

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE VARIOUS READINGS OF
1 TIMOTHY III. 16.

BY REV. WILLIAM H. WARD, UTICA, N. Y.

Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον· Θεὸς ἐφανερῶδη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώδη ἐν πνεύματι, ὤφθη ἀγγέλους, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ᾧννεσω, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ.

INSTEAD of Θεός in this passage many editors read *ὅς*, and some writers have defended *ὁ*. The latter reading may at once be dismissed as untenable, not being supported by any such authority as either of the others, and being plainly a grammatical variation, introduced for the purpose of relieving an apparent impropriety in the gender of *ὅς*. The question then rests between *ὅς* and Θεός. Having endeavored carefully to investigate all the authorities for either reading, as far as they are accessible to us, we propose to give the result of this labor in such a form that the reader can easily decide for himself between the two readings.

While Θεός in this passage supports the divinity of Christ, this is not a doctrine which rests on any single text. If the result of criticism could be proved adverse to this reading, it would not affect our general faith. God does not leave such an important doctrine as the Trinity to depend on so few and feeble arguments that a single proof-text more or less makes any appreciable difference in our belief.

VOL. XXII. No. 85. — JAN. 1865.

We have perfect confidence in the principles of our faith, and look with no feelings of concern upon investigations of the purity of the scripture text. Even with the reading $\delta\varsigma$, some of the early Fathers, as will be seen, deduced from this passage the divinity of Christ, and Dr. S. Clarke truly says of this passage, that "the same is evident; that that person was manifest in the flesh, whom John in the beginning of his gospel styles $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, God."¹

I. MANUSCRIPTS.

The authority of this source of evidence in identifying the original text is paramount to all others. Although they are not, of course, accessible in this country, yet accurate copies of all the older MSS. have been published, and in the case of doubtful readings they have been carefully and repeatedly examined by the most competent critics. A collection of their researches will be as satisfactory as any personal examination, especially as we have in the case of the older MSS. (κ and D excepted) the advantage of good facsimiles, or even photographs, of this passage.

The *Codex Sinaiticus*, distinguished as κ , and belonging to the fourth century, clearly reads $\delta\varsigma$ *a prima manu*. Tischendorf says: "*A prima $\delta\varsigma$ ἐφανερώθη*. Another corrector, the latest of all who have altered this MS., of nearly the twelfth century, has substituted $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, but so carefully has he done it, that he has left the more ancient writing untouched."² This seems to leave the reading of this most ancient MS. in no kind of doubt. Would that we could say as much for some of the others.

The *Alexandrian* MS., which is marked as Codex A, and belongs probably to the fifth century, has been referred to as authority by the advocates of either reading. The form $\overline{\delta\varsigma}$, as it now appears, is the ordinary contraction for $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, but it has evidently been altered or retouched at quite a

¹ Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, by Samuel Clarke, D.D. (3d ed., 1732), p. 89.

² Not. Codicis Sinaitici, p. 20.

late period.¹ The heavy black line above the letters and the point within the Θ are palpably modern, and at present there is no trace visible of either line as drawn by the original scribe, if such were the case. It is true that the superior line is so heavy that it would conceal any earlier one, but the mark within the Θ consists of a simple dot within the circle, instead of a diametral line extending across the Θ ; and it might be supposed that if a transverse line were originally present, some faint remains of it might yet be discovered on either side of the central point; but such is not the case. It is said, however, that this line, if originally present, might now be completely worn away, although faintly seen a century or two ago. Indeed, the passage has been so repeatedly examined that this page has become somewhat defaced.² It has accordingly been the practice of the defenders of the reading $\Sigma\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ to refer the whole question to the authority of the earlier critics who have examined our text. But even they speak of the old line as being exceedingly faint, although most of them assert that traces of it were visible. It is to be noted, however, that neither Patricius Junius nor Mr. Huish who collated this MS. for Walton's Polyglot makes any definite assertion in reference to this passage. In fact Huish, whose negative authority has been much relied on, in no case notices the reading of the original scribe where it differs from that of the corrector.

The earliest distinct notice which we find of the reading of A is by Mill, who says, in his critical edition, published A.D. 1707, "This transverse line of which I speak is so faint and evanescent, that at first sight I did not doubt that it was written $\delta\varsigma$, which I therefore had placed among the

¹ Perhaps by Patricius Junius, curator of the royal library in the time of Charles I. See Wetstein's *Nov. Test.*, Vol. L, Proleg. pp. 20, 21, also Wotton's *Clement*, Cap. 6, pp. 26, 27.

² Griesb. *Symbol. Crit.*, Vol. I. p. x. Others say that the passage itself has not been defaced, only that part of the page being affected where the hand has rested while holding the microscope. The facsimile given by Porter seems to confirm the statement.

various readings, but afterwards, having more carefully examined the passage (*perlustrato attentius loco*), I found some marks and remains sufficiently distinct (*satis certa*) of the line which at first had escaped my examination, especially towards the left side, where it touches the circumference of the letter."¹

. Next after Mill we find that the passage was examined by Wetstein, in the year 1716 or 1717,² in order to discover what Mill had supposed himself to see, "*perlustrato attentius loco*," but he failed to find any traces of the more ancient lines. In 1718 Henry Wotton seems to have found the transverse line quite plain compared with the previous experience of Mill and Wetstein. He says: "In this MS., without doubt, was always read Θ *ἐφανερώθη*, as will readily be discovered by any one who inspects it quite carefully [*accuratioribus oculis*]."³

About twenty years later, Rev. J. Berriman made a careful examination of this passage, with several of his friends; the result of which was published in 1741. He says: "I have several times carefully examined this manuscript myself, and though I could never perceive any part of the old transverse line by the naked eye (nor others who were with me, whose eyes were better than mine), yet by the aid of a glass and the advantage of the sun shining on the book, I could see some part of the old line toward the left hand of the new stroke within the circle of the Θ , and the same was seen by two gentlemen who viewed it at the same time; one of whom also could discern some remainder of the old line towards the right hand, as well as the other towards the left."⁴

It will be seen that the transverse stroke was so faint that it could be only seen on the most minute examination, and then only with a microscope, the leaf being held in the sun-

¹ Mill's Nov. Test., in 1 Tim. iii. 16.

² Wetstein's Nov. Test., Proleg. p. xx.

³ Epistles of Clement, p. 27 (Oxford, 1710).

⁴ Berriman's Works, Vol. V. pp. 155, 156.

light. It was left for Wetstein, in the year 1746, to explain the faint appearance of this line. His discovery may best be given in his own words. He says: "I asked an old friend to take me into the Royal Library, and when he had done it, and carefully examined this passage in the Alexandrian MS., not only with the naked eye, but with various kinds of glasses, he pronounced that it had originally been written in no other way than OC; but when I sought towards the left for the line of Mill and Berriman, I found it indeed, but when I wished to show it to my friend, I could not, because it had vanished; and when the line alternately appeared and again disappeared, and I was not a little perplexed by the phantasm, my friend, with his peculiar penetration, immediately suggested the cause, and showed that the line was not written on the page where it is read $\delta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\delta\eta$, but on the other side of the leaf, where is written $\kappa\alpha\tau'$ $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\nu$ (1 Tim. vi. 3), and that it formed a part of the first letter ϵ of the word $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\nu$. For when the book was laid on the table, as often as the leaf which we were considering was so placed on the following leaves that it should touch and cover the whole of the next leaf, the line could not be seen, because the parchment was opaque; but as soon as the leaf was so raised and separated from the following leaves that both sides should be shone upon, not only was this line seen through the translucent parchment, but even whole letters and words."¹ This explanation of Wetstein, that the supposed faint transverse line was only the sagitta of the ϵ seen through the thin vellum, is probably the true one. Woide, the learned editor of this Codex, endeavored in his Prolegomena to throw discredit upon it; but it has been defended by Tischendorf,² Porter,³ Tregelles,⁴ and more lately by Ellicott,⁵ so satisfactorily that there seems but little room to doubt its correctness.

¹ Wetstein's Nov. Test., Vol. I., Proleg. p. xxii.

² Cod. Rescr. (ed. Tischendorf), p. xlii.

³ Principles of Text. Critic., p. 487.

⁴ Printed Text of Griesb. Nov. Test., p. 228.

⁵ Commentary on 1 Tim. iii. 16; also note on p. 100. This note seems

It is astonishing how many errors Dr. Henderson has compressed into the single page which he devotes to the Alexandrian MS. He says: "This proof (of its reading $\Sigma\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$) is furnished by the unimpeachable testimony of Junius, Huish, Mill, Wotton, Croyk, Berriman, Ridley, Hewitt, and Pilkington, who carefully and minutely inspected the passage before it became illegible, and found the genuine transverse line in the Θ . To these names may be added those of Walton, Tell, Bentley, and Grabe, all of whom had access to this MS. at an earlier period, and who concur in its exhibiting ΘC and not OC . The evidence thus elicited was attempted to be set aside by Wetstein, who on first examining the MS. was able to discover no stroke, and conjectured that what Mill had taken for it was merely the line of an E in the word $\epsilon\tau\text{C}\epsilon\text{B}\epsilon\text{I}\text{A}\text{N}$ on the opposite side of the leaf, which made its appearance through the vellum; but on inspecting the Θ more minutely afterwards, he found that the fine stroke which was originally in the body of the letter was discoverable at each end of the fuller stroke, with which some corrector had retouched it."¹

most satisfactory, especially as coming from so sound a critic. His experiment consists of having the leaf held in the light, so that the edge of an instrument held on the obverse side of the leaf, exactly over the sagitta of the O , can be seen through the leaf by an observer looking at the suspected letter. In opposition to Woide, he finds that this sagitta exactly corresponds with the supposed transverse line of the Θ . Scrivener asserts, however, in his Introduction to the Criticism of the New Test. (1859), p. 453, that Ellicott's experiment is too delicate to be reliable. It is remarkable that neither Tregelles, nor Scrivener, who has examined this passage "twenty times within as many years" (p. 453), has noticed Prof. Porter's statement that a pinhole, made by some one at the extremity of the sagitta, falls exactly upon the supposed transverse line. One could hardly suppose that a pinhole sufficiently distinct to be pointed out, as Prof. Porter says, to Sir F. Madden, keeper of the MSS. in the Museum, could have become *worn out* by the lapse of time. We may add that Prof. Porson spent two days examining this passage, and was satisfied that the original reading of A was $\zeta\varsigma$. See Porson's Tracts, p. 290.

As an offset to the suspicion of Woide that some critics, like Wetstein, may have failed to see the transverse line because they did not wish to do so, may be placed the testimony of Hempelius, who affirmed that the reading was certainly $\zeta\varsigma$, although, as he informed Woide, he had expected and desired to read $\Sigma\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$. Vide Spohr's Woide's Proleg., p. 181.

¹ Biblical Repository, Vol. II. p. 82.

Here are almost as many errors as assertions. We will examine his statements in order.

1. *Junius* nowhere makes the slightest reference to this passage.

2. The same is true of *Huish*. The only foundation for this statement is that *Huish* collated this Codex for *Walton's Polyglot*, and failed to notice any various reading in this passage. The word had been previously altered or retouched, and he does not notice the fact.

3. *Mill* found the "genuine transverse line" so faint that at first in his *Various Readings* he referred to this MS. as authority for $\delta\varsigma$.

4. *Wotton* certainly defends the reading $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, but even he says it can only be seen by examining the letter *accuratioribus oculis*.

5. *Croyk* is he who informed *Berriman* that he remembered having plainly seen the transverse line "twenty-five years ago,"¹ about the year 1716. This is the only authority which we have been able to discover that it was ever at all distinct, and we shall be obliged to throw discredit upon it, as it was about the time of *Wetstein's* first examination, and long after that of *Mill*.

6. *Berriman* distinctly asserts that he "could never perceive any part of the old transverse line by the naked eye," although able by the help of a glass to "perceive some part" of it when the leaf was held in the full sunshine.

7. *Ridley, Gibson, Hewitt, and Pilkington* were the four gentlemen who examined the passage with *Berriman*; ² all of whom were indebted to the combined advantages of a microscope and the bright sunlight for their discovery.

8. *Walton, Tell, Bentley, and Grabe* did not have "access to this MS. at an earlier period" than some before mentioned. In fact, *Junius* took charge of it when first presented to *Charles I.*

9. *Walton* never, as far as is known, examined this pas-

¹ *Berriman's Diss.*, p. 154, also *Woide's Proleg.* to *Alex. MS.*, p. 31.

² *Nolan's Greek Vulgate*, p. 285, note; also *Woide's Proleg.*, p. xxx.

sage, but confided the collation of this MS. to Huish. Is it possible that Henderson refers to Wotton, whose name has been Latinized into Waltonus by Wetstein,¹ and perhaps others?

10. Dean *Tell*, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, published an edition of the Greek Testament in 1765; his name, however, being suppressed. His collation of this MS. was drawn chiefly from Junius and Huish. He says nothing of the reading in this passage.

11. *Bentley*, as far as we can learn, nowhere speaks of the reading of this MS. as $\Sigma\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$; certainly not in his *Essay on Freethinking*, nor in the Notes for his projected edition, which have been published.

12. *Grabe* edited the Old Testament portion of the Alexandrian Codex, and in his MS. of the New Testament portion, preserved in the Bodleian, is this note:² "Some modern pen, I know not whose, has heavily retouched the line within the Θ , and also the stroke drawn over the word, lest otherwise it should be read $\delta\varsigma$." *Grabe* says nothing of the distinctness of the "genuine" lines.

13. The statement of Henderson in reference to *Wetstein's* subsequent discovery of the nearly obliterated transverse line is incorrect in almost every particular. It may be true that, when first in England, he supposed on one occasion while examining this MS., that he saw the old line, and so told *Berriman's* anonymous correspondent; but, if so, this was twenty-five years *before* he found that the phantasm of the line was due to the stroke on the other side of the leaf; so that the last statement of Henderson is utterly incorrect. Had he appended references to his statements, their correctness could have been more easily verified.

The Vatican MS., B, does not contain this Epistle.

Codex C, or *Ephraemi Syri*, is a MS., probably of the fifth century, over which, has been written a part of the works of *Ephraem Syrus*. The ancient text has been chem-

¹ Prolegom., p. xxii.

² Quoted by *Woide*, pp. xxx and 76, or *Spohr's* Leipsic ed., p. 421.

ically restored, and has been published by Tischendorf, who has also given us a beautiful facsimile of this passage. This MS. had been regarded as authority for Deós till Wetstein questioned its reading. He says: "C, I think, has δ ; for the slender line which converts O into Θ is not apparent,¹ and the other line, drawn over the letters ΘC as a sign of contraction for Deós , and which elsewhere is drawn evenly over them, is so made, with a more heavy and unskilful stroke, that it seems to betray a different hand."² This supposed inelegance, other critics, as Woide and Less, failed to discover; but Griesbach, in his notice of this MS.,³ ably and satisfactorily defends the opinion of Wetstein. Since the ancient text has been restored, and the transverse stroke of the Θ brought to light, Tischendorf has found fresh reason to believe that the relative was the original reading. His facsimile seems to confirm this opinion. He even goes so far as to assign the change to his second corrector, relying on the character of the strokes and the color of the ink.⁴ Tregelles confirms the reading of Tischendorf.⁵

Codex D, or *Claromontanus*, dates from the seventh or eighth century, and was written by a Latin *librarius*. It contains the Greek and Latin texts in parallel columns. At present it reads Deós , but it has been conclusively proved by Griesbach,⁶ and is now generally admitted, that the original reading was δ . The change was made by erasing enough of the original O to convert it into C and then prefixing a Θ , which could be readily done, as the word happens to begin the line.⁷ The Θ will then, of course,

¹ The transverse line was not visible till the writing had been chemically restored.

² Wetstein's Nov. Test. in 1 Tim. iii. 16.

³ Symbol. Crit., Vol. I. pp. viii-xxv.

⁴ Codex Rescr. (ed. Tischendorf), p. xlii.

⁵ Printed Text of Griesb. Nov. Test., p. 228.

⁶ Symbol. Crit., Vol. II. pp. xlii, lvi-lxxvii.

⁷ The same explanation of this alteration is given by Le Clerc in his *Epist. de Ed. Nov. Test. Millii*, prefixed to Küster's edition of Mill (1768).

protrude beyond the regular commencement of the line, while in shape it is more circular than the same letter as drawn by the original scribe, and the *C* has the general outlines of the *O* out of which it was made. This MS., is the only one known which has *ō*, and a reading so unique is no doubt referable to the Latin scribe, who accommodated the relative to his Latin text, which has *quod*. Tischendorf has also edited this MS. and says: "It is most certain that the first hand wrote *O*, and the third *ΘC*."¹

The MSS., designated as F and G, *Augiensis* and *Boernerianus*, of about the ninth century, agree in reading *ōs*. They closely resemble each other, and seem to be copies of the same exemplar. Scrivener has given, in his edition of F, a photograph of this passage, which shows that he is right in saying, "*ōs* most expressly."² A facsimile of this passage as found in G is given by Matthaei.³

J and K, Moscow MSS. of the ninth or tenth century, have *Θεός*.

All the cursive MSS. agree in reading *Θεός*, with the exception of 17 (33 of the Gospels, called sometimes "the Queen of the Cursives"), 73, and 181.

Reviewing the testimony of the MSS., we find that all which are older than the ninth century, either probably or certainly, have a relative, and that relative, with one exception, *ōs*, while all of a later date, but three, read *Θεός*. In point of antiquity, the great preponderance is for *ōs*, in point of numbers, for *Θεός*.

II. ANCIENT VERSIONS.

Next in value to the MSS. as a means of determining the true state of the sacred text, stand the Ancient Versions. With remarkable unanimity all which possess any critical value reject the reading *Θεός*. The only question is, which relative do they favor, *ōs* or *ō*? The difference between them is so slight as not to affect the sense, if the mystery

¹ p. 584.

² p. 282.

³ Nov. Test. (ed. Matthaei), Vol I. p. 286.

passage be translated, "Great is the mystery of godliness, that he," i.e. *God*, referring to the clause "house of God" in the fifteenth verse, was manifested in the flesh,"² a most improbable supposition.

The *Philoxenian* Version, made A.D. 508, is generally remarkable for its servile adherence to the Greek. Its translation reads: $\Delta\sigma\epsilon\beta\alpha\iota\ \eta\ \theta\epsilon\upsilon\ \sigma\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\eta\ \theta\epsilon\upsilon\ \sigma\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$. "And confessedly great is the mystery of the *good fear of God*, who [or *which*] was manifested in the flesh." The only question which can be raised here is whether "the good fear of God" is to be regarded as a compound expression equivalent to *εὐσέβεια*. White, who edited this version, so regards it, and translates the whole clause simply by *pietatis*. It is remarkable, however, that this is the only case in which *εὐσέβεια* is translated by $\eta\ \theta\epsilon\upsilon\ \sigma\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$, *good fear of God*; its usual equivalent being simply $\Delta\sigma\epsilon\beta\alpha\iota$, *good fear*. The addition of $\eta\ \theta\epsilon\upsilon$, *God*, seems then to favor *θεός*, while the use of the relative η favors *ὃς*. In 1 Tim. ii. 10, the same full form, *good fear of God*, occurs as the translation of *θεοσέβεια*, and it would seem probable that the translator either found that reading in the present passage, or, which is more probable, was aware that both *ὃς* and *θεός* were current, and endeavored to combine them both in his translation. Mar Xénayas, under whose auspices this version was made, was one of the leaders in the Monophysite controversy, and no doubt acquainted with the charge made against Macedonius of corrupting this passage.

In the margin of this version is added $\sigma\alpha\iota$, *ille*, which White thinks was meant to be inserted before $\eta\ \theta\epsilon\upsilon$, as a fuller form of the relative, but without rendering its gender any clearer.¹ But this seems too trivial an alteration even for the *Philoxenian* Version, and we conjecture that it

¹ White's *Philox. Version*, 1 Tim. iii. 16; also note, p. 338.

the Syriac, and *quod* in the Latin, for in this shorter form of the verse, **H** is preceded only by the demonstrative **Ἦ.Η.**

The *Coptic* or *Memphitic* Version, which has been referred to the third century, as edited by both Wilkins and Boeticher, translates τὸ μυστήριον by *ΠΙ ΜΥCΤΗΡΙΟΝ*, and for the relative gives us *ΦΗ ΕΤ*, i.e. *ille qui*.

In the *Thebaic* Version, which is perhaps even more ancient, the form is almost identical with the Memphitic. Both certainly have the relative, but do not distinguish its gender.

The *Gothic* Version, of the fourth century, translates μυστήριον by the feminine substantive *runa*, and connects with it the *masculine* relative *saci*, which seems to require *δς* rather than *δ*. The adjective *mikils*, *great*, is also masculine, though connected with the feminine *runa*, the mystery being referred personally to Christ, and the gender of *mikils* being determined by the idea rather than the grammatical form of the noun with which it is connected.

The *Armenian* Version, belonging to the fifth century, plainly has a relative.

The various *Arabic* Versions are all too modern to possess any critical authority, unless an exception be made in favor of a MS. version preserved in the Vatican. With the exception of the Arabic of the Polyglot they all have a relative.

The *Slavonic* and *Georgian*, which are of even less weight than the Arabic, are said to favor *θεός*.

It will, then, be seen that all the versions made previous to the sixth century have the relative, and that, with the apparent exception of the Gothic, they leave its gender in doubt, a point which can be decided only by the Greek MSS. As these afford but very slight support to *δ*,—only a single copy having this reading, and then probably arising from grammatical accommodation to the Latin which is written beside it,—the versions may confidently be adduced as unanimously supporting *δς*.

III. AUTHORITY OF THE FATHERS.

Our third source of evidence is the authority of the Fathers. All their citations which have any bearing upon our text we will endeavor to give from minute personal examination of the original authorities, omitting, however, those Latin Fathers who did not also use the Greek, and who are therefore authority only for the Old Latin or the Vulgate Version. It is to be premised that it is difficult always to discover the original text of the Fathers, especially in quotations of scripture, because scribes, and too often editors, have altered these quotations so as to make them correspond with their own copies of the scriptures. Accordingly we may rely with more confidence on the comments connected with our text than on the words in which we now find it quoted. The mere citation of this passage with the reading Θεός is no sure sign that such was the real reading of an author, for the temptation to change ὁς to Θεός has been very strong, while, as all the later MSS. have Θεός, and this also seems the more orthodox reading, there has been since the sixth century no such tendency to alter Θεός to ὁς. This being the case, a citation of this passage with the reading ὁς almost certainly has not been altered, while with the reading Θεός it may have suffered corruption. This principle may be expressed in more general terms: when of two earlier readings one has at a later period become universal, the writings of the early Fathers may in all honesty of intention be so altered as to accord with the received reading, but not with the obsolete one. In accordance with this rule, a citation with the reading ὁς has more probably not been altered than with the reading Θεός.

Again, the passage may be alluded to in such a way as to indicate what was the author's reading, although not formally quoted. If we read that "the mystery of godliness was manifested in the flesh," we may be sure that the writer's copy of the scriptures contained only a relative

between *μυστήριον* and *ἐφανερῶδη*. On the other hand, if an author frequently allude to this passage, persistently connecting *θεός* with some form of *φανερῶ*, we may be sure that he read this passage as in the *Textus Receptus*, while if he generally connects *ἐφανερῶδη* with such subjects as *κύριος*, *υἱός*, *Χριστός*, and *σωτήρ*, instead of *θεός*, it is a probable proof that *θεός* was not in his copy, although the presumption is much weakened if such subjects are connected with the subsequent predicates. Thus, little can be gathered from Origen's remark: "My Saviour is said to have been received up into glory."

It may be added of Latin translations of Greek Fathers that they are especially worthy of confidence, as correctly expressing the original, in cases where they show a variation from the Vulgate.

The following Fathers *clearly* support *ὄς*:—

1. *Epiphanius*. A.D. 368. Ὁς ἐφανερῶδη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώδη ἐν πνεύματι.¹ This passage is found in a long quotation from the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius, taken by him into his *Panarium*. The two passages have been generally quoted as independent authorities, and correctly so, as Epiphanius himself transferred these sections from one work to the other. In the *Ancoratus*, as we now have it, *ὄς* is omitted,² a remarkable omission if the reading had been *θεός*.

2. *Theodorus of Mopsuestia*. A.D. 407.

a. Ὁς ἐφανερῶδη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώδη ἐν πνεύματι· δεδικαιώσθαι ἐν πνεύματι λέγων αὐτὸν εἶτε ὡς, κ. τ. λ.³ "Who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit; saying that he was justified in the spirit either because, etc."

b. *Consonantia et apostolus dicit, et manifeste magnum est*

¹ *Panarium*, Tom. I. p. 894 (Coloniae, 1682). A single MS. of little note is said to read *ὄς* for *ὄς*, viz. the Cod. Rhedig. of the fifteenth century, noted by Oehler in his edition of the *Panarium*, Vol. I. Part I. p. 157.

² *Ancor.* 69, Tom. I. p. 894.

³ *De Incarn.* ap. Leont. Hieros. Fragm. 21. *Maii Script. Vet. Vat. Coll.*, Tom. VI. p. 303. The same passage translated into Latin by Fr. Tarrasius may be found in *Basnago's Thesaurus*, Tom. I. p. 583.

*pietatis mysterium, qui manifestatus est in carne, justificatus in spiritu.*¹ "And agreeably with this the apostle says: 'And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness, who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit.'" Note here, that this old translation from the Greek varies from the Vulgate in having *mysterium* for *sacramentum*, and *qui manifestatus* instead of the neuter form, and therefore no doubt correctly represents the original of Theodorus.

Less decisive in its present form is the following:

*c. Christum justificatum et immaculatum factum virtute Sancti Spiritus, sicut beatus Paulus modo quidem dicit quod justificatus est in spiritu.*² "Christ was justified and made spotless by the agency of the Holy Spirit, as Paul says, in one place, that he was justified by the spirit," etc.

d. In another place Theodorus speaks of Christ as not needing to be "justified by the Spirit," if the proper Godhead dwelt in him; ³ a comment hardly appropriate had he read Θεός . . . ἐδικαιώθη ἐν.

3. *Cyril of Alexandria.* A.D. 412. This author has been quoted at times as favoring Θεός, but it may be abundantly proved that his real reading is ὁς. He several times quotes this passage.

*a. Πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς, μήτε μὴν τῆς εὐσεβείας τὸ μέγα μυστήριον, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ Χριστόν, ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη, κ. τ. λ. Εἴη γὰρ ἂν οὐχ ἕτερον οἶμαι τι τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, ἢ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος, ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. Bis.*¹ "Ye err, not knowing the scriptures, nor indeed the great mystery of godliness, that is, Christ, who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, etc. ; for the mystery of godliness could be nothing else, I think, than the Word of God the Father sent to us, who was mani-

¹ De Incarn., Lib. XIII., ap. Concil. Constant. II., Mansi, Tom. IX. col. 221. Henderson calls both Theodorus and Epiphanius Diaconus "Latin Fathers," pp. 35, 64.

² Ad Baptizandos, Mansi, Tom. IX. col. 218.

³ Ibid., col. 206.

⁴ De Incarn. Unig. Dial. VIII. (ed. Aubert), Tom. V. Part 1. pp. 680, 681 ; also, in nearly the same words, De Recta Fide, Tom. V. Part. II. p. 6.

fested in the flesh." This explanation necessarily requires the reading *ὅς*, for if *Θεός* takes its place, the *mystery* is evidently the great *doctrine* of redemption through the God-man, and not the *person* of the Word of God.

b. "Ὁς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι· κατ' οὐδένα γὰρ τρόπον ταῖς ἡμετέραις ἀσθενείαις ἤλω.¹ "Who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit; for in no way was he overcome by our infirmities." The same passage exists in a Latin translation by Marius Mercator, A.D. 418, in the following form: *Divinus Paulus magnum quidem sit esse Mysterium pietatis, et vere res ita se habet. Manifestatus est enim in carne, cum sit Deus Verbum; justificatus est autem in spiritu, nullo enim modo nostris videtur infirmitatibus contineri.*"² This quotation of the Greek form by Oecumenius has been universally but erroneously supposed to refer to the citation quoted below from the Twelve Anathematisms; but Oecumenius distinctly states that it was taken from the twelfth chapter of the Scholia;³ the very place where we find it in Mercator's translation.

c. Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον; Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ.⁴ Here *Θεός* has been foisted into the text, as is shown by the comment upon the passage. Cyril is engaged in upholding the divinity of Christ, and without dwelling on the word *Θεός*, as he indubitably would, if he had employed that reading, he adds, *Εἰ Θεὸς ὦν ὁ λόγος ἐνανθρωπήσας λέγοιτο* (notice that *ὁ λόγος*, and not *Θεός*, is made the subject). "If the Word, being God,⁵ be said to have become incarnate, and this without dropping his

¹ Schol. de Incarn. Unig., Cap. 12, ap. Oecum. Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 16 (Par., 1631), Tom. II. p. 227.

² Cyril, Tom. V. Part 1. p. 785, also Mar. Merc. (ed. Migne), col. 1013.

³ Oecumenius introduces the quotation with the words 'Ὁ ἐν ἁγίῳ Κίριλλῳ ἐν τῷ δωδεκάτῳ κεφαλαίῳ τῶν Σχολίων φησὶν· ὅς ἐφανερώθη, κ. τ. λ. This is frequently quoted in the margin of MSS.

⁴ De Recta Fide, Tom. V. Part II. p. 153.

⁵ This expression, *Θεὸς ὦν ὁ λόγος*, is quite common with Cyril; cf. Id. pp. 73 A, 94 D.

divinity, but continuing the same that he ever had been, then great, and confessedly great, is the mystery of godliness." The argument for Christ's divinity is drawn from the fact that the mystery is called *great*, and not from the word *θεός*. "But," he adds, "if Christ be regarded as a common man, how has he been manifested in the flesh? or rather, is it not evident that all men are in the flesh, and cannot be seen in any other way?" This Father thus goes on to draw his argument from the predicates *ἐφανερῶδη*, *ᾤψθη*, etc., and bases not the slightest proof on the word *θεός*. "And how was he seen of the holy angels? Do not the angels see us? and what is there strange or mysterious if, being no different from us, some of the angels saw him? And how was he preached to the Gentiles?" And so Cyril proceeds to comment on the remaining clauses of the verse, from each of which he concludes that Christ must have been God. He then closes with these words: "Great, then, is the mystery of godliness, *πεφανέρωται γὰρ ἐν σαρκὶ θεὸς ὢν καὶ ὁ λόγος*, for the Word has been manifested in the flesh, being also God; he was also justified in the spirit; was also seen of angels; was preached also to the Gentiles; and is believed on by the inhabitants of the world, as in truth the Son of God and the Father, and he who appeared in the flesh." Is not the context clear that Cyril did not recognize *θεός*?

d. *Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως, κ. τ. λ., θεὸς ἐφάν., κ. τ. λ.*¹ In this place also the text of Cyril has been tampered with, as the context shows; for he asks: *Τίς ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς; ἢ δῆλον ὅτι πάντητε καὶ πάντως ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος οὕτω γὰρ ἔσται μέγα τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον [θεὸς ἐφανερῶδη ἐν σαρκί],*² *ᾤψθη δὲ ἀγγέλοις ἀναβαίνων εἰς οὐρανοῦς.* "Who is it that was manifested in the flesh? Is it not evident that

¹ De Recta Fide, p. 124 C.

² The words enclosed in brackets are omitted by Euthymius Zigadenus in his citation of this passage from Cyril (vid. Matthæi's Greek Test., Vol. II., Pref. to Cath. Epp., also Max. Biblioth., Tom. XIX. p. 165 D); they are not translated in Aubert's Latin Version, nor are they necessary for the sense. They are, no doubt, spurious. Cf. Griesb. Symbol. Crit., Tom. I. p. lii.

it was most certainly the Word which is from God, the Father? for so will the mystery of godliness be great. He was seen also of angels as he ascended into heaven; was preached unto the Gentiles by the holy apostles; was believed on in the world. By no means can we then say that he was a mere man, like us; but as God he was made in the flesh, even as we are." This passage taken as a whole, like the one previously quoted, shows that Cyril read $\delta\varsigma$, for it were most strange that with the word $\Thetaεός$ before him, he should have omitted to speak of it when so much to his purpose, and should have endeavored to prove that $\delta\ \phiανερω-\Thetaεός$ was divine by the use of the word $\muυστήριον$, the mystery not being "confessedly great" unless the man Christ Jesus is also God. Can we believe that he would have felt obliged to fortify his proof of the divinity of him who was manifested in the flesh, by showing that the further statements in regard to him, "was seen of angels, was preached to the Gentiles," etc., are inconsistent with his mere humanity, if this very text had called Christ *God*? Is it possible that so keen a champion of orthodoxy as Cyril would, in professedly quoting a passage to prove the divinity of Christ, have withheld all reference to the most important word in it, and expended his strength in drawing comparatively feeble deductions? Would he have been content with throwing sand when he might have hurled a cannon ball at the heretics? He did not certainly set the same value upon $\Thetaεός$, if he had it, as do some later critics. If any one is inclined to doubt that Cyril here read $\delta\varsigma$, let him compare with these passages the same Father's comment on Col. i. 26, "the mystery which has been hidden from ages," etc., and see how similarly the argument is there drawn from the word *mystery*. "For the mystery would not be great, nor worth speaking of, unless we regard Christ as God," etc.¹

e. 'Ο Θεοπέσιος γράφει Παῦλος, . . . ὁμολογουμένως, κ. τ. λ., $\Thetaεός\ \acute{\epsilon}\phiαν$, κ. τ. λ. Τί οὖν ἔστι τὸ Ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί; τοῦτ'

¹ De Recta Fide, p. 72 A.

ἔστι, γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατὴρ λόγος,¹ κ. τ. λ. "St. Paul writes: Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God [as now edited] was manifested in the flesh, etc.' What then is the meaning of this, 'He was manifested in the flesh'? It means that the Word, who is from God the Father, became flesh, not that his nature was transmitted into flesh by any conversion or change, etc." Does not the context here render it probable that Θεός is a corruption of ὄς? In separately quoting this clause, Cyril omits the Θεός, a fact which casts much suspicion upon it. Griesbach and others loosely assert that MSS. read ὄς in this passage, but we can find no particular MS. specified which preserves this reading. No doubt these assertions rest on Wetstein's statement that "MSS., and those who made catenae from them, read ὄς." Those who made the catenae referred to must have found the reading ὄς in Cyril's Scholia de Incarn., cap. 12, or rather in Oecumenius's quotation from it; but there is no proof that Wetstein ever found ὄς in any MS. of the Twelve Anathematisms.

Other allusions are less decisive; as,—

f. Ὁ Μονογενὴς ἐπέφανεν ἡμῖν, ὡφθῆ γὰρ ἐπὶ γῆς.² "The only-begotten appeared to us, for he was seen on the earth."

g. Τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ πεφηνότα.³ "Him who has appeared in the flesh."

In two passages Cyril might seem to favor Θεός :

h. Ὁ γε μὴν ἐνανθρωπήσας Θεός, καίτοι νομοθεῖς οὐδὲν ἕτερον εἶναι πλὴν ὅτι μόνον ἀνθρώπος, αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτ' ὁρῶμενον, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ.⁴ "God, indeed, having become man, although in no other respect human except in what was visible, was preached unto the Gentiles, was believed on in the world." Here Θεός is made the subject of the later predicates, but not of ἐφανερώθη.

¹ Explan., Cap. xii. Anath. 11., Tom. VI. p. 148.

² De Recta Fide, p. 20 E.

³ De Recta Fide, p. 7 C. Cf. Adv. Nest., Tom. VI. p. 61.

⁴ De Recta Fide, p. 170 D.

i. Καὶ ταῦτα . . . ὁ ἀποστόλος ἡμῶς ἐδίδαξε λέγων, Ὁμολογούμενος, κ. τ. λ., Θεὸς ἔφαν., κ. τ. λ. Καὶ τὴν μὲν φανέρωσιν συνέξενε τῇ σαρκί, τὴν δὲ δικαίωσιν κατὰ τὴν τῶν αἰρετικῶν ἀβελτηρίαν ἐδικαιώθη δὲ τῇ συνεργείᾳ τοῦ πνεύματος. Ἄρα τὸ δικαίωσαν πνεῦμα κρείττον τοῦ δικαιοθέντος υἱοῦ; ἀλλ' οὐκέτι ταῦτα οὐκ ἔστι· τὸ γὰρ ἡμέτερον ἐδικαιώθη διὰ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ φανερωθέντος Θεοῦ, ὃς ἀχωρίστως αὐτῷ συνημμένος, κ. τ. λ.¹ "And this . . . the apostle teaches us, saying: 'And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifested in the flesh,' etc. He connects not only the manifestation with the flesh, but, according to the absurdity of the heretics, the justification also; but he was justified by the co-operation of the Spirit. Was then the justifying Spirit superior to the justified Son? By no means; for our Saviour was justified through the God manifested in him, who was joined inseparably with him, etc." This comment seems rather to favor Θεός, but is by no means conclusive. We have found no other reference in Cyril so favorable to the received text. It has not before been collated.

It will be seen from these quotations that Cyril certainly read ὅς. He has formally cited this passage seven times. In three of these cases ὅς is still retained; in the others it has suffered corruption. The only wonder is, that in any case it has escaped. In three of the four cases where we now read Θεός, the context demands ὅς.

The negative evidence is nearly as strong as the positive. Why has Cyril on no occasion, while proving Christ's divinity, relied on this Θεός? He evidently does not regard it as a proof-text of the first class, or why did he not quote this passage in the thirty-second chapter of his Thesaurus, in which, with the scriptures evidently before him, he collects *seriatim* the passages which seem to him to prove that "the Son is by his nature God, and if so, not made, nor created."² He selects no less than five texts from 1 Tim.;

¹ Cap. de Incarn. Dom., Script. Vet. Vat. Coll. (ed. Mai), Tom. VIII. Part II. p. 97, or Mai's Script. Nov. Biblioth., Tom. II. p. 68.

² Tom. V. Part I. p. 267.

and it is unaccountable that he should have overlooked this passage, had he read Θεός.

It is no less significant that this Father fails to adduce our text in opposition to Julian, who asserted that "neither Paul nor Matthew nor Luke dared to call Jesus God,"¹ although he does refer to such passages as Rom. ix. 5, in which Christ is called "God over all," 1 Cor. ii. 8, in which he is called "the Lord of glory," and Rom. viii. 9, in which the "Spirit of Christ" is also called "the Spirit of God." I have dwelt at greater length on the reading of Cyril, as it has been made the subject of so much controversy. He may now be most confidently cited as favoring ὄς.

4. *Gelasius*. Scr. A.D. 476. His history of the Council of Nice is not perfectly reliable, and we do not therefore give his account of the proceedings as an authority for the reading of the Council, but solely for that of Gelasius, although he claims to have drawn his facts from Eusebius, Rufinus, and others, and especially from old MSS. of a certain John Presbyter.

a. The philosopher Phaedo asks: "How was he seen on earth, and associated as a man with men, if he was the unchangeable God? Answer of the holy fathers, by Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem: Κατὰ τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ Θεοπεσίου Παύλου, Μέγα ἐστὶ τ. τ. ε. μ., ὅς ἐφ. ἐ. σ., τοῦτ' ἐστίν, ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱός. Τότε αὐτὸς ὠφθῆ καὶ ἀγγέλοις, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ἢ ἀρχαγγέλοις ἢ τισι τῶν ἐπουρανίων δυνάμενων Θεατὸς ὁ Μονογενής, ἐπειπερ Θεὸν οὐδεὶς εἶώρακε πώποτε."² "According to the words of St. Paul, 'Great is the mystery of godliness, who was manifested in the flesh, that is, the Son of God. Then was he seen also of angels, since neither to angels nor archangels, nor any of the heavenly hosts, is the Only-begotten visible, for 'no one hath seen God at any time.' " In the editions is printed ὄ, but, at least four MSS., including those from which Gelasius was first printed, read ὄς.³

¹ Cont. Jul., Tom. VI. p. 327 A.

² Lib. 2, Cap. 23, Coll. Concil. Mansi, Tom. II. col. 871.

³ Berriman's Diss., p. 180.

b. Ἰησοῦ ὅς μετὰ τὴν τῆς ἐνσάρκου αὐτοῦ παρουσίας οἰκονομίαν, τὸ μέγα ἀληθῶς τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, καθὼς γέγραπται φανερωεῖς ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ ἀγγέλοις, ὁφθαίς, κ. τ. λ.¹ "Of Jesus, who after the dispensation of his presence in the flesh, the great mystery of godliness, as it is written, having been manifested in the flesh and seen of angels," etc.

5. *Cyril Scythopolitanus*. A. D. 555.

a. Τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἐν ἣ τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐφανερώθη μυστήριον.¹ "The holy city Jerusalem, in which the great mystery of godliness was manifested.

b. Ἐν ἣ τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου σωτηρίας φανερωθὲν καὶ τελειωθὲν, κ. τ. λ.² In which [i.e. in Jerusalem] the great mystery of godliness, having been manifested and completed for the salvation of the world, etc." In both of these passages, the fact that the *mystery* is said to have been manifested, is sufficient proof that the author did not read that "God was manifested." If this latter reference be taken from a genuine letter of Theodorus and Sabas, it will carry back its date nearly a century.

The following writers probably read ὅς.

1. *Origen*. A. D. 230. "Ne forte is qui verbum caro factus apparuit positus in carne, sicut apostolus dicit: 'quia [read *qui*] manifestatus est in carne, justificatus in Spiritu, apparuit angelis,' hoc quod apparuit angelis, non eis absque evangelio, sicut ne nobis quidem hominibus."³ "Nor perhaps did he who, as the Word made flesh, appeared placed in the flesh, as the apostle says, 'who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels,' when seen of angels appear to them without a gospel, any more than to us men." We have only the Latin version of Rufinus, who certainly omits Θεός, and, if we read *qui* for *quia*, also gives us the equivalent for ὅς. Two other trivial allusions are made to our passage by Origen.

¹ Gelas. Praef., Mansi, Tom. II. col. 761.

² Vita Sabae, Sect. 52. Wetstein erroneously has Sect. 50.

³ Vita Sabae, Sect. 5, 7, Ep. ad Anast. Imp.

⁴ Comm. in Rom. i. 2 (ed. De la Rue), Tom. IV. p. 465.

Ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ἐμὸς Ἰησοῦς ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι ἐν δόξῃ λέγῃται.¹
 "If my Jesus be said to be received up into glory."

Οἱ ἄγγελοι οἷς ᾤφθη.² "The angels by whom he was seen," referring to Ἰησοῦς, not Θεός.

2. *Apollinaris*. A.D. 370. *Εἶτα ἐπάγει τοῖς εἰρημένοις ὅτι τὸ μυστήριον ἐν σαρκὶ ἐφανερῶθη.*³ "Then he [i.e. Apollinaris] adds to what he has said that 'the mystery was manifested in the flesh.'" This would seem of itself quite conclusive that Apollinaris did not read Θεός; but the quotation of his words here made by Gregory is very brief, and perhaps not exact.

*Καὶ ἔστι Θεὸς ἀληθινὸς ὁ ἄσαρκος ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθεὶς, τέλειος τῇ ἀληθινῇ καὶ δεῖα τελειότητι.*⁴ "And he who without flesh was manifested in the flesh is truly God, complete in true and divine perfection." The reading of this passage found by Franc. Turrianus is perhaps preferable: "He who without flesh was *manifested* in the flesh is truly *one*," etc,⁵ especially as the writer immediately adds, "not two persons, nor two natures." Wetstein, however, quotes this passage with Θεός, "*apud Photium, cod. 280.*"

8. *Jerome*. A.D. 378. Not only did this Father retain the relative in his version, but he quotes this passage: "Qui apparuit in carne, justificatus in spiritu,"⁶ more literally translated than in his version.

4. *Chrysostom*. A.D. 386. We were at first inclined to class this Father among those whose reading is quite doubtful; but a more careful examination of facts not before collected, inclines us to the belief that he probably read ὄς. Although his homilies have suffered from frequent transcription more

¹ Cont. Cels., Lib. III., Tom. I. p. 467 C.

² Comm. in Matth. xix. 14, Tom. III. p. 660 C.

³ App. Greg. Nyss. Antirrhct. (ed. Zacagn.), p. 138.

⁴ Script. Vet. Vat. Coll. (ed. Mai), pp. 147, 174. The work here quoted was generally ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus, but Leontius Byzantinus, in his *Fraud. Apollinist.*, says it is falsely ascribed by heretics to this Father, being really a production of Apollinaris.

⁵ Ap. Leontius Byzant., *Fraud. Apollinist. Basn. Thes.* Tom. I. p. 609.

⁶ Comment. in Isa. liii. 11 (ed. Martiani, Par., 1704), Tom. III. col. 387.

then the writings of any other Father, and the reading *θεός* is now found in three passages in his works, yet in two of these cases there are important various readings which contradict his printed text.

*α. Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως, φησί, μέγα ἐστὶν τ. τ. ε. μ., θεὸς ἐφ. ε. σ., ε. ε. πν., τούτεστιν, ἡ οἰκονομία ἡ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.*¹ "And without controversy, it is written, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, that is, the dispensation over us." Here the text of scripture has *θεός*, but, as has been abundantly proved in the case of Cyril, little reliance can be placed on this fact. Let us compare the context. Chrysostom proceeds: "Tell me no more of [the old dispensation, of] bells, nor of the holy of holies, nor of the high priest." *Εἰς ἕτερον ἀνάγει τὸ πρᾶγμα λέγων, θεὸς ἐφανερῶδη ἐν σαρκί, τούτεστιν, δημιουργὸς ἁφᾶθη, φησὶν, ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώδη ἐν πνεύματι.* "To another [High priest] he leads the subject, saying: 'God was manifested in the flesh,' that is, the Demiurge was, he says, seen in the flesh, justified in the spirit. Wherefore he says it is without controversy great, for it is really true; for God became man, and man God. A *man* was seen without sin, a *man* was received up, was preached unto the world." Taking this passage as it now stands, does it not seem probable that it has suffered corruption? If Chrysostom had written *θεός*, would he have felt it necessary to elucidate so very plain a word by the explanatory clause *τούτεστιν δημιουργός*? Would he thus have emphasized the humanity of Christ, "a *man* was seen without sin, a *man* was received up, was preached unto the world," if the passage just quoted had possessed *θεός* as the subject of these very verbs? But we have external evidence that the words of Chrysostom have been tampered with. Cramer gives another form taken from a catena in which *ὅτι* takes the place of *θεός*, thus; *εἰς ἕτερον ἀνάγει τὸ πρᾶγμα, ὅτι ἐφανερῶδη ἐν σαρκί δημιουργὸς ἁν.*² "To another High priest he leads the subject, that he

¹ Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 16, Tom. XI. pp. 605, 606.

² Cramer's Catena on 1 Tim. iii. 16, p. 31.

was manifested in the flesh, being the Creator." This reading finds strong confirmation in a Latin translation which reads: "Ad altiora profecto nos subvehit, quod scilicet in carne manifestatus est Conditor."¹ This translation made directly from an old MS. agrees with the Greek given by Cramer, which is in all probability the more correct reading, as the alteration would be more naturally made for the purpose of conforming to the supposed words of scripture than the contrary.

b. Having spoken of Christ as invisible, because the image of the invisible God, Chrysostom adds, according to our printed editions: *Εἰ δὲ ἀλλαγῆς φησί, Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, μὴ θαυμάσης· ὅτι ἡ φανέρωσις διὰ τῆς σαρκός, οὐ μὴν κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν γέγονεν. Ἐπεὶ ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἀόρατος οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄνω δυνάμεσι ὁ Παῦλος, εἰπὼν γὰρ ὅτι ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐπήγαγε ὅτι ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις.*² "But if it is elsewhere said, God was manifested in the flesh, wonder not at it; for the manifestation had regard to the flesh, and not the invisible essence. For Paul shows that he is invisible, not only to men but to the higher intelligences; for having said that he was manifested in the flesh, he adds that he was seen of angels." The context here does not especially confirm or oppose the reading *Θεός*, as here quoted in the text; but some MSS. here have *ὅς* for *Θεός*. Instead of *Εἰ δὲ ἀλλαγῆς φησί, κ. τ. λ.* Savil gives in his edition the various reading. *Διὰ τοῦτό φησιν, ὅς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἡ γὰρ φανέρωσις διὰ τῆς σαρκός, κ. τ. λ.*³ "Therefore," i. e. because Christ is in his nature invisible, "it is said, 'Who was manifested in the flesh,' for the manifestation had refer-

¹ This translation we find in Chrysost. Enarr. in Pauli Epp. (Antwerp, 1544), Vol. II. fol. 36, p. 1; "incerto interprete," very likely Bergundio Pisanus of the twelfth century. It is also found in the Frankfort reprint (1697-98) of Fronto Ducaeus's Paris edition of Chrysostom.

² In Joan. Hom. XV., Tom. VIII. pp. 85, 86.

³ Etonæ (1612), Tom. II. p. 613, l. 27. For the facts in reference to this passage in Chrysostom, as also for the quotations from Theodorus Studites, and for much other valuable assistance, we are indebted to the combined kindness and learning of Mr. Ezra Abbott, of Cambridge, Mass.

ence to the flesh, etc." This reading gives an equally good sense, and bears internal marks of genuineness. In confirmation of it, compare the Latin translation made from a MS. in the fifteenth century by Francesco Accolti of Arezzo [Franciscus Aretinus.] It reads in the most exact conformity with the variation given by Savil: "Propterea inquit 'Qui manifestatus in carne,' manifestatio autem per carnem non est secundum substantiam."¹

In the Benedictine edition of this Father, after having noted a comparatively unimportant various reading but three lines before our text, Montfaucon adds, in apparent reference to this passage, *Et in sequentibus quoque, verbo tenus variant.*² Would that he had given us the exact authority for what he implies is so unimportant a "verbal variation."

c. "But that, when he was God, he should be willing to become man, etc., here is ground for astonishment and awe, and in wonder at this St. Paul said, 'And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness,' *ποῖον μέγα; Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί,* in what respect is it great? God was manifested in the flesh."³ This would seem to require *Θεός* as the true reading; if Chrysostom had not, with characteristic freedom of quotation, in the same sentence coupled *Θεός* with a direct quotation from Heb. ii. 16: *Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται ὁ Θεός.* "For God took not on himself the form of angels."

5. Nestorius. A.D. 428. *Κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὸ πλασθὲν ἀνέπλασεν, Ἐφανερώθη, γὰρ φησιν, ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι.*⁴ "According to justice he [i.e. the Spirit] filled⁵ that which had been made, [i.e. the humanity of Christ], for it is said, 'he was manifested in the flesh, justified in the

¹ Found in the same Frankfort edition just referred to.

² Tom. VIII. p. 85 E.

³ Homil. de Philog., Tom. I. p. 497 D; published also as a scholium by Matthæi, Pref. to Cath. Epp.

⁴ Apud Cyr. Adv. Nest., Tom. VI. p. 103 E.

⁵ Reading *ἀνεπλήσεν* for *ἀνέπλασεν*, in accordance with *repleverit* in Cassian and *replevit* in Arnobius, though Mar. Merc. has *reformavit*.

spirit.'” Not only is so striking a word as *θεός* here omitted, but the insertion of *ὄς* would make the citation peculiarly apposite, being translated “He who appeared in the flesh, i.e. τὸ πλάσθην, was made just by the spirit,” i.e. κατὰ δικαιοσύνην ἀνέπλασεν. No relative, however, is preserved by Marius Mercator in his translation of this sermon of Nestorius,¹ nor by Arnobius² or Cassian,³ although the latter uses the masculine form *justificatus* to translate ἐδικαιώθη.

6. *Eutherius Syanensis*. A.D. 431. “To be united to flesh is not to be converted into flesh, wherefore it is said, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ οὐκ ἐφανερώθη ἢ σάρξ, he was manifested in the flesh; not that the flesh was manifested.”⁴

7. *Pseudo-Chrysostom*. Ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ε. τ. τ. ε. μ. ὁ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ.⁵ The present form exhibits ὁ, which favors ὄς rather than *θεός*.

Πῶς οὖν γνωστὸν τὸ μυστήριον; ἐφανερώθη, φησὶν, ἐν σαρκί.⁶ “How then was the mystery known? He was manifested, it is said, in the flesh.” These citations are probably by different writers.

Pseudo-Epiphanius. Ἐξ μεγάλα μυστήρια ἐποίησεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ὡς λέγει Παῦλος, ἐφανερώθη⁷ ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ.⁸ “Six great mysteries did our Lord Jesus Christ perform, as Paul says: “He was manifested in the flesh, etc.”

9. *Pope Martin*. A.D. 649. Ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ε. τ. τ. ε. μ. ὡς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ.⁹ This peculiar reading of ὡς

¹ Serm. 3, Tom. II. p. 11, (ed. Garn., Par., 1673). Migne's Patr. Lat., Vol. XLVIII. col. 767.

² Conflict. cum Serap., Lib. XXI.

³ De Incarn. Dom., Lib. VII. cap. XVI.

⁴ Confut. quar. Prop. ap. Athan., Tom. II. p. 564 B. This is attributed to Theodoret by Photius.

⁵ Homil. de Incarn. Dom., Chrysost. Opp., Tom. VIII. Part. II. p. 214.

⁶ Tom. X. p. 763; cf. p. 764.

⁷ This word is printed ἐκλερώθη; an evident error in transcription.

⁸ De Num. Myst., ap. Opp. Epiph., Tom. II. p. 307.

⁹ Concil. Lateran. I., Ep. 5; Mansi, Tom. X. col. 813. The Acts of this Council were composed in Greek as well as Latin.

for *ὅς* is probably due to the first editor; cf. the alteration suffered by Liberatus.

10. *Oecumenius*. Flourished between A.D. 800 and 990. *Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ε. τ. τ. ε. μ., θεὸς ἐφανερώθη, κ. τ. λ.* After commenting on the first clause, he adds: *θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί· εἶτα λέγει τὸ μυστήριον· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις φανερωθεὶς, οὗτος οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρωπίνους ὀφθαλμοῖς δίκαιος ἐκρίθη, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τοῦ πνεύματος ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῖς ἐρευνώσι καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ. Τὸ δέ, 'Ἐδικαιώθη, διὰ τὴν σάρκα, καθὸ γὰρ ἐστὶ θεὸς οὐ δικαιοῦται, ἀλλὰ δικαιοῦ.¹* "God was manifested in the flesh;" here he tells the mystery, for he who was manifested in the flesh to men was not judged just by human eyes, but by the eyes of the Spirit, which search even the deep things of God. The phrase 'was justified,' refers to his humanity, for as God he is not justified, but justifies." This comment renders it almost certain that Oecumenius read *ὅς*. With this reading it is natural to say that the mystery consists in the way in which "he who was manifested in the flesh was justified," while with the reading *θεός*, the mystery *must* consist in the *fact* of the manifestation of *God* in the *flesh*. The manner in which this writer speaks immediately after of Cyril's comment on this passage,² confirms us in the belief that he read *ὅς*, for he does not quote Cyril, as has generally been understood by scholiasts, for the purpose of giving a various reading, but simply for the sake of his comment attached to the text.

We have a negative argument for including *Athanasius*, A.D. 326, among those whose reading was probably *ὅς*. Our text occurs in no part of his genuine writings, a most remarkable fact if this great defender of Christ's divinity read *θεός*. How happens it that on almost every page of these discussions we have references to John i. 14: "The Word was made flesh," and yet throughout all his writings not one clear reference to 1 Tim. iii. 16. "God was mani-

¹ Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 16, Tom. II. p. 227 (Paris, 1631).

² Vide supra, p. 21.

fested in the flesh?" It is to be accounted for only on the supposition that he read *ὁς*.

This text is found in our editions of Athanasius: Ἐχουσι γὰρ καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον συγγνώμην αὐτοῖς νέμοντα, καὶ οἰονεὶ χεῖρα αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ λέγειν ἐκτείνοντα, ὅτι. Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα, ε. τ. τ. ε. μ., θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.¹ For they have the apostle also extending pardon to them, and, as it were, stretching out his hand to them, with the words: "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh." This passage is probably spurious. The Benedictine editors found it in but a single MS., and accordingly enclosed it in brackets. Yet Henderson, who must have known these facts, quotes it without a hint at its more than dubious authenticity.²

The following Fathers clearly read *θεός*.

1. *Gregory of Nyssa*. A.D. 370.

a. Ὁς οὐ μόνον θεόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέγαν θεόν, καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων θεόν, ὀνομάζεται τὸν κύριον. . . . Τιμοθέῳ δὲ διαρρήδην βοᾷ ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι.³ "Who [Paul] not only calls our Lord, God, but also 'the great God,' and 'God over all' [here he quotes Rom. ix. 5, 'God over all,' and Tit. iii. 13, 'great God and our Saviour,' and then proceeds to add]; and to Timothy he boldly cries that 'God was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the spirit.'" Gregory had already cited from other sacred writers various passages in which Christ is called *God*, and then gives 1 Tim. iii. 16 as another proof that Paul gives Jesus the title of God. Nothing could be more express and unquestionable than his reading. His other citations of this text, though not so definite, are yet in strict unison with this one.

b. Ἀλλὰ πεισθέντες ὅτι ἀληθῶς θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί,

¹ Adv. Scorp., Epist. xv. Cap. iv. (ed. Bened.), Tom. I. p. 706.

² Another quotation sometimes referred to the same Father will be found under the name *Pseud.-Athanasius*.

³ Contra Eunom., Orat. iv. (Paris, 1638), Tom. II. p. 693.

ἐκεῖνο μόνον ἀληθινὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον εἶναι πιστεύομεν.¹ "But being persuaded that truly God was manifested in the flesh, let us believe this to be the true mystery of godliness."

c. Διὸ καὶ πάντες οἱ τὸν λόγον κηρύσσοντες, ἐν τούτῳ τὸ θαῦμα τοῦ μυστηρίου καταμηνύουσιν, ὅτι θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ὅτι ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο.² "Wherefore also, all who preach the word, point out in this the wonder of the mystery, that God was manifested in the flesh, that the Word was made flesh."

d. Ὁ θεὸς φανερούμενος.³ "God who was manifested."

e. Πῶς οὖν ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ ὁ θεός;⁴ How then was God manifested in the flesh?"

f. Ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν θεὸς ἐν σαρκὶ φανερῶνται, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἡ τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἑαυτῇ δείξασα, . . . εἰς ἐκεῖνο μετατεθείσα καὶ ἀλλαγείσα, ὅπερ ἦν ὁ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ σαρκὶ ἑαυτὸν φανερώσας, κ. τ. λ.⁵ "But God indeed is manifested in the flesh, and the flesh which exhibited God in itself, . . . having been transformed and changed into that which he was, who manifested himself in the flesh, etc."

g. Δι' ὧν μανθάνομεν ὅτι οὐτ' ἀν' σαρκί, ὁ θεὸς ἐφανερώθη, εἰ μὴ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο.⁶ "By which we learn that God would not have been manifested in the flesh unless the Word was made flesh."

h. Ὁ κατὰ σάρκα ἄνθρωπος ἐν ᾧ ὁ θεὸς ἐφανερώθη, . . . ἄνθρωπος ἐν ᾧ ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς ἐφανερώθη . . . διὰ τῆς δουλικῆς ταύτης κτίσεως ἐν σαρκὶ ἐφανερώθη.⁷ "The bodily man, in whom God was manifested; . . . man in whom God was manifested; . . . through this servile creature [i.e. the body] he was manifested in 'the flesh.'"

i. Ἐπειδὴ τὸ φῶς καὶ ἡ ζωὴ καὶ ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐν σαρκὶ

¹ Contra Eunom., Orat. II. (Paris, 1638), Tom. II. p. 430.

² Orat. v., Tom. II. p. 581.

³ Orat. II., Tom. II. p. 445.

⁴ Orat. IV., Tom. II. p. 536.

⁵ Orat. VI., Tom. II. p. 594.

⁶ Orat. VI., Tom. II. p. 595.

⁷ De Fide, ad Simplic., Tom. III. p. 39.

ἐφανερώθη.¹ "Since the Light and the Life and God and the Word was manifested in the flesh."

j. Ὁ Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.² "God was manifested in the flesh."

This passage is again quoted without the article ;

k. Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.³ "God was manifested in the flesh."

l. Οὐτοσὶ δὲ φησιν οὐ Θεὸν ἐν σαρκὶ πεφανερούσθαι.⁴ "But this [Apollinaris] says that God was not manifested in the flesh."

m. Καθ' ἣν ἐν σαρκὶ Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη.⁵ "According to which, God was manifested in the flesh."

n. Δείξατο τὸν εἰρηκότα μὴ Θεὸν ἐν σαρκὶ πεφανερούσθαι.⁶ "Let him show any one who says that God was not manifested in the flesh."

o. Ὁ φανερωθεὶς ἡμῖν ἐν σαρκὶ Θεός.⁷ "God, who was manifested to us in the flesh."

p. Ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη.⁸ "In which God was manifested."

q. Ἐν σαρκὶ πεφηνέναι τὸν Θεόν.⁹ "That God appeared in the flesh."

r. Θεὸν διὰ σαρκὸς ἔμψυχον πεφανερούσθαι.¹⁰ "That God was manifested through the flesh, with a human soul."

s. Εἰ . . . Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.¹¹ "If . . . God was manifested in the flesh."

t. Τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ πεφανερωθέντα Θεόν.¹² "God, who was manifested in the flesh."

u. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.¹³ "Since God was manifested in the flesh."

v. Τὸν δὲ Θεὸν ἐν σαρκὶ πεφανερούσθαι ἡμῖν ὁ τὰς ἀποδείξεις

¹ Contra Eunom., Orat. vi., Tom. II. p. 715.

² Antirrhct. adv. Apolin. (ed. Zacagni, 1698), p. 126.

³ Ibid., p. 149.

⁴ Ibid., p. 126.

⁵ Ibid., p. 129.

⁶ Ibid., p. 131.

⁷ Ibid., p. 163.

⁸ Ibid., p. 207.

⁹ Ibid., p. 183.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 239.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 246.

¹² Ibid., p. 258.

¹³ Ibid., p. 270.

ἐπιζητῶν.¹ "He who seeks proofs that God was manifested to us in the flesh."

In all these cases now given we find Θεός used in connection with an allusion to this passage, or a quotation of it. In the following allusions to this text Θεός does not occur:

a. Τῷ τὸ μέγα φανεροῦντι τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον.² "To him who manifests the great mystery of godliness."

b. Τὸν ἐν ἀρχῇ λόγον ἐν σαρκὶ πεφανερῶσθαι λέγει.³ "He says, that in the beginning the Word was manifested in the flesh."

It will be seen from the extracts now given, that Gregory not only unequivocally asserts that in this passage Christ is called God, but also that out of twenty-three other quotations of this text, or allusions to it, which we have been able to find, in twenty-one cases he connects Θεός with some form of the verb φανερόω. He uses the text much as Athanasius employs John i. 14. There can be no doubt whatever that he reads Θεός. These facts cannot be explained away, as Davidson endeavors to do, by throwing suspicion on the fidelity of copyists, who never could have made such systematic corruptions, and by adducing as counter evidence his quotation from Apollinaris, as if it had been in the words of Gregory.

2. *Didymus*. A.D. 370.

a. Καὶ Τιμοθέῳ δὲ γράψας, εἰς ἄκρον ἐθεολόγησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν τῶν λέξεων τὸ μὴ εἶναι κατὰ θεότητα παρὰ φύσιν τὴν πατρικὴν ἐδίδαξεν. Εἶπεν γὰρ τοιῶσδε· Ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ε. τ. ε. μ., θεὸς ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ.⁴ "And, writing to Timothy, he most distinctly speaks of him as God, and from both passages [i.e. Col. ii. 9 and 1 Tim. iii. 16] he teaches that he does not differ in the nature of his divinity from the Father, for he says: 'Without controversy, great

¹ Orat. Catechet., Cap. xii., Opp., Tom. III. p. 67 A.

² In Psalm., Lib. II. Cap. x., Tom. I. p. 322.

³ Contra Eunom., Orat. vi., Tom. II. p. 588.

⁴ De Trinitate, Lib. I. (ed. Mingarel.), p. 83.

is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, etc.'” This seems so clear as to leave no room to doubt the reading of Didymus. With what show of justice can Davidson say, “No importance can be attached to the reading of Didymus, a blind man.”¹ But Didymus was one of the lights of the Alexandrian school, and certainly accustomed to hear the scriptures read; and we see no reason why his blindness should, as Davidson insinuates, invalidate his testimony. Less reliable is the following citation from a Latin translation; “Secundum quod dictum est, manifestatus in carne.”²

3. *Eriphanius Diaconus.* A.D. 787.

Ἀκουσον τοιγαροῦν τοῦ Παύλου μεγαλοφώνως ἐμβοῶντος, καὶ τῆν ἀληθειαν τούτοις ἐπισφραγίζαντος· Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ. Θεός, φησί, ἐφανερώθη.³ “Hear, then, Paul crying with a loud voice, and confirming to them the truth: ‘God was manifested in the flesh, etc.’ ‘God, he says, was manifested.’”

4. *Theodorus Studites.* A.D. 815.

α. Καὶ βεβόηκεν ὁ ἱερός ἀπόστολος· Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ. ὡς οὖν θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ.⁴ “And the holy apostle cries, ‘God was manifested in the flesh, etc.’ As, then, God was manifested in the flesh, etc.”

β. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ . . . ὃ φησὶ ὁ μέγας ἀπόστολος· Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί· καὶ ἔστιν εἰς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν δυοσὶ φύσεσι, τέλειος θεὸς καὶ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος.⁵ “For this is . . . what the great apostle says: ‘God was manifested in the flesh’; and he is one and the same in two natures, perfect God and perfect man.”

5. *Theophylact.* A.D. 1077.

Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί . . . Ἐνταῦθα γὰρ θεὸς ἐφανερώθη·

¹ Biblical Criticism, Vol. II. p. 394.

² Comm. in 1 John iv. 2, 3.

³ Concil. Nic. II. Paneg., Mansi, Tom. XIII. col. 446.

⁴ Lib. II. Epist. xxxvi. (Venet., 1728), p. 349.

⁵ Ibid., Epist. clvi. p. 498.

πῶς; ἐν σαρκί, τῇ γὰρ θεότητι ἀόρατος.¹ "God was manifested in the flesh. . . . For here God was manifested; how? in the flesh; for in his godhead he is invisible."

6. *Pseudo-Athanasius*. Besides the interpolation in one of the writings of Athanasius already noticed, there is another quotation found among his spurious works.

Ὁ μακάριος ἀπόστολος Παῦλος φησι, Μέγα ἐστὶ τ. τ. ε. μ., θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ. . . . πεφανέρωται θεὸς ἐν σαρκί, . . . εἰ μὴ, θεὸς ἐν σαρκὶ πιστεύοιτο εἶναι.² "The blessed apostle Paul, says, 'Great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifested in the flesh, etc.' . . . God has been manifested in the flesh, . . . unless God was believed to be in the flesh." This epistle, the author of which evidently read θεός, was not Athanasius, as it opposes the errors of the Nestorians. The Benedictine editors give as another reason for questioning its authenticity: "And if Athanasius had read the passage, θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, as here, quoted, he would certainly have made use of it against the Arians, to prove the divinity of Christ. But he seems to have used copies which had ὁ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί [or rather εἶς], as does the present Vulgate. . . . If he had read in the other way, Athanasius, a man so skilled in the scriptures, could never have passed by so remarkable a passage."³

The following Fathers probably read θεός:

1. *Theodoret*. A. D. 423. α. Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μ. ε. τ. τ. ε. μ., Μυστήριον δὲ αὐτὸ καλεῖ ὡς ἄνωθεν μὲν προορισθέν, ὑπερουθεν δὲ φανερωθέν. Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. Θεὸς γὰρ ὢν, καὶ θεοῦ υἱός, καὶ ἀόρατον ἔχων τὴν φύσιν, δηλὸς ἅπασῃ ἐνανθρωπήσας ἐγένετο. Σαφῶς δὲ ἡμᾶς τὰς δύο φύσεις ἐδίδαξεν, ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ τὴν θείαν ἔφη φανερωθῆναι φύσιν.⁴ "And without

¹ Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 16 (Venet.), Tom. II. p. 569. This is also given by Matthæi as a scholium found by him, Praef. to Cath. Epp.

² Ep. de Incarn. Dei Verbi, Tom. II. pp. 33, 34.

³ Athan. Opp., Tom. II. p. 33; cf. also Griesb. Symbol. Crit., Vol. I. p. xlii.

⁴ Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 16 (Paris, 1642). Quoted also by Matthæi, Praef. to Cath. Epp., from a scholium.

controversy, great is the mystery of godliness.' He calls it a mystery, as having been pre-ordained of old, but latterly manifested: 'God was manifested in the flesh.' For being God and the Son of God, and having an invisible nature, he became evident to all by his incarnation. Clearly, then, he teaches us the two natures; for 'in the flesh' he says, that the divine nature was manifested."¹

b. Ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ε. τ. τ. ε. μ., θεὸς ἐφανερώθη κ. τ. λ. ἄηλον, τοῖσιν, ὡς ἀόρατος μὲν ἢ θεία φύσις, ὁρατὴ δὲ ἢ σὰρξ. Ἀρμοδίως, τοῖσιν, ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος εἶπε, θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.² "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, etc.' It is evident, then, that the divine nature is invisible, but the flesh visible. Properly, then, did the divine Spirit say, 'God was manifested in the flesh.'" The context in these quotations shows θεός was probably the reading of this Father. He draws from this text the doctrine of the two natures in Christ. The clauses, θεὸς ὢν, καὶ θεοῦ υἱός, and ἡ θεία φύσις, seem to have reference to the reading θεός. But it may be said, on the other hand, that these phrases are of such frequent occurrence in Theodoret's dialogues, that they do not here necessarily require this reading, and that the quality of Christ's nature might also be deduced with the reading ὅς. Besides this, Theodoret adds, to show that before our Saviour's advent the angels had never seen God, ὁ ἀπόστολος εἶπεν ἐπι φανερωθεὶς ἐν σαρκὶ ὡφθη ἀγγέλοις. "The apostle says that after he was manifested in the flesh he was seen of angels," a statement peculiarly consistent with the reading and construction: "He who was manifested in the flesh was seen of angels." A little further on he adds, in pursuance of the same thought: Μετὰ μέντοι τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ὡφθη καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις κατὰ τὸν θεῖον ἀπόστολον, . . . θεός

¹ There seems to be here an allusion to other passages, such as Rom. xvi. 25 and 1 Cor. ii. 7, otherwise it would be a strong evidence that Theodoret read θεός as the mystery, and not God, is here spoken of as being made manifest.

² Eccl. Dial. I., Tom. IV. pp. 13-15.

ἐφανερώθη, γὰρ φησιν, ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνευματι, ὡφθθη ἀγγέλοις, which with the reading *ὅς* would be translated: "Indeed, then, *after* the incarnation he was seen also of the angels, according to the holy apostle, 'He who was manifested in the flesh was justified in the spirit, was seen of angels.'" The fact that in his commentary Theodoret does not refer the mystery personally to Christ would accord with this construction, as well as with the reading *θεός*.

2. *Severus, Patriarch of Antioch.* A. D. 513. Τὸν νομοθέτην, τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθέντα θεόν.¹ "The lawgiver, the God, manifested in the flesh." This is preserved only in a catena, but yet quite reliably indicates *θεός*.

3. *Pseudo-Dionysius Alexandrinus.* Εἰς ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, συναϊδιος λόγος· ἐν αὐτοῦ πρόσωπον, ἀόρατος θεὸς καὶ ὀρατὸς γενόμενος· θεὸς γὰρ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, γεγόμενος ἐκ γυναικός, κ. τ. λ.² "Christ is one, the co-eternal Word existing in the Father; one in his person, God invisible and made visible; for God was manifested in the flesh, made of a woman, etc." This would seem to imply *θεός*, although there is no direct quotation. Not only does this belong to a later age than that of Dionysius, but an old Latin translation of the first part of this work, which is still extant, contains, as Tregelles has mentioned,³ no such reference to 1 Tim. iii. 16.⁴

4. *John of Damascus.* A. D. 730. The text of this author's commentary on 1 Tim, iii. 16,⁵ reads *θεός*. There is nothing in the comments, composed of excerpts from Chrysostom, to shed light on his reading. In another work he refers to this passage: Διὰ γὰρ τῶν θαυμάτων καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιφωιτήσεως τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφανερώθη καὶ ἐπιστώθη τῷ κόσμῳ ὅτι υἱὸς ἔστι τοῦ θεοῦ.⁶ "For by miracles, and

¹ Wolfe's Catena on Acts iii. 23, Tom. III. of his *Anecdota Graeca*, p. 138.

² Cont. Paul. Sam. (Rome, 1796), p. 211, or Mansi, Tom. I. col. 1044.

³ Horne's Introduction (ed. Tregelles), Vol. IV. p. 339.

⁴ Dionys. Opp., p. 300.

⁵ Tom. II. p. 263 (ed. Le Quien, Paris, 1712).

⁶ De Fide Orthodox., 91, or Lib. IV. Cap. xviii., Tom. I. p. 267 E.

the resurrection, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, was he manifested, and believed on in the world that he is the Son of God."

5. *Photius*. A.D. 858. *Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ε. τ. τ. ε. μ., θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ.* This is quoted by Nolan¹ from a MS., but without the connection or comment; so that we cannot judge of its value. *Τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ φανέντα θεόν.*² "God, who appeared in the flesh."

We subjoin a number of real or supposed references to this passage, from which, in our opinion, little or nothing can be gathered as to the early text; but as many of them have been before quoted on one side or the other, we add them for the sake of completeness.

1. *Epistle of Barnabas*. *Ἴδὲ πάλιν Ἰησοῦς οὐχ, ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλ' ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τύψω καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθεῖς.*³ "Behold again Jesus, not the Son of Man, but the Son of God, and in a figure manifested in the flesh." *Ἐν σαρκὶ οὖν αὐτοῦ μέλλοντος φανερούσθαι* [i.e. κυρίου]. "When the Lord was about to be manifested in the flesh." *Ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ μέλλοντα φανερούσθαι ὑμῖν Ἰησοῦν.* "Trust in Jesus, who is about to be manifested to you." *Ὅτι ἐμελλεν ἐν σαρκὶ φανερούσθαι* [i.e. κύριος].⁴ "Because the Lord was about to be manifested in the flesh."

2. *Ignatius*. A.D. 101. *Εἷς Ἰατρός ἐστιν, σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός, γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός.*⁵ "There is one Physician, both corporeal and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten, God made in the flesh." Here there is no certain allusion to this passage. *Πῶς οὖν ἐφανερώθη τοῖς αἰῶσιν;* "How then was he made manifest to the ages?"⁶ "A star shone in heaven, etc." *θεοῦ ἀνθρώπινως*

¹ Nolan's Greek Vulgate, p. 290. Phot. comment. in 1 Tim. E. cod. MS. Cantab. n. 2430. 250.

² Basnage's Thesaurus, Tom. II. p. 436.

³ Sect. 12.

⁴ Sect. 6.

⁵ Epist. ad Eph., Cap. VII.

⁶ The reference is to Col. i. 26.

φανερομένου εἰς καινότητα αἰδίου ζωῆς,¹ "when God in a bodily form was manifested in the newness of an eternal life."

But the Syriac here reads *υἱοῦ* for *θεοῦ*, ܘܝܘܢ ܨܘܠܘܢ.² The interpreted form of Ignatius reads in this place, *θεοῦ ὡς ἀνθρώπου φαινομένου, καὶ ἀνθρώπου ὡς θεοῦ ἐνεργούντος.*³ "God appearing as man, and man working as God." Whatever may have been the original of Ignatius, there is no probable allusion to this text.

3. *Valentinus*. A. D. 120. "Intelligetis deum in corpore apparuisse ac spectatum esse."⁴

4. *Justin Martyr*. A. D. 140. *Οὗ χάριν ἀπέστειλε Λόγον, ἵνα κόσμῳ φανῇ· ὃς ὑπὸ λαοῦ ἀτιμασθεῖς, διὰ ἀποστόλων κηρυχθεῖς, ὑπὸ ἔθνων ἐπιστεύθη.*⁵ "For which reason he sent the Word, that he might appear to the world; who, having been dishonored by the people, and preached by the apostles, was believed on by the Gentiles." The authenticity of this epistle has been questioned.

5. *Apostolic Constitutions*. *Θεὸς κύριος, ὃ ἐπιφανεῖς ἡμῖν ἐν σαρκί.*⁶ "God the Lord, who appeared to us in the flesh."

6. *Clement of Alexandria*. A. D. 192. *Ὡ μυστήριον· μεθ' ἡμῶν εἶδον οἱ ἄγγελοι τὸν Χριστόν, πρότερον οὐχ ὄρωντες.*⁷ "O the mystery! with us the angels saw Christ, whom before they had not seen."

7. *Hippolytus*. A. D. 220. *Οὗτος προελθὼν εἰς κόσμον θεὸς ἐν σώματι ἐφανερώθη, ἄνθρωπος τέλειος προελθὼν.*⁸

¹ Epist. ad Eph., Cap. xix.

² Cureton's Corpus Ignatianum, p. 287.

³ Ed. Dressel, p. 336.

⁴ Apud Leontius Byzant. adv. Fraud. Apollinist., Basnago's Thesaurus, Tom. I. p. 603.

⁵ Epist. ad Diogn.

⁶ 7. 26.

⁷ Quoted by Oecumenius, in 1 Tim. iii. 16 (Paris, 1631), Tom. II. p. 228. Chrysostom, John of Damascus, and Theophylact read *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ* instead of *τὸν Χριστόν*, though some manuscripts of the latter author have *τὸ μυστήριον*. Scholia of Codd. 19 and 20 have, according to Wetstein, *Οἱ ἄγγελοι μεθ' ἡμῶν εἶδον τὸ μέγα τῆς εἰσεβείας μυστήριον*, a form which forbids *θεός*.

⁸ Cont. Noet., Cap. xvii. A similar passage is quoted by Theodoret, Dial. 2, Tom. IV. p. 89, although professing to be taken from a commentary on the

"This God coming into the world was manifested in the body, coming as a perfect Man."

8. *Eudoxius of Constantinople.* A.D. 360. "There were not in Christ two natures, for he was not a complete man, but instead of a soul, God in the flesh," ἀλλ' ἀντὶ ψυχῆς θεὸς ἐν σαρκί.¹

9. *Basil.* A.D. 370. Αὐτὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.² "He [i.e. κύριος] was manifested in the flesh." Κατέλιπεν δὲ ἡμῖν τοῦτο τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον.³ "And he left us this great mystery of godliness."

10. *Euthalius.* A.D. 458. Περὶ θεῆς σαρκώσεως.⁴ "Concerning the divine incarnation." This title is given to the seventh Euthalian division of 1 Tim., which includes our text. Some have improperly quoted the MSS. which have these divisions, as if their reading was sanctioned by his authority.

11. *Pseudo-Gregory Thaumaturgus.* A.D. 475, or later. Οὐχ ἡμῶν γινῶναι τὸ πῶς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν.⁵ "It is not for us to know how the Son of God became man, for this is the great mystery."

12. *Hesychius.* Πρὸς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῆς οὐκ ἤγγισε, τὸν ἐν

second Psalm: Οὗτος ὁ προελθὼν εἰς κόσμον θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐφανερώθη. "He who came into the world was manifested as God and man."

¹ Ap. Anast. de Verb. Incarn. Script. Vet. Vat. Coll. (ed. Mai), Tom. VII. p. 17.

² Ep. 261 (ed. Bened.), Tom. III. p. 402 A. Tischendorf and Scholz, following Wetstein, refer to this as Ep. 65, although professing to use the Benedictine edition, which numbers the epistles differently from the Paris edition of 1638. They also misquote the words of Basil, or rather of Wetstein.

³ Ep. 261, Tom. p. 678 B. The mystery here, however, has reference to the Lord's supper, rather than to Christ.

⁴ Zacagni Collect., p. 689.

⁵ Anath. Cap. XII., Basnage's Thesaurus, Tom. I. p. 33.

⁶ In Zophon. 3. 2. Quoted from Wetstein. We have failed to discover and verify this quotation. It certainly is not found in Hesychius's Sticheron, Crit. Sac., Tom. VII. Part III. p. 26, the only work of Hesychius which Wetstein refers to in his Prolegomena. It may be a scholium found attached to some MS. of the Old Testament.

σαρκὶ φανέντα ἀντῆ.⁶ "She did not approach to her God, who appeared to her in the flesh."

13. *Leontius Hierosolymitanus*. A.D. Δόκησις δὲ ἦν ἡ φανέρωσις τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ κυρίου;¹ "Was the manifestation of the Lord in the flesh a mere semblance?"

14. *Elias Cretensis*. A.D. 787. Εἰπόντος γὰρ τοῦ ἀποστόλου περὶ Χριστοῦ ὅτι ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, καὶ ὤφθη ἀνθρώποις.² "For when the apostle says of Christ that he was manifested in the flesh and was seen of men," etc.

It will be seen from a comparison of the citations which have now been given from the various Fathers that both readings were certainly current in the fourth century, and, what would seem unexpected, neither reading seems to be geographically provincial. It might have been supposed from the remarkable unison of the versions in defence of *ὅς*, that the other reading would prove in the early centuries to have been restricted to some small area, from which it had spread through the church. But instead of this, we find the reading *θεός* not only in Constantinople and the East, but quoted by Didymus in Alexandria itself, nearly fifty years before the time of Cyril. Nothing can save us from this conclusion, except the assumption, resting on no proof, that Didymus has here been interpolated. On the other hand, the bishops of Constantinople, Chrysostom, and Nestorius seem to have *ὅς*, as well as Origen or Cyril.

A comparison with these citations will also satisfy any one how much credit is to be attached to the story told of Macedonius by Liberatus, and repeated by Hincmar. The former says: "At this time Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, is said to have been banished by the emperor Anastasius for having falsified the gospels, and especially that saying of the apostle, 'Who appeared in the flesh, was justified in the spirit.' For he is said to have changed *ὅς*, a Greek monosyllable, by the alteration of *O* into *Θ*, and

¹ Cont. Theoph. Script. Vet. Vat. Coll. (ed. Mai), Tom. VII. p. 146.

² Quoted by Wetstein, who took it from a manuscript source.

thus made *Deós*, so that it would read 'God appeared in the flesh.' Being therefore accused as a Nestorian, he was expelled by the Monk Severus."¹ With this story, told by Liberatus not half a century after the occurrence recorded, must be compared the conflicting statement made a few years later by Victor Tununensis, in which he stigmatizes Anastasius as having himself tampered with the sacred text. "In the year 506, at the command of the emperor Anastasius, the holy gospels are revised and corrected, as if composed by ignorant evangelists."² The first version of this charge, laying the blame on Macedonius, is repeated by Hincmar, almost in the very words of Liberatus.³

There can be little doubt that there is some foundation for this story. At the same time Macedonius must be acquitted of any intention to corrupt the text; for we have shown that it was read with *Deós* by Gregory of Nyssa, more than a century before. Very likely he may have innocently altered some MSS. from *ōs* to *Deós*, and this may have made

¹ Hoc tempore Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus ab imperatore Anastasio dicitur expulsus tanquam evangelia falsasset, et maxime illud apostoli dictum: Quia [lege qui] apparuit in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu. Hunc enim mutasse ubi habet *ōs*, id est qui, monosyllabum Graecum, litera mutata O in Θ vertisse, et fecisse *Deós* id est, ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem. Tanquam Nestorianus ergo culpatus expellitur per Severum Monachum. — Concil. Coll. (ed. Mansi), Tom. IX. col. 692. The printed editions read *ōs* and *ōs*, but the true reading is evident. Indeed, it has been said that the Greek letters were supplied by the first editor, because wanting in the MS. It will be seen that Hincmar has *Deós* clearly, and not *ōs*.

² Messalla V. C. Cos. Constantinopoli iubente Anastasio Imperatore, sancta evangelia, tanquam ab idiotis evangelistis composita, reprehenduntur et emendantur.

³ Quidam nimirum ipsas scripturas verbis inlicitis imposturaverunt, sicut Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus, qui ab Anastasio Imperatore ideo a civitate expulsus legitur, quoniam falsavit evangelia, et illum apostoli locum ubi dicit: Quod apparuit in carne, justificatum in Spiritu, per cognationem Graecarum literarum O et Θ, hoc modo mutando falsavit. Ubi enim habuit *qui*, hoc est, OC, monosyllabum Graecum, litera mutata O in Θ vertit et fecit ΘC, id est, ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem; qua propter tanquam Nestorianus fuit expulsus. — Opusc. xxxiii. Cap. xviii. (ed. Sismond, Paris, 1645), Tom. II. p. 449. Similar statements are found, Cap. xxii. p. 465; also cf. Concil. Du-siacense, I. Mansi, Tom. XVI. col. 595.

one of the charges against him preferred by Anastasius, who would have been glad to employ any plausible pretext for his deposition. It may have been the restoration of the readings altered by Macedonius which gave occasion to the charge made by Victor; for the corruptions of Anastasius are said to have taken place several years after the deposition of the bishop.

Some critics have said that the statement that Macedonius was therefore deposed, as being a *Nestorian*, throws discredit on the whole story. We cannot think so; for the reading *θεός* seems peculiarly fitted to convey the notions of Nestorius. He taught the divinity of Christ as clearly as did Athanasius or Cyril. He differed from Cyril in asserting that only the human nature was born of Mary, in which the divine nature dwelt, as in a temple. For this reason he refused to call Mary the mother of God. He says: "The God-Word was not born of Mary, but abode in that which was born of her. He did not take his beginning from the Virgin, but became inseparably connected, for all time, with that which was slowly formed within her womb."¹ "The spirit formed a temple for the God-Word, which he should inhabit."² "The Word was made flesh, that is, took flesh, and dwelt with us, that is, put on our nature."³ Such a text, then, as "*God* was manifested in the flesh," which seemed to distinguish clearly between the two natures, would seem to the followers of Nestorius particularly consonant with their opinions, and a good offset to the text "The Word was made flesh," so blindly urged against them by the Monophysites; for it must be remembered that in the early part of the sixth century, all who opposed the Eutychians were branded by them as Nestorians. There is no real reason to believe that Macedonius favored Nestorianism. He was, however, a zealous defender of the Council of Chalcedon, and for this reason incurred the displeasure

¹ Serm. III. in Mar. Merc. (ed. Migne), col. 769.

² Serm. I. col. 761.

³ Serm. III. col. 771.

of Anastasius, and of all who believed that Council to have distinguished too clearly between the human and divine natures as joined in Christ.

It is remarkable that those who have supposed it absurd that Macedonius should be accused of Nestorianism on account of his partiality for Θεός, have failed to notice the fact that Theodoret, a prominent Nestorian, relies on this text, with the reading Θεός apparently, to prove the quality of Christ's nature, while Cyril, the champion of orthodoxy, read ὁς. Probably both were aware of the variation in the text. There is nothing absurd, then, in the story of Liberatus, except in so far as it attributes too much importance to this charge. No other writer of that century refers to it.

The result of this examination of the external evidence may be summed up in a tabular form as given below. We shall include in the second column a few authorities for the neuter form of the relative.

FOR THE READING *ὁς*.*Manuscripts.*

J, K, and all cursive MSS. except three.

Versions.

Arm. (of Polyglot), Slav., Georg.

FOR THE READING *ὁ*.*Manuscripts.*

κ*, A* probably, C*, D* has δ, F, G, 17, 73, 181.

Versions.

Old Lat., Vulg., Pesch. Syr., Aeth. (both Rom. and Platt's), Copt., Theb., Goth., Arm., Arab. (of Erp. and of the Vatican). All of these, except Platt's Aeth. and the Gothic, may read ὁ as well as ὁς.

WHOLLY DOUBTFUL,

The Philox. Syr., both text and margin.

Fathers.

Greg. Nyss. ³⁷⁰, Didymus ³⁷⁰, Epiph. ³⁷⁶, Theod. Stud. ³¹⁸, Theoph. ¹⁰⁷⁷, Pseud.-Ath.

Probably, Theodoret ⁴²³, Severus ⁵¹³, Pseudo-Dion., John Dam. ⁷³⁰, Phot. ⁸⁵⁸.

Fathers.

Epiph. ³⁶⁸, Theod. Mops. ⁴⁰⁷, Cyr. ⁴¹³, Gelasius ⁴⁷⁶, Cyr. Scyth. ⁶⁴⁶.

Probably, Origen ²³⁰, Apollinarius ³⁷⁹, Jerome ³⁷⁸, Chrys. ³⁸⁶, Nest. ⁴²⁸, Euther. Syanen. ⁴²¹, Pseudo-Chrysost., Pseudo-Epiph., Pope Martin ⁵⁴³, Oecu. ⁸⁰⁰⁻⁸⁸⁰. With little doubt Athan. ⁸²⁵ may also be included here, though he nowhere quotes the text.

We next come to consider the internal evidence. In favor of Θεός may be adduced the improbability of its being a careless alteration from ὄς. If the original reading were ὄς, it would seem to require an intentional corruption of the text to produce Θεός. It is a good rule never to have recourse to the charge of intentional corruption to explain a various reading when it can be accounted for equally well without imputing bad motives to the copyists. Now the change from OC to ὄς, requires the positive, intentional addition of two strokes, which were evidently not in the transcriber's exemplar. On the other hand, the change from ὄς to OC might be unintentionally made, simply by omitting two small strokes, which may have become effaced in the MS. copied, or been carelessly omitted by a sleepy scribe. It would be much like the failure to cross a *t* or to dot an *i*. It is not rare to find cases in old MSS. where Θ has failed to receive its transverse stroke at first, or lost it through age, and thus at present exhibits only the circular outline. It is true that the rule is often given, that of two forms the longer is the more suspicious; but this rule relates only to cases where one or more entire words may have inadvertently been admitted from the margin. In the case of kindred letters a stroke is more liable to be omitted than added. The addition implies intentional corruption, a charge which should, if possible, be avoided. In this view Θεός has the preference.

In favor of Θεός it has also been asserted that the form ὄς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι is "not Greek." But this statement is founded on the assumed translation "*He who* was manifested in the flesh was justified in the spirit," making ὄς equivalent to *he who*, and including both the demonstrative and the relative. But it has been shown by Professor Stuart,¹ that this is by no means an unparalleled

¹ Biblical Repository, Vol. II. pp. 70-72. Matthæi, whom Henderson thinks the most learned man who ever edited the New Testament, says of the notion that τὸ φανερωθῆναι would be the only form grammatically allowable if we reject Θεός: "If we were speaking of a Greek author, I should have nothing to say

construction. Very few, however, of the defenders of the reading $\delta\varsigma$ admit this translation. They regard the clause $\delta\varsigma \epsilon\phiανερωθη$ not as the subject of the subsequent predicates, $\epsilonδουκωθη$, $\omegaφθη$, etc., but as co-ordinate with them. Their translation would be: "Great is the mystery of godliness; he who was manifested in the flesh, [he who] was justified in the spirit, [he who] was seen of angels, etc."

In favor of the reading $\delta\varsigma$ is the fact that it requires but a single step to obtain from it the other readings $\Thetaεός$, δ , or $\omegaς$. The addition of two short strokes converts $\delta\varsigma$ into $\Thetaεός$. On the other hand, the omission of a single letter gives us δ , a form evidently derived from $\delta\varsigma$, and adopted merely as a supposed grammatical correction. If we suppose, however, that $\Thetaεός$ was the original reading, we must first obtain $\delta\varsigma$ from it, and then obtain δ by altering this alteration. *Cæteris paribus*, that form is to be preferred from which the others are most easily explained.

Again, $\delta\varsigma$ is at first sight the more difficult reading, and as such has the preference. The form $\delta\varsigma$ seems harsh, while $\Thetaεός$ is very easy. Copyists are liable to alter a harsh form for an easier one. At the same time $\delta\varsigma$ gives a good sense, even without resorting to the opinion defended by Conybeare and Howson, and by others, that Paul here quotes a fragment from a hymn of the early church, as in other places in his pastoral epistles. In accordance with this idea the verse would read: "And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness.

'He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit,

'Seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles,

'Believed on in the world, received up into glory.'

The omission of the article before $\Thetaεός$, although it is the subject of the sentence, is another suspicious circumstance mentioned by Professor Stuart. He found, out of two hun-

against it; but Paul wrote this, who in another passage, in immediate connection with $\tau\delta \muυστηριον \tau\delta αποκρυμμενον$, has $συνη \delta\delta \epsilon\phiανερωθη$, which is no sort of Greek." — Note on 1 Tim. iii. 16.

dred and fifty-seven cases in the New Testament in which *θεός* is used as the subject of the sentence, only *four* cases in which it fails to take the article, and so strong is the tendency to insert it, that in *three* of these cases, an examination of the authorities collected by Tischendorf will show that important MSS. exhibit the article. It is however noticeable that these four cases all occur, like our passage now under discussion, in the writings of Paul.

It is a further argument in favor of *ος* that Paul has in other cases similarly connected *μυστήριον* with some form of the verb *φανερῶω*. In Coll. i. 26, 27, he has τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, νυνὶ δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἳ ἠθέλησαν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὅς ἐστι Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης. Here *μυστήριον* is not only followed by *ἐφανερώθη*, but a little later τοῦ μυστηρίου is followed by *ὅς ἐστι Χριστός*, which shows that *μυστήριον* may be applied personally to Christ, and followed by the masculine relative, unless the gender is here due to attraction. In Rom. xvi. 25, 26, Paul again connects *μυστήριον* with *φανερῶω*: κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνους αἰωνίους σεσυγημένου, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν, κ. τ. λ.

In favor of *ος*, has sometimes been adduced the argument that *θεός* seems to be an alteration made for the purpose of its use in polemic theology, as giving the orthodox an additional text to use against the Arians and other heretics. But there seems to have been no intentional corruption of this sort, for we cannot see that there was any distinction between the orthodox and the heretics in their use of the passage. Some defenders of the deity of Christ favor one, and some the other reading. Both Gregory of Nyssa in the East, and Didymus at Alexandria, simultaneously exhibit *θεός*, the former using it as freely as if it were the universally received reading; while, on the other hand, the multifarious polemical writings of Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, and Epiphanius nowhere contain this passage, except

that the latter quotes it to prove the divinity of the Holy Ghost. If we descend to a later period, we shall find that in the fifth and sixth century the reading $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ would be likely to be looked on with suspicion as favoring the heresies of Nestorians. It would not be regarded as the orthodox reading, for it distinguishes most clearly between the divine and the human natures: *God* is not confounded with the *flesh*, but said to have been manifested *in it*. It was only after a long controversy that the Eastern and North African churches settled to a general opposition to the doctrine of the single nature of Christ. The conflict waged so bitterly by Cyril and his supporters against Nestorius and Theodoret had the effect of leading his successors into the opposite Monophysite heresy. For a season there was scarcely any middle ground allowed between the Nestorians and the Eutychians. All who opposed the blind and intolerant zeal of the Monophysites were branded by them as Nestorians. The whole Eastern church seemed falling into this extreme. At this time it will be seen that those who regarded themselves as the orthodox party, and the devoted followers of Cyril, would have looked with great suspicion on the reading "*God* was manifested *in* the flesh," a reading so apparently opposed to their Monophysite rendering of John's text: "The Word was *made* flesh." Accordingly we find that Liberatus distinctly speaks of the reading with $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ as Nestorian and heretical. If there had been at an earlier time a temptation to the orthodox to alter $\delta\varsigma$ to $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, the temptation was now equally strong to change $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ to $\delta\varsigma$.

Editors of the New Testament, have according to their different principles of criticism or means of information, varied in their reading of this passage. In favor of $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ may be mentioned Stephens, Mill, Matthaei, Scholz, and others of less note; Griesbach, Lachman, Tischendorf, and Tregelles prefer $\delta\varsigma$, while Wetstein's choice seems to favor δ .

We do not propose to balance against each other the various arguments for either reading, with the purpose of defending

one or the other. It has been our aim simply to give a more complete, accurate, and impartial statement of the facts in the case than has heretofore been accessible, that each one who studies them may have all the materials necessary for the satisfaction of his own judgment, and that something may thus be done for perfecting the purity of the original text of the scriptures.

It is gratifying to discover that none of the early Christian writers, whether called orthodox or heretic by the general councils of the church, have ventured to tamper with the sacred text. Epiphanius, Athanasius, Basil, and Gregory Nazianzen, all active opponents of Arianism, either read $\delta\varsigma$ distinctly, or else do not quote the passage, although it would seem that with the reading $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ it might have been used with effect against their opponents. On the other hand, when, a century later, $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ seemed the less orthodox reading, we find Theodorus and Nestorius, though treated as heretics, employing the relative. Again the tide has turned, and $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ has been called the more orthodox reading, and the identical alteration for which the Constantinopolitan bishop was deposed as a heretic has of late years been charged upon the defenders of the doctrine of the Trinity as an orthodox trick. There is no proof on either side of any intentional corruption of the sacred text.