Caesarea the following form of text:

πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ θήνη ἐν τῷ ονόματι μου, διδά-

kovtcs autou tis anōmat'( a hea, di-

1 "Flerusque in codicibus Graecis, ubi Origenes Eusebii Apollinaris in medium afferitur ad marginem scriptum observas, ψεύδο, mensuratu. Incidi ego in centonem Colleritaniae bibliothecae manuscriptum, qui ad singula Origenis, Eusebii, Apollinaris, etc., loca, singularem hunc castionem, minio exaratum, in marginie afferit, διόνυσα τὸν, ono-

thema τοῦ. Quamobrem miror hunc Eusebii commentarium ad nos usque devenisse." Bernard de Montfaucon, Preliminaria in Eusebii commentaria in Psalmos.
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familiar with Armenian or Syriac versions know how common was this device of saving labour. At first sight the comment upon this citation when it speaks of the "mystery of cleansing", seems to involve the presence of βαπτίζοντες in the original Greek; but the definition which immediately follows of this cleansing, as being "by the mystery of his doctrine", precludes the idea that the writer had in view the cleansing by the water of baptism, and rather suggests the exorcism at use of the name which preceded baptism, and were specially a "cleansing by his power" from the pollution of demons.

25. Thus we have some 17 attestations of the reading ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, to the exclusion of the words βαπτίζοντες and τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἄγνω πνεύματος. We have also two passages viz. 8 and 9, favorable to it. One, viz. 18, that is doubtful. Two at least that are neutral. As a matter of fact there are other neutral passages, where the citation only extends as far as the words τὰ ἔθη, but they were not worth while collecting.

Against this body of testimony we have three passages in the works of Eusebius, in which the textus receptus of Mt 28, 19 is cited; and all three belong to the last period of his literary activity which fell after the council of Nice.

26. Two writers earlier than Eusebius, shew a knowledge of this shorter form of text; and neither of them formally cite the passage, but rather echo it. The first is Justinus Martyr in the Dialogue with Tryphon 39, p. 258: "Ον δέ τρόπον διὰ τοὺς ἑπτακισίλους ἐκεῖνου τὴν ἑρήμην ὧν ἔκφερε τότε ὁ θεός, τὸν αὐτόν τρόπον καὶ τὸν χάριτι συνέβη, ἡ καταγίζεται ἐπὶ καθ' ἑκάτερον τῆς μαθητευμένους εἰς τὸ δόμων τοῦ Χριστοῦ τούτου καὶ ἀποκάλυπτας τὴν ὅπως τῆς πλάνης, οί καὶ λαμβάνοις δόματα ἕκαστος ὡς ἀεικές, φυτίζομενοι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦτοῦ.

In another passage of his dialogue, c. 53, p. 272 D, Justin glances at Mt 28, 19: Καὶ τὸ Δεσμεύων ... (Gen 49, 11) ... τῶν ἔθνων ὁμοίως, τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύων αὐτῷ, προδήλωται ἦν. Οὕτω γὰρ ως πάλιν ἄντικες καὶ λυόντος ἐπὶ αὐχένα μὴ ἔχων τὸν εἰσαφός, μέχρι ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πέμπεις ἐμαθητεύσειν αὐτοῦ.

Here there is no confirmation or rejection of the words ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί; nevertheless the very occurrence of the passage strengthens the surmise that Justin was acquainted with Mt 28, 19, and really glanced at it in p. 258. In this latter place the words "and abandoning the path of error" indicates that it was the Gentiles and not the Jews that were daily being made disciples into the name.

The first of the above passages has been recognised by Resch in his Aussercanonische Parallelstellen as a citation of Mt 28, 19; but he sets it down, along with three of the passages above adduced from Eusebius, under the head of Abbreviation, or abridgements of the ordinary text. From such an error a wider reading of Eusebius would have saved him.

27. The second passage is in the Pastor Hermæ and is a less certain reference, Simil. IX, 17, 4: πάντα τὰ ἔθη τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ὀφείλον κατοικοῦντα, ἀκούσαντα καὶ πιστεύσαντα ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι ἐκλήθησαν [τοῦ υἱοῦ] τοῦ θεοῦ, λαβόντες οὖν τὴν φραγμίδα μίαν φρόνησιν ἔχον καὶ ένα νοῦν.

The above might almost as well be taken to echo Lc 24, 47, although Harnack commenting on the words: πάντα τὰ ἔθη, remarks: "Haec vox omnes expellit dubitationes; cf. Mt 28, 19." It is to be remarked that Lc 24, 47 with its keynote: δρέαμεν ὁμοίως ἀπὸ ἱερουαλήμη, is seldom absent from Eusebius' mind when he quotes Mt 28, 19; and the Lucan passage itself has the air of being a reminiscence of the Eusebian text of Mt 28, 19. For Luke has merely added the words μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν, and substituted κηρυχθήσατε ... εἰς γιαβησέωτε.

28. The earliest writer who cites Mt 28, 19 in a form approximating to the text established in the manuscripts of the Gospels, is the Gnostic Theodotus, whose literary activity cannot be precisely dated, but must have been as early as 160. It has been conjectured that he used the Gospel according to the Egyptians. An excerpt (§ 76) from his writings appended to the eighth book of the Stromatae contains the following (Syll. p. 987):

Καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐνέτειλεν ἀπερίγραπτης καὶ τοῖς πιστεύοντας βαπτίζετε εἰς ἄνωμα πατρός καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἅγιον πνεύματος. Dr. P. M. Barnard who has collected the N. T. citations of Clement in a volume of the Cambridge Texts and Studies suggests, perhaps without good reason, that the words εἰς ἄνωμα κ. τ. λ. in the above were added by Clement to the text of Theodotus. The use of the word περιτυντες suggests that in the third of our excerpts from Eusebius on the psalms col. 653 the impossible reading περιτυντες is a corruption of περίτυντος. And this conjecture is confirmed by a neighboring passage in ps. col. 409: τοῦ γὰρ ἐναπεικτοῦ λόγου ἐνεστὶ περὶτυντος εἰς τὸν βιον, ἐνεστὶ-
mended you'. And it is significant that Origen gives no hint of the important precept to baptize in the trine name which in our texts intervenes.

31. If we could trust Rufinus' versions of Origen's homilies, we would have to admit that he used the textus receptus at Mt 28, 19 and even set store by it. But we cannot trust them. At the conclusion of his version of the commentary on Romans Rufinus boasts that he had taken much 'trouble to fill in what was lacking in Origen', laborem adimplendi quae deecrant for this reason: ne pulsatae quaeestiones et relictae, quod in homiletico dicendi genere ab illo fieri solet, latino lectori fastidium generarent. The learned Benedictine editor deplores in the following words the zeal shewn by Rufinus for rewriting the author he professed to translate: Sed utinam hoc labore adimplendi quae deecrant supersedesisset! Ex ejus enim licentia factum est, ut qui legit has homilias, incertus sit utrum legat Origenem, an Rufinum.

The text Mt 28, 19 comes thrice in Rufinus' version of the Commentar in Romanos, in V, 2 and 8; and VIII, 4. The last two passages smack of Rufinus rather than of Origen. No sane critic would undertake to say where Origen ends and Rufinus begins. 'Vix certo distinguui potest, ubi solus Origenes loquant, aut ubi suas merces obtusitat Rufinum', says De la Rue (monitum in Exodum). In Hom. viii, § 4 in Exodum, as rendered by Rufinus comes the fourth reference to Mt 28, 19:

Cum ergo uenimus ad gratiam baptismi, uninseris alius dies et dominus remuniantes, Solum confitemur Deum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum. Sed hoc confitentes, nisi toto corde diligamus Dominum Deum nostrum . . . non sumus effecti pars Domini . . . et Dominum, ad quem confugimus, propitium non efficimus, quem non ex toto et integro corde diligimus. Why is Dominum alone mentioned, if just before the trine formula had stood in the original Greek? The commentary awakes this suspicion in us.

Thus it is only in Rufinus' work that the text Mt 28, 19 occurs; in three cases embedded in comment which smacks of him rather than of Origen, while in the other two the trine formula is in no way necessitated by the context.

32. It is true that Origen attests the use of the trinitarian formula in baptism, in his Greek commentary on John tom. VI, § 17 in these words used of the person baptised: τῷ ἐμπαρθένῳ ἑαυτῷ τῇ θεοτητι τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν τῆς προςκυνήσεως τριάδος ἐπικλήσεως. But because the
trine epiclesis was used in his δυσλουσθα of Baptism, it does not follow
that the text Mt 28, 19 was in his copies of the N. T. anymore than
in those of Eusebius; and the same caution must be used in regard to
the references made by Irenaeus and Justin to the use of a trine for-
mula in Baptism.

33. Cyprian of Carthage used the text: “Baptising them in the name
of Father, Son and Holy Spirit”, as a battlecry in his strife with Pope
Stephen: Quomodo ergo quidam dicunt, foris extra ecclesiam, immo et
contra ecclesiam, modo in nomine Christi, ubicunque et quomodounque
gentilem baptizatum remissionem peccatorum consequi posse, quando
ipse Christus gentes baptizari inebat in plena et adunata trinitate? (Epist.
73 ad Iubaianum). And just before in the same letter: Insinuat trinita-
tem, quin sacramento gentes baptizarentur. The official church of
Rome however ignored his arguments, and adopted the position that
baptism in the name of Christ alone was quite valid. As the canon
of the Synod of Nemours (1284) expressed it: Dicimus, infantem baptizi-
atum esse, si baptizans dicit: Baptizo te in nomine Christi.

It in some measure explains this decision of the Popes that the
text of Mt 28, 19 was not yet authoritatively fixed by the church. That
the Pneumatomachii of the fourth century retained the Eusebian reading
can be inferred from the arguments used by and against them.

34. In his discourse: de communione sub utraque specie addressed
A. D. 1433 to the Council of Bâle (Mansi concilia XXXIX, col. 858),
John of Ragusa used these words: Dominus noster Jesus Christus ascen-
dens in coelum praecepit apostolis dicens, Ite docete—Spiritus Sancti,
in quibus verbiis dedit eis et limitavit formam baptismi et in persona
eorum toti ecclesia. Et tamen non post longum tempus ipsi apostoli
et ecclesia dimittendo dictam formam, in nomine Patris etc., tradidam
per Dominum baptizantan tantum in nomine Christi dicentes: Te baptizo
in nomine Domini Jesu Christi. He proceeded to infer that, as the
Apostles deviated from their master’s precepts in regard to baptism,
so the church had a right to set them aside as regards the Euchar-
ist, by withholding the cup from the laity. I do not know if any will
pursue this hypothesis a little further and argue that the apostles, when

3 Thomas Aquinas propounds the same argument III, 9, 66, a. b, ad 1. John
writes (L. c. col. 853): Si enim immutaverunt Apostoli formam baptismi, quae dat essen-
tiam sacramentum, taliter ut si quis nunc in illa forma, quae ipsi apostoli, baptizaret, non
esse baptismum, quanti magis potest ecclesia mutare vel tollere suam speciem etc.

they “set aside the formam traditam per Dominum”, also introduced the
Eusebian form of text at Mt 28, 19.

35. A different explanation of the dissonance between Mt 28, 19
and other baptismal formulas found in the New Testament has been
broached by certain scholars, whose conclusions, lest I should appear
to ignore previous workers in this field, I venture in conclusion to refer
to, although, being based on no textual research, they hung entirely
in the air and were merely happy guesses.

Canon Armitage Robinson inclines to the view (Art. Baptism in
Encyclopaedia Biblica) that Matthew “does not here report the ipsissi-
ma verba of Jesus, but transfers to him the familiar language of the
“church of the Evangelist’s own time and locality”.

The German scholar Teller in Exc. 2 of his edition of Burnet: De
Fide et officiis christianorum, Halae, 1786, p. 262, disputed the genui-
ness of the text. So did Evanson, vicar of Tewkesbury in his letter
(Dogmengeschichte I, 68): Dass Jesus die Taufe eingesetzt habe, lässt
sich nicht direct erweisen; denn Mt 28, 19 ist kein Herrwort.

Martineau in his “Seat of Authority” Bk. IV, ch. IV, p. 515 writes
thus: “The very account which tells us that at last, after his resurrec-
tion, he commissioned his apostles to go and baptize among all nations,
“betrayed 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.”

Socinus (opera Irenopolii 1696 vol. I, 712 and II, 438) accepted the
usual text as genuine, but sought to explain away its obvious meaning
by means of tortuous and special pleading.

J. H. Scholten in his work: Die Taufformel (übersetzt von Max
Gubalke, Gotha, 1885) wrote: Die gegenseitige Vergleichung der Texte
unserer drei ersten Evangelien und die kritische Untersuchung über ihr
Alter führen somit zu dem Schlusse, dass dem Bericht über die Ein-
setzung der Taufe durch Jesus in dem nach Matthäus benannten
kanonischen Evangelium ein relativ spätes Datum zukannt werden
muss.

H. Holtzmann in an article on Baptism in the N. T. in the Zeit-
schrift f. wissenschaftliche Theol. 1879, p. 401, arrives at a similar
conclusion.

36. The following questions therefore need to be discussed.

1. Is the Eusebian and Justin's reading of Mt 28, 19 original?
2. If so, was not the textus receptus created about 130—140?
3. Was it not due to a reaction on the text of Matthew of liturgical, and, specially, of baptismal usage?
4. Did it not arise, like the text of the three witnesses, in the African old Latin texts first of all, thence creep in to 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?