

of the body into the wings and to develop all its beauty and strength. You would cut down the cocoon of your trial, but you would never have the beautiful colours in your wings. You would never know what it was to soar Godward. The things you are trying to get rid of are for the making of soul.—A. T. PIERSON.

**'Fortitude' of Sandro Botticelli.**—What is chiefly notable in her is—that you would not, if you had to guess who she was, take her for Fortitude at all. Everybody else's Fortitudes announce themselves clearly and proudly. They have tower-like shields and lion-like helmets, and stand firm astride on their legs, and are confidently ready for all comers.

But Botticelli's Fortitude is no match, it may be, for any that are coming. Worn somewhat, and not a little weary, instead of standing ready for all comers, she is sitting, apparently in reverie, her fingers playing restlessly and idly—nay, I think, even nervously—about the hilt of her sword. For her battle is not to begin to-day; nor did it begin yesterday. Many a morn and eve have passed since it began—and now—is this to be the ending day of it? And if this—by what manner of end?

That is what Sandro's Fortitude is thinking, and the playing fingers about the sword-hilt would fain let it fall, if it might be; and yet, how swiftly and gladly will they close on it, when the far-off trumpet blows, which she will hear through all her reverie.

RUSKIN, *Mornings in Florence*, iii. 57.

**Patience.**—Patience is a manly virtue. It marks the highest type of man, it distinguishes the man from the child, the higher races from the lower races, the civilized man from the savage. The savage is always, like a child, impatient; you can hardly persuade him to till the ground, because he has to wait six months for the harvest. And there are hundreds of young men who are just as senseless as the savage in that respect: they burn the candle of pleasure at both ends and in the middle too, heedless of the darkness that is coming in future years, if they can only make a big glaring flame at the present moment. But as soon as ever you lift men up in the scale of being, they begin to build and plant and labour, though the results may not be seen for years, and you can always measure the strength and nobility and the very magnitude of a man by this. Does he know how to wait?—J. G. GREENHOUGH.

**Ye shall win your lives.**—A crew of fifteen men once left a burning ship in mid-Pacific. They were thousands of miles from land. They left the ship so hastily that they had no time to take oars, or sail, or any other tackle or gear with which to produce motion. They were only able to snatch at some food and water. They lived for six weeks in that boat, and for the last three-and-twenty days they dreamed every night of feasting and awoke every morning to the same starving comrades, vacant waters—for they passed no ships—and desolate sky. Yet these men never lost their reason, and never lost their courage, because they perceived from the outset that their boat was in the current of an Equatorial ocean, a current which those who knew the geography of the sea were aware would slowly but surely carry them at last to land, *which it did*. In their calm endurance they won their lives.—J. LAIDLAW.

#### Endure Hardness.

A COLD wind stirs the blackthorn  
To burgeon and to blow,  
Besprinkling half-green hedges  
With flakes and sprays of snow.

Thro' coldness and thro' keenness,  
Dear hearts, take comfort so:  
Somewhere or other doubtless  
These make the blackthorn blow.

CHRISTINA ROSSETTI.

#### FOR REFERENCE.

- Easton (T.), *A Year's Ministry*, 209.  
Herford (B.), *Anchors of the Soul*, 160.  
Horne (C. S.), *The Soul's Awakening*, 253.  
Maclaren (A.), *Beatitudes*, 118.  
" " *Expositions*, Mt xviii.—xxviii., 148.  
Martin (A.), *Winning the Soul*, 3.  
Parks (L.), *The Winning of the Soul*, 1.  
Smellie (A.), *In the Secret Place*, 187.  
Smyth (N.), *Reality of Faith*, 135.  
Soyres (J. de), *Children of Wisdom*, 92.  
Vincent (M. R.), *The Covenant of Peace*, 269.  
Watkinson (W. L.), *Ashes of Roses*, 31.  
*Christian World Pulpit*, vol. xlii. 244; lv. 212; lvii. 86.

## St. Paul's Epistle to the Laodiceans.

BY THE REV. JOHN RUTHERFURD, B.D., RENFREW.

IN Col 4<sup>16</sup> St. Paul writes: 'And when this epistle hath been read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye also read the epistle from Laodicea.' What was or what is this epistle?

The words may mean—(1) a letter written by

the Laodiceans; (2) an epistle written by St. Paul from Laodicea; (3) an epistle written to the Laodiceans—and to be procured from them by the Colossians.

*First.* The words may mean a letter written by the Laodiceans. But it is sufficient to refer to

how the apostle enjoins the Colossians to procure and read the 'epistle from Laodicea.' How could a command of this kind be given in reference to an epistle written by third parties? how could it be known that a copy of it had been made by the Laodiceans before despatching it? or even that the Laodiceans would be willing to give a copy of it to the Colossians? The suppositions involved by this hypothesis are incredible. Besides, the context regards the Epistle to the Colossians and 'that from Laodicea' as companion epistles, of which the two churches are to make an interchange so that each church is directed to read both.

*Second.* An epistle written by St. Paul from Laodicea; and here a choice of four epistles is offered to us, 1 Ti, 1 Th, 2 Th, and Gal.

But in the case of these epistles the probability is that every one of them was written elsewhere than from Laodicea. For at the time when he wrote to Colossæ he was a prisoner in Rome, and for this reason alone it was impossible that he could at any recent date have written any epistle from Laodicea. But his own statement (Col 2<sup>1</sup>) is that those in Laodicea had not seen his face in the flesh. As he had never been in Laodicea, he could not have written any epistle from that city.

*Third.* An epistle addressed to the Laodiceans—

(a) By some person other than St. Paul. But the whole tone of the passage does not favour this interpretation in the least.

(β) By St. Paul, but that the epistle is lost. This is the ordinary explanation.

(γ) The apocryphal Latin epistle 'to the Laodiceans.' This spurious epistle has no marks of authenticity; it is a mere compilation clumsily put together. Its general character is thus given by Lightfoot: it 'is a cento of Pauline phrases strung together without any definite connection or any clear object. They are taken chiefly from the Epistle to the Philippians, but here and there one is borrowed elsewhere, e.g. from the Epistle to the Galatians. Of course, it closes with an injunction to the Laodiceans to exchange epistles with the Colossians. The apostle's injunction in Col 4<sup>16</sup> suggested the forgery, and such currency as it ever attained was due to the support which that passage was supposed to give to it. Unlike most forgeries it had no ulterior aim. It was not framed to advance any particular opinions whether heterodox or orthodox. It has no doctrinal peculiarities. It

is quite harmless so far as falsity and stupidity combined can ever be regarded as harmless.' (Lightfoot's *Colossians*, p. 282).

(δ) The only other alternative is that 'the epistle from Laodicea' is an epistle to the Laodiceans from St. Paul himself which he directs the Colossians to procure from Laodicea, and that it is the epistle known as 'the Epistle to the Ephesians.'

The apostle then had written an epistle to Laodicea, a city which he had twice already named in the Epistle to the Colossians: 'For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea' (Col 2<sup>1</sup>): 'Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea, and Nympha, and the church which is in her house' (4<sup>15</sup>). There is no notice of Laodicea in any of the missionary journeys of St. Paul, and it is not elsewhere mentioned in the N.T. except in the opening chapters of Revelation.

Granted that the apostle wrote an epistle to Laodicea, what has become of it? Do we know nothing more of it now than is given in this reference to it in Colossians? The fact that it was by the apostle's express command to be communicated to, at least, two churches, would make its disappearance and loss very strange.

But are we warranted in concluding that the epistle is lost at all? A statement of the facts of the case seems to show that we actually possess the epistle which was written to the Laodiceans, but only under a different name. The lines of evidence which lead to the conclusion that the so-called 'Epistle to the Ephesians' was really written to the Laodiceans are these.

1. It is well known that the words 'at Ephesus' (Eph 1<sup>1</sup>) in the inscription of the epistle are very doubtful. The R.V. reads in the margin, 'Some very ancient authorities omit *at Ephesus*.' Among the authorities which omit 'at Ephesus' are the Vatican and the Sinaitic MSS, the best and most ancient authorities we have.

Tertullian asserts that the heretics, *i.e.* Marcion, had altered the title 'the Epistle to the Ephesians' to 'the Epistle to the Laodiceans.' But this accusation does not carry with it any doctrinal or heretical charge against Marcion in this respect. 'It is not likely,' says Moule (*Ephesians*, p. 25), 'that Marcion was guilty here where the change would have served no dogmatic purpose.' And the fact that at that very early period, the first half

of the second century, it was openly suggested that the destination of the epistle was Laodicea is certainly entitled to weight, especially in view of the other fact, which is of no less importance, that 'at Ephesus' is omitted in the two great MSS,  $\aleph$  and B.

2. The 'Epistle to the Ephesians' was not, and could not be, primarily at least, addressed to Ephesus, because St. Paul speaks of his readers as persons in regard to whose conversion from heathenism to the faith of Christ he had just recently heard. 'For this cause I also, having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus which is among you, and which you shew toward all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers' (Eph 1<sup>15</sup>). These words could not well be used, in the first instance at least, in regard to the church in Ephesus which St. Paul himself had founded, and in regard to persons among whom he had lived for three years, and where he even knew personally 'every one' of the Christians (Ac 20<sup>31</sup>).

And in Eph 3<sup>1</sup> he writes: 'For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles,—if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to youward.' But how could he ever doubt that the elders of the church in Ephesus (Ac 20<sup>17</sup>), as well as all the members of that important church, were in any degree ignorant of the fact that a dispensation of the grace of God had been given to him? The inquiry whether his readers had heard of the one great fact on which his ministry was based could not apply in any degree to the Christians in Ephesus. The apostle and the Ephesians had a clear and intimate mutual knowledge. They knew him, and valued him, and loved him well. When he bade the elders of the church farewell, they all fell on his neck, and kissed him (Ac 20<sup>37</sup>).

Clearly, therefore, the statements that the apostle had just recently heard of their conversion, and his inquiry whether they had heard that a dispensation of the grace of God had been entrusted to him, do not and cannot describe Christians in Ephesus. 'It is plain,' writes Bishop Moule ('Ephesians' in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, p. 26), 'that the epistle does not bear an Ephesian destination on the face of it.' The tone is non-local. Only one name, Tychicus (6<sup>21</sup>), occurs beside that of St. Paul himself, and Tychicus was specially commissioned as the person

chosen to carry and to deliver both 'Ephesians' and 'Colossians.'

In the Epistles to the Corinthians there are many local references, as well as allusions to the apostle's work in Corinth. In the Epistle to the Galatians there are also many references to his work among the people of the churches in Galatia. The same is the case in the Epistle to the Philippians, several names being mentioned of persons well known to the apostle. In the two Epistles to the Thessalonians references also occur to his work among them.

How is it, then, that in 'the Epistle to the Ephesians' there are no references at all to the three years which he had spent at Ephesus, and how also is there no mention of any one of the members or of the elders whom he knew so intimately and so affectionately?

When we look at the Epistle to the Colossians and that to the Romans,—Colossæ and Rome being cities which the apostle had never visited previous to the writing of his epistles to the churches there,—we find that he knows several persons in Colossæ, and in the case of the Epistle to the Romans he mentions by name no fewer than twenty-six persons in that city.

'Ephesians,' therefore, is inexplicable on the ordinary supposition that Ephesus was the city to which the epistle was addressed.

The other theory that the epistle was a circular one, sent in the first instance to Laodicea, involves no such difficulty.

3. But a very important consideration is that 'the Epistle to the Ephesians' was written by St. Paul at the same sitting almost as the 'Colossians.' These two are sister epistles. An ordinary reading of them and of that to Philemon shows that all three were written and sent off at the same time, Onesimus and Tychicus carrying the Epistle to the Colossians (Col 4<sup>7-8, 9</sup>); Onesimus being the bearer of that to Philemon; while Tychicus, in addition to carrying the Colossian epistle, was also the messenger who carried 'the Epistle to the Ephesians' (Eph 6<sup>21</sup>).

A close scrutiny of Colossians and Ephesians shows to an extent without a parallel elsewhere in the Epistles of the N.T., a remarkable similarity of phraseology. The same words are used, while the thought is so varied and so rich that the one epistle is in no sense a copy or repetition of the other. Both epistles came warm and instinct with life

from the full heart of the apostle, who had never been in either city, but on whom, none the less, there daily came the care of all the churches.

The 'Epistle to the Ephesians,' therefore, is the epistle written at this very time by St. Paul to the

Laodiceans, and despatched by the same messenger, Tychicus, on the same journey, and filled to overflowing with the same richly varied thought regarding Christ and the church, which occupies the Epistle to the Colossians.

## Literature.

### THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.

THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS. Translated from the Editor's Greek Text, and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices, by R. H. Charles, D.Litt., D.D. (*A. & C. Black.* 15s. net.)

'THE Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs has, since its rediscovery by Bishop Grosseteste in the thirteenth century till the last decade, been a sealed book, misunderstood and misdated on every hand. The research of the last few years has, however, succeeded in discovering its true date, purpose, and character. It now comes forward as a book second in importance to none composed between 200 B.C. and the Christian era. It was written in Hebrew in the last quarter of the second century B.C. by a Chasid on behalf of the high-priesthood of the great Maccabean family, and especially on behalf of the Messianic claims of John Hyrcanus, who, according to Josephus, was the only Israelite who enjoyed the triple offices of prophet, priest, and king. But its claims to historical importance, however great, are overshadowed by its still greater claims as being the sole representative of the loftiest ethical standard ever attained by pre-Christian Judaism, and as such, attesting the existence of a type of religious thought in pre-Christian Judaism that was the natural preparation for the ethics of the New Testament, and especially of the Sermon on the Mount. Not only so, but this book influenced directly the Sermon on the Mount in a few of its most striking thoughts and phrases, and the Pauline Epistles in a great variety of passages.'

Such is Dr. Charles's estimate of the book of which he has produced the latest and, as usual, the incomparably best edition. Pursuing the subject in his Introduction, he says that the ethic of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs 'is indefinitely [infinitely?] higher and purer than

that of the Old Testament'; that it is nevertheless its 'true spiritual child,' and that it 'helps to bridge the chasm that divides the Ethics of the Old and New Testaments.' This is enough to give the general scholar an interest in the book. For the special student of Apocrypha, even Dr. Charles has never before rendered a greater or more welcome service. His volume is full of good things, facts and inferences, fancies also perhaps, but such fancies as only the thoroughly furnished scholar can indulge in, fancies which touch the imagination and are more conducive to progress than much accumulation of dry fact. So let no student of the Bible think that the book is outside his interest. It stands between the Old Testament and the New (Professor Charles's date is 109 to 106 B.C.), and it casts light and understanding on both. It would be difficult to exaggerate its value for either.

It is, however, for the study of the New Testament that Professor Charles finds its value greatest. In the Introduction he quotes a large number of parallel passages. There are parallels in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* to almost every book of the New Testament, and some of them are far too striking to be mere coincidences. Take this from Test. Dan (v.<sup>3</sup>): 'Love the Lord with all your soul, and one another with a true heart.' Yet more striking, but rather long for quotation, is the parallel in Test. Jos. (1<sup>5-6</sup>) to the familiar words: 'I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat' (Mt 25<sup>35, 36</sup>); and it is further of interest that Dr. Charles is able to quote a Buddhist parallel already used by Allen in his Commentary on St. Matthew: 'Who-soever, O monks, would wait upon me, let him wait upon the sick.'

A good illustration of the place held by *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* between the Old Testament and the New is offered by Professor Charles in the section on Forgiveness, but we shall