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 of all others, we might expect to find the distinction between Jew and   
 Gentile pass into the background, the subject being, the constitution and   
 glories of the universal Church: 3) that, as before remarked (under 7),   
 indications are not wanting of the mixed composition of the Ephesian   
 Church. Surely “that He might make the two into one new man in   
 Himself” would not have been written to a Church exclusively Gentile.   
 To the latter objection I answer, that in no one of the passages cited   
 is there the slightest intimation of their having been recently converted;   
 —but, if any temporal conclusion can be drawn from them, all three   
 testify rather to a considerable period having elapsed since that event.   
 In ch. y. 8 we have, “ Ye were once darkness, but now are light in the   
 Lord:” in i. 18, “ When ye also believed, ye were sealed . . .:” in ii. 18,   
 “Ye who were once far off, became nigh.”   
 Of the first and third of these, we may observe that the same word,   
 once, designates their unconverted state, by which he designates his own   
 in Gal. i. 13, 23 bis, Tit. iii. 3: yet his conversion was by many years   
 antecedent to that of the Ephesians. Of the second and third, that the   
 indefinite past tenses serve to remove both the things spoken out of the   
 category of recent events. Had their conversion been recent, and its   
 presence, as an act, still abiding, we should have read the perfect tense   
 here and not the indefinite past.   
 15. Having endeavoured to give a reply to these internal objections   
 to the Ephesian view of the Epistle, I go on to notice the external diffi-   
 culties besetting the view which I have taken.   
 16, They may be summed up in a discussion of the various reading in   
 ch. i. 1, by which in Ephesus is omitted from the text. Basil the Great   
 says: “ Writing to the Ephesians as truly united to Him that 1s, by   
 knowledge, he uses, in addressing them, the peculiar appellation of   
 ‘those that are: saying, ‘To the saints that arr, and the faithful in   
 Christ Jesus.’ For thus those before us have handed down the text,   
 and thus we have found it in our older copies.” From this we infer,   
 that Basil received our Epistle as really written to the Ephesians, but   
 read ch. i, 1 without the words in Ephesus, both traditionally, and be-   
 cause he had seen it so read in ancient MSS. The testimony then does   
 not touch the recognition of the Epistle as written to the Ephesians, but   
 simply the insertion or omission of these words in the text; a matter   
 with which we will deal below.   
 17. “ This assertion of Basil’s is confirmed by Jerome, Epiphanius, and   
 Tertullian.” C. and H. vol. ii. p. 487.   
 Lhave discussed these testimonies in my Greek Test., vol. iii. (Prolegg.   
 p- 16 f.), and have shewn that none of them are strictly applicable.   
 18. If it be thought necessary to deal with the fact of the omission of   
 in Ephesus in our two most ancient MSS., we may find at least an illus-   
 tration of it in the words in Rome (Rom. i. 7) being omitted in some   
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