

PRIMITIVE LITURGIES AND CONFESSIONS  
OF FAITH.

II.

LET it be conceded that there is a strong *à priori* probability in favour of the assumption, that a brief summary of the prime essentials of the Christian faith was among the first requisites of the apostolic Church, and that all we know of the prudence, decision, and divinely instructed wisdom exhibited in the administration of that Church would lead us to expect that such a summary was drawn up at a very early period, and was issued with the sanction and authority of the Apostles themselves,—and a further inferential probability suggests itself.

If such a summary did exist, and if it be again and again *mentioned* and *referred to*, is it not at least extremely probable that in the apostolic writings it should be *quoted* also? Nay, is it indeed conceivable that a “symbol” so dear and so familiar,—round which so many solemn associations clustered, and which must necessarily have taken so firm a hold upon the memory,—could *fail* to be quoted in the sacred writings addressed to the several Churches of the baptized?

Let it be remembered that the several Epistles were addressed to Christians in every possible grade of spiritual progress: men of Rome perplexed by Jewish troublers; men of Corinth stirred by the wildest excitement of overwrought enthusiasm, and phrenzied by notions of the most extravagant antinomianism; men of Galatia, so fickle as to be ready to give up the faith for some dream of hybrid

Christianity, half gospel and half law ; men of Thessalonica, disturbed by expectations of an immediate consummation of all things ; up to that blameless and simple Philippian Church to which the Apostle could write as if the peace of God had rested on it, and the atmosphere of a Divine joy were peculiarly its own. In writing to each and all of these, is it credible that *quotation* of familiar documents could be avoided ?

And if, on the contrary, it is reasonable to expect that we should meet with such quotation, what better task can we set ourselves than that of endeavouring to detect the fragments of the ancient formularies embedded in the apostolic writings ? If these have not been duly pointed out by others, perhaps it has been only because they have not been sought for with an intelligent scrutiny.

But our business now is mainly with that summary which we have seen is called by the various names, *λόγος, πίστις, διδαχὴ, ὁδὸς*, a brief summary of *credenda* (and I should be inclined to think a very brief one), which it appears was offered for the acceptance of those who were to "put on Christ" at their baptism. Where is any quotation from this to be found ?

In the eighth chapter of the Acts we meet with the story of Philip and the eunuch of Candace, queen of Ethiopia, and we read of the conversion wrought by the Apostle and the celebration of baptism on that extraordinary occasion. In the Textus Receptus we find that, in reply to the question of the eunuch *τί κωλύει με βαπτισθῆναι ;* (Acts viii. 36) St. Philip answers, *εἰ πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας ἔξεστιν*, and it is added, *ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε, Πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.* Now there is little or no doubt that this thirty-seventh verse is an interpolation : the Codex Laudianus is the only uncial MS. in which it is to be found, the immense majority of the cursives do not notice it, the early versions agree in omitting it, and critical editors with-

out hesitation reject it as undoubtedly spurious. But how far back is the interpolation to be traced? To begin with, the Codex Laudianus cannot, it seems, be set down to a later date than the end of the sixth century, but before it could have been received into so splendid an uncial as E, it must evidently have been accepted without question or suspicion for some considerable time.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we find it quoted by Augustine and Jerome in the fifth century, by Pacian in the fourth, by Cyprian in the third, and by Irenæus in the second. "This passage," says Scrivener, "affords us a curious instance of an *addition* well received in the Western Church from the second century downwards, and afterwards making some way among the later Greek codices and writers" (*Introduction*, p. 444). But how did it get interpolated in the first instance? Scrivener's suggestion is doubtless the right one, namely, that it was received into the text from the margin, "where the formula πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν had been placed, extracted from some Church ordinal." Observe how much is implied in this hypothesis! Already, at the end of the second century, we find an interpolation received into the text from the margin, and *that margin a quotation from a service book*. But the marginal note itself must have been regarded with some kind of reverence, and have been somewhat familiar to the memories of the annotator and of those in whose hands he expected his MS. to fall, before a scribe could have ventured to deal with it so boldly.

Let it be remembered that before the whole process of introducing this interpolation from the service book into the margin, and from the margin into the text, could be so complete as that Irenæus should quote it from the text without a suspicion of its spuriousness, a considerable lapse of time must be conceded; and whether we put the date

<sup>1</sup> Scrivener, *Introd.*, p. 128; Tischendorf, *Proleg.*, ed. 7<sup>ma</sup>, p. clxxviii.

of Irenæus' death with Dodwell as early as 167, or with Baronius as late as 205, in any case we are compelled to allow that, probably at the very beginning of the third century, possibly towards the end of the second, we find unmistakable indications of a service book being familiarly known in the sub-apostolic Church (to use an expression of the late Professor Blunt) which contained, as one clause of a primitive confession of faith, πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

But though this clause be all that Irenæus quotes of the verse now standing in the *Textus ab omnibus Rejectus*, yet the whole verse is found in E, and with a very suggestive variant in the reading. Instead of εἰ πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας ἔξεστιν, the Laudian MS. reads, ἐὰν πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σωθήσῃ. Now, although it cannot be doubted that the particle ἐὰν is found with the indicative in the New Testament, yet it is, to say the least, a rare construction, and singularly inexplicable here; but what are we to make of the word σωθήσῃ? On turning to the Epistle to the Romans we find the true key to the whole matter; although in doing so a wide field of interesting inquiry (too wide to allow of our doing more than touch lightly upon the present occasion) is opened out to our attention. At the tenth chapter of the epistle (Rom. x. 5) St. Paul is contrasting the δικαιοσύνη of the Mosaic law with the δικαιοσύνη offered under the gospel, and at the fifth verse he thus proceeds:

“For Moses writes about (γράφει) the δικαιοσύνη which proceeds out of the law, saying (ὅτι recitative),<sup>1</sup> the man

<sup>1</sup> Winer barely notices this idiom, which appears to me to play a very important part in the Greek Testament, and Dr. Moulton seems strangely to have misunderstood Winer's meaning. The translator's footnote at p. 683 has nothing to do with the construction with which the text is concerned. In the last edition of Kühner's *Ausf. Gram. der Gr. Sprache* (Hanover, 1872), this use of ὅτι is carefully handled, and a large number of instances given, §§ 551-4, vol. ii., p. 885. See too Madv., *Grk. Syntax* (Eng. tr.), §§ 192-6, and Goodwin's *Grk.*

that doeth these things (*αὐτὰ*) shall live by them. But the *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως* (an expression which I leave untranslated advisedly) speaks thus-wisely (*οὕτω*—where note that there is no *ὅτι* recitative—no actual quotation), ‘Say not in thy heart, Who shall go up to heaven?’ *i.e.* to bring Christ down, nor, ‘Who shall go down into the abyss?’ *i.e.* to bring up Christ from the dead; but *what does it say?*—The phrase is near thee, *in thy mouth and in thy memory*; that is, the phrase of the faith, which phrase we proclaim (*τὸ ῥῆμα<sup>1</sup> τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν*), saying (*ὅτι* recitative), (and here observe that the particle indicates the commencement of an actual quotation once more)—*ἐὰν ὁμολογήσης ἐν τῷ στόματί σου Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστεύσης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν σωθήσῃ.*”

Here we have the very words of the interpolation of the eighth chapter of the Acts; here the *ἐὰν* and the *σωθήσει* of the Codex Laudianus receive their elucidation; in the Acts the *ἐὰν* is ungrammatical, here it is perfectly correct; *there* there is no mention of the confession to be made with the mouth, here the particle belongs first to *ὁμολογήσης*, next to *πιστεύσης*; *there* the first clause is omitted, though the original particle is retained.

But what is the meaning of this word *σωθήσῃ* or *σωθήσει*?

In the account which St. Peter gives of his baptism of Cornelius at Cæsarea, in the eleventh chapter of the Acts, the Apostle (ver. 13) tells his hearers that on his arrival at Cornelius’ house, the centurion had reported to him that he had seen an angel, and that the angel had bidden him send for Peter, *ὃς λαλήσει ῥήματα πρὸς σε ἐν οἷς σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου*, and that just as he had begun to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them; and he adds,

*Moods*, § 79. Cf. Thuc. i. 51 (Shilleto): *ὅτι νῆες ἐκείναι ἐπιπλέουσι*. A capital instance of the use of *ὅτι* recitative is to be found at Mark x. 33.

<sup>1</sup> See a valuable note by the lamented Mr. James Riddell, on the expression *ῥήμασί τε καὶ ὀνόμασι*, in Plato’s *Apol. Socrat.* c. i.

“I remembered the saying (τοῦ ῥήματος) of the Lord, how He said, John baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.” Can there be any reasonable doubt that the word σωθήσῃ of the fourteenth verse is the equivalent of the βαπτισθήσεσθε of the sixteenth, and that the ῥήματα ἐν οἷς σωθήσῃ of verse fourteen must be explained by the ῥήμα τῆς πίστεως of the tenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans?

An interesting parallel to this passage in the eleventh chapter of the Acts is afforded in the sixteenth chapter. We there read that the gaoler in the prison at Philippi, alarmed by the earthquake, and thinking his prisoners had escaped, was reassured by the presence of mind and coolness exhibited by Paul and Silas, and falling down before them said, Κύριοι, τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν ἵνα σωθῶ; (Acts xvi. 30) “What is it necessary for me to do in order that I may be saved?” St. Paul, true to himself and to the principles which he enunciates in the Epistle to the Romans, that it was not a question of *doing* anything at all, but of profession and believing, replies, Πίστευσον ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου (ver. 31), “Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou mayest be saved, thou and all thy house.” And accordingly, after receiving the necessary instruction, for ἐλάλησαν αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου (ver. 32)—then ἐβαπτίσθη αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ πάντες παραχρῆμα (ver. 33). The conclusion appears inevitable; that the “*saving*” of the one verse answers to the “*baptism*” of the other, and that whether the gaoler meant to apply for baptism or not (using the expression ἵνα σωθῶ), St. Paul, at any rate, gave this sense to his words.

If this view of the passages examined be the correct one, then more than one other passage confessedly difficult is cleared up; e.g. we can understand what St. Paul means, in 1 Corinthians i. 18, by saying that the λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ is folly τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, but a Divine power ἡμῖν τοῖς

σωζόμενοι; for the unbaptized were still ἀπολλύμενοι,—in a state of perdition,—but the baptized were *in a state of salvation* (σωζόμενοι). So again in the second epistle and second chapter, making use of the simile of a triumphant procession, he says at the fifteenth verse (2 Cor. ii. 15), Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις; i.e. *to the baptized and the unbaptized*, to those in a state of salvation and those in a state of perdition. For, as St. Peter explains to us, “just as the ark in the days of Noe *put into a state of safety* (1 Pet. iii. 20, 21) the eight that were delivered from the flood, and so by means of water the few were *saved*, so its antitype, baptism, ὑμᾶς νῦν σώζει”: and hence too, after the day of Pentecost, when that amazing awakening brought thousands to embrace the faith and to put on Christ by baptism, it is said, “the Lord added to the Church daily τοὺς σωζομένους” (Acts ii. 47); for, as St. Paul says to Titus (there too possibly, as is maintained by Canon Liddon, quoting an early Christian document), ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας (Tit. iii. 5).<sup>1</sup>

I cannot but conclude then, from a comparison of the passages cited, that we have in the spurious thirty-seventh verse of the eighth chapter of the Acts a fragment of the apostolic summary of faith designated by the technical terms previously referred to; and that this same clause is again quoted, with greater exactness and verbal accuracy, in the tenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

I turn next to a passage in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where another such quotation is to be found.

In the fifteenth chapter (1 Cor. xv. 1), St. Paul, preparing to speak with the most solemn emphasis on the subject of the resurrection of the body, introduces the subject thus: “I declare unto you, brethren, the gospel which I announced (εὐηγγελισάμην) to you, which too ye receive, in which ye have your standing, by means of which too ye are *in a*

<sup>1</sup> Liddon's *Bampton Lectures* (2nd ed.), p. 328.

state of salvation (δι' οὗ καὶ σώζεσθε), if ye abide by the 'word' which I announced to you, unless ye believed in vain."<sup>1</sup>

Then he continues to explain what it was which he did transmit to them (ver. 3). "For I delivered to you, as of prime importance (ἐν πρώτοις), *that which I received.*" Received from whom? Dean Alford (*in loco*), says, "from the Lord by special revelation." So far from St. Paul even implying anything of the sort, he implies exactly the contrary. When, as in the eleventh chapter (1 Cor. xi. 23), he reminds the Corinthians he had delivered to them a special and peculiar account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, which *differs materially from the account given by any of the three synoptic Evangelists*, he expressly tells them that he received *that* account ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου. Here the inference is just the reverse. No; that to which he is alluding in the fifteenth chapter is clearly something different, *viz.* the elementary and fundamental doctrines of the primitive faith, which, *as it was delivered to him at his baptism*, to keep safe, and to hold

<sup>1</sup> The difficulties of the passage are many and perplexing. I must repeat that I do not think this the place for discussing them elaborately; but after long and careful consideration I have arrived at the following conclusions:

- (1) τινι is to be regarded as a substitution of the interrogative for the relative pronoun as at St. Mark xiv. 36 and 1 Tim. i. 7. [See Green's *Gram. of the N. T. Dialect*, p. 247. Winer, as represented by his translator, p. 210, is obscure to the verge of being unintelligible. Compare Soph. *El.* 1167, and Hermann's note as against Jebb; cf. too Soph., *Trach.* 339.]
- (2) κατέχετε must have the same meaning as at 1 Cor. xi. 2, and it is to be compared with μένειν in such passages as 1 Tim. ii. 15 and 2 Tim. iii. 14; or with προσέχειν, Acts xvi. 14, and frequently elsewhere.
- (3) The strange construction of κατέχειν, c. dat., though, as far as I know, without parallel, is hardly more violent than the use of the same verb by Thuc. viii. 28 . . . ἐν ἧ Ἀμόργῃς . . . κατεῖχε. Nor is it at all more peculiar than Thuc. ii. 16, τῇ οὐκῆσει . . . μετείχον.

The Revised Version is ingenious in *getting round* the difficulty of τινι λόγῳ with κατέχειν, but it does no more. With regard to the rendering of σώζεσθε, can the word *strictly* be translated by our English "ye are saved"? If σώζω be a *present imperfect*, and means I am saving [somebody else], then in the passive it can only mean *I am being saved*—the tense expressing an action going on.



firm, so it was a precious deposit he was bound to hand on to others also.

Accordingly here, as in the passage of the Romans previously discussed, he proceeds to quote this *παράδοσις verbatim*, introducing the several clauses, as before, by the particle *ὅτι* in its recitative usage. "This is what I received, *viz.* Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and He was buried, and He was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures: and He was seen by Peter, then by the Twelve. . . ." Here I believe the actual quotation ceases, and what follows is appended by the Apostle as corroborative of the actual clauses of the *παράδοσις* cited before; the style changes, from the short sentences above, to a longer and more explicit statement the moment the recitative *ὅτι* ceases to be employed.

Feeling, as I do, that a deliberate consideration of the passages hitherto discussed will hardly allow any competent student to hesitate as to the conclusion to be arrived at, I refrain from weakening the argument by introducing any doubtful passages into the discussion.<sup>1</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

So far the attempt has been to detect the fragments of the first or elementary and fundamental creed, which, as I have said before, there is reason to believe was drawn up by the Apostles shortly after the ascension of the Lord.

I proceed next to an examination of such passages as appear to contain quotations from supplementary and more expanded statements of primitive doctrine, regarding which

<sup>1</sup> A very interesting passage is Jas. i. 19, where Hort and Westcott read *ὅστε* for *ὡστε* with Lachmann. But they also read with L. . . . *ἔστω δέ*. . . . Of course they do, because they fail to see that *ἔστω πᾶς ἄνθρωπος* . . . is a quotation. Regard the latter clause of the 19th verse as a quotation, and then the *δέ* drops out (as it does from G, J, and other MSS) as an interpolation which a later hand has added because he did not understand the original; just as the Revisers have found themselves in their translation compelled to interpolate *this* to make their rendering intelligible.

it is reasonable to assume that they were of the nature of esoteric formulæ delivered to the *πιστοὶ* for their edification and advancement in Christian knowledge.

A less elaborate discussion of these passages will suffice, as they are more numerous than might be expected, and their bearing upon the subject under review acquires its main force from the amount of cumulative evidence that can be produced.

The first passage to be noticed is in the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (Rom. xiii. 8): *Μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε*, says the Apostle at the eighth verse, *εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν, ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν*. . . . Then, after explaining this, he resumes at the tenth verse, *πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη*, adding, *καὶ τοῦτο εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν*,<sup>1</sup> “and do that, knowing the occasion”; then follows the quotation indicated by the particle *ὅτι*; *viz.* (ver. 11)—

ᾧρα ἡμᾶς ἤδη  
 ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι  
 νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον  
 ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία  
 ἢ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν  
 ἢ νῦν προέκοψεν  
 ἢ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν.

“Already 'tis the hour to be wakened out of slumber, for nearer now is our salvation than when [first] we did believe. Far spent is the night, the day is near at hand.”

Exactly parallel to this is another “fragment of a Hymn on Penitence,” as Canon Liddon calls it,<sup>2</sup> quoted in Ephesians v. 13, 14:

τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐλεγχόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦνται·  
 πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστίν· διὸ λέγει

<sup>1</sup> See Winer, p. 707.

<sup>2</sup> *Bampton Lectures*, p. 328.

ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων  
καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν  
καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός.

Passing on from the Epistle to the Romans, we find St. Paul in the First Epistle to the Corinthians dealing with certain matters with which the controversies in the Corinthian Church were mainly concerned (1 Cor. vi. 1). With regard to quarrels between the brethren, he lays down the principle that it is best to "settle them out of court." With regard to questions of meats clean and unclean, and with regard to fornication, he takes up the same ground as that occupied by the *δόγματα*. In both cases however he bases his argument upon certain *assumptions which he takes it for granted that the Corinthians would not dispute*. Thus at the first verse he says: "Does any of you . . . venture to go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? Know ye not (ver. 2), οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινοῦσι; . . ." Continuing in the same strain, he proceeds: "What! know ye not (ver. 9), ἄδικοι Θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν;" Again, while on the subject of fornication, he asks, "Know ye not (ver. 15), τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ;" Lastly, he asks once more, at ver. 19, "What, know ye not τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῶν ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐστίν;"<sup>1</sup>

We have here in half a page of writing four several appeals to the intimate knowledge of certain profound truths possessed by the Corinthians. Consider what these appeals assume. They assume that four statements—any one of which might well be regarded as "a hard saying"—had

<sup>1</sup> Dean Alford says St. Paul "appeals to an axiomatic truth"! The words are familiar to us *now*, but could they have appeared other than very startling "axioms" to the mass of educated men in the reign of Nero? Nevertheless the Apostle *does* appeal to these truths as matters of familiar knowledge *among his Corinthian converts*. The question is, "*How* had truths like these become 'axiomatic'?"

already been accepted as indisputable, NOT *by virtue of their being put forth by the Apostle, but antecedent to the writing of the epistle in which they occur.* Now what are these statements?

- (1) The saints shall judge the world.
- (2) The unjust shall not inherit the kingdom of God.
- (3) Our bodies are the members of Christ.
- (4) Our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost.

Of course it is easy to say that the first of these statements is an "extension to the whole body of believers of that promise which our Lord in the first instance gave to the Twelve" (St. Luke xxii. 30, St. Matt. xix. 28); but surely this is to assume that the Apostle gives the Corinthians credit for making an inference from our Lord's words which, at least, is not an obvious one. Or, again, it is easy to say that the *second* statement is no more than "the converse of the promise given in the Sermon on the Mount, that the meek *shall inherit the earth* (St. Matt. v. 5); though here too the assumption is, at least, a bold one, that the Corinthians would so understand the words. But when we come to the third and fourth statements, we are introduced to a thought quite supplementary to any such promises as occur in our Lord's teaching,—a thought, indeed, which could only suggest itself *after* the Lord's death, resurrection, and ascension with His glorified body. On the other hand, regard these four statements as derived from some recognised and authoritative summary of things believed and received, and St. Paul's appeal to them and quotation of them become immediately intelligible,—then, *and only then*, they require no explanation and no comment; and so regarded, a fresh light is thrown upon those other passages where similar assumptions are made and similar appeals resorted to. Thus the emphatic repetition of the second of these statements at Galatians v. 21, and the

recurrence of precisely the same expressions at Ephesians v. 5, acquire a new significance; and thus too the frequent allusion and reference to the mysterious doctrine set forth in the third and fourth of these statements, which the apostolic writings contain, is accounted for and explained.

Again, in the eighth chapter of the same epistle it appears to me that much of the obscurity of the first few verses is dispelled if it be conceded that the Apostle is referring to and quoting from such a "recognised summary" as I am contending for. St. Paul thus begins the chapter (1 Cor. viii. 1): "We know that we all *have a γνώσις about the idol sacrifices—γνώσις* puffs up, love builds up. If any one thinks<sup>1</sup> he has got to know anything,<sup>2</sup> not yet has he got to know anything as he ought to know it; but if any one love God, he has become known by Him."

We have here a contrast drawn between the *γνώσις*—which (*exactly as in the case of the πίστις*) is treated at one time as having an objective existence, and at another as a subjective intellectual apprehension—and the *ἀγάπη*, *i.e.* the sanctified emotional faculty which appropriates and clings to Christ. The former is not to be trusted as our sole guide; it requires to be controlled and directed by the latter. Nevertheless, as regards the matter under discussion, *viz.* the idol sacrifices, the *γνώσις* in the main *is* to be taken as our guide; for, "*We know*

(1) οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ."

And again, "*We know*

(2) οὐδεὶς Θεὸς ἕτερος εἰ μὴ εἰς."

And whatever may be asserted of other gods and other lords, *yet for us* (1 Cor. viii. 5, 6),

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps it would be pressing the force of the perf. infin. too much to translate, "If any one thinks he *has perfect knowledge of anything*" and yet I am not sure that this is not St. Paul's meaning.

<sup>2</sup> δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι.

(3) εἰς Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτὸν, καὶ εἰς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ."

"Howbeit," he adds, "the *γνώσις* is not granted to all"—

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνώσις.<sup>1</sup>

In these verses again we have three statements made, and each is appealed to as a matter of intimate knowledge. If it be said that the second of these is little more than a *quotation* from the decalogue, and that the first is a *reference* to the second commandment likewise, I should not feel any very great reluctance to concede the point so far as those two quotations are concerned; but it will certainly not be contended that the sixth verse could be derived from any but a Christian source, and that it is an actual quotation from such a document as I have before referred to seems to me to be obvious.

Once more, in the eleventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, a passage which has before been alluded to, St. Paul writes, at the twenty-third verse (1 Cor. xi. 23-25): "For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you, *viz.* this (*ὅτι* recitative), 'The Lord Jesus, in the night that He was betrayed, took bread, and, after giving thanks, He brake, and said . . .'" Then follow the remarkable verses which give the Pauline version of the institution of the Lord's Supper, ending with the twenty-sixth verse; where the Apostle resumes the argument which the quotation had interrupted, and explains the bearing of that quotation upon the subject in hand. What is to be insisted

<sup>1</sup> For this use of *ἐν* compare 1 Cor. ii. 6, *σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις*. It is hardly necessary to point out that the rendering of our version which represents the article as used for the demonstrative ("that knowledge") is untenable. There is no instance in the Greek of the New Testament of this use of the article.

For the sentiment expressed, compare 2 Thess. iii. 2 . . . οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις.

on however is that the twenty-third, twenty-fourth, and twenty-fifth verses are actual quotations, expressly introduced by that same particle of which the Apostle makes such frequent use.

In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, there is if possible a still more obvious quotation. In the fifth chapter, at the thirteenth verse, St. Paul says (2 Cor. v. 13), "with a brave religious scorn," "For whether we are mad, it is on God's behalf, or whether we are of sound mind, it is on yours; for Christ's love constraineth us, after deciding this (*κρίναντας τούτου*), *viz.* (again the particle *ὅτι* introduces the quotation), *εἰ εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον· καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν ἵνα οἱ ζῶντες μηκέτι ἑαυτοῖς ζῶσιν ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι*: "if one died for all, then all died; and He did die for all, that the living should no more live for themselves, but for Him who died for them and rose."

The next passage I shall adduce is to be found in the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. xiii. 7); and it is a remarkable one, because the document or symbol there quoted is designated by the distinctive title *ἡ πίστις*. I allude to the seventh verse:

*Μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὧν ἀναθεωροῦντες τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς μιμείσθε τὴν πίστιν*

*Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς χθὲς καὶ σήμερον ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

Adopting the interpretation of *ἔκβασιν* given by Dean Alford, though it is far from certain, and bearing in mind that *μιμείσθαι* is used only once more in the New Testament with an inanimate object [*viz.* in the Third Epistle of St. John ver. 11, *μὴ μιμοῦ τὸ κακὸν*, "do not take evil as your pattern to copy"], and that *μιμητῆς* is probably never used at all with an inanimate object (unless in 1 Peter iii. 13 we read with Tischendorf, as against Lachmann and Tregelles,

ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μιμηταὶ γένησθε, “if ye take good as your pattern to copy”), I translate the passage thus :

“Remember your leaders, who spake to you the word of the Lord, the end of whose course as ye keep in view, take as your pattern the πίστις,” viz.

“Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and to-day and for ever.”

Then, in marked contrast, he adds, “As for *various and strange teachings*, be not carried away by *them*.” Unless the eighth verse be regarded as a quotation, I am unable to understand its connexion with what precedes or follows.

It is however when we enter upon a critical examination of the pastoral epistles that the evidence in favour of the existence of these early formularies, and the number of unmistakable quotations from them, become absolutely overwhelming. Nay, the very peculiarity of the language employed, and the frequency of the citations, have actually been made the main ground of argument for rejecting these epistles as spurious by those barren and hungry critics whose business in life seems to be to reduce all belief to a minimum.

In the pastoral epistles there are at least eight different terms used for designating the early Christian formularies referred to and cited. These are (1) ἡ παραγγελία; (2) ἡ διδασκαλία, or ἡ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία, or ἡ καλὴ διδασκαλία; (3) ἡ πίστις; (4) ἡ διδαχὴ; (5) ἡ καλὴ ὁμολογία; (6) ἡ παραθήκη, or ἡ καλὴ παραθήκη (for which some, on wholly insufficient evidence, read παρακαταθήκη); (7) τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως, or τὸ μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας; (8) ὁ πιστὸς λόγος.

It cannot be denied that there is something very striking in the way in which the Apostle, in these his last epistles, dwells again and again upon the importance of adhering to the formularies which he designates by these peculiar terms.



If we assume that these pastoral epistles were composed during a second imprisonment at Rome, and very shortly before his martyrdom, it is no more than reasonable to suppose that between the two imprisonments an authoritative confession of faith or summary of doctrine, supplementary to the first and shorter symbol, was drawn up by the surviving Apostles and elders of the apostolic Churches as a safeguard against the troubles that now began to threaten on all sides, and as a sacred deposit which the teachers especially, and perhaps too the taught, were charged to keep in trust for future times. Be that however as it may, here we have in these epistles unmistakable evidence of the existence of some such document, from whatever source it emanated, and, as I shall now proceed to show, we have unmistakable quotations from it in the epistles themselves.

In the First Epistle to Timothy i. 3, St. Paul expressly states that his object in bidding Timothy to remain in Ephesus was *ἵνα παραγγέλῃς τισὶ μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*. But how *could* a man be a teacher of a *different* doctrine unless there were some standard from which to differ? <sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, St. Paul immediately, at ver. 5, proceeds to indicate what that standard is; he calls it *ἡ παραγγελία*—the *εὐαγγέλιον* was one thing, the *παραγγελία* was its supplement and comment—and he says that the object (*τὸ τέλος*) of that *παραγγελία* was love. Proceeding to talk of the law and its province, he says it is concerned with the wicked and immoral, and (at the tenth verse) with everything that is opposed to the wholesome teaching, *καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ*; then, breaking out

<sup>1</sup> Entirely assenting, as we must needs do, to the dictum of Mr. Shilleto,—that “*ἕτερος* and *ἄλλος* are marvellously confounded in Greek” (Thuc. i., xlviii. § 2)—and perfectly aware, as I am, that the Greek of the New Testament scarcely recognises any distinction in meaning in the two *adjectives*, I cannot admit that the notion of *diversity* is even faintly lost sight of in the compounds *ἑτερόλογος* (1 Cor. xiv. 21), *ἑτεροζυγεῖν* (2 Cor. vi. 14), or *ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν* (1 Tim. i. 3 and vi. 3).

into one of his characteristic bursts of adoring gratitude for the miracle of mercy wrought upon himself, he says (1 Tim. i. 15), at the fifteenth verse, πιστὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος, "Faithful is the word, and worthy of all acceptance," viz. (for the ὅτι, as so frequently noticed, is here again recitative, and marks the quotation), "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." The fifteenth verse can be no other than a quotation, the particle ὅτι indicating that the citation is a verbal one.

In the second chapter the Apostle is insisting on the necessity of women being silent in the assemblies of the Church (1 Tim. ii. 13). "For," says he, "Adam was *first* formed, then Eve. And Adam was not the one deceived, but it was the woman who committed the transgression when she had been deceived, yet she shall be saved *by the childbirth*." What childbirth?

The allusion is to the promise given after the fall—the first announcement of the coming of the Deliverer in the person of the Son of man: "The Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." Then St. Paul once more gives a quotation ἐὰν μείνωσιν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἀγιασμῷ μετὰ σωφροσύνης—πίστος ὁ λόγος.<sup>1</sup>

Of all the stumbles that Robert Stephens made, *inter equitandum*, only one seems to me to have been more unfortunate than his division of the chapters at this point. The old lectionary of the Church of England makes the best of the bad blunder by ordering that both the second and third chapters should be read on the 19th of March, the 18th of July, and the 14th of November; but as long as the chapters remain divided as they are in our Bibles, the unlearned though thoughtful reader will never cease to marvel how it could be a *faithful saying* that if any one desireth the office of a bishop he desireth a good work!

And yet our *Revisers* entertain little or no doubt that

<sup>1</sup> See Shilleto on Thuc. i. 120.

a hankering after the episcopal office is, not only a desirable craving which all Christians may indulge, but that it is one which needed an apostolic counsel to emphasize in the old days, and would require to be stimulated in days to come!

The next passage calling for examination is the famous one in 1 Timothy iii. 16. This is not the time to enter into any discussion on the reading of the verse, indeed  $\delta\varsigma$  for  $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  is now accepted by almost every scholar qualified to have an opinion on the point. But how to account for the anacoluthon  $\delta\varsigma$  is the difficulty; a difficulty which was felt so much by the early copyists, that in many copies  $\delta\varsigma$  was actually altered to  $\delta$ . Treat the words that follow as a quotation, and the whole passage becomes clear; the *μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας* of ver. 16 is the *μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως* of the ninth, and the *διδασκαλία κατ' εὐσεβείαν* of chapter vi. 3; and these are some of its sayings,

<i>ἐφανερώθη</i>	. . .	<i>ἐν σαρκί,</i>
<i>ἐδικαιώθη</i>	. . .	<i>ἐν πνεύματι,</i>
<i>ᾤφθη</i>	. . . .	<i>ἀγγέλοις,</i>
<i>ἐκηρύχθη</i>	. . .	<i>ἐν ἔθνεσιν,</i>
<i>ἐπιστεύθη</i>	. . .	<i>ἐν κόσμῳ,</i>
<i>ἀνελήμφθη</i>	. . .	<i>ἐν δόξῃ.</i>

Whether this extract may be considered metrical or not I dare not presume to decide, but that the whole structure of the passage suggests that it was composed with a view to its being used in the congregation antiphonally is, to say the least, highly probable.

This view is strongly confirmed by another quotation in the Second Epistle. In the second chapter, at the ninth verse, he says, "I am suffering hardship even to imprisonment (*μέχρι δεσμῶν*), but the word of God is not imprisoned (*ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ δέδεται*)"; and then at the eleventh verse he adds *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος*, "faithful is that word" (of

course the πιστὸς is a predicate, and not a mere attribute); then he quotes it,—

εἰ [γὰρ]<sup>1</sup> συναπεθάνομεν, . . . καὶ συνζήσομεν  
 εἰ ὑπομένομεν, . . . [καὶ] συνβασιλεύσομεν  
 εἰ ἀρνησόμεθα, . . . κακείνος ἀρνήσεται ἡμᾶς  
 εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν, . . . ἐκεῖνος πιστὸς μένει  
 ἀρνήσασθαι . . . ἐαυτὸν οὐ δύναται.

For the exposition of the particle γὰρ in the eleventh verse, there is an exact parallel in another quotation in the First Epistle (1 Tim. iv. 9);

πιστὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος, “ Faithful is the word, and it deserves all acceptation ”;

εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ κοπιῶμεν καὶ ὀνειδιζόμεθα, ὅτι ἠλπίκαμεν ἐπὶ Θεῷ ζῶντι, ὃς ἐστι σωτὴρ πάντων μάλιστα πιστῶν.

Only one more quotation remains, but with regard to that I confess to a feeling of considerable uncertainty. The passage I allude to occurs in the third chapter of the Epistle to Titus, at the eighth verse. That there is a quotation is undeniable, for the usual formula (πιστὸς ὁ λόγος—“ faithful is the word ”), which occurs five times in these pastoral epistles, indicates this; I hesitate however to decide whether that formula refers to the words that go before, δικαιοθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι κληρονόμοι γενηθῶμεν κατ’ ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου, or whether they refer to what follows, φροντίζωσι καλῶν ἔργων προύστασθαι οἱ πεπιστευκότες Θεῷ. On the one hand, we are reminded of an expression in the Epistle to the Romans viii. 24, τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν, “ For we were saved (*i.e.* put into a condition of salvation at our baptism) with the hope ”; as though ἡ ἐλπίς were a familiar term having a prominent position in the πιστὸς λόγος. On the other hand, we cannot overlook the evident repetition of the injunction, φροντίζειν καλὰ ἔργα προύστασθαι, in ver. 14, μανθανέτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι καλῶν ἔργων

<sup>1</sup> For the omission of γὰρ, see Tisch. and Tregelles.

προότασθαι εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας. It is not impossible that both the words which precede and those which follow the expression πιστὸς ὁ λόγος may all be extracted from the same document, and the occurrence of the final particle ἵνα lends colour to this view.

I have now completed the examination of all those passages in the apostolic writings which appear to me to contain quotations from or references to primitive formulæ. It is not to be supposed that any one document contained them all. Rather is it much more likely that we have in these passages so quoted extracts from compositions differing widely in character or perhaps even in authority. Some of these passages must have come from "Formulæ for Instruction of Catechumens before Baptism, and for customary Rehearsal after Baptism, or for the Interrogatives used at the actual time of Baptism";<sup>1</sup> some from the fuller and more expanded expositions of primitive doctrine, intended for those more advanced in Christian knowledge. Some appear to have been derived from liturgies used in public worship, some possibly from directions addressed to the ordained officers of the Church.<sup>2</sup> It may be that many more

<sup>1</sup> Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica*, preface.

<sup>2</sup> No one, I think, could read the *Διδαχὴ τῶν Δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων* and dream of claiming for it any *authority* as a recognised summary of Christian doctrine. It is clearly an early Christian *tract* of some good man, who felt called upon to give his views on certain points of Christian duty and practice. It is a word of warning and advice, and little more. The thirteenth chapter of the tract does however refer to some rule of discipline to which appeal could be made and which may have been of the apostolic age, or may, on the other hand, have been a rule derived from apostolic teaching, and formulating such *principles* as are laid down in Heb. xiii. 7, 1 Tim. v. 17, etc. The curious *Liturgical Fragments* in the ninth and tenth chapters go some way to prove that these forms of prayer were usual, and indeed well established; and the remarkable injunctions regarding fasting and the sacrament of baptism (chaps. vi. and vii.) clearly indicate that within a century after our Lord's ascension the Churches had adopted and were governed by certain ordinances which were very different in form, and entered much more into details than those earlier ones of which we read in the eighteenth chapter of the Acts.

such citations remain to be pointed out. I shall be satisfied if scholars will accept these suggestions, and correct or confirm, and possibly supplement them.

AUG. JESSOPP.

---

### THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

#### XV. THE ANCIENT TABERNACLE (CHAP. IX. 1-10).

THE writer now proceeds to compare the old and the new covenants with reference to their respective provisions for religious communion between man and God, his purpose being to show the superiority of the priestly ministry of Christ over that of the Levitical priesthood. In the first five verses of the section now to be considered he gives an inventory of the furniture of the tabernacle pitched in the wilderness; in the next five he describes the religious services there carried on. Thereafter he proceeds to describe in contrast the ministry of Christ, the new covenant High Priest, as performed in the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands.

The first paragraph simply continues the train of thought, and hence the subject of the affirmation in ver. 1 is left to be understood: "Now (*οὖν* leading back to viii. 5) the first (covenant) had ordinances of Divine service and its mundane sanctuary." The epithet *κοσμικόν* here applied to the tabernacle evidently signifies belonging to this material world, in opposition to the heavenly sanctuary (ver. 11) not made with hands out of things visible and tangible. Some have rendered "ornate," or well ordered, for which however the usual Greek word is *κόσμιος*. The purpose of the writer is to point out that the tabernacle belonged to this earth, and therefore possessed the attributes of