

MANIFESTATIONS OF THE RISEN JESUS.

BY WM. WEBER.

THE Gospels and Acts contain a few accounts of appearances of Jesus after his resurrection which may be considered together under the heading "Manifestations of the Risen Jesus." They are: the Last Interview, the Emmaus Appearance, the Touch and Food Test, and the Thomas Episode. I pass over the appearance at the Lake of Tiberias, the last appendix to the fourth Gospel, because that narrative is based on Luke v. 3-9, belonging to a different period of the life of Jesus. For several reasons, it is advisable to examine first the Last Interview. In doing so, the first Gospel will be disposed of as far as the resurrection is concerned. Besides, it is the only one of the pericopes just named of which we possess parallel versions. Last but not least, it is the most important and instructive of them all, as will appear in the course of the following investigation.

The first Gospel records only a single meeting of Jesus and his disciples after he had risen from the dead (Matt. xxviii. 16-20). It took place in Galilee, and the opening words: "And the eleven disciples went into Galilee," apparently join it directly to either of the two preceding versions of the story of the Women at the Grave. For the angel as well as Jesus directed the women to tell the disciples they should go to Galilee where they would meet their risen master. But when we find verse 16 to continue: "unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them," grave doubts are bound to arise whether the final pericope of Matthew is really and organically connected with the preceding passage. For no mountain nor any other place of rendezvous is mentioned in either the angel message or the command of Jesus. Acts i. 12 locates the last meeting of Jesus and his disciples expressly on Mount Olivet near Jerusalem; and Luke xxiv. 50 names Bethany, a village on the same mountain, as the exact place where Jesus ascended into heaven. Our

tradition is, therefore, contradictory; and it is not improbable that the just quoted first part of verse 16 owes its existence to the compiler who added the burial and resurrection chapter to the first Gospel. That impression is confirmed by the peculiar character of the pericope of the Women at the Grave as well as by the negative testimony of the other sources. We neither expect any direct continuation of the angel message, nor is such a continuation met with in any of the other Gospels. Our passage is therefore to be recognized as an entirely independent narrative, leaving, however, the question where the mountain was located undecided.

The most important feature of Matt. xxviii. 16-20 is the new commandment of Jesus: "Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Am. R. V., verse 19). To convey a more distinct idea of the meaning of that commandment, it would be better to use the term "all the Gentiles" instead of "all the nations." For that is what the corresponding Greek words really signify.

We have here a strict and unequivocal order, directly opposed to the first missionary precept given by Jesus and found Matt. x. 5. The latter reads: "Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." According to those words, Jesus enjoined his apostles emphatically to confine their missionary work strictly and absolutely to members of their own nation; he forbade them directly to preach the Gospel to Gentiles and Samaritans.

Jesus considered himself bound by that rule, as one may learn from the pericope of the Canaanitish Woman (Matt. xv. 21-28 and Mark vii. 24-30). He refused at first to heal the daughter of the Gentile woman, saying: "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. xv. 24), and: "It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs" (Matt. xv. 26 and Mark vii. 27). The "children," of course, are the Jews and the "dogs", the Gentiles. Another saying of Jesus to the same effect has been preserved Matt. vii. 6: "Give not that which is holy to the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine."

Statements of that kind are characteristic of the spiritual pride and exclusiveness of the Jewish nation which was either shared or at least taken into serious consideration by Jesus. It does not fall within the scope of the present paper to account for or to explain the attitude of Jesus in this matter. But it is necessary to establish the fact that Jesus prohibited his apostles when he first

commissioned them to preach his Gospel from attempting to reach the Gentiles or even the kindred Samaritans. That will render it clear how strange and unexpected the missionary charge of the risen Jesus must have sounded to the astonished disciples. It was bound to leave just on that account an indelible impression upon their minds and memory; and if they ever had believed in Jesus and obeyed him before, they now could not but regard it as their most sacred duty to go at once to the Gentiles and invite them to enter into the Kingdom of God.

It might be said, of course, those words which bear the imprint of all that is repulsive in Pharisaic Judaism, occur with a single exception only in Matthew. We have learned to look upon everything vouched for by one of the Gospels, and especially one of the Synoptic Gospels only, as of doubtful authenticity. Why should not that rule be applied to the passages under discussion and Matt. xxviii. 19 be accepted as the only genuine missionary commandment of Jesus? It certainly forecasts the actual course of the Christian propaganda and the development of the religion of Christ into one of the universal religions. Both commandments can have been given hardly by one and the same person since they contradict and exclude each other. Moreover, also the third Gospel ascribes to the risen Jesus a statement closely related to Matt. xxviii. 19, namely, "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the Gentiles" (Luke xxiv. 47). Besides, we have a similar saying in the parallel account Acts i. 6-11: "Ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Thus, as far as the number of witnesses is concerned, the universal commandment is even better attested than its opposite.

We must not be overhasty, however, to apply mechanically in any instance a text-critical rule which holds good in very many, if not in most cases. There are in the given instance some other factors which ought not to be lost sight of. That Matthew alone has handed down those sayings of Jesus does not stamp them as spurious automatically. It is not difficult to understand how and why the early Christians may have obliterated the corresponding passages in the other Gospels. For those words must have struck the Gentile Christians from the very beginning as incompatible with the spirit of Christianity and the actual spread of their religion. They could not see how such a phenomenal growth could have started in opposition to Christ's will and command. They failed to conceive the circumstances which might have made such a precept

of Jesus wise and reasonable, at least as a temporary measure. Thus, all the Gentile compilers and editors of the Gospels during their formative period were sorely tempted to reject all such obnoxious words of Jesus they might come upon in their sources. That they were retained in the first Gospel may be due to especially favorable conditions. Matthew may have been, for instance, in the care and keeping of Jewish Christians much longer than the other Gospels. After a certain time, reverence of the written sacred words of the New Testament writings no longer permitted any serious omissions and other changes in the text as it had been handed down.

Fortunately, we are not dependent upon such reflections in order to decide whether Matt. x. 5-6 or Matt. xxviii. 19 or both preserve genuine sayings of Jesus. Everybody has to admit that the charge given the disciples by their glorified master admitted of neither doubt nor hesitation. It was impossible for them to forget that momentous precept. Supposing, therefore, the words Matt. xxviii. 19 to have actually been uttered by Jesus, we must take it for granted that the apostles began at the very first opportunity to carry their message not only to the Jews but also to the Samaritans and Gentiles.

On the day of Pentecost, indeed, when the disciples bore witness to their faith in Jesus for the first time in public, they seem to have addressed representatives of all nations on earth (Acts ii. 9-11). But we ought to remember: Jerusalem at that time was by no means a cosmopolitan metropolis with a large foreign population. The city was nothing but the religious center of the Jews, not even the official residence of the Roman governor. Far removed from the great routes of travel, it had no commercial importance; no great industries flourished within its walls. Its life and existence depended altogether upon the temple and its visitors. There was nothing to attract foreign settlers, nor would they have been welcomed to stay. They were "dogs" and "swine," unclean beasts whose very breath defiled a pious Jew. A heathen would hardly dare to sneak into the temple, as to pass a certain limit within the temple meant death for him. Hence it is unthinkable that heathen in any number should have gathered anywhere in the temple at the Feast of Weeks and admitted in public not to be Jews. What happened to the apostle Paul who was accused of having brought Greeks into the temple and thereby defiled the holy place (Acts xxi. 28), gives us an inkling of what the Jews would have done to unknown

and uninvited visitors, reckless enough to proclaim their foreign nationality within the halls of the temple.

But the Pentecost address of the apostle Peter (Acts ii. 14-36) shows unmistakably who was really present at that occasion. He appeals to his audience as "Jews and all ye people of Jerusalem." The translation "ye men of Judea" (Am. R. V.) is misleading. For at that period, the term "Jews" had long become the name of the entire nation. The apostle speaks to two classes of people, pilgrims who had come from the different districts of Palestine as well as other parts of the world, and inhabitants of the holy city. Both of them were Jews by birth and by religion. Thus, when he employs the vocative a second time he calls them simply "Israelites" and, in his peroration, appeals to them as "all the house of Israel." The leader of the Twelve is therefore trying in his first great effort of making converts, to reach, not representatives of heathen nations, but alone his own countrymen.

According to Acts x the first-fruits of the Gentiles, gathered in by St. Peter, were the centurion Cornelius of Cæsarca and some of his kinsmen and friends. But it required, on the one hand, a special divine revelation, repeated three times, to cause the apostle to listen to the invitation of the Gentile centurion, and, on the other hand, the gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed upon those Gentiles, even before they were baptized, to bring him to the conclusion: "Can any man forbid the water that these should not be baptized who have received the gift of the Holy Spirit as well as we?" If St. Peter had been aware at that time of Matt. xxviii. 19, neither the vision nor the gift of the Holy Spirit would have been necessary. He would not even have waited for being invited by a Gentile to explain the Christian conception of the Kingdom of God to him; but would rather have inquired among his friends who of their heathen acquaintances might be interested in his message.

Acts xi. 1-13 illustrates how ignorant also the other apostles and brethren were of the great missionary commandment. They rebuked St. Peter when he came again to Jerusalem for having held intercourse with Gentiles and were not satisfied until he had explained in detail all the circumstances which had led to the baptism of Cornelius and his people. "When they heard these things, they held their peace and glorified God, saying: Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life."

The first to preach Jesus to Samaritans and Gentiles were followers of the protomartyr Stephen, who had to leave Jerusalem after the death of their leader. Philip, one of the colleagues of

Stephen, became the apostle of the Samaritans (Acts viii. 4ff). Others traveled north as far as Antioch but spoke "the word to none save only to Jews." Not till they had arrived at the Syrian capital, did some of them speak "to the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus" (Acts xi. 19).

The persecution whose first victim was the Hellenistic deacon Stephen did not affect the Palestinian Christians but only those who had been won over from among the Jews of the diaspora who spoke Greek. These held more liberal views than the natives of Palestine and were the first to recognize the true character of their new religion and that Christianity was superior to Judaism. The charges raised against St. Stephen, who was evidently the leader of the universalistic movement whose chief exponent afterward St. Paul became, was: "We have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place [the temple] and change the customs which Moses delivered unto us" (Acts vi. 14). In his defense, the martyr does not deny that accusation but rather undertakes to prove the truth of the statements ascribed to him. The temple cannot be the house of God; and the Law, credited by the Jews to Moses, is an adulterated substitute for the true divine law which had to be revealed anew through Jesus.

If men who cherished such convictions acted at first as if they were still bound by Matt. x. 5-6, they cannot have known the commandment of Matt. xxviii. 19. To be sure, they communicated eventually their religious knowledge to Gentiles, but, in doing so, they followed their individual judgment and not an order given by Jesus. Consequently, a special meeting of the apostles was required at Jerusalem to approve of that missionary work among the Greeks at Antioch (Acts xv).

The frequent references of the apostle Paul to Judaistic interference with his work among the Gentiles will close and clinch our argument. Numerous passages in his Epistles treat of that controversy. It is sufficient for our purpose to review only the statements found in the first two chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians. The apostle furnishes us a few data of his Christian career. He was called by Jesus to preach him among the Gentiles (Gal. i. 16). He labored first for some time in Arabia and then "again," that is, a second time, at Damascus (Gal. i. 17). Apparently three years after his second stay in Damascus, he spent two weeks at Jerusalem and made the acquaintance of Cephas and James the brother of the Lord. Thence he went to Syria and Cilicia. Fourteen years later, he ascended another time to Jerusalem, and to use his own

words: "I laid before them the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles" (Gal. ii. 2). He wanted to come to an understanding with the leading men among the original disciples, "lest by any means I should be running, or had run, in vain" (Gal. ii. 2). Judaistic intrigues had forced that decision upon him (Gal. ii. 4f). The outcome of that conference may best be told in the apostle's own words: He writes: "When they saw that I had been intrusted with the gospel unto the uncircumcision, even as Peter with the gospel to the circumcision (for he that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also unto the Gentiles); and when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision" (Gal. ii. 7-9).

Such words leave no room for doubt but that the first apostles as late as twenty years or more after St. Paul's conversion and even a longer time after the death and resurrection of Jesus, obeyed still the command of their master, preserved in Matt. x. 5f, and worked exclusively among the Jews. They acknowledged the apostleship of St. Paul, not because they remembered words of Jesus like those of Matt. xxviii. 19, but because they could not overlook the great success of St. Paul and his fellow-workers among the heathen. Yet in spite of that official recognition, even St. Peter was not quite sure whether St. Paul was right or not. During a visit to Antioch, he communed at first freely with Gentile Christians, but withdrew from all intercourse with them after some friends of St. James had arrived (Gal. ii. 11ff).

The objection might be raised the controversy between St. Paul and the Judaistic Christians did not involve the question whether Gentiles could become Christians but rather whether Gentile Christians had to accept the entire Jewish religion in addition to their belief in Jesus. But how could Gentiles have been converted at all, if all the disciples had worked exclusively among the Jews and if they shrank from intercourse even with Gentile Christians that had not been circumcised? Such an attitude presupposed that they would not approach Gentiles except they had been converted to Judaism by some one else. How impossible that was appears from the words of Jesus: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is become so, ye make him twofold more a son of hell than yourselves" (Matt. xxiii. 15).

Our present knowledge entitles us to maintain: If all the early

Christians had decided to wait with preaching to Gentiles directly until the latter had become Jews, Christianity would have remained an insignificant Jewish sect and as such would have been lost to the world. For Judaism as a strictly national religion could and can never become a universal religion. If the world at large was ever to accept the religion of Jesus of Nazareth, that task had to be approached in just the way St. Paul and his colleagues went at it. Christianity pure and simple, not Judaism plus Christianity, had to be offered to the Gentiles. That is what St. Paul did, not because Jesus had left any direct order to that effect, but because he had become convinced that he was doing what was right and necessary. He himself calls the process by which he arrived at that conviction a special and personal divine revelation. "God . . . called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles" (Gal. i. 15f).

The statement of St. Paul, representing a strictly authentic and contemporary source of history, a characteristic which does not belong unconditionally to all the passages found in the Gospels and the Acts, carry the greatest possible weight, especially as they are confirmed in our case by the testimony of the Acts. They render it absolutely certain that the passage Matt. xxviii. 16-20 cannot be an authentic record of what actually happened and was said when Jesus appeared after his death to his disciples. It is rather an account written many years afterward by a person to whom evidently the conquest of the heathen world for Jesus was the result of the divine master's will and express command.

That conclusion, from which there is no escape, enables us to fix, at least approximately, the date when the closing section of the first Gospel originated, which, however, is not by any means the date when it was added to the Gospel. As an indisputable fact, nobody could have dreamt of putting the universal missionary commandment into the mouth of Jesus during the Apostolic Age. For it was contradicted by the fierce struggle of Judaism against the Pauline conception of Christianity. Wherever St. Paul had succeeded in founding a congregation of believers, he was followed by Judaistic missionaries who taught in the name of the original apostles that it was not sufficient simply to believe in Jesus Christ but that the Gentile Christians had to become full-fledged Jews before they could be sure of their salvation. They did not acknowledge the apostleship of St. Paul and evidently claimed that Jesus had not sent his true apostles to the Gentiles.

The memory of that bitter struggle cannot have died with the

Apostolic Age. The second generation of Gentile Christians must have been quite familiar with all its phases, especially since the Judaistic propaganda remained very active. But several circumstances combined in causing the Gentile Christians to forget during the first half of the second century entirely under what conditions the new religion had first gained a foothold among their grandfathers. The number of Gentile Christians increased and multiplied so rapidly that oral tradition, handed down from father to son, ceased to be a living factor. The Judaistic Christians, while still very active, were no longer a real menace, for lack of proportionate numbers. The Gospels, or rather what Justin calls "Memoirs of the Apostles," were translated into Greek and other languages and read regularly at the religious services of the Christians (Just. Mart., 1 *Ap.*, 67). From those "memoirs" the Gentiles learned to regard and honor the Twelve Apostles as the leading representatives and principal missionaries of Jesus Christ even among the heathen. Justin Martyr himself, who had received some philosophical training, does not mention the apostle Paul by name in his writings, although he speaks of St. Peter. The pressing duties of the day and the bloody war with the religious intolerance of their heathen neighbors, left those Christians neither time nor inclination for studying the history of their religion, provided there were people able to do such work in their midst.

In such an atmosphere, the words of Matt. xxviii. 19 were bound to be ascribed to Jesus sooner or later. But I doubt very much whether Justin Martyr ever found them in his "Memoirs of the Apostles." He mentions repeatedly that the Gospel was carried to every nation on earth. But in doing so, he rather introduces an accomplished fact. The nearest he comes to ascribing that fact to a direct command of Jesus is that statement (1 *Ap.*, 31): "Some were sent by him to every nation of the human race." But that is very far from being a direct quotation of either our Matthew passage or Acts i. 8f or Luke xxiv. 44ff. Matt. xxviii. 16-20 has, therefore, been written hardly before the death of Justin Martyr. We may assign that section to about the year 150.

The second half of Matt. xxviii. 19 contains another clause which, if part of the original text, would bring down the date of the origin of our passage to A. D. 200, or even a later year. I am referring to the words: "Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." They are our present-day baptismal formula. But that, while very old, does certainly not go back to the Apostolic Age. The New Testament

mentions baptism and baptizing quite frequently. But wherever the word is modified by a prepositional phrase, it is always baptizing in or into the name of Jesus Christ. On the day of Pentecost St. Peter advised his hearers: "Repent ye and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts ii. 38). People of Samaria, as we learn Acts viii. 14, where baptized "into the name of the Lord Jesus." St. Peter ordered Cornelius and his friends "to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts x. 48). The apostle Paul met at Ephesus certain disciples who had been baptized "into John's baptism" and had them baptized "into the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts xix. 15). The Epistles of St. Paul give testimony of the same fact. Rom. vi. 3 we find the question: "Are you ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?" Gal. iii. 27 the apostle states: "As many of you as were baptized into Christ put on Christ." Likewise the question: "Were you baptized into the name of Paul?" (1 Cor. i. 13), and the clause: "lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name" (1. Cor. i. 15), imply clearly that the baptism St. Paul knew and practised was performed into the name of Jesus.

Here again we encounter a discrepancy between Matt. xxviii. 19 and the whole New Testament which cannot be removed by any explanation. We are thus compelled to regard the words which appear but once as unhistorical. The statement put into the mouth of the risen Jesus must be spurious. The risen Christ either directed his disciples to baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. In that case the apostles would doubtless have done so. Or the risen Christ did not tell the Eleven to employ that formula because they always baptized into the name of Jesus only.

The Baptismal Confession, or "Apostles' Creed" represents the oldest attempt of systematizing the Christian doctrine. It is generally supposed to be based upon the baptismal formula, naming the three persons of the Trinity, which in turn is supposed to be of apostolic origin. But that belief is an unproven and unprovable assumption. The "Apostles' Creed" may just as well and even more likely be older than the trinitarian formula; and the latter would then represent the shortest epitome of the former. As such it cannot have been used in baptizing before it had become customary to have the candidates for baptism repeat the "Apostles' Creed." Neither the New Testament nor the *Didache* nor Justin Martyr know of such a use of the Baptismal Confession. They antedate, of course, the latter.

The early history of the "Apostles' Creed" is comparatively well known. It is supposed to have originated in Asia Minor after the first quarter of the second century and spread during the second half of that century gradually among the churches of the East and West. It may have been used at Ephesus and Rome as early as A. D. 130. But it was bound to require quite a good while until the trinitarian formula, derived from it, succeeded in replacing the original apostolic formula. That could not happen before the Christians had come to look upon the doctrine of Trinity as the very corner-stone of their religion. The first writer who uses the word "Trinity" and says distinctly "that tri-personality pertains to the one God as He is in Himself" is Tertullian, A. D. 150-230. Consequently the baptismal formula: "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," has to be assigned to the beginning of the third century.

However, the direction: "Baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," occurs twice in the seventh chapter of the *Didache*, which treats of baptism. That little book is assigned by most authorities to the beginning of the second century. Bryennios, the discoverer and editor of the text, places it between 120 and 160. If what was said shortly before is correct, we could not expect to meet the trinitarian formula in such an early writing even though it should belong to the year 160. As a matter of fact, the apostolic formula appears at the end of Chapter IX where we read: "No one shall eat or drink of your Eucharist except those who are baptized into the name of the Lord." How can, under these circumstances, the trinitarian formula be accounted for in Chapter VII? To say: "The shorter form does not necessitate the inference that the larger formula was not in use," means nothing but to refuse to recognize and try to solve the problem presented by the occurrence of both formulas in one and the same writing.

No matter whether one accepts or rejects what has been said about the origin of the trinitarian baptismal formula, the apostolic formula is the older of the two. The two formulas express different ideas, belonging to different ages of Christian thought and development. To baptize *in* the name of Jesus means to baptize by the authority of Jesus, who was a real person. To baptize *into* the name of Jesus signifies, if we accept the definition of St. Paul, to unite with Jesus. Both ideas are understood readily and by everybody, being, if one may use such a term, of a concrete nature. The trinitarian formula, on the other hand, bears a mystic char-

acter. Nobody can baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, for there exists no baptismal commandment given by the three persons of the Trinity. And to baptize into the name of the Trinity is something of which no distinct and adequate idea can be formed. During the period of transition, there may and must have been Christians, especially in different parts of the Christian world, some of whom continued to cling conservatively to the original formula while others of a more progressive nature adopted the new one. But it is inconceivable how one and the same person could make use of both alternately.

Under these conditions, the occurrence of both formulas in the *Didache* simply demonstrates that the original text contained the apostolic formula in both chapters and that this was replaced later on for certain reasons by the trinitarian formula in the first passage.

The *Didache* is the oldest church manual handed down to us. It consists of two main parts; the first six chapters are devoted to Christian ethics for the instruction of catechumens, the remaining chapters contain directions pertaining to worship and discipline. Any one who wanted to be admitted into the fellowship of the Christians had to learn and know the first six chapters before he was admitted to baptism, as the opening words of Chapter VII indicate and as also Bryennios sets forth in a long note to that passage. That excludes, as a matter of fact, the "Apostles' Creed" and the formula based upon that confession. The booklet was used as a catechism for a long time, as appears from the following statements of Bryennios: "Other Christian writers who read the *Didache* of the Twelve Apostles and used it evidently in their writings are: the author of the *Clementinae*, Irenæus, Clemens of Alexandria, and John of Climax. Clemens, the teacher of the Alexandrians, counts indeed the *Didache* among the Divine Scriptures and is evidently, in doing so, exaggerating its authority. Eusebius, the friend of Pamphilus, has placed it among the doubtful writings. The great Athanasius, however, counts it among those scriptures which were ordained by the holy Fathers to be read by neophytes and such as wish to be taught the principles of our religion."

The *Didache* was used therefore as a text-book for religious instruction even in the fourth century. In the long time between its first publication and the Council of Nicæa, important changes took place in the Christian Church. The orthodox faith was elaborated and firmly established. The new doctrines affected the entire church life and, not least, the old sacred rites. The

Didache had thus become obsolete. But being held in such high esteem, it could not be put aside. Thus, the only alternative left was to bring the text by emendations up to date. In that way the apostolic baptismal formula was replaced in the chapter on baptism by the trinitarian formula and the words "three times" inserted in the statement: "If you have no running water, baptize in other water. If you cannot do it in cold water, do so in warm water. If you have neither, pour [three times] water upon the head [in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit]." For I am under the impression that baptism in the Apostolic Age consisted of only one, not three immersions.

Having drawn above the conclusion that Matt. xxviii. 19 was still unknown to Justin Martyr, we are facing now the question whether the philosopher was familiar with the trinitarian formula. If that formula is related closely to belief in Trinity, Justin Martyr is not likely to have ever heard of it. The doctrine of Trinity, the most important contribution of the Greek mind to Christianity, was formulated and developed in the course of the third century. Apart from the insignificant body of Judaistic Christians, it was universally acknowledged from the day of its first appearance. For the controversies, settled by the ecumenical councils, did not concern the fundamental doctrine but rather the accurate definition of the mutual relationship of the three persons who formed the one Trinity. Accordingly, it is *a priori* improbable that the trinitarian formula was known and used during the age of Justin. For, as Fisher in his *History of the Christian Doctrine* expresses it: "It is evident that his conception of the Holy Spirit and of the relation of the Spirit to the Father and Son is not well defined in his own thoughts." What that really means may best be learned from the confession of faith with which the apologist meets the charge of atheism right in the beginning of his *First Apology* (6): "We confess to be atheists as far as such so-called gods are concerned, but not as for the most true God, who is both Father of righteousness and self-control and the other virtues and unalloyed by wickedness. But we adore and worship Him and also the Son who came from Him and taught us this and the host of the other good angels who follow and are similar to them and the prophetic Spirit, giving honor in word and truth and imparting ungrudgingly to everybody who wishes to learn what we were taught."

1 *Ap.*, 61, however, we come upon the statement: "For in the name of the Father of the universe and of the Lord God and of the Saviour Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit they are then made

the bath in the water." The translation follows closely the Greek text. In the first place, those words are not exactly our trinitarian formula. In the second place, the verb does not agree with its direct object. The Greeks used to say "to give a bath" and "to bathe a bath," but not "to make a bath." Even if "to make a bath" were idiomatic Greek, the passive voice could not be constructed with the accusative of the direct object, just as little as we could say "I am made a bath." The quoted sentence is therefore, to say the least, suspicious. The temporal adverb "then" strengthens that suspicion. Baptism with Justin is a new birth, or regeneration. The immersion in water is the act that symbolizes the new birth. The very last word, preceding the just quoted passage, is the verb "they are born anew," "they are regenerated," that is to say: "they are baptized." Under these circumstances, the adverb "then" proves the whole statement of which it forms a part to be entirely out of place. That means, the sentence must be a gloss. This conclusion is confirmed when we drop the sentence. The whole passage then reads: "As many as have become persuaded and believe what is told and said by us is true and promise to be able to live accordingly, are taught to pray and ask from God with fasting forgiveness of their former sins while we pray and fast with them. Then they are led by us to a place where there is water, and in an act figurative of a new birth, as we ourselves also were born anew, they are regenerated. For also Christ said: Unless you are born anew, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." The terms "born anew" and "regenerated" stand for the same Greek word. The sentence omitted stood between the words "regenerated" and "For also Christ said." It interrupts undoubtedly the close and original connection which exists between the first two and the third sentences just given. For all these reasons, the baptismal formula 1 *Ap.*, 61, must be assigned to a commentator.

There remains to be examined the closing section of that chapter. It is introduced by the words: "As a statement, however, to that effect we learn from the apostles this." The words indicate that the text is hopelessly corrupted. It follows directly upon a lengthy quotation from Isaiah. Thus the demonstrative pronoun "this" must be constructed with the succeeding passage. The latter reads: "Since we were begotten, unconscious of our first birth, by necessity out of the humid semen at the mutual mixture of our parents and grew up in foul habits and bad education, in order not to remain children of necessity and ignorance, but of choice and understanding, and to obtain forgiveness of the sins we committed

before, the name of the Father of the universe and the Lord God is named in the water upon the person who has chosen to be born anew and repents his sins; the party who leads the person to be washed to the bath pronouncing just that alone. For nobody can give the name of the unexpressible God. If, however, anybody should *dare to be to do so*, he would suffer of incurable madness. But this bath is called enlightenment as those who learn this are enlightened in their understanding. And the person enlightened is washed in the name of Jesus Christ who was crucified under Pontius Pilate and in the name of the Holy Spirit who foretold everything about Jesus through the prophets."

There are two distinct assertions neither of which can be correct as they stand. According to the first, the neophytes were baptized in the name of the Father of the universe and the Lord God *alone*. According to the second, baptism was administered in the name of Jesus Christ and in the name of the Holy Spirit. As we have no other information of these two modes of baptism, we may safely assume that the original text of our passage, whatever that may have been, contained only the apostolic formula.

If we had to close our investigation concerning the baptismal formula in the received text of Matt. xxviii. 19 right here, we should have to assign the entire passage Matt. xxviii. 16-20 to the third century. But Eusebius has preserved for us in his *Church History* (III, 5, 1) another version which reads: "Go ye and make disciples of all the Gentiles in my name." The words, as far as they go, are identical with those we find in our text. Only "baptizing them" is omitted and, instead of the trinitarian formula, the phrase "in my name," which answers to the apostolic formula, appears. The omission of "baptizing them" does not affect the meaning of the passage.

Eusebius cannot be accused of having changed the text deliberately for any ulterior purpose. His orthodoxy cannot be doubted. He was one of the leading members of the Council of Nicæa. He never was an anti-trinitarian. As is more than probable, the trinitarian formula was used at that time exclusively in the Gentile churches. The bishop of Cæsarea must, therefore, have found the words as he quotes them in his copy of the first Gospel, and his contemporaries must have been aware of that fact. As the most learned man of his age, Eusebius cannot have used an inferior text. He certainly enjoyed exceptional opportunities for comparing his text with others. He had studied at Antioch, and afterward spent some years at Tyre and in Egypt; as a friend of Constantine, he

traveled extensively and had occasion to visit the principal seats of Christian learning. His copious writings attest how well he used his opportunities for gathering information. Therefore, his reading of Matt. xxviii. 19 must be accepted as the original text; and the additional words now found there have to be regarded as a later emendation made in order to represent Jesus as the author of the trinitarian formula. Moreover, that formula must have been inserted into the official text after the Council of Nicæa, for Eusebius lived till A. D. 339 or 340.

The entire passage Matt. xxviii. 16-20 forms one organic whole. The author, however, cherishes a certain opinion of his own. He does not know anything about the ascension of Jesus—at least, he does not mention it. His silence in that respect is significant, the more so as it is shared by two other Gospels, the second and the fourth. But more important even are the parting words he puts into the mouth of Jesus: "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." According to these words, there was no separation and hence no need of a return, or "second coming." The statement implies the idea of immanence of the crucified Jesus, which does not agree exactly with the transcendence of the ascension account in the Acts.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]