

escape corruption. We have here exactly a similar conception to that of the Hebrews, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption' (Ps. xvi. 10). The *Book of the Dead* was, then, the guide-book which furnished the deceased with the means of doing as Osiris did. It supplied the prayers, the charms, the passwords, and mysterious formulæ which enabled the deceased who identified himself with Osiris to take upon himself the title of Osiris; thus we read: 'Riseth up Osiris, the scribe of offerings of all the gods Ani in triumph' (ch. xvii.).

This, then, being the character of the ritual, it was necessary that the deceased should be acquainted with its mysterious contents.

For this purpose a papyrus was placed in the coffin with the mummy, containing the necessary topographical directions, and passwords, prayers,

peopled with all the fantastic creations of the ancient Egyptians.

The word *maakheru*, rendered 'victorious,' 'triumphant,' 'justified,' 'blessed,' is always applied after the name of the deceased, he being victorious as Osiris had been, and having such a reward given him. Compare Rev. iii. 21.

and charms. The wiser Egyptians, says M. Maspero, copied out the principal chapters for themselves; and there seems every reason to suppose that the earlier and best-written portion of this papyrus is the work of Ani himself. Many learned large portions by heart. Those who had not prepared themselves in life for the long journey studied the ritual in the coffin; or in some cases relatives or the priests read the necessary chapters to the mummy's ear, that he might learn them before he was carried away to the grave. To the deceased, thus provided with the necessary guides, the name of the 'equipped shade' or instructed shade was given. This custom must have been of immense antiquity, as we find it referred to in the Pyramid Texts, as in the tomb of Pepi we read: 'Hail to thee, Pepi; thou placest thyself upon the throne of Him that dwelleth among the living; and it is the writing which thou hast that striketh terror into their hearts.'

Being provided with this all-important writing, it is necessary now to see what was the true nature and character of the journey of the soul, and how it was accomplished.

Dr. Resch on the Trinitarian Baptismal Formula.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. J. T. MARSHALL, M.A., MANCHESTER.

IN a paper of mine which appeared in the *Critical Review* for January, giving a résumé of Dr. Resch's latest work, entitled *Extra-Canonical Parallel Texts to the Gospels*, vol. i. *Matthew and Mark*, I directed special attention to a part of the work which I deemed exceedingly valuable, and which is the matured product of the study of many years on Dr. Resch's part, namely, his collection of passages from Christian writers of the early centuries, alluding to the Trinitarian Baptismal Formula. In the issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March, the Editor (p. 247) called attention to Resch's work, and gave some quotations from my paper. I venture to think that what appealed to the Editor as being of such importance will be appreciated by his readers, if presented more at length than was possible in the *Critical Review*. Dr. Resch complains that it has been far too readily assumed by certain schools of theologians that the

words ascribed to the Lord Jesus in Matt. xxviii. 19, 'Baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' cannot really have been spoken by our Lord, because the Trinitarian conception therein expressed was 'a comparatively late product of the dogmatic development of the Church.' To rebut this position, Dr. Resch devotes fourteen pages of quotations from very early Christian literature, orthodox and heretical, showing the universal use of this formula. The arguments which our author adduces in favour of the genuineness of the logion are these:—

I. In the ministry of John the Baptist a Trinitarian arrangement of thought is discernible. 'God (δ θεός) is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham.' 'He that cometh after me (δ ἐρχόμενος) is mightier than I.' 'He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit.'

II. In the baptism of Christ Himself 'the

Trinitarian conception is unmistakable.' 'The Spirit as a dove descended upon Him, and a voice came out of the heavens, Thou art My beloved Son: in Thee I am well pleased.' This event was, in Dr. Resch's regard, the deep underlying theme in Christ's mind, which at the close of His ministry found its fruition in the Trinitarian baptism of the people.

III. A comparison of Matt. xxviii. 18-20, with the synoptic utterances of our Lord, as well as with the Johannine.

IV. An investigation of the Trinitarian parallels in the apostolic doctrinal writings.

An examination of these, which Dr. Resch rightly considers of supreme importance, is reserved for a prospective work.

V. A collection of the Trinitarian passages in the oldest extra-canonical literature.

The earliest author of post-apostolic times is Clement of Rome, and in his writings Resch finds three clear Trinitarian references. In chap. 46 of his *First Epistle to the Corinthians* he says: 'We have one God, and one Christ, and one Spirit of Grace, which was shed upon us.' In chap. 42 he says: 'Having received the commission, and been fully assured through the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, and confirmed by the word of God, with the assurance of the Holy Spirit, they went out preaching the kingdom of God.' In chap. 58 we read: 'For God liveth, and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit.' Ignatius has four passages equally clear:—*Ephesians* ix. 1, 'Stones of the temple of the Father, prepared for the building of God the Father, raised on high through the instrumentality of Christ Jesus, who is the cross, using as a cord the Holy Spirit.' *Magnesians* xiii. 1, 'Study to be confirmed in the preaching of the Lord and the apostles, that all things whatsoever ye do, may be prospered . . . by the Son and the Father and by the Spirit, in the beginning and in the end.' So xiii. 2, 'Be subject to the episcopus and to one another, as Christ was to the Father according to the flesh, and as the apostles were to Christ, and to the Father and to the Spirit.' *Philadelphians*, Introduction, 'Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, to the Church of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, which has received mercy and confirmation by the concord of God; rejoicing unceasingly in the suffering of our Lord; . . . whom He hath, according to His own will, firmly established by

His Holy Spirit.' Perhaps the next document in point of antiquity is the *Didaché*, the so-called 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,' which may be allocated with much probability to about 110 A.D. Here, for the first time outside the Scriptures, we meet with the baptismal formula. The words are: 'And concerning baptism, so baptize ye: having previously said all these things, baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in running water' (ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι). On this point Dr. Resch observes: 'The author of the *Διδαχή* is in his own person so far removed from Trinitarian and Christological thoughts that one might suppose the greater part of his work to be derived from Jewish sources, yet when he comes to traditional liturgical material,—the Lord's Prayer, the Eucharistic prayers, etc.,—he presents foremost of this traditional matter the Trinitarian formula of baptism, as something given and permanent. And even if the foregoing catechetical instruction and preparation for baptism (τὰντα προειπόντες βαπτίσατε) does not show the least internal connexion with the formula of baptism, yet this is a proof of the antiquity of the formula,—a proof in this way, that even where very little interest in, or understanding of the Trinitarian conception of God is possessed, the baptismal formula is continued as a permanent tradition.'

In the Apology of Aristides, which comes a little later, we have the following passage. After Aristides has alluded to the four religious divisions or families of mankind,—the Heathens, the Greeks, the Jews, and the Christians,—he says: 'The Christians are genealogically descended from Jesus Christ; but He is the Son of God most High, and is acknowledged by the Holy Spirit.' Next comes Justin Martyr. 'His theology,' says Dr. Resch, 'is full of the component parts of creeds of the ancient Church, which, as *dissecta membra*, lie scattered in all parts of his writings. His theology is the first attempt to grasp speculatively the doctrine of the Trinity—an attempt which as regards the doctrine of the Holy Spirit remains incomplete. But he shares this Trinitarian conception with the Church which he has travelled through in all its chief provinces, and learnt to know. He represents this Trinitarian faith of the Church as resting on the basis of the old Church creeds, but especially on the baptismal formula and on the Eucharist and the daily prayer.' So far, then, from the formula being the matured product of

doctrinal development, Dr. Resch insists, we see, that it is the root from which speculation on the doctrine within the Church grew. Justin says (*Apology*, i. 6): 'We confess we are atheists, if by that is meant denying the existence of such so-called gods; but not with reference to the most true God, even the Father of righteousness and prudence and the other virtues, and who is unsullied by evil. Yea, we revere and worship Him, and also the Son who came from Him and taught us these things . . . as well as the prophetic Spirit.' In another passage, *Dialogue with Trypho*, chap. 32, Justin says: 'I will tell you other words also from which ye may know the Lord, who by the holy prophetic Spirit is called Christ, and the Father, who is Lord of all.'

After this, Dr. Resch gives six quotations from Athenagoras, in which the Father, Son, and Spirit are mentioned in close connexion, and three from Clement of Alexandria; but perhaps these are too far removed from the apostolic age to be of much service for the argument. We cannot refrain, however, from giving one or two interesting varieties of expression, by which the Trinity is designated. They are all taken from *The Apostolical Constitutions*. The first is—

ἀσεβοῦσιν εἰς τὸν ἀποστέιλαντα
εἰς τὸν παθόντα
εἰς τὸν μαρτυρήσαντα.

'They dishonour Him that sent, Him that suffered, Him that bore testimony' (vi. 15). Again—

τοῦ ἀποστέιλαντος πατρός
τοῦ ἐλθόντος χριστοῦ
τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος παρακλήτου.

'The Father who sent, the Christ who came, the Paraclete who bore testimony' (vii. 22).

But the variation in the *Constitutions* which impresses Dr. Resch most is the following: 'Having received commandment from Him . . . to baptize *into His death*, on the authority of the God of all who is the Father, and with the testimony of the Spirit, who is the Paraclete.' The *Constitutions* dates from the middle of the fourth century, but in the heat of the Trinitarian controversies no one would have dared to insert this unique formula unless it had been venerable with antiquity. It is true that the Arian Eunomius and his followers, instead of using the Trinitarian formula, baptized 'into the death of the Lord.' So says Socrates, v. 24: 'They baptize not εἰς

τριάδα, but εἰς τὸν τοῦ χριστοῦ θάνατον.' But the *Constitutions* is not an Arian production, as Dr. Resch takes pains to show. In fact, pseudo-Ignatius mentions 'one baptism, that which is imparted *into the death* of the Lord.' And Justin Martyr says: 'He who is illuminated is immersed (λούεται) in the name of Jesus Christ who was crucified under Pontius Pilate' (*Apology*, i. 61). And in *Barnabas*, xi. 8, we read: 'Observe how He has connected together water and the cross; for this He says, Blessed are they who, hoping in the cross, have gone down into the water.' And even the Apostle Paul says: 'As many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized *into His death*.' On these grounds Dr. Resch feels justified in maintaining that this formula rests on the words of the Lord Jesus Himself; and that He was the one who first so intimately associated baptism with His own death, though this is unrecorded in the Gospels.

We come now to what Dr. Resch considers his strongest point, namely, the uniform practice of all the early heretical sections of the Church of baptizing into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Though the heretical tendency of many sects had no connexion with the Trinity, yea, often stood in antagonism to it, yet we find in almost all the Trinitarian formula in use. For instance, among the Jewish Christians, where, instead of a Trinitarian, rather a Unitarian conception of God appears; even in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, where the Unitarian conception is strongest, we still have a baptismal formula closely allied with Matt. xxviii. 19. In *Clem. Hom.* xi. 26, we read: 'For thus the prophet sware to us, saying, Verily I say to you, except ye be born again in running water, into the name of Father, Son, (and) Holy Spirit, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of God.' So *Clementine Recognitions*, i. 63: 'For I showed them that they could be saved in no other way, unless, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, they hastened to be immersed in the baptism of the threefold invocation' ('trinæ invocationis'). Some have sought to explain the contradiction between the belief and practice of these Ebionites by saying that the baptismal formula was with them a mere ceremony. The *τρισμακαρία ἐπονομασία*, the 'nomen trinæ beatitudinis' was degraded to a mere ceremony, which men *did not dare* to set aside! No! and why not? Surely, for no other reason than that it was hoary with

antiquity, and belonged to the very *origines* of Christianity. The tendency of doctrine among the Ebionites was foreign, nay, hostile to Trinitarianism, but the 'trina invocatio' was too venerable to be set aside.

Similarly with the Gnostic system of doctrine. There were other systems of numbers which played a much more important part with them than the Triad, yet for the sacrament of Initiation, they used the Trinitarian baptismal formula, either in verbal agreement with the Greek of Matt. xxviii. 19, or in a garbled or Kabbalistic form of the original Aramaic. This is surely startling! Why should this be so? Evidently, replies Dr. Resch, only that they might not altogether lose connexion with the common consciousness of the Church, and forfeit the right of the Christian name. Here also, as in the case of the Ebionites, the baptismal formula, so far from being in process of formation, is in the process of degeneration.

Then we have the Monarchian heresies, with their expressed hatred to the Trinitarian conception of God, yet never swerving from the Trinitarian tradition in baptism, but rather spending their skill in forming ingenious modifications of it; we have Simon Magus connecting his mysteries in a spiritual manner with the three Trinitarian names; and the Montanists, Encratites, and Manichæans

preserving the Trinitarian formula as a band which connects them with the great Church, though not within its borders.

Even in the *Pistis Sophia*, of which Harnack rightly says that Trinitarianism cannot be found in the book, there is (as Harnack has overlooked) a reference to the practice of Trinitarian baptism: 'Post hæc Jesus videns mulierem quæ venit μετανοειν βαπτισεν eam *tribus vicibus*, quamquam non fuerat dignum βαπτισμασιν.'

Evidently then, Trinitarian baptism was universal in the oldest churches, and no less so in the oldest heresies. We nowhere find the Trinitarian formula the subject of dispute. In the development of the Church, no one can assign a moment when the tradition was not in existence; and the earliest heretical sects, who were opposed to its plain implications, never ventured to dispense with it. Are not these facts altogether at variance with the theory that the Trinitarian formula was for the first time 'smuggled in' at a comparatively late period? Certainly. They rather prove that the baptismal formula was the bond of union between all who claimed the Christian name; the one thing which, amid a thousand divergencies of creed and practice never changed; the one thing *common* among all so-called Christians, orthodox and heretics alike.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF II. CORINTHIANS.

2 COR. viii. 9.

'For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might become rich' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'For ye know.'—Christ is the reference for everything. To Christ's life and Christ's Spirit St. Paul refers all questions, both practical and speculative, for a solution. For all our mysterious human life refers itself back to Him. Christ's life is the measure of the world.—ROBERTSON.

'The grace.'—'Grace' when used by itself in the New Testament denotes the whole compassion and

love of God to sinners of mankind in Christ Jesus, embracing His eternal purposes of salvation, and every step in the process of it from first to last. (See, for example, Rom. v. 21; Eph. ii. 7, 8; John i. 14, 16, 17.) Hence the gospel is called 'the gospel of the grace of God,' and 'the word of His grace' (Acts xx. 24, 32, xiv. 3). In this all-comprehensive sense it is used here.—BROWN.

'Of our Lord Jesus Christ.'—When our apostle would lay peculiar stress on anything connected with Christ, he loves to give Him His full name—'Our Lord (or "The Lord") Jesus Christ.' Out of numberless such cases (exclusive of salutations, etc.) we may refer to Acts xvi. 31; Rom. v. 21; vi. 23, viii. 39; 1 Cor. xv. 57; Gal. vi. 14; Phil. iii. 20. When, therefore, we read here of 'the