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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) πορευόμεθα μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτιζόντες αὐτούς εἰς τὸ δύονα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, (20) διδάσκοντες αὐτούς κηρύξαντες πάντα διὰ εὐαγγελίαν ὑμῖν. καὶ ἤδει ἐξω μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμί πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἡς τῆς εὐαγγελίας τοῦ αιώνος.

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 beside 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 largement et "comprend sous une forme assez syncrétique les trois mots sacramentels "de la théologie du temps, le Père, le Fils, le Saint-E스prit. Le germe "du dogme de la Trinité est ainsi déposé dans un coin de la page "sacrée, et deviendra fédor,"

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

1. Comment. in Psal. Ed. Migne Vol. 23, col. 569: πλὴν ἄλλα πρῶτας τους ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ καλεῖ . . . . λέγων· Οὐκ ἔλθαν εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἰκού Ἰσραήλ (Mt 15, 24) καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις δὲ αὐτοῦ πρῶτοι αὐτοῖς παρέχοντο εἰς εὐαγγελίαν παρῆγεν φάσκων· Εἰς ὅδον ἔδωκαν μὴ ἀπέλθητε, καὶ εἰς πόλιν Σαμαρείτων μὴ ἐσέλθητε· πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἰκού Ἰσραήλ (Mt 10, 5, 6).
Είτα με, έκεινος προσέτατε τοις έαυτοις μαθηταῖς εὐαγγελίζεσθαι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί αὐτοῦ.

2. Ίδιος οὖσα γραμματαῖος ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, ὁ Μαθητής, προσταθήσεται καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, τόμος, ὅπως τοῖς αὐτοῖς διδάσκαλοις ἐμπεφεύγωσαν τῆς, τὴν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πορείαν στείλεσθαι, διήλθαν καὶ τὰ βάρβαρα φύλα καὶ τὴν ἑκουσάνθην διδαχόμενας ὅρισαν.

3. Διὰ τέτειλα ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ δοθήκη εἰς καθαρότατα εἰς τὸν ἄγαν ἐνδιακεφαλάτους, ἐπεφεύγω, τὸ χαίρετον ἐν τῷ λαοῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, διὸ πρὸς τὸν οὗτος δοθήκη ἐνδιακεφαλάτους ἐκ τῆς ἑκουσάνθην διὰ τῆς ἑκουσάνθην διαδόθη τῶν ἑξῆς.

4. ἐν τῷ Καθημέριν Προσκύνησιν τοῖς αὐτοῖς μαθηταῖς, ἀφοῦ τό ἴδιον ἐκεῖνος πρὸς τῶν Μαθητῶν μαθηταῖς εἶπεν ἡ διδασκαλία τῶν πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελιστοὺς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ. Διὰ τέτειλα ὑπὸ τοῖς Μαθητῶν ἐκεῖνος ἐπεφέυγε τὸν ἄγαν ἐκεῖνος ἐπεφέυγε τῆς, ἐνδιακεφαλάτους τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐνδιακεφαλάτους εἰς τὰς ἑκουσάνθην διὰ ταῖς ἑκουσάνθην διαδόθη τῶν ἑξῆς.

5. Ἡ τύπῳ τοῦ Ὀσίου Καθημέριου Προσκύνησιν τῶν αὐτοῦ μαθητῶν αὐτοῖς εἶπεν ἡ διδασκαλία τῶν πρὸς τῶν Μαθητῶν μαθηταῖς ἐκεῖνας ἐν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ. Διὰ τέτειλα ὑπὸ τοῖς Μαθητῶν ἐκεῖνος ἐπεφέυγε τῆς, ἐνδιακεφαλάτους τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐνδιακεφαλάτους εἰς τὰς ἑκουσάνθην διὰ ταῖς ἑκουσάνθην διαδόθη τῶν ἑξῆς.

6. Ἡ τύπῳ τοῦ Ὀσίου Καθημέριου Προσκύνησιν τῶν αὐτοῦ μαθητῶν αὐτοῖς εἶπεν ἡ διδασκαλία τῶν πρὸς τῶν Μαθητῶν μαθηταῖς ἐκεῖνας ἐν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ. Διὰ τέτειλα ὑπὸ τοῖς Μαθητῶν ἐκεῖνος ἐπεφέυγε τῆς, ἐνδιακεφαλάτους τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐνδιακεφαλάτους εἰς τὰς ἑκουσάνθην διὰ ταῖς ἑκουσάνθην διαδόθη τῶν ἑξῆς.
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 Mat 28, 19—20 is cited. The first of these is in III, 4, in Lee's version p. 159:

17. "Who, of those that 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: "Go! 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 worshipped 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."

1 The Greek is given below No. 20. It adds έν τῷ οίωραί μου which must here have stood in the original. Here then we catch the Syriac translator in the act of garbling his text.
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 "held 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 sqq H): Τις πάντως τῶν σοι άρετής ἀπήντηκα ταῦτα γιὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐν εἰς τῷ κηρύτται τοῖς οὐντι τῆς ἀνθρώπων αἴκων καὶ γλώττων ἐπιλέγεται τῆς αὐτοῦ προσεγγισίας, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὸνος εἰς δῷ ἡμέτερος σωτήρ μετὰ τὴν κατὰ τοῦ θανά-

21. In the Greek controversial works of Eusebius Mat 28, 19 is cited fully twice, viz. in the Contra Marcellum Ancreanum, 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 έθνη. 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

21. 11. 1901.
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 ἑαρτίς ἐν ἑαρτίς 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 ὄνοματι μου, to the exclusion of the words ἑαρτίς ἐν ἑαρτίς and τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἅγιου 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 ἔθνη, 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 these all 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: Οὐ τὸν τρόπον διὰ τούτου ἐπαντικείμενος ἐκεῖνος τὴν ὄρθιν ἡκεῖ ἐπεφέρε τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τὸν οἴκητα τῆς κρίσεως ἐπιστέφειν ἢ ἐπάγει, γινόμενοι ἢ καὶ ἡμέρα τινὰς μαθητευμένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀποληπίζοντας τὴν ὅδηγον τῆς πλάνης, οἱ καὶ λαμβάνουσιν δώματα ἐκαστὸς ὡς ἐξοί εἰς, φωτιζόμενοι διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦτου.

In another passage of his dialogue, c. 53, p. 272 D, Justin glances at Mt 28, 19: Καὶ τὸ Ἑσεμενῶν . . . (Gen 49, 11) . . . καὶ τῶν ἔθνων δομοίως, τῶν ἐμπλήγματι πιστείναι αὐτῷ, προδίδομεν ἦν. Οὔτε γὰρ ὡς πύλης ἡταίρις καὶ λυγὸν ἐπὶ αὐξάνει μὴ ἓχουν τὸν ἑαυτόν, μέχρις ὁ Ἑρμίκτος οὗτος ἔλθων διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πέμπας ἐμμαθητεύειν αὐτοὺς.

Here there is no confirmation or rejection of the words ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι; 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 Parallelelisten 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 Abbreviaturen, 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 ἔθνη τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν κοτοικύνητα, ἀκούσαντα καὶ πιστεύσαντα ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι ἐκλήδησεν [τοῦ υἱοῦ] τοῦ θεοῦ. λαβόντες οὖν τὴν σφραγίδα μιᾶς φρονήσεως ἔχον καὶ ἔναν νοῦν.

The above might almost as well be taken to echo Lc 24, 47, although Harnack commenting on the words: πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, remarks: "Haec vox omnes expellit dubitationes; cf. Mt 28, 19." It is to be remarked that Lc 24, 47 with its keynote: θράκειον ἀπὸ Ιερουσαλήμ, 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 μετάνοϊαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτίων, and substituted παρουσίας . . . εἰς for μαθητεύετε.

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 Stromateis contains the following (Syib. p. 987):

Καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐντελεῖται περιμένεισι καὶ τοῖς πιστεύοντας βαπτίζετε εἰς ὄνομα πατρός καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου 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 ὄνομα κ. τ. λ. in the above were added by Clement to the text of Theodotus. The use of the word περιμένεισι suggests that in the third of our excerpts from Eusebius on the psalms col. 653 the impossible reading περιμένεισι is a corruption of περιμένετε. And this conjecture is confirmed by a neighboring passage in ps. col. 409: τῷ τὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου λόγου νεωτερικοῦ περιμένετε εἰς τὸν βιον, εὐνιζό-
minded you'. And it is significant that Origen gives no hint of the important precept to baptise 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 decenter for this reason: ne pulsatae quaestiones et reticulae, quod in homiletico dicendi genere ab illo fieri solet, latino lectori fastidium generarent. The learned Benedictine editor deposes in the following words the seal shewn by Rufinus for rewriting the author he professed to translate: Sed utinam hoc labore adimplendi quae decenter supersedisset! Ex ejus enim licentia factum est, ut qui legit has homilias, incertius sit utrum legat Origennem, an Rufinum.

The text Mt 28, 19 comes thrice in Rufinus' version of the Commentar in Romanos, in V, 2 and 8; an 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 distinguo potest, ubi solus Origenes loquatur, aut ubi suas merces obtundat Rufinus", 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, uniuris alius diis et dominis remnantientes, 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 configimus, propitium non efficimus, quem non ex toto et integro corde diligamus. 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 ἐμπαρέχοντι ἑαυτὸν τῇ θεότητι τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν τῆς προσκυνήτης τριάδος ἐπικλήσεων. But because the
trine epiclesis was used in his διώκουσα 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 dicit, foris extra ecclesiam, immo et
contra ecclesiam, *modo in nomine Christi*, ubicunque et quomodocun-
que gentilem baptizatum remissionem peccatorum consequi posse, quando
ipse Christus gentes baptizari ubebat in plena et adunata trinitate? (Epist.
73 ad Ubaianum). And just before in the same letter: Insinuat trinita-
tem, cuins 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 bapti-
zatum esse, si baptizat dicit: Baptizate 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 Pneumatomachia 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
by A. D. 1433 to the Council of Bâle (Mansi concilia XXXIX; col. 88),
John of Ragusa used these words: Dominus noster Jesus Christus ascen-
dens in coelum praecedit apostolis dicens, Ite docete—Spiritus Sancti,
in quibus verbis dedit eis et limitavit formam baptismi et in persona
eorum toti ecclesia. Et tamen non post longum tempus ipsi apostoli et
clescia dimitteundo dictam formam, *in nomine Patris* etc., traditam
per Dominum baptizabant tantum in nomine Christi dicentes: Te baptizo
in nomine 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 his hypothesis a little further and argue that the apostles, when

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 genuine-
ness of the text. So did Evanson, vicar of Tewkesbury in his letter to
(Dogmengeschichte I, 68): Dass Jesus die Taufe eingesetzt habe, lässt
sich nicht direkt erweisen; denn Mt 28, 19 ist kein Herrnwort.

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 Irenopolis 1656 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 zukommen wird.

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 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?