

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

*THE SHORTER FORM OF ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO  
THE ROMANS.*

IF it were certain that the Epistle to the Romans had never existed in any other form than that in which it is now known, there would be no more certain point in the whole complex of historical problems connected with the Pauline Epistles than that it was written from Corinth just before St. Paul left that city to take alms to the Church at Jerusalem. But it is well known that there is quite a large amount of evidence which points to the existence of an early short recension of the Epistle, and in the following pages an effort will be made to do three things: (1) to give a statement of the main reasons why the existence of this short recension is practically certain; (2) to explain the theory, at present very popular, which connects this recension with Marcion; and (3) to suggest an alternative theory.

*The existence of the short recension.*

The proof of the existence of a short recension of the epistle resolves itself into the treatment of the reference to Rome in the first chapter, and of the two last chapters. It is probably best and *methodisrichtig* to begin by showing why there is reason to believe that there was once a text which omitted the two last chapters, and then to go on to give the reasons for thinking that this shorter form had no reference to Rome.

The most widespread evidence for the omission of the two chapters can be found in the ordinary Latin chapter divisions given in the *Codex Amiatinus* of the Vulgate and in many others (Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 357, mentions at least 48). This system gives Romans as divided into 51 chapters: the last but one (No. 50) is entitled *De periculo contristante fratrem suum esca sua, et quod non sit regnum dei esca et potus sed justitia et pax et gaudium in*

*spiritu sancto*. This clearly covers Romans xiv. 15–23. The next and last (No. 51) is *De mysterio dei ante passionem in silentio habito, post passionem vero ipsius revelato*. This equally clearly covers Romans xvi. 25–27 and nothing else. In other words, it implies a text of the epistle which ended with chapter xiv. *plus* the doxology which we usually read at the end of the epistle.

Moreover, proof is not wanting that this conclusion is just. There is found in some MSS. a sort of concordance or harmony of the Pauline epistles, which arranges under reference to the chapter numbers the parallel passages which deal with the same questions. The references to Romans are usually missing; but according to Corssen<sup>1</sup> the full text is preserved in a MS. at Murbach which gives 43 headings from Romans. These are given according to the Amiatine chapter divisions, and the two last are *Quod regnum dei non sit esca et potus, ad Rom. L. ad Cor. pr. XI.*, and *De abscondito sacramento a saeculo, ad Rom. LI., ad Eph. IX., ad Coloss. III., ad Tit. I., ad Heb. II.* This can scarcely be explained except on the hypothesis that a short recension was used. Even if Corssen be wrong in believing that the *Codex Morbacensis* belongs to the same system as the other MSS. which omit Romans, this inference is not changed.

For myself I cannot see any possible answer to this argument, and the attempts of Zahn and Riggensbach to maintain that the Amiatine capitulations are defective have little or no strength.<sup>2</sup> It is not as though the Amiatine system

<sup>1</sup> It is, however, necessary to add that the point is not quite simple. I think Corssen is right, but those who find the point important should read not only his articles, *Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes* in the *ZNTW*, 1909, 1 and 2, but also Dom Donatien de Bruyne's *Une concordance biblique d'origine pélagienne* in the *Revue Biblique*, 1908, pp. 75–83.

<sup>2</sup> Zahn, *Einleitung in das neue Testament*, i, 280 f. (2to auf.), and Riggensbach in the *Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1892, pp. 526 ff., on *Die Textgeschichte der Doxologie, Rom.* 16. 25–27. The full text of the "concordance" can be found in Vezzosi's edition of the works of J. M.

was only found in a few MSS. ; those mentioned by Berger are probably not a twentieth of the whole number, and there seems to be no reason to doubt the obvious conclusion drawn from the facts by a whole series of scholars who have agreed in thinking that the Amiatine capitulations point to a short recension, though they have differed widely enough in their explanation of the fact.

It is obvious that the Latin version implied by the Amiatine capitulations is not the Vulgate, but was ante-Hieronymian, and further traces of the existence of the short text can be found in Latin in Cyprian and in Tertullian. In the case of the former the evidence is merely the dangerous *argumentum e silentio*, but is a very strong example of its kind. In his *Testimonia* he gives a collection of texts from every possible source arranged according to their community of meaning, so as to serve as an arsenal of proof-texts for various dogmas. It is certainly a fact that he does not clearly quote anything from chapters xv. and xvi. of Romans, and each must judge for himself whether this can be accidental. The main point is, that in Test. iii. 68, 78, 95, Cyprian musters the passages enjoining the duty of avoiding heretics, under the three headings, 68 *Recedendum ab eo qui inordinate et contra disciplinam vivat.* 2 Thess. iii. 6. 78. *Cum hereticis non loquendum* Tit. iii. 10 f. ; 1 John ii. 19 ; 2 Tim. ii. 17. 95. *Bonis convivendum malos autem vitandos* (1 Cor. xv. 33). Why does he not quote Romans xvi. 17, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned, etc." ? It is instructive to note that in the spurious *de singularitate clericorum* (Cyprian, ed. Hartel, appendix, p. 212), 2 Thessalonians iii. 6 is quoted and a few lines further down Romans xvi. 17, Thomasius, i, 489, and the Amiatine capitulations in Tischendorf's edition of the *Codex Amiatinus*.

which shows how naturally any one who knew Romans xvi. would have used it in this connexion. It seems to me exceedingly probable that Cyprian had the same short text<sup>1</sup> as the Amiatine capitulations and that this text must be provisionally regarded as having obtained in Africa in the third century. The evidence of Tertullian is, if anything, stronger; for not only is there the same *argumentum e silentio* in the fact that he nowhere quotes chapters xv. and xvi., but in *adv. Marcionem* v. 13 he quotes Romans xiv. 10 and says that this verse comes "in clausula," i.e., in the closing section of the epistle. It is true that he is contrasting the end with the beginning, and Hort (cf. Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 335) argued that this need not imply the absence of the two last chapters. This might be admitted if it were not for the other evidence for a short recension; as it is, the natural interpretation of the facts is that Tertullian, like Cyprian, used a short text of Romans. Moreover, though it be true that the *argumentum e silentio* is much less strong in the case of Tertullian than in that of Cyprian, because he quotes so much less, it is noteworthy that Romans xv. and xvi. are so full of passages opposed to the doctrine of Marcion that it is suggested (by Sanday and Headlam and by Corssen) that the short recension is a Marcionite production: yet Tertullian never alludes to these passages, either to throw at Marcion or to comment on his excision of them,—and he was by no means disposed to pass over Marcion's emendations (real or supposed) in silence, even though he endeavoured to answer the heretic out of his own text.

Thus there is good reason for believing that in Africa, in the second as well as in the third century, the Epistle to the Romans was used in a short text which omitted chapters

<sup>1</sup> The same, that is to say, in extent. It is not probable that the text used by the maker of the Amiatine capitulations was African.

xv. and xvi. The Amiatine capitulations were made for a similarly short text, and suggest that this recension was closed by the doxology which we usually read in Romans xvi. 25–27.

It is, however, improbable that the Amiatine capitulations represent an originally African text. Riggensbach has shown that in the summaries given the text of the epistles is sufficiently closely followed to enable us to identify its character. It is not African; and it is not Vulgate, but represents the European type which was current in Italy before the days of Jerome. Moreover it must have been an early European type, for Ambrosiaster, who represents the later form, did not use the short text. Thus we have early European as well as early African evidence for the short recension. It is at present impossible to say whether there was originally one or more Latin versions; so that we do not know whether this agreement between African and European Latin ought to be taken as representing one or two Greek originals. It is, however, in any case, clear that the evidence takes us back to the second century in Africa, and probably also in Europe.

Another witness, but a suspected one, to the same short text is Marcion. For our knowledge of this fact we are indebted to Rufinus' translation of Origen's commentary on Romans xvi. 25–27. He says, *Caput hoc Marcion, a quo scripturae evangelicae atque apostolicae interpolatae sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit; et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco ubi scriptum est "omne autem quod non est ex fide, peccatum est (xiv. 23) usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit.* The meaning of this passage is one of two things. Clearly it implies that Marcion removed the doxology altogether (*abstulit*), but there is room for doubt as to what he did with the rest of the epistle. What is the meaning of *dissecuit*? The obvious meaning, which is nearly always adopted, seems to be "cut away," but the objection, first made, I think, by Hort, is that this is not

the true meaning either of *dissecuit* or of the Greek which it may be supposed to represent—*διέτεμεν*; it ought rather to be translated “separated off.” This argument gains strength if we try to distinguish between *abstulit* and *dissecuit*. It is perhaps impossible to decide the point; if *dissecuit* be used loosely, it means that Marcion cut away not only the doxology, but also chapters xv. and xvi.; if it be taken strictly, it means that Marcion separated Romans xv. and xvi. from the rest of the epistle, and cut out the doxology which came at the end of chapter xiv. Probably the former view is right, and the difference between *abstulit* and *dissecuit* is to be explained as merely due to a desire for variation.

No MS. exists in any language which preserves the short recension in a pure form; but traces of its influence on the history of the text are obvious. In the Epistle to the Romans as it stands at present in critical editions the arrangement of the contents of the last three chapters is as follows: (1) xiv. 1–23 is devoted to the question of the propriety of observing a distinction between lawful and unlawful food; (2) Romans xv. 1–13 continues the argument on more general lines; (3) Romans xv. 1, 4–33 is chiefly concerned with St. Paul's plans for the future; (4) Romans xvi. 1–20a is a list of greetings to members of the Church to which he writes, and a commendation of Phœbe of Cenchrea; (5) Romans xvi. 20b is a benediction; (6) xvi. 20–23 is a postscript of greetings from companions of St. Paul; and (7) Rom. xvi. 25–27<sup>1</sup> is a closing benediction. It is clear that there is no serious break in thought between xiv. 23 and xv. 1, and that the doxology is in a natural place at the end of everything. Yet in the Antiochene text represented by the great majority of Greek MSS. the doxology comes not at the end, but between chapters xiv. and xv. Moreover, it is certain that this represents an early text, which was adopted, to use

<sup>1</sup> Rom. xvi. 24 is omitted by the R.V. and all critical editors.

Westcott and Hort's expression, by the "Syrian Revisers," because we have the express evidence of Origen that this reading was that of some of the texts which had not been corrupted by Marcion: "*In nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum quem supra diximus, hoc est, Omne autem quod non est ex fide peccatum est, statim cohaerens habetur. Ei autem qui potens est, etc.,*" though he was also acquainted with others which put the doxology at the end of the epistle, and, like modern critical editors believed that this was the right place for it. The same text was used by Chrysostom and Theodoret, so that, leaving out the Latin version for the moment, it would seem as though the Eastern text outside Alexandria had the doxology after chapter xiv., and that in Alexandria it was moved to the end of chapter xvi., though in the time of Origen the MSS. known to him differed on the question.

The history of the Latin text on this point is not easy to follow, owing to our almost complete ignorance of the Old Latin text of the epistle. The facts, however, seem to be these: there were in Latin before Jerome three types: (1) with the doxology at the end of the epistle, used by Ambrosiaster, probably owing to Alexandrian influence; (2) with the doxology after xiv. 23, *Codex Guelpherbytanus* and a fragment at Monza<sup>1</sup> (cod.  $\frac{1-2}{9}$ ); and (3) without any doxology, used by Priscillian and found in *Codex Ambrosianus* E. 26. It is also probable that the archetype of the Graeco-Latin MSS. DEFG ought to be added either to the second or third of these categories.

The most probable solution of these facts seems to me to be that the earliest type of Old Latin had the doxology after xiv. 23 and that the texts of Priscillian and Ambrosias-

<sup>1</sup> For the fullest statement of the facts about this MS. see Dom D. Bruyne, *Des deux derniers chapitres de la lettre aux Romains*, *Revue Bénédictine*, 1908, p. 423 ff.



ter represent the Spanish and Italian attempts to emend an obviously difficult reading. It is, I think, an illustration of the fact that, with the exception of the Alexandrians, the Greeks were less apt to be struck by textual difficulties than the Latins.

It will now be possible to sum up the probabilities of the case with regard to the doxology. It is very improbable that this was originally anywhere than at the end of the epistle, wherever that was: therefore all the MSS. which insert it after xiv. 23 are really evidence for the existence of the short recension, and confirm the witness of Tertullian, Cyprian and the Latin capitulations.

Moreover, it is exceedingly unlikely that any scribe who had the short recension before him, and also knew the long text, would pick out the doxology from xvi. 25-27 and insert it after xiv. 23: he would have added the whole of what was lacking in his text. Therefore it is improbable that the doxology really belongs to chapter xvi. at all; it is more probable that the short recension originally closed with the doxology,<sup>1</sup> while chapters xv. and xvi. ended with the "Grace" followed by a postscript. The textual history of the doxology seems, then, to be explicable as the result of the various efforts of scribes to combine these two. The simplest method was simply to add chapters xv. and xvi., leaving the doxology where it was. This was the course followed by the Antiochene text, and possibly by the archetype of DEFG. A slightly different method was to begin the transition from one text to the other just before the doxology, thus omitting it, and this is the course followed

<sup>1</sup> Dom Bruyne raises the interesting question whether the doxology was not preceded by the "Grace" (xvi. 20*b*). It appears to have been so in the Monza MS., and this would help to clear up the residuum of difficulties concerned with the text of xvi. 20*b* and 24,—a point which I have thought it unnecessary to deal with above. Perhaps Dom Bruyne is right; but the evidence is small. In any case, the point is not of the first importance for the general problem.

by Priscillian. A third course, taken in Alexandria, or at least in circles known to Origen, consisted in moving the doxology from xiv. 23 to the end of the epistle, and this was also done by Ambrosiaster and Jerome. These are the three principal methods, and all the other textual variants seem to be combinations and conflation of them.

The most important conclusion from these results is that there are no longer extant any pure MSS. either of the short or of the long recension; granting the existence of the short recension, it is plain that it now only exists in conflation with the long text, and similarly the existence of the doxology in almost all MSS. is a proof that the long text has been contaminated by the short. The only possible witnesses to the long text, uncontaminated by the short, are Priscillian and MSS. known to Jerome (cf. his comment on Eph. iii. 8); but it is by no means certain that these do not imply omission of the doxology rather than the use of a text which never had it.

In any case, there is, I think, quite convincing proof that in the second and third centuries a short text of Romans was widely used, though it was universally abandoned<sup>1</sup> by the official texts of the fourth century.

It is necessary to go on to show that this short text probably omitted the references to Rome in the first chapter. For this there are three direct witnesses, Origen, Ambrosiaster and *Codex Boernerianus* (G), and the last probably represents in this case the archetype of DEFG.

The evidence of Origen is given directly in *Codex Athous Laurae* 184, a MS. which E. von der Goltz discovered in

<sup>1</sup> It would perhaps be true to say that the process of extinction had already begun in the third century. Origen's text shows clear signs of the short recension, but he certainly regarded the longer text as the only right one, and attributed the short form to Marcion. No doubt the text changed at a varying pace in various places. The short recension seems to have lasted longer in Africa and perhaps in Italy than in Alexandria.

1897<sup>1</sup> to contain a text of the Epistle to the Romans made from the last Greek of the commentary of Origen. This MS. gives, it is true, the words ἐν Ῥώμῃ in Romans i. 7 and 15, but the scribe has been honest enough to add a note to the effect that this was not in his original “ τοῦ ἐν Ῥώμῃ οὔτε ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει οὔτε ἐν τῷ ῥητῷ (i.e., the section of text at the head of the comment) μνημονεύει.” The unexpressed subject of this sentence<sup>2</sup> is of course Origen. Von der Goltz is, however, probably mistaken in thinking that this reading is not confirmed by the Latin text of Origen made by Rufinus. It is true that the words in dispute come in the text, but, as Lightfoot pointed out long ago in *Biblical Essays*, p. 287, the comment does not imply them.

It is possible that Origen knew MSS. containing the word ἐν Ῥώμῃ, but it is at least certain that he preferred to follow others which omitted them, and it is therefore probable that this was the old Alexandrian reading as distinguished from the later recension found in our extant MSS.

Similarly the evidence of Ambrosiaster claims the omission of ἐν Ῥώμῃ for the European Latin, for he says, “ *Quamvis Romanis scribat, illis tamen scribere se significat qui in caritate Dei sunt.* Again, it is true that the text accompanying the comment is *qui sunt Romae in caritate Dei*, but from the comment it is clear that the word *Romae* is a later addition of the scribe, and that the text commented on is *qui sunt in caritate Dei*, which represents in Greek τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ. This is actually the reading found in G, which seems here to have the original text of the archetype of DEFG, while D (if one judge from a comparison of the Latin d and of the copy E), had the conflated reading which is now found in

<sup>1</sup> E. Freiherr von der Goltz, *Eine textkritische Arbeit des zehnten bezw. sechsten Jahrhunderts*, in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen, neue Folge*, ii., 4, 1898.

<sup>2</sup> The same note, but without any explanation, is found in MS. Bodl. Roe 16 (Cod. Paul 47).

the text of Ambrosiaster, *τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ*. This is also found in *Cod. Amiatinus* and *Fuldensis* of the Vulgate : either they represent the opinion of Jerome, or are introducing Old Latin readings.

Thus the absence of the words *ἐν Ῥώμῃ* from the oldest form of the European Latin is as certain as their absence in some Alexandrian MSS. Seeing that the same type of Latin is, through the Latin capitulations and the evidence of the doxology, one of the chief witnesses for the existence of the short text,<sup>1</sup> it is reasonable to think that the omission of *ἐν Ῥώμῃ* was a characteristic of the short recension ; this conclusion is strengthened by finding Origen witnessing both to the omission of the two words, and also to the existence of MSS. which, by their treatment of the doxology, point to the short recension, is supported by the fact that Codex G, which omits *ἐν Ῥώμῃ*, also implies a knowledge of the short form, and would be absolutely proved if Corssen be right (as I believe he is) in thinking that the reconstructed original of DEFG shows that a different textual character in chapters xv. and xvi. from the rest of the epistle,—for it would then be direct evidence that in MS. of the short recension the reference to Rome was wanting.

All the available evidence seems to show that the short recension of Romans was widely known in the second century, and that it was not universally supplanted by the longer form until after the third ; the question then arises whether the same can be said for chapters xv. and xvi., and, if so, whether they ought to be regarded as genuine Pauline writings directed to the Church at Rome, or—whether Pauline or not—intrusive matter.

It is well known that—quite apart from the question of the short recension, doubts have been raised as to chapter xvi.

<sup>1</sup> I can find no satisfactory evidence either way as to the African text of Rom. i. 7. Cyprian never quotes the verse.

Here, it is said, we have much more probably a short note of commendation from St. Paul to the Church at Ephesus. Doubtless there is much to be said on this matter, but I must content myself here with a reference to Zahn, Riggensbach, or Sanday and Headlam, and the expression of my belief that there is no reason to doubt the tradition connecting chapters xv. and xvi., or that both of them were—in some way—sent by St. Paul to Rome.

In this case the problem is to account for the existence of two texts, both equally genuine, in the sense that all the whole sixteen chapters were written by St. Paul.

*The "Marcion hypothesis."*

The most popular solution at present is certainly that offered by Sanday and Headlam, and recently supported with a wealth of learning by Dr. Corssen, to the effect that the short recension was made by Marcion. The arguments for this view are that Marcion undoubtedly did alter the text in some way in order to suit his own purposes, and that it is possible to find passages in Romans xv. and xvi. which may have offended him, so that he cut those chapters off altogether. In any case, he certainly had a text which omitted the doxology, and probably also the two last chapters. The weak point of the argument is not so much in regard to chapters xv. and xvi., as to the omission of the reference to Rome. It is said that Marcion wished to manufacture a general treatise on Christianity instead of a letter to a single Church, and therefore omitted ἐν Ῥώμῃ. But there is no evidence in favour of this, and in the Marcionite prologues<sup>1</sup> the epistle is described as *ad Romanos* in the usual way, which is, of course, no proof that Marcion read ἐν Ῥώμῃ in i. 7, but at least shows that he did not try to

<sup>1</sup> See Dom Donatien du Bruyne, *Prologues Bibliques d'origine Marcionite* in the *Revue Bénédictine*, 1907, p. 1 ff.

treat the epistle as a general treatise. Therefore, supposing that Marcion used the short recension, it is, so far as the omission of ἐν Πώμῃ is concerned, more probable that he used it because he found it already existing than that he manufactured it.

Moreover, in the Marcionite Prologues there is a difference of reading between the various manuscripts as to the place from which *Romans* was sent. The majority say from Corinth, as is the usual tradition, but some say from Athens. Corssen is inclined to regard the latter reading as original, and I believe that he is right, for it is easy to understand how Athens came to be altered to Corinth, but the reverse process is unintelligible. The tradition naming Corinth is generally recognized to be an obvious (and correct) deduction from chapters xv. and xvi. ; if this be so, is it not probable that the tradition mentioning Athens is based on a text, known as it is to have existed, which omitted these chapters ? In this case it would seem more likely that Marcion, the author of the Athens tradition, used the short recension because he found it already in existence, than that he fashioned for the first time. If he had known—but rejected—chapters xv. and xvi., he would surely have chosen Corinth rather than Athens.

Finally, there is the objection that, if it be true that Marcion made the short recension, the influence of the Marcionite text must have been much greater than has hitherto been recognized. This may be the case ; but if so, it is exceedingly important for the history of the text of the Pauline epistles

Various other theories have been invented by various critics to account for the existence of the short recension ; but they have for the most part had but a short and feeble existence, and are now decently buried in the pages of Zahn and similar books. One of the simplest was suggested by

Bishop Lightfoot,<sup>1</sup> who thought that St. Paul may have made the short recension himself in order to give a general account of his position in the controversy between Jewish and Gentile Christians. To this theory the decisive objection is the improbability that any one who was not animated by dogmatic prepossessions, as Marcion is supposed to have been, would ever have split the epistle at xiv. 23. The natural divisions are after xi. 36 ; xiii. 14 ; or xv. 13. Moreover, it is doubtful whether it is on general grounds so likely that an originally local letter was turned into a general treatise, as that the reverse took place.

*An alternative hypothesis : the priority of the short recension.*

Ought not more attention to be paid to the possibility that the short recension is the original form of the text which was afterwards expanded? This view was suggested, in a complicated and somewhat fantastic form, by E. Renan in the introduction to his *L'Apôtre Paul*, and was decisively criticized by Lightfoot in the Essay just mentioned. Yet after all Lightfoot only answered Renan's form of the hypothesis, and I should like to plead that a hearing should be given to a simpler one, as an alternative to the popular Marcionite hypothesis.

The main features of the problem which must be taken into account are two : (1) there was from as early a time as evidence on textual points reaches an epistle to the Romans which stopped at Romans xiv. 23 with or without (I think probably with) the doxology, and without any reference to Rome in chapter i. ; (2) nevertheless, chapters xv. and xvi. are clearly genuinely Pauline, and are never found except as a continuation of the other chapters. I suggest, as a working hypothesis, that the short recension represents a

<sup>1</sup> *Biblical Essays*, pp. 287 ff. It is perhaps not unnecessary to note that this is a reprint of the articles often quoted from the *Journal of Philology*, 1869-71.

letter written by St. Paul at the same time as *Galatians*, in connexion with the question of Jewish and Gentile Christians, for the general instruction of mixed Churches which he had not yet visited. It had originally nothing to do with Rome. Later on he sent a copy to Rome, with the addition of the other chapters to serve, as we should say, as a covering letter.

The arguments in favour of this hypothesis may be formulated somewhat as follows. Assuming that St. Paul first wrote an epistle which in i. 7 read<sup>1</sup> τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν . . . ἀγαπήτοις θεοῦ, κλήτοις ἁγίοις, and ended with xiv. 23 and (possibly) the doxology, what are the probabilities as to its date, the place from which it was written, and the Christians to whom it was addressed? Dealing with the last point first, it is clear that there is nothing whatever to indicate any one community, though the general tone points to those in which Jewish and Gentile Christians came into contact with each other. We have to deal with a general epistle, devoid of address, or of concluding greetings. That is to say, exactly the same phenomena as are found in the best text of *Ephesians*. In that epistle the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are omitted by the critical editors, and the generally received explanation is that it, which we call *Ephesians*, and Marcion called *Laodiceans*, was originally designed exclusively for neither of these Churches, but was a circular epistle in which the name could be filled in according to circumstances. As companion letters to *Ephesians* we have *Colossians*, and *Philemon*, and it would seem that *Ephesians* is the general epistle to the Christians in Asia, *Colossians* an epistle to a special Church in that province, and *Philemon* a private note to an individual Christian either in Colossae or a neighbouring town. The connexion in thought between *Ephesians* and

<sup>1</sup> I reserve the justification of this reconstruction of the text to the end of the article.



*Colossians* is scarcely plainer than that between *Romans* and *Galatians*, and if we take the short recension, the parallel is almost perfect. Why should it not be, then, that *Romans* was originally a general epistle written by St. Paul at the same time as *Galatians*, to the mixed Churches which had sprung up round Antioch, and further on in Asia Minor? In that case we should have another instance of St. Paul's custom of writing a general epistle, and supporting it by a series of letters to the separate Churches<sup>1</sup> in the district for which it was intended.

If this argument be sound, it follows that if you can date *Galatians* you can also date the short form of *Romans*. The date of *Galatians* is no easy problem: but there seems to be a growing consensus of opinion that it ought not to be placed far from the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem. My own view is that it was written before the Council, but soon after is a more popular view. In any case, the circumstances can probably be roughly described thus. In the fifth de-cennium of the first century the two main centres of the Christian Church were Jerusalem and Antioch; in the former the community was essentially Jewish, held to the Jewish law as a matter of course, and had not at first contemplated the possibility of the admission of Gentiles to the Messianic kingdom. The episode of Cornelius finally convinced the Christians of Jerusalem that this possibility was to be reckoned with, and they were theoretically persuaded that the Gospel ought to be preached to the Gentiles. But the problem as to the relation of Gentile converts to the law had never struck them as a practical question: naturally, it was thought, a Gentile who became a Christian would accept

<sup>1</sup> *Galatians* is of course not a letter to a single Church as *Colossians* was. But it was sent to a sharply defined and probably comparatively small circle of Churches—Lystra, Derbe, Iconium being the chief if not the only ones.

the customs of the Jewish Christians who were the original members of the Messianic kingdom. In Antioch, on the other hand, the majority of the Christians were Gentiles, who saw no necessity for accepting all the obligations of the Jewish law, and distinguished between what the original Christians did because they were Christians, and what they did merely because they had been born Jews.

Thus came into existence the two parties which ultimately discussed their differences in Jerusalem. We know from the *Acts* that the Jerusalem Christians, once they saw the gravity of the situation, sent representatives to make propaganda in Antioch and in the daughter churches of Antioch, such as those of Galatia. It is also clear that this campaign was stoutly resisted by St. Paul. Is it not practically certain that *Galatians* belongs to this period and was written to the Galatians in answer to the efforts of the emissaries of the conservative party at Jerusalem,—whether before or after the Council is for the present purpose less important,—and is not the short recension of *Romans* exactly what he might have written at the same time, as a general epistle to be circulated in the neighbourhood of Antioch? <sup>1</sup>

So far there is not much difficulty, and probably no one would deny that, if the present text of *Romans* did not exist and we had only a short form with no reference to Rome, and neither of the two chapters which are now at the end, the similarity of thought to *Galatians* and of form to *Ephesians* would be regarded as sufficient proof that the theory just set out is *primâ facie* probable.

The difficulty is to show that this *primâ facie* probability is not destroyed by chapters xv. and xvi., and that a reason-

<sup>1</sup> The idea has struck me that the title πρὸς Ῥωμαίους may possibly have been attached to it from the beginning. Ῥωμαῖος does not mean an inhabitant of Rome, but a member of the Roman Empire, and it might have been used in this sense in Antioch. But I attach no importance to this suggestion.

able hypothesis can be suggested which retains the advantages of this theory, and yet explains how the two chapters in question came to be attached to the epistle so as to form the long recension.

Sanday and Headlam (who fully accept the existence of the short recension) have long ago pointed out that no theory is satisfactory which does not recognize a connexion of thought between chapters xiv. and xv. This is incontrovertible, but the conclusion which is drawn by them from the fact is unnecessarily far-reaching. They argue that therefore no theory can be accepted which does not regard the short recension as later in time than the long one. If this were the case, I think we should be forced to accept the Marcionite hypothesis with all its important consequences as to the history of the text and the value of existing MSS. But it is not necessary to accept this reasoning. An alternative theory is that St. Paul himself sent a copy of the "short recension" to Rome when he was in Corinth, and added the last two chapters as a "covering letter," in which he naturally took up and expanded the theme which was found at the end of his enclosure. A more or less imaginative reconstruction of the circumstances would be the following :—St. Paul was in Corinth, on the point of departure for Jerusalem, when he was told that Phœbe of Cenchrea was going to Rome, and would like an introduction to his friends in Rome. This was the occasion of his sending a short letter introducing Phœbe and explaining his plans for visiting Rome on his next journey. But he knew through Aquila that in Rome there were difficulties between the Jews and Christians.<sup>1</sup> Now this was just the subject which had been

<sup>1</sup> This is not imaginative, but a legitimate deduction from the statement of Suetonius that the edict of Claudius, which led to Aquila's withdrawal from Rome, was due to an uproar among the Jews—*impulsore Chresto*. How Christianity reached Rome we do not know: but the evidence of Aquila and Suetonius shows that it did so before the year 50 A.D.

the cause of his writing the "short recension" some years previously, so he enclosed a copy and made his "covering letter" begin in such a way as to carry on the thoughts with which he had ended formerly.

The only objection that I can see to this hypothesis is St. Paul ought to have described in his covering letter the contents of his enclosure. It is true that would have been more natural, especially had he been using modern paper and envelopes. But I take it that what happened was that St. Paul told Tertius to make a copy of the "short recension" and then dictated the remainder. If the Romans wished to know any more about the form of the document, and why it so plainly consisted of two parts separated by the doxology, they must ask Phœbe, or quite possibly Aquila knew the facts about the short recension already and would see what St. Paul had done.

The history of the epistle after it reached Rome is another problem which can never be solved with certainty, yet I think that we can form a fair guess. The growth of the *corpus Paulinum* is practically unknown to us. All that we know is that in the second century the progress of collecting Pauline epistles was going on in more than one place, so that in one locality there was one order, in another something different. That is to say, at an early period churches began to exchange copies of St. Paul's epistles, not because of their intrinsic value as letters, but because they were Pauline. It was for that reason that the Epistle to Philemon came into the canon. Considerably earlier than this must have been the time when the letters were copied not simply because they were Pauline, but because they dealt with important subjects. During this time no epistles are more likely to have been copied than *Romans*—in the short form—and *Ephesians*, and as a matter of fact there is no epistle, except perhaps 1 *Corinthians*, which is so well attested in

the subapostolic period as these two. A scribe in Rome would be likely to copy the short form of Romans down to the doxology after xiv. 23, but not to go on to add the "covering letter"; thus the short form would come into circulation from Rome, and it is also probable that other copies were circulating in the East which were from the beginning independent of the Roman tradition. As soon, however, as the emphasis of interest came to fall not on the contents but on the authorship of the epistles the tendency was to copy and circulate everything which was Pauline, and so in future copies of *Romans* made in Rome the "covering letter" would be added, and the original form of the "long recension" (with the doxology still in the original place after xiv. 23?) would come into circulation, copies of the short recension would be amplified by the addition of the fresh material, and the complicated textual process described at the beginning of this article would begin. A parallel to this process may probably be found in 2 Corinthians. The remarkable book of Dr. Kennedy ought, I think, to convince every one who takes the trouble to study its pages that this epistle is really a combination of the fragments of two letters,<sup>1</sup> copied out in order in Corinth at a time when interest in anything Pauline had become a dominating feature of Christian literary activity. The interval evidence is here much stronger than it is in *Romans*, but on the other hand there is no trace of any textual evidence. It is perhaps interesting to ask why the textual tradition should be less strong in the case of 2 *Corinthians* than in that of *Romans*. Probably the answer is to be found in the

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Kennedy, *The Second and Third Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. Methuen & Co., 1900. I fancy that this learned book has not generally received the recognition that it deserves. In spite of a certain obscurity of style, it seems to me to be far away the best book on the subject in any language, and to state the case in a way which avoids the objections usually made to the Vier-Capitel-Hypothese.

independent circulation of the short form of *Romans*, and in the fact that *2 Corinthians* seems to come into general use much later than *1 Corinthians*—Dr. Kennedy suggests only after the Epistle of Clement drove the Corinthians to look at their archives and find various fragments of an almost forgotten correspondence.

That the theory which is suggested as to the history of the Epistle to the Romans can never become more than a possible hypothesis is, of course, obvious, nor would I venture to claim that it has self-evident probability. But the fact that a "short form" did exist in the second and third centuries is certain, and has to be dealt with somehow. The theory which holds the field is that of a Marcionite recension: feeling that this is unsatisfactory, I have ventured to suggest an alternative which, though not simple, seems to me to do more justice to the facts, which are also not simple, and to be supported by the analogy of other epistles.

It only remains to deal with some subordinate points which could not be discussed advantageously in the course of the main argument.

(1) What was really the original text of Romans i. 7? We have in the oldest authorities a choice between *τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ρώμῃ ἀγαπήτοις θεοῦ*, and *τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ*. I suggest that the original was *τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν . . . ἀγαπήτοις θεοῦ*, with a blank for the name of community (just as seems to be the case in *Ephesians*). If the name were not filled in and the blank space not left we should get in connected script **ΤΟΙΣ ΟὐΣΙΝ ΕΝ ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΙΣ ΘΕΟΥ**, and a very natural correction would be the removal of the **ΤΟΙΣ** before **ΘΕΟΥ**. If this be not so, I think *ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ* is probably the right reading and *ἀγαπήτοις* a stylistic emendation, though the point is difficult to decide.

(2) An advantage of the theory suggested is that it enables us to bring *Romans* and *Galatians* chronologically together,

and to have fewer doubts as to the true date of *Galatians*. It may be said in general that the most obvious lines of argument tend to place *Galatians* before 1 *Corinthians* and close to the Apostolic Council, but there has always been the difficulty that *Galatians* is so like *Romans*, and *Romans* seemed to be fixed after 2 *Corinthians*. This has been felt especially by Lightfoot and Askwith, and their arguments have never been answered but only put aside. If, however, *Romans* i. to xiv. be separated from xv. to xvi. the position is turned, and we can bring *Galatians* and *Romans* i.–xiv. together without difficulty.

(3) It may be said that the early date suggested for *Romans* i. to xiv. is negatived by a comparison between *Romans* xiv. and 1 *Corinthians* viii. This is a really serious point, but I think that the argument can and ought to be turned. *Romans* xiv. implies a difference of opinion about food in general; this is the situation implied by the Apostolic Council, and by the episode of St. Peter in Antioch, which ought probably to be placed just before the council. To my own mind it is most easily explained (as in *Galatians*) if it be placed before the agreement represented in the Apostolic decrees. On the other hand, 1 *Corinthians* viii. is not concerned with food in general, but with *εἰδωλόθυστα* and the practical working of the Apostolic decree against *εἰδωλόθυστα*, and this is the background against which the whole chapter must be placed in order to be understood. Placed against this 1 *Corinthians* viii. is intelligible,<sup>1</sup> and *Romans* xiv. is obscure—at least not to me—but it becomes clear as soon as it is placed against the different background which is earlier than the Apostolic decrees.

KIRSOPP LAKE.

<sup>1</sup> I would, however, guard myself against seeming to admit that the Apostolic decrees represent a Food-law,—but that is another question, and not a short one.