

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE V.

ON THE READING "ONLY-BEGOTTEN GOD," IN JOHN I. 18;
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE STATEMENTS
OF DR. TREGELLES.¹

BY EZRA ABBOT, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς [αἰ. θεός], ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ
πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

IN John i. 18, which reads in the common version: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him," it has long been known to scholars that important critical authorities, instead of the expression ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς, "the only-begotten Son," have the remarkable reading μονογενὴς θεός, "only-begotten God." The manuscripts that contain it, though not numerous, are of the very highest rank, including both the famous Vatican manuscript, and the newly discovered *Codex Sinaiticus* of Tischendorf. This reading has also a respectable support from the ancient versions, and has been *supposed* to be attested by a great majority of the ancient Fathers, both Greek and Latin. Though not adopted into the text of any edition of the Greek Testament yet published, its genuineness has been maintained by Dr. S. P. Tregelles, the most eminent among English scholars in the department of textual criticism; and it will undoubtedly be presented as the true reading in his long expected edition. It would also have been

¹ "An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament; with Analyses, etc., of the respective Books. . . . By the Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne, B. D. The critical part re-written and the remainder revised and edited by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, LL. D. Second Edition." London: Longman, etc., 1860. 8vo. pp. xxvii., 801; pp. 751—784 being "Additions" and "Postscript," which alone distinguish this from the former edition. These Additions, with the Postscript, have also been published separately.

received by Lachmann into his text, had he been aware of the authorities by which it is supported.

It is evident from this brief statement of the claims of the reading *μονογενῆς Θεός*, that the question of its genuineness well deserves a critical investigation, while its theological character gives it a special interest, which, however, must not be suffered to bias our judgment. This investigation is the more necessary in consequence of the circumstance that in respect to one very important branch of the evidence, — the quotations of the passage by the ancient Fathers, — no critical edition of the Greek Testament gives even a tolerably complete and accurate account of the facts in the case. On the contrary, the most important editions which have been published since the time of Wetstein, as those of Griesbach, Scholz, Tischendorf, and Alford, not only neglect to state a very large part of the evidence, but contain almost incredible errors in regard to the authorities which they professedly cite.¹ Many of these errors were repeated by Dr. Tregelles in his remarks on the passage in his "Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament" (London, 1854), in which he maintained the genuineness of the reading *Θεός*.² His observations led to an examination of the evidence on the subject by the present writer, the results of which were published in a note appended to the second edition of Mr. Norton's "Statement of Reasons for not believing the Doctrines of Trinitarians" (Boston, 1856), pp. 448—469.

I cannot better introduce the discussion proposed in the present Article, than by quoting from the note just referred to a statement of some of the conclusions arrived at. After mentioning the fact that Wetstein, in his note on the passage, has fallen into extraordinary errors, many of which

¹ In his recent edition of the Greek Testament, "Editio septima critica major," Lips. 1859, Tischendorf has considerably corrected and enlarged his former account of the evidence of the Fathers on this passage. But his note is still very defective, and contains important mistakes.

² See pp. 234, 235.

have been blindly copied by subsequent editors, it was observed :

“ One who should take the statements in Wetstein’s note to be correct, would suppose that not less than *forty-four* Greek and Latin writers, in the first eight centuries, have quoted the passage in question with the reading *μονογενῆς Θεός* or *unigenitus Deus*; and that the number of distinct quotations of this kind in their writings, taken together, is not far from *one hundred and thirty*. I have examined with some care all the passages specifically referred to by Wetstein, and the whole work, or collection of works, cited, when his reference is general, — as ‘*Epiphanius duodecies*,’ ‘*Hilarius de Trinit. passim*,’ ‘*Fulgentius plusquam vicies*,’ not confining my attention, however, to these particular passages or works. The following is the result of this examination. Of the forty-four writers cited by Wetstein in support of the reading *μονογενῆς Θεός*, there are but *four* who quote or refer to the passage with this reading only;¹ *four* quote it with both readings;² *nine* quote it with the reading *υἱός* or *filius* only, except that in one of the quotations of Titus of Bostra *υἱός Θεός* occurs;³ *two* repeatedly allude to it, — sometimes using the phrase ‘only-begotten *God*,’ and sometimes ‘only-begotten *Son*,’ in connection with the words ‘who is in the bosom of the Father,’ — but do not distinctly quote it;⁴ and *twenty-five* do not quote or allude to it at all.⁵ Of the particular passages referred to by Wetstein, a great majority have no bearing whatever on the subject, but merely contain the expression *μονογενῆς Θεός* or *unigenitus Deus*, with no trace of an allusion to the text in question, — an expression often occurring, as will hereafter

¹ “ It is thus quoted in the ‘*Excerpta Theodoti*,’ and also by Clement of Alexandria and Epiphanius. It appears to be once referred to in the Epistle of the second Synod of Ancyra.”

² “ Irenaeus, Origen, Basil, and Cyril of Alexandria.”

³ “ Eusebius, Athanasius, Julian, Gregory Nazianzen, Titus of Bostra, Maximinus the Arian bishop, Hilary, Vigilius of Tapsa, Alcuin.”

⁴ “ Gregory of Nyssa and Fulgentius.”

⁵ “ That is, all the remaining authorities cited by Wetstein, for which see his note.”

appear, in writers who abundantly and unequivocally quote John i. 18 with the reading *υἱός* or *filius*. Indeed, in some of these passages we do not find even this expression, but only the term *γεννητός* [al. *γεννητός*] *θεός*, or *genitus Deus*, applied to Christ.¹ Sufficient evidence that these assertions are not made at random will be given in what follows, though the mistakes of Wetstein cannot here be all pointed out in detail.

“ We may now examine the witnesses brought forward by Dr. Tregelles. . . . Of the *twenty-five* writers whom he has adduced in support of the reading *μονογενῆς θεός*, but *four*, I believe, can be relied on with much confidence, and even their testimony is far from unexceptionable; *three* may be regarded as doubtful; *eight* really support the common reading; *two* merely allude to the passage; and *eight* have neither quoted nor alluded to it.”²

These statements were supported by a detailed exposition of the facts in the case, accompanied in every instance by precise references to the passages in the Fathers bearing on the subject. In addition to the correction of these enormous errors in respect to the evidence alleged for the reading *θεός*, I produced, as the result of original investigation, quotations of the passage, supporting the reading *υἱός*, from no less than *eighteen* Greek and *six* Latin ecclesiastical writers, whose testimony had never before been adduced to this purpose in any critical edition of the Greek Testament,—twelve or thirteen of them belonging to the third and fourth centuries. The examination made of the works of the Fathers enabled me also to give the evidence much more fully and accurately than had before been done in the case of many other writers who *had* been cited, on one side or the other, in editions of the Greek Testament. In this exposition of the evidence I was scrupulously careful to mention not only

¹ “ As in the following: ‘*Origenes* in Psalm. i. ap. Epiphanium,’ see Epiphanius, *Haeres.* LXIV. c. 7, Opp. I. 531^b, or Origen, Opp. II. 526^e; ‘*Eusebius*, D. IV. 2,’ i. e. Dem. Evang. Lib. IV. c. 2; ‘*Prudentius* in Apotheosi,’ viz. line 895; ‘*Claudianus Mamert.* de statu animae l. 2,’ where Lib. I. c. 2 must be the place intended.”

² Norton’s Statement of Reasons, etc. Appendix, Note C, pp. 451—453.

every quotation of the passage which I had found with the reading $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, but every allusion to it which might be imagined to favor this reading, even in cases where it seemed clear that no real argument could be founded on these allusions.

In the Postscript to the second edition of his Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament (pp. 780, 781), Dr. Tregelles has taken notice of my remarks on this passage, which "have led," as he says, "to a reëxamination of the whole of the evidence." After exhibiting the authorities for the different readings, he says in a note:

"In this one instance I have given at length the evidence for and against the reading, so as to show what authorities do really support $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\eta\varsigma$ $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ and what uphold $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\eta\varsigma$ $\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$. The statement is here given just as it stands in my Greek Testament, with the precise references to the Patristic citations."

The conclusion to which he comes is thus expressed:

"It appears to be most clear that not only is $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\eta\varsigma$ $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ the ancient reading of MSS. and some versions, but also of the Fathers *generally*; for those that have both readings in the present copies of their works, evidently do support that which is not in the *later* Greek text, with which those who copied their writings were familiar; and the doubtful passages must give way to the *express* mentions of $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ by the same writers as the reading in this place."

Here a regard for the truth compels me to state some facts which may give an unfavorable impression concerning Dr. Tregelles's character for fairness and accuracy. No one can regret this more than myself; and in simple justice to a scholar whose services to biblical criticism have been so valuable, and who has often shown himself superior to the influence of dogmatic prejudice, I must beg the reader not to regard his note on John i. 18 as a specimen of his usual manner of dealing with evidence.

Dr. Tregelles, it will be observed, professes to give at length the testimony for and against the reading $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$. In doing this, he does not confine himself to the chronological limit generally followed in his Greek Testament, so far as

the Fathers are concerned, but comes down to the latter part of the eighth century, including the latest author (namely Alcuin) who has ever been cited in favor of the reading "only-begotten God." He leads us to expect a full and accurate statement of the evidence on both sides, which, in a case like this, it was unquestionably his duty to give. How is it, then, in reality?

I answer that, for some cause which I do not pretend to explain, his account of the evidence is most deceptive and untrustworthy. He has entirely omitted to mention the greater part of the facts in the case, though they were placed directly before his eyes. In stating the evidence for the reading *θεός*, it is true, he has not been guilty of the sin of omission. On the contrary, he not only appears to have availed himself very freely of the matter which I had for the first time collected that seemed to favor that reading, even copying my references, in one instance at least, without verification,¹ but he has repeated many mistakes in the evidence alleged for this reading after they had been clearly pointed out. He has referred, in various instances, to places in different authors where John i. 18 is not quoted or even alluded to, but which merely contain the *expression* *μονογενὴς θεός* or *unigenitus Deus* applied to Christ by the writer, and has intermixed these references indiscriminately with those to actual *quotations*, thus leading the unwary reader

¹ I had cited the Dialogue of Cyril, "Quod Unus sit Christus," Opp. Tom. V. P. i. p. 786^e, for the reading *θεός*. The reference should have been to p. 768^e instead of p. 786^e. Dr. Tregelles has copied this mistake in reference, though an examination would have shown that the treatise ends on p. 778.

The only acknowledgement made by Dr. Tregelles of any indebtedness to my researches on this passage is the following: "He points out rightly that I had incorrectly alleged *Phoebadius* for the reading *μονογενὴς θεός* (an error which originated, I believe, in revising in the proof-sheet the name which had been intended for *Prudentius*)." This statement has not mended the matter. *Prudentius* has not only never quoted John i. 18 with the reading *unigenitus Deus*, but has never used this *expression* even, in any part of his writings. As to *Phoebadius*, I not only pointed out the fact that the same remark was true of him, but that he had expressly quoted the passage with the reading *unigenitus filius* (*Contra Arianos*, c. 12). Of this Dr. Tregelles, in his account of the evidence, takes no notice. Why should he not be as ready to adduce the testimony of *Phoebadius* on one side as the other?

to suppose them to denote quotations, and to attach to them undue weight.

But how fares the evidence on the other side? The answer to this question may well astonish the reader. Of the *twenty-three* Greek and *thirteen* Latin writers whom I had cited as supporting the reading *υἱός*, giving in every case exact references to their quotations of the passage, Dr. Tregelles notices only *seven*! Of the twenty-nine witnesses whom he thus ignores, at least *twenty-six* are as ancient as Alcuin, whom he cites, though erroneously, in favor of the reading "only-begotten God;" and a great majority of them belong to the third and fourth centuries. Even this is not all. His exhibition of the testimony of the authorities which he does cite as containing the reading *υἱός* is far from complete. See the note below.¹

¹ For the convenience of Dr. Tregelles, and those of his readers who may happen to see this Article, I will here point out in order some of the principal errors and defects in his note on John i. 18. A fuller discussion of various questions will be given hereafter.

Authorities cited for the reading μονογενῆς Θεός.

Lines 4, 5. "*Orig. Int. IV. 92^d.*" To be omitted. Merely an instance of the use of the expression "unigenitus Deus Salvator noster," without any reference to John i. 18.

Line 5. "*Marcel. ap. Eus. 19^c.*" To be omitted for a similar reason. Eusebius simply says of a letter of Marcellus, containing his creed: Γέγραφε πιστεύειν εἰς πατέρα θεόν παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ θεόν, τὸν κτίριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

Lines 5, 6. "*Eus. c. Mcl. 67^d.* ὁ μονογ. υἱὸς ἢ μονογ. θεός." This should be quoted with the context, τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ διαρρήθην αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ εἶναι διδάσκοντος δι' ὧν ἔφη, θεὸν οὐδέως ἔφακε πρότερον: ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός, ἢ μονογενῆς θεός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον, κ. τ. λ., which makes it, I think, evident that the words ἢ μονογ. θεός are a marginal gloss which has crept into the text; and that the proper place for the reference is among the authorities for *μονογενῆς υἱός*, where *vice* other places are cited, in which Eusebius has expressly quoted the passage with this reading.

Line 6. "*Eus. c. Mcl. 124^c.* θεὸν δὲ καὶ μονογενῆ." Irrelevant. Eusebius simply says here that Christ is represented by the Evangelist "as God *and* only-begotten," *not* only-begotten God, "inasmuch as he alone was truly the Son of the God over all."

Ibid. "*Hil. 1124^c seq.*" etc. To be omitted. The passage is not a quotation of John i. 18, except so far as the words "in sinu patris est" are concerned, as was shown in the Appendix to Norton's "Statement of Reasons," p. 465, note, and will be fully shown below. The stress of Hilary's argument, such as

Under such circumstances, no apology can be necessary for offering a restatement of the evidence for the various readings of the passage in question. In doing this, I may

it is, rests wholly on the word *est*. The "et in sequentibus saepe" which Dr. Tregelles adds is altogether deceptive, as it will naturally be understood to signify that Hilary has "often" quoted John i. 18 with the reading *unigenitus Deus*. The truth is, that he has never quoted the passage with this reading, but has, on the contrary, expressly quoted it seven times with the reading *filius*; and not only so, but has commented upon it in such a way (De Trin. Lib. VI. c. 39) as to demonstrate beyond question that he thus read the passage.

Lines 18, 19. "*Epist. Synodi Ancyranæ* 2^o [2^{da}] ap. Epiph. . . . Haer. lxxiii. 8 (i. 854^o)."
It is quite proper to adduce this among the authorities which favor the reading *θεός*, but as it is not an express quotation of the passage, it would be more accurate to add the Greek: $\delta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ [sc. *ἰσίδωρος*] τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν λόγον μονογενῆ θεόν . . . φησί. The imprudence of a confident reliance on references of this kind was illustrated in the Appendix to Norton's "Statement of Reasons," pp. 454, 455, note, and will be shown below.

Line 23. "*Cyr. Alex.* V. p. i. 786^o. For 786^o read 768^o."

Ibid. "*Fulgentius interdum.*" *Dele.* Fulgentius has never quoted the passage. His allusions to it were given in full in the "Appendix" just referred to, and will be again exhibited below.

Lines 23, 24. "*Isidorus Pcl.* 6. iii. 95 (ap. Wetst.)." *Dele.* Isidore of Pelusium has nowhere quoted or alluded to John i. 18. The passage referred to by Wetstein, as was pointed out in the Appendix to Norton's "Statement of Reasons," p. 460, note, contains merely the expression "only-begotten God," — δ μονογενῆς γοῦν θεός ἐπιδημήσας, φησί, κ. τ. λ. This is the only place in his writings in which Isidore uses even this expression.

Lines 24—29. "Scriptores Graeci et Latini saepissime habent verba *μονογενῆς θεός*, *unigenitus Deus*, tanquam nomen Jesu in Scriptura tributum; e. g., *Greg. Nyss.* saepissime, *Greg. Naz.*, *Bas. Sel.*, *Arius*, *Lucianus* (s. pseudo-Luc.), nec non *Eunomius*, *Tit. Bostr.*, *Gaudentius*, *Ferrandus*, *Prudentius*, *Vigilius*, *Alcuinus*, etc.; quod ab hoc loco ut videtur pendet." Here it is to be observed: 1. That it is not pretended that any of these writers quotes the passage in question with the reading "only-begotten God;" on the other hand, four of them, *Greg. Naz.*, *Tit. Bostr.*, *Vigilius*, and *Alcuin*, do expressly quote it with the reading "only-begotten Son." 2. Two of them, *Titus of Bostra* and *Prudentius*, have never even used the phrase "only-begotten God" in their published works. 3. Four of the remainder, *Bas. Sel.*, *Arius*, *Lucianus* (or Pseudo-Luc.), and *Gaudentius*, instead of employing this expression "saepissime," have used it but once each, in their extant writings; and it occurs very rarely, perhaps only once, in those of *Gregory Nazianzen*. 4. None of the writers named speak of it as "applied to Jesus in Scripture," except *Gregory Nyssen*; and his assertion, as I shall show, is very poor evidence that he ever found it there.

Authorities cited for the reading μονογενῆς υἱός.

Line 29. After "1." insert "69.," a manuscript of great value, ranking with 1. and 33.

be pardoned for saying, that so far as the testimony of the Fathers is concerned, nothing whatever will be given at second hand. When it is affirmed that a particular Father has not quoted John i. 18, or has never used in his writings even the expression *μονογενῆς Θεός*, or, on the other hand, that he *has* used it a certain number of times, the statement is founded on a personal examination of the whole of his published works. It would be presumptuous to assert that in this examination, extending over so wide a field, nothing has escaped my notice; I can only say that I have aimed at accuracy, and have had no object but to ascertain the truth. The new note of Dr. Tregelles has added nothing to the evidence which was presented in the Appendix to Norton's "Statement of Reasons," except one reference to Didymus of Alexandria, confirming the two citations which I had given from him in favor of the reading *Θεός*;¹ and, on the other side, the fact (already mentioned in Tischendorf's last edition of the Greek Testament), that

Line 31. Add "*Iren.* 189 (unigenitus filius Dei), et vid. seqq." Add also "*Orig.* IV. 102^d, δ μ. υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ap. De la Rue, δ μ. υἱὸς Θεός ap. Haet.; cf. δ μ. υἱὸς Θεός, Clem. 956. *Orig. Int.* III. 91^e, unigenitus Dei filius."

Line 32. For "197" read "297."

Line 33. *Dele* "123^b." There is no reference here to John i. 18.

Line 34. Insert among the references to *Hil.*, "799^e," and for "852^e" read "852^e."

Ibid. For "vid. *Tert. adv. Prax.* 8" read "*Tert. adv. Prax.* 15." Dr. Tregelles omits the place where Tertullian has quoted the passage with the reading *unigenitus filius*, and refers instead to a place where he has merely alluded to it in such a way as not to determine the reading.

Ibid. For "*Athanas.*," which is out of place, read "*Athanas.* I. 219^e (diserte), 227^d, 530^d, 638^a (dis.); cf. 628^{ef}, 631^d, 634^f, 635^a, ed. Benedict." Athanasius quotes the passage four times, twice *commenting* on the word *υἱός*, and refers to it in three other places in such a way as to show, in each of them, that he unquestionably read *υἱός*.

Within the chronological period to which Dr. Tregelles has confined himself, namely, the first eight centuries, I shall further adduce in support of the reading "only-begotten Son," the testimony of not less than *thirty* writers whom he has not mentioned; to which, for the sake of completeness, will be added that of ten or twelve others of later date.

¹ Not having been able to procure at that time the treatise of Didymus "De Trinitate," I was compelled to cite it at second hand from the work of Guericke, "De Schola quæ Alexandriae floruit catechetica," carefully stating, however, this fact in a note. Didymus was the only author thus cited.

the Aethiopic version, as edited by Mr. Platt, supports the reading *υἱός*. The very few other apparent additions are merely errors.

I may here advert to an extraordinary statement in the note of Dr. Tregelles, which, if correct, would make this whole investigation on my part an absurdity. He says: "Mr. Abbot has entirely failed in his endeavour to show that Patristic citations are wholly a matter of uncertainty" (p. 781). There is not the slightest ground in my note for ascribing to me such a preposterous "endeavor." I did endeavor to show that the evidence of some of *Dr. Tregelles's* "Patristic citations" was very uncertain; I called attention to the indisputable fact that several of his principal authorities were notorious for the general looseness and inaccuracy of their quotations; I pointed out the importance of carefully distinguishing express *citations* of a passage from mere *allusions* or *references* to it; and I proved that it was not always safe to rely on the assertion of a Father that a particular expression was found in scripture. But I can assure Dr. Tregelles that had I endeavored "to show that Patristic citations are wholly a matter of uncertainty," I should not have taken pains to adduce *eighty* of them, from *thirty-six* different writers, in opposition to the reading which he defends as genuine. The evidence of the Fathers in regard to various readings always needs to be carefully weighed and sifted; the references to it in all critical editions of the Greek Testament hitherto published are very incomplete, and often untrustworthy; but it is frequently of great importance.

WE will now examine the evidence for the reading *μονογενῆς Θεός* as compared with that for *μονογενῆς υἱός*. The testimony of the *Greek manuscripts* is first to be considered. It is here important to observe, that the words *υἱός* and *Θεός* in the abbreviated form in which they are written in the most ancient codices ($\overline{\Upsilon\text{C}}$, $\overline{\Theta\text{C}}$), differ in but a single letter, so that one might easily be substituted for the other through the inadvertence of a transcriber.

The reading $\Sigma\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ is found in the MSS. $\aleph^* B C^* L, 33$; only five in number, but three of them of the highest antiquity, and all of great value. \aleph , the *Codex Sinaiticus*, which has the reading *a prima manu*, was probably written, according to Tischendorf, about the middle of the fourth century; B, the Vatican manuscript, is of nearly the same age; C, the Ephrem manuscript, is about a century later; L is of the eighth century, but remarkable for its affinity with the Vatican and the Ephrem; and 33 is a cursive manuscript of the eleventh century, also very remarkable for its agreement with our oldest copies. It is one of the three manuscripts of this class which reads $\delta\varsigma$ in 1 Tim. iii. 16.

The reading $\upsilon\acute{i}\omicron\varsigma$, on the other hand, is found in $\aleph^{**} A C^{***} E F G H K M S U V X \Delta A$, also in 1. 69., and all the other cursive manuscripts containing the passage (so far as is known), amounting to four or five hundred in number, but many of them imperfectly collated. \aleph^{**} denotes the *Codex Sinaiticus* as corrected; A is the Alexandrine manuscript, of the fifth century; C^{***} denotes the Ephrem manuscript as corrected in the ninth century; X and Δ are manuscripts of the latter part of the ninth century, but distinguished from the others of that period by their more frequent agreement with the most ancient documents; this is particularly true of X, the text of which is of great excellence. The other uncial manuscripts range in date from the eighth century to the tenth; 1 and 69 are cursive manuscripts, the first of the tenth, the second of the fourteenth century, but of uncommon value on account of the accordance of their text with that of our oldest copies; a remark which applies, in a somewhat inferior degree, to a considerable number of others, especially, 13, 22, 118, 124, 157, and 209.

The concurrence of three out of our four most ancient manuscripts in the reading $\Sigma\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ is remarkable; but some circumstances may lessen its apparent weight. The testimony of \aleph , which has the reading *a prima manu*, cannot be properly estimated till we know something respecting the date of the *correction*, which possesses an authority, of course, equal to that of a manuscript at the time it was made. The

alterations which κ has undergone are by many different hands, but Tregelles remarks (p. 784) that "it will apparently be found that one at least of these has carefully corrected the errors of the original scribe; indeed it seems not improbable that such a corrector may have been the person whose business it was to revise what had been written by a mere mechanical copyist. For a full apprehension of the value, etc., of the corrections, we must wait the appearance of Tischendorf's edition." Should it appear that the original διορθωτής, or a very early corrector, altered the reading of κ from Θεός to υἱός, the importance of its testimony to the former would be greatly diminished, or even nullified; on the other hand, if the change was made by a *late* corrector, the alteration would be of little consequence. That the original transcriber was careless or sleepy when he copied John i. 18 is evident from the fact that he has omitted the words $\delta\ \omega\nu$ before εἰς τὸν κόλπον. Another circumstance may be regarded as weakening in some measure the authority of $\kappa^* B C^* L$ in this passage. They all agree in reading μονογενῆς Θεός instead of $\delta\ \muονογενῆς υἱός$. It seems hardly possible that this omission of the *article* can be correct; but if this be an error, it throws some suspicion on the reading which accompanies it.

The balance of evidence in the case of the manuscripts will be estimated differently by different critics according to the school to which they belong. Tregelles would attribute greater weight than Tischendorf to the preponderance of the few most ancient manuscripts in favor of Θεός, while Mr. Scrivener would lay greater stress than either on the testimony of the later uncials and cursives. It may be sufficient to say here that the united testimony of the manuscripts of the ninth century and later, though numbered by hundreds, cannot disprove the genuineness of a reading which is supported by a great preponderance of the more ancient evidence; and on the other hand, that the coincidence of the MSS. $\kappa B C L$ in a reading, though entitled to grave consideration, is far from being decisive. The testimony of several of the ancient versions and Fathers goes

further back than that of our oldest manuscripts; and that of the versions, in particular, is of great importance in cases like the present, where, from the similarity of the questionable words in the Greek, a transcriber might easily mistake one for the other.

We will proceed, then, to examine the evidence of the *ancient versions*. The following support $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$:—1. the Peshito Syriac, which has been assigned to the second century, but the text of which is regarded by Dr. Tregelles and others as having been greatly corrupted and modernized, especially in the Gospels, by a later revision;¹ 2. the Harclean or Philoxenian Syriac (A. D. 616) in the *margin*; 3. the Coptic or Memphitic (third or fourth cent.); and, 4. the Aethiopic (fourth or fifth cent.) in the Roman edition.

The following support $\nu\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\varsigma$:—1. the Old Latin or Italic, of the second century; 2. the Vulgate, of the fourth; 3. the Curetonian Syriac, probably of the second century;² 4. the Harclean or Philoxenian Syriac (A. D. 616) in the *text*; 5. the Jerusalem Syriac, of uncertain date, but representing a very ancient text; 6. the Aethiopic (fourth or fifth cent.), as edited in 1826 by Mr. Platt; and, 7. the Armenian, of the fifth century.

It will be perceived that the weight of authority, so far as the ancient versions are concerned, greatly predominates in favor of the reading $\nu\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\varsigma$. The evidence of the Old Latin and the Curetonian Syriac is particularly important.

The testimony of the *ancient Fathers* is next to be attended to. We will examine the evidence, 1. of those ~~which~~ ^{who} favor $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$; 2. of those ~~which~~ ^{who} support $\nu\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\varsigma$; and, 3. of a few ~~which~~ ^{who} have quoted the passage with *both* readings, and may be regarded as doubtful. I add, for convenience, the time at which they flourished as assigned by Cave.

I. The following favor the reading $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$.

1. Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 194, who has once quoted

¹ See his *Introd. to Textual Criticism*, pp. 265, 266; comp. p. 757.

² Of this version Dr. Tregelles observes that "its readings are in far greater accordance with the oldest authorities of various kinds than is the case in the previously known Peshito."—*Ibid.* p. 267. It has been printed from a MS. of the fifth century.

the passage with this reading (Stromat. Lib. V. c. 12. p. 695 ed. Potter). This evidence is however somewhat weakened by the fact, that in another place, in alluding to the text, he has the words ὁ μονογενῆς υἱὸς Θεός, "the only-begotten Son, who is God."¹ He does not comment on the passage, in either case, in such a way as to show how he read it; and as Dr. Tregelles has remarked (p. 333), "he often gives his own phrases instead of those of any writer whom he may cite." Indeed, he is one of the most remarkable among the Fathers for the looseness of his quotations from scripture.

2. The "Excerpta Theodoti," or "Doctrina Orientalis." This is a compilation of uncertain authorship, but supposed by many to have been made by Clement of Alexandria, with whose works it is generally printed. "Theodotus" is several times cited in it, but more frequently "the followers of Valentinus." The quotation of John i. 18 occurs in an account of the manner in which the Valentinians understood and explained the first chapter of John. It is a very important testimony to the reading Θεός, both on account of its high antiquity, and because it is express:—*ἀντικρυς Θεὸν αὐτὸν δηλοῖ λέγων, Ὁ μονογενῆς Θεός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.*²

3. Epiphanius, Bp. of Constantia or Salamis in Cyprus, A. D. 368, has quoted the passage three times with the reading Θεός. (Haer. LXV. c. 5, *bis*, and LXX. c. 7. Opp. I. 612^a and 818^a ed. Petav.) In the remark, however, which follows the quotation in the first passage, Θεός and υἱός are interchanged:—*Καί φησι, Ὁ μονογενῆς Θεός· ὁ μὲν γὰρ λόγος ἐστὶν ἐκ πατρὸς γεννηθείς, ὁ πατὴρ δὲ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη διὰ τοῦτο μονογενῆς υἱός.* He also speaks of John as "calling Christ only-begotten God:"—*Μονογενῆ Θεὸν αὐτὸν φάσκων Περὶ πατρὸς γέγραπται, ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ περὶ υἱοῦ δέ, ὅτι μονογενῆς Θεός.* (Ancorat. c. 3. Opp. II. 8^{od}.) A little before, however, in a quotation of John i. 18, ὁ μονογενῆς is given

¹ Καὶ τότε ἐποπτεύσεις τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ὃν ὁ μονογενῆς υἱὸς Θεός μόνος ἐξηγήσατο. — Quis dives salvetur, c. 37. p. 956.

² Excerpta Theodot. c. 6, ap. Clem. Alex. Opp. p. 968 ed. Potter; also in Fabricii Bibl. Graec. V. 136, and in Bunsen's Analecta Ante-Nicensia, I. 211.

without either *θεός* or *υἱός*. But here the context renders it probable that *θεός* has been omitted after *μονογενής* by the mistake of a transcriber, though the text, both in what precedes and follows, appears to be corrupt.¹

4. Didymus of Alexandria, A. D. 370, has quoted the passage twice with the reading *θεός*. (De Trinit. Lib. I. c. 26, and Lib. II. c. 5; pp. 76, 140 ed. Mingarel., or in Migne's Patrol. Graeca, XXXIX. 393^a, 495^a.) He also says, *ὁ υἱὸς κέκληται μονογενής θεὸς λόγος, καὶ εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*. (*Ibid.* Lib. I. c. 15. p. 27, or col. 313^a ed. Migne.) But here it may be doubted whether a comma should be placed after *μονογενής*, or after *θεός*, or after neither.

The four writers whose testimony has now been adduced, comprise all who have expressly quoted John i. 18 with the reading *μονογενής θεός* alone, and are all who can be cited in its support with much confidence. There are four others who have quoted the passage with both readings, namely, Irenaeus, Origen, Basil the Great, and Cyril of Alexandria. The first of these favors *υἱός*; the last, perhaps, *θεός*; while the two remaining are altogether doubtful. Their evidence will be considered hereafter.

There are, however, some *allusions* and *references* to the passage which may be supposed to favor the reading *θεός*, but in regard to which there is room for a difference of opinion. A statement of the facts will enable the reader to form his own judgment.

1. The Second (semi-Arian) Synod of Ancyra, A. D. 358, may have read *θεός* in John i. 18, but the evidence is not decisive. After quoting Prov. viii. 22, etc., Col. i. 15, etc., and the first verses of the Proem to the Gospel of John, without any allusion, however, to John i. 18, the Fathers of this Synod state their conclusion as follows:—“ So that we

¹ After having quoted and remarked upon John xvii. 3, Epiphanius says: *Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τίνα; ἀληθινὸν θεόν. Εἰ δὲ θεὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὡς λέγει περὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰωάννης, Ὁ μονογενής, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, αὐτὸς ἐξηγήσατο. Εἰς θεὸν τοιοῦτον ὁ πατήρ, κ. τ. λ.*—Ancorat. c. 2. p. 7^c. Here *εἰ δέ* must be wrong unless the whole conclusion of the sentence has been lost. Perhaps we should substitute *οἶδε* (comp. Basil. de Spir. Sanct. c. 8, p. 14^c) or *οἶδare*, though *θε* may seem at first an easier emendation.

have testimony 'from the mouth of two or three witnesses' in proof that the substance of the Son is like that of the Father; for one [Solomon] calls the wisdom of the [all-] Wise his Son; another [John] calls the Logos of God only-begotten God; another [Paul] calls the Son of God his Image."¹ We have no reason to suppose, *a priori*, that the reference to John is verbally accurate any more than that to Proverbs, where we find neither the word *υἱός*, nor the expression *ἡ σοφία τοῦ σοφοῦ*. It is not uncommon with the Fathers to give as the language of scripture, expressions formed from several passages combined, or which they regard as fully authorized by scripture, though not occurring there in so many words. The Logos being called "God" in John i. 1, and the Son being called "the only-begotten" in John i. 18, nothing was more natural than that they should unite the two passages, and speak of John as calling the Logos "the only-begotten God." This would be done the more readily by many of the Fathers, as they regarded the terms "Son" and "only-begotten" as necessarily implying a participation of the Divine nature, and as in themselves justifying the appellation *θεός*. Thus the Epistle of this Synod says, a little after the passage just cited, *υἱὸς θεὸς μὲν, καθὸ υἱὸς θεοῦ, ὡς ἀνθρώπος, καθὸ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*. (Cap. 9. p. 855^b ap. Epiph.) So Eusebius says that Christ is *τοῦ θεοῦ μονογενῆς υἱός, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θεός* (Dem. Evang. Lib. V. c. 4. p. 227^b), and an indefinite number of passages might be quoted to the same purpose.

2. In one place Gregory of Nyssa (A. D. 370) says: *Εἰρηται παρὰ τῆς γραφῆς περὶ τοῦ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντος λόγου, ὅτι ὁ μονογενῆς θεός, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*. (De Perf. Christ. Forma. Opp. III. 291^a.) Some may regard this as a clear proof that Gregory read *θεός* in John i. 18. One, however, who has become accustomed to the style in which scripture is quoted and referred to in the writings of the Fathers, will

¹ Ὡς ἔχειν τὴν ἐπὶ στόματος δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων [f. μαρτυρίαν, Ρεταν.] εἰς ἀπόδειξιν τῆς κατ' οὐσίαν πρὸς πατέρα τοῦ υἱοῦ ὁμοιότητος. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ σοφοῦ τὴν σοφίαν υἱόν· ὁ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν λόγον μονογενῆ θεόν· ὁ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν υἱὸν εἰκόνα φησί. — Apud Epiphani. Haer. LXXIII. c. 8. Opp. I. 854^{bc}; or Concilia, ed. Coleti, II. 872^b.

he more likely to regard it as affording but a slight presumption of this fact; a presumption altogether outweighed by the consideration, that he has nowhere expressly quoted the passage, though the deity of Christ is so prominent a subject in his writings. If he had actually read Θεός in John i. 18, it would have been a testimony too remarkable to be overlooked. It is not easy to perceive why it should not have been quoted as often as John i. 1. But we have not far to seek for an illustration of the imprudence of a confident reliance on such references to scripture as the one before us. Turning back a few leaves in this same treatise of Gregory Nyssen we find the assertion that, among the names which the Apostle Paul has given to Christ,—“He has called him a propitiation for souls, and first-born of the *new* creation, and *only-begotten Son*, crowned with glory and honor,” etc.¹ In another place he expressly quotes the words “whom God hath set forth as a propitiation for our souls” as the language of the Apostle.² But it would be idle to suppose that he had anything corresponding to the italicized words in his manuscripts in Rom. iii. 25, or that his Greek copies contained the expression “*new* creation” in Col. i. 16; still more that his copy of the Epistle to the Hebrews contained the words “*only-begotten Son*,” a phrase occurring only in the writings of John. The looseness and inaccuracy of such references to scripture in the writings of the Fathers might be much more fully illustrated.

Though Gregory of Nyssa has nowhere quoted John i. 18, he has repeatedly *alluded* to it, using the words ὁ ὢν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρὸς *eight* times in connection with the expression ὁ μονογενὴς Θεός, *twice* in connection with the phrase ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, and *once* with the phrase ὁ ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεός. For examples and references see below.³ The

¹ Αὐτὸν ἐκάλεσε ἰλαστήριον ψυχῶν, καὶ τῆς καινῆς κτίσεως πρωτότοκον, καὶ υἱὸν μονογενῆ, δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον, κ. τ. λ. — De Perf. Christ. Forma. Opp. III. 276, 277.

² Ὁς [ὁ ἀπόστολος] φησιν· ὅτι ἄν προέδετο ὁ θεὸς ἰλαστήριον τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν. — De Vita Mosis. Opp. I. 225^d.

³ Ὁ μονογενὴς θεός, ὁ ὢν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρὸς, οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δεξιὰ τοῦ ὑψίστου. — De Vita Mosis. Opp. I. 192^b. See also In Cantic. Hom. xiii. Opp. I.

expression ὁ μονογενῆς Θεός is a favorite designation of Christ in the writings of this Father. I have noted *one hundred and twenty-five* examples of its occurrence in his treatise against Eunomius alone. But this expression, as we shall see, is also a favorite one with other Fathers who unquestionably read "only-begotten Son" in John i. 18.

3. We may here take notice of the allusions to John i. 18 in the writings of a Latin Father, Fulgentius, who flourished A. D. 507. They are so instructive as to deserve to be quoted in full. Taken together, they show clearly how little can be inferred concerning the reading of a passage from such allusions, and may serve to guard us against hasty conclusions from those of Gregory of Nyssa. See the note below.¹ Neither Fulgentius, nor any other Latin Father, has ever *quoted* John i. 18 with the reading *unigenitus Deus*. This is only what might be expected, as both the Old Latin version and the Vulgate read *Filius*. But if Fulgentius had found the reading *Deus* in his copies, the nature of his writings is such that he could not have failed to quote it frequently in proof of the deity of Christ.

663a. — Contra Eunom. Orat. II., *tris*, III., VI., X. Opp. II. 432^b, 447^a, 478^d, 506^e, 595 [605]^a, 681^a.

Ἵ ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός, ὁ ὢν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὢν, κ. τ. λ. — Epist. ad Flavian. Opp. III. 648^a. See also Contra Eunom. Orat. II. Opp. II. 466^e.

Ἵ ὁ ἐν ὑψίστοις θεός, ὢν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρὸς, κ. τ. λ. — In Cantic. Hom. XV. Opp. I 697^a.

¹ Fulgentius has alluded to John i. 18 six times.

1. In connection with the phrase *unigenitus Deus*. "Ut ille unigenitus Deus, qui est in sinu Patris, non solum in muliere, sed etiam ex muliere fieret homo." Epist. xvii. c. 3, in Migne's Patrol. LXV. 272^b. "De Deo unigenito, qui est in sinu Patris, ut dixi, omnia hæc personaliter accipe." De Fide, c. 20, col. 681^b, ed. Migne.

2. With *unigenitus Filius*. — "Quis enim natus est Deus verus ex Deo vero, nisi unigenitus Filius, qui est in sinu Patris?" Ad Trasim. Lib. III. c. 4, col. 272^b. "Si vero unigenitus Filius, qui est in sinu Patris, post æternam nativitatem," etc. Epist. xvii. c. 15, col. 459^e. "Dei ergo Filius unigenitus, qui est in sinu Patris, ut carnem hominis animamque mundaret," etc. De Fide, c. 17, col. 679^e.

3. With *unigenitus* alone. "Quia unigenitus, qui est in sinu Patris, secundum quod caro est, plenus est gratiæ," etc. De Incarnat. c. 18, col. 583^e.

The expression "unigenitus Deus" occurs in the writings of Fulgentius about *ninety* times.

II. The following Greek Fathers, with one Pagan writer, support the reading *υἱός*. They expressly quote the passage with this reading, unless the contrary is stated.

1. Irenaeus, Bp. of Lyons in Gaul, but educated in Asia Minor, fl. A. D. 178. According to the very early Latin version in which his work against Heresies has come down to us, he has quoted the passage once with the reading *Filius*; once with *Filius Dei*; and once with *Deus*. As *Filius Dei* is a merely trivial variation of *Filius*, and as the words which follow his quotation in one passage confirm the latter reading, his testimony may be fairly regarded as favoring *υἱός*.¹

2. Hippolytus, Bp. of Portus Romanus, A. D. 220. λέγει γὰρ Ἰωάννης· Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε, μονογενὴς υἱός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, αὐτὸς διηγήσατο. (Cont. Noet. c. 5. In Routh's Script. Eccles. Opusc. I. 58 ed. alt., or Migne's Patrol. Gr. X. 812*.)

3. The Third Synod at Antioch (A. D. 269), in their Epistle to Paul of Samosata. (Concilia, ed. Coleti, I. 869^b; also in Routh's Reliq. Sacr. II. 473, or III. 297 ed. alt.)

4. Archelaus, or rather the "Acta Disp. Archelai cum Manete" (about A. D. 300?), as preserved in a Latin version. (Cap. 32. In Routh's Reliq. Sacr. IV. 213, or V. 121 ed. alt.; also in Migne's Patrol. Gr. X. 1479*.)

5. Alexander, Bp. of Alexandria, A. D. 313. (Epist. ad Alex. Constant. § 4, ap. Theodoreti Hist. Eccl. Lib. I. c. 4 (al. 3); or in Migne's Patrol. Gr. XVIII. 553*.)

6. Eusebius, Bp. of Caesarea, A. D. 315, quotes the passage with the reading *υἱός* not less than six times. In one case, indeed, which has already been briefly noticed, the words ἡ μονογενὴς Θεός are added *after* ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, and

¹ The passages are as follows: 1. "Deum enim, inquit, nemo vidit unquam, nisi unigenitus Filius Dei, qui est in sinu Patris, ipse enarravit. Patrem enim invisibilem existentem ille qui in sinu ejus est Filius omnibus enarrat." (Cont. Haer. Lib. III. c. 11. § 6. p. 189 ed. Mass). 2. "Quemadmodum in Evangelio scriptum est: Deum nemo vidit unquam, nisi unigenitus Filius, qui est in sinu Patris, ipse enarravit." (Ibid. Lib. IV. c. 20. § 6. p. 255.) 3. "Quemadmodum et Dominus dixit: Unigenitus Deus, qui est in sinu Patris, ipse enarravit." (Ibid. Lib. IV. c. 20. § 11. p. 256.)

on this ground Dr. Tregelles claims his authority in support of the reading *θεός*. This passage *alone*, however, when carefully examined with the *context*, seems enough to disprove' this claim; and when it is taken in connection with at least *five* other unequivocal quotations in which Eusebius reads *υἱός*, there really appears to be no room for doubt. The facts are given below.¹

¹ Eusebius quotes John i. 18 with the reading *υἱός*, De Eccles. Theol. Lib. I. c. 20. §§ 4, 5. p. 86^{ab}. In the remarks which follow the last quotation, he repeats the expression *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*, and uses the words *ὁπῶν καὶ ὁ υἱὸς εἰς τὸν κήρυκον ἦν τοῦ πατρὸς* in such a way as to afford strong confirmation of that reading. A little further on (p. 86^c) he enumerates the appellations given to Christ by the Apostle John, in their order, in such a manner as to demonstrate that he read *υἱός* in John i. 18. He calls upon us to observe how the Evangelist, *μ ε τ ἀ τὸ ἔπαξ ὀνομάσαι λόγον* (John i. 1), *καὶ θεὸν τὸν αὐτὸν ἀνειπεῖν* (ver. 1), *καὶ φῶς ἀποκαλέσαι* (ver. 7), *καὶ μονογενῆ φάναι* (ver. 14), *καὶ υἱὸν θεοῦ ὁμολογήσαι* (ver. 18), *οὐκ ἔτι λόγον ὀνομάζει, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν λοιπὸν ἱστορεῖ τὸν σωτήρα οὐ λόγον ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλοῦντα, ἀλλὰ υἱόν, καὶ μονογενῆ, καὶ φῶς, κ. τ. λ.*, quoting John iii. 16, etc. Now the only place before this citation from the third chapter, in which *the Evangelist*, in his own person, applies the name *Son* to Christ, is in the passage in question. Eusebius *must*, therefore, have read *υἱός* in John i. 18; and the arbitrary hypothesis that in all his apparent quotations of the passage with this reading, *θεός* has been changed to *υἱός* by transcribers, falls to the ground.

Eusebius also reads *υἱός*, De Eccles. Theol. Lib. I. c. 20. § 7. p. 92^d; Lib. II. c. 23. p. 142^c; and Comm. in Psalm. lxxiii. 11, in Montfaucon's Coll. Nova, I. 440^a. We may add his Comm. in Is. vi. 1, where we find *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κήρυκον τοῦ πατρὸς*, though not introduced as a formal quotation (Montf. Coll. Nova, II. 374^d). It may here be observed that no various reading affecting the word *υἱός* is given by Nolte, who made use of four manuscripts in revising the text of Eusebius de Eccles. Theol. published by the Abbé Migne in his Patrol. Graeca, Tom. XXIV.

Let us now examine the passage on which Dr. Tregelles relies, De Eccles. Theol. Lib. I. c. 9. p. 67^d. Here the quotation is introduced by the assertion that the Evangelist "*expressly* teaches that Christ is the only-begotten *Son* in the following words," and is succeeded by a quotation of John iii. 16, where the same expression also occurs, in which Eusebius says that "*our Saviour confirms this.*" Τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ διαρρήθην αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ εἶναι διδασκοντος δι' ὧν ἔφη, θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πρόποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, ἢ μονογενὴς θεός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κήρυκον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. Under these circumstances, an impartial critic will probably think that no clause ever more clearly betrayed itself as a marginal gloss, than the words *ἢ μονογενὴς θεός* in the present instance. It is perhaps hardly worth while to mention that they are so regarded by the original editor, Bp. Montagu, who says of them in his note: "Non sunt hæc evangelistæ, sed nec credo Eusebii, nisi forsan, ἡγουν μονογενὴς θεός."

The only passage that I have found in Eusebius which might seem at first view to countenance the reading *μονογενὴς θεός* is in his treatise De Eccles.

7. Eustathius, Bp. of Antioch, A. D. 320. (De Engastrimytho, c. 18, in Galland. Bibl. Patr. IV. 563^c, or Migne's Patrol. Gr. XVIII. 652^c.)

8. Athanasius, Bp. of Alexandria, A. D. 326, has expressly quoted John i. 18 with the reading *υἱός* four times, and referred to it in such a way in *three* other places as to show in each of them that he had this reading.¹

9. Pseud-Athanasius, fourth cent.? (Contra Sabellian. c. 2. Opp. II. 38^d.)

10. Cyril of Jerusalem, A. D. 350, *probably*. He has nowhere expressly quoted the passage, but *alludes* to it as follows:— Πιστεύομεν τοίνυν εἰς ἓνα θεὸν πατέρα . . . ὃν ἀνθρώπων μὲν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν, ὁ μονογενὴς δὲ μόνος ἐξηγήσατο. (Cat. VII. c. 11. Opp. p. 117 ed. Tout.) Here the omission of *υἱός* after *μονογενὴς* affords no ground for supposing that it was absent from his Greek copies in John i. 18, because its omission does not affect the sense. But if he had read *θεός* in this passage, it is improbable that he would have neglected so important a word. To this it may be added, that in his Eleventh Catechesis, it is his special object to prove that the *sonship* of Christ implies his *divinity*, or, as he expresses it, that *θεός θεὸν ἐγέννησεν*. Such being the case, had

Theol. Lib. III. c. 7. pp. 174, 175. After having quoted Eph. iv. 5, 6, he says of the Father: "He alone may be called (*χρηματί(σοι) ὁ ὅν*) the One God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; but the Son [may be called] only-begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father (*ὁ δὲ υἱὸς μονογενὴς θεός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς*); and the Paraclete, Spirit, but neither God nor Son." Here it will be observed that Eusebius does not assert that the Son is called "only-begotten God" in scripture, but only that it is proper to give him that name. This passage, therefore, does not weaken the force of his express quotations of John i. 18 with the reading *υἱός*.

¹ The direct quotations of Athanasius are, De Decret. Nic. Synod. c. 13: Περὶ δὲ τοῦ κυρίου εὐαγγελιζόμενος λέγει· Ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον, κ. τ. λ. Εἰ τοίνυν υἱός, οὐ κτίσμα, κ. τ. λ. (Opp. I. 219^e, ed. Bened., Par. 1698.) *Ibid.* c. 21. p. 227^d. Orat. II. cont. Arian. c. 62. p. 530^d. Orat. IV. cont. Arian. c. 26. p. 638^a: Πάλιν δὲ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ εἰρημένον, Ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον, κ. τ. λ. δείκνυσι τὸν υἱὸν ἀεὶ εἶναι. Ὅν γὰρ λέγει ὁ Ἰωάννης υἱὸν, τοῦτο χεῖρα ὁ Δαβὶδ ψάλλει λέγων· Ἴνα τί ἀποστρέφεις τὴν χεῖρά σου . . . ἐκ μέσου τοῦ κόλπου σου (Psalm lxxiii. al. lxxiv. 11). Οὐκοῦν εἰ ἡ χεὶρ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ, καὶ ὁ υἱός ἐν κόλπῳ, κ. τ. λ. The references to the reading *υἱός*, which in this case are as explicit as quotations, are found in Orat. IV. cont. Arian. c. 16. p. 628^{ef}; *ibid.* c. 20, p. 631^d; and c. 23. pp. 634^f, 635^a.

he read *μονογενῆς Θεός* in John i. 18, he could hardly have failed to quote the passage; none would seem so likely to suggest itself. But he has not referred to it.

11. The Emperor Julian, A. D. 362, has quoted the passage *twice* with the reading *υἱός*. (Ap. Cyril. Alex. Lib. X. cont. Julian.; Opp. VI. ii. 333.)

12. Titus of Bostra, A. D. 362. (Cont. Manichaeos, Lib. III. c. 6, in Galland. Bibl. Patr. V. 332^b, or Migne's Patrol. Gr. XVIII. 1224^b.) He has also once quoted the passage with the reading *υἱὸς Θεός*.¹

13. Gregory of Nazianzus, A. D. 370. 'Επειδὴ υἱὸς *μονογενῆς* ὁ *μονογενῆς υἱός*, ὃ ὦν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκείνος ἐξηγήσατο. (Orat. XXIX. al. XXXV. c. 17, p. 535^a ed. Bened.) Euthymius quotes this passage from Gregory with the same reading. (Panopl. Pars I. Tit. xi.)

14. *Pseudo-Basilii* (4th cent.?), that is, the author of a Homily published with the works of Basil. (Hom. in Psalm. xxviii. c. 3, in Basili Magni Opp. I. 359^f ed. Bened.)

15. Rufinus Syrus or Palaestinensis, about A. D. 390, as preserved in a very early Latin translation. (De Fide, Lib. I. c. 16, in Sirmondi Opera Varia, I. 166^a, ed. Venet. 1728.)

16. Chrysostom, A. D. 398, not less than *eight* times. In several of these instances he so *comments* on the word *υἱός* as to show beyond question that he had this reading.²

17. Theodore of Mopsuestia, A. D. 407, in his comment on John i. 29. *Εἰρηκῶς ἐνταῦθα ὁ βαπτιστής, ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν*

¹ *Ibid.* c. 11, ap. Galland. Bibl. Patr. V. 338^c, or Migne, XVIII. 1240^a. Here *θεός* may have been added by Titus from John i. 1 to indicate, as he says in the following sentence, that the *υἱός* was *υἱὸς γνήσιος ὁμοῖος τῷ γεγεννηκότι*. Compare the insertion in the next sentence to this, where he quotes Matt. iii. 17 (or xvii. 5) thus: *Ὁστός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ μονογενῆς καὶ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα*.

² De Incomp. Dei Natura, Hom. IV. c. 3, *his*; *ibid.* c. 4; *ibid.* Hom. V. c. 1; Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt, c. 3; In Is. cap. vi. § 1; In illud, *Filius ex se nihil*, etc. c. 6; In Joan. Hom. XV. al. XIV. cc. 1 (text), 2. Opp. I. 475^a, 476^b, 481^a; III. 470^b; VI. 64^a, 264^d; VIII. 84^b, 86^c, cf. 87^b, ed. Montf. Of these passages, those first referred to will be found, on examination, to exclude the *possibility* of the supposition that Chrysostom really quoted the passage with the reading *θεός*, and that transcribers have substituted *υἱός*. I may also remark that neither Savile nor Montfaucon have noted in their manuscripts, in any of these instances, any various reading affecting *υἱός*.

ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, οὐκ εἶπεν Ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, οὐδέ, Ὁ ὢν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρὸς, ὅλα φαίνεται ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρω εἰρηκῶς (i. e. in John i. 18).—Ap. Maii Nov. Patr. Bibl. Tom. VII. P. i. p. 397, or in Migne's Patrol. Gr. LXVI. 733^d.

18. Nonnus, of Panopolis in Egypt, A. D. 410, *probably*. In his poetical Paraphrase of the Gospel of John, he has no trace of the reading θεός, which he would hardly have failed to express, had he found it in the original. He uses *μονογενής* alone, which implies υἱός.

19. Theodoret, Bp. of Cyrrhus, near Antioch, A. D. 423, at least *four* times. (Comm. in Psalm cix. 1;—Dial. I.;—Haer. Fab. Lib. V. cc. 1, 2. Opp. I. 1392, and IV. 20, 379, 383, ed. Schulz.)

20. Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople, A. D. 434. (Orat. XV. c. 2. Analect. p. 440, ed. Riccard., or in Migne's Patrol. Gr. LXV. 801^a.)

21. *Pseudo-Cyril*, fifth century? I refer under this name to a work, "De sanctâ et vivificâ Trinitate," ascribed to Cyril of Alexandria, and published as his by Cardinal Mai. Dr. Tregelles, however, to whose judgment I have deferred, regards it as the production of a later writer than Cyril.¹ In this work (cap. 6) John i. 18 is quoted with the reading υἱός.²

22. Andreas, Bp. of Crete, A. D. 635? (Orat. in Transfig. Opp. p. 44^a ed. Combefis.)

23. *Pseudo-Caesarius*, seventh century? (Quaest. et Respons., Dial. I. Resp. 4, ap. Galland. Bibl. Patr. VI. 8^b.) The work here cited has been attributed, but it would seem erroneously, to Caesarius, the brother of Gregory Nazianzen. It was accredited as his in the time of Photius, who has described it.

24. Joannes Damascenus, A. D. 730, *three* times. (De Fide Orthod. Lib. I. c. 1;—Adv. Nestorianos, c. 32, *bis*. Opp. I. 123^c, 562^c ed. Le Quien.)

¹ Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Test., p. 232, note †.

² In Maii Script. Vet. Nov. Coll., Tom. VIII. P. ii. p. 31, and in his Nov. Patr. Bibl. II. 5; also in Migne's Patrol. Gr. LXXV. 1153_b.

25. Theodore Studites, A. D. 813, *twice*. (Antirrhet. III. 14, and Epist. II. 56. Epist., etc., pp. 108^d, 349^e, as edited by Sirmond in his Opera Varia, Tom. V.)

26. Andreas the Presbyter (9th or 10th cent.?), in his Catena on 1 John iv. 11—17. (Cramer's Catena, VIII. 134.)

27. The Catena on John i. 18, published by Cramer. (Cramer's Catena, II. 189.)

28. Theophylact, A. D. 1070. (Comm. in loc. Opp. I. 519^e ed. Venet.)

29. Euthymius Zigabenus or Zygadenus, A. D. 1110, *thrice*. (Comm. in loc. III. 35, 39 ed. Matth.; and Panopl. P. II. Tit. xxiii. (Adv. Bogomilos) c. 6, p. 10, ed. Gieseler.)

It is hardly worth while to go lower than this, but two or three more writers may be added for completeness.

30. Elias Cretensis, A. D. 787, according to Cave, 1120 Oudin. (Comm. in Greg. Naz. Orat. I., in the App. to Greg. Naz. Opp. II. 210^a, ed. of 1630.)

31. Zacharias Chrysopolitanus, A. D. 1157. (In Unum ex Quat., Lib. I. in loc., according to the Latin version in Max. Bibl. Patr. XIX. 762^d.)

32. Nicetas Choniates, A. D. 1200, *four* times. (Thes. Orthod. Lib. I. c. 27; IV. 31; V. 41, 60, according to the Latin version in Max. Bibl. Patr. XXV. 75^f, 130^e, 165^e, 176^b.)

We will now attend to the testimony of the Latin Fathers. Some of them, as Tertullian, Hilary, Victorinus Afer, Ambrose, and Jerome, were acquainted with Greek, and occasionally, at least, consulted the original; but the evidence of the majority bears only on the reading of the Old Latin and Vulgate versions. Notwithstanding the extraordinary statements of Dr. Tregelles, and various editors of the Greek Testament who have been misled by Wetstein, no quotation of John i. 18 with the reading *unigenitus Deus* has ever been produced from a single Latin Father. The following quote the passage with the reading *Filius*:

1. Tertullian, A. D. 200. (Adv. Prax. c. 15.)

2. Hilary of Poitiers, A. D. 354, at least *seven* times.

(Tract. in Psalm. cxxxviii. c. 35;— De Trin. Lib. II. c. 23; Lib. IV. cc. 8, 42; Lib. V. cc. 33, 34; and Lib. VI. c. 39. Opp. coll. 520^d, 799^e, 831^e, 852^e, 873^d, 874^e, 905^e, ed. Bened.)¹

3. Phoebadius (or Phaebadius), Bp. of Agen in Gaul, A. D. 359. (Cont. Arian. c. 12, in Galland. Bibl. Patr. V. 253, or Migne's Patrol. XX. 21^d.)

4. Victorinus Afer, A. D. 360, *six* times. (De Gen. Verb. Div., ad Candidum, cc. 16 (unigenitus Dei Filius), 20;— Adv. Arium, Lib. I. cc. 2, 4; Lib. IV. cc. 8, 33. In Migne's Patrol. VIII. 1029, 1030, 1041, 1042, 1050, 1119, 1137. In the last instance he had the Greek before him.— Adv. Arium Lib. I. c. 15, he omits *Filius*.)

5. Ambrose, Bp. of Milan, A. D. 374, at least *seven* times.

¹ In the last passage referred to (De Trin. Lib. VI. c. 39) Hilary has *commented* on his quotation of John i. 18 in such a way as to demonstrate that he read *Filius*. He remarks; "Naturae fides non satis explicata videbatur ex nomine *Filii*, nisi proprietatis extrinsecus virtus per exceptionis significantiam adderetur. Praeter *Filium* enim, et *unigenitum* cognominans, suspicionem adoptionis penitus exsecuit."

The only passage, so far as I know, in all Hilary's writings, which has even the appearance of supporting the reading *unigenitus Deus*, is in his work De Trin. Lib. xii. c. 24. This is partially quoted by Dr. Tregelles, and has already been adverted to. We will now compare it with the context, which will make it clear that it affords no reason for supposing that Hilary read *Deus* instead of *Filius* in John i. 18. Having quoted Exod. iii. 14, "Misit me ad vos *is qui est*" (Sept. *δὲ θεός*), and remarking "Deo proprium esse *id quod est* non ambigens sensus est," he goes on to argue that this expression implies eternity, and then says: "Quod igitur et per Moysen de Deo significatum id ipsum unigenito Deo esse proprium Evangelia testantur: cum in principio *erat Verbum* (John i. 1), et cum hoc apud Deum *erat (ibid.)*, et cum *erat lumen verum* (ver. 9), et cum unigenitus Deus in sinu Patris *est* (ver. 18), et cum Jesus Christus super omnia Deus *est* (Rom. ix. 5). *Erat* igitur, atque *est*; quia ab eo est, qui quod est semper est."

From this it will be perceived that Hilary's argument rests wholly on the word *est*. When he says "cum unigenitus Deus in sinu Patris *est*," there is no more reason for regarding the words "unigenitus Deus" as quoted from John than there is for supposing them to be quoted from Paul a page or two below (c. 26), where Hilary says, "cum secundum Apostolum ante tempora aeterna sit unigenitus Deus," referring to 2 Tim. i. 9.

The expression "unigenitus Deus" is a favorite one with Hilary. It occurs in his treatise De Trinitate about one hundred and four times. The frequency of this expression in his writings, with the *certainty* that he read *Filius* in John i. 18, shows how futile it is to argue from the mere use of this phrase in the works of a Father, that he found it in scripture.

(De Jos. c. 14, al. 84;— De Bened. Patr. c. 11, al. 51;— In Luc. Lib. I. c. 25; Lib. II. c. 12;— De Fide, Lib. III. c. 3, al. 24;— De Spir. Sanct. Lib. I. c. 1, al. 26;— Epist. xxii. c. 5. Opp. I. 510^a, 527^r, 1274^d, 1286^b; II. 501^a, 605^r, 875^e, ed. Bened.)

6. Jerome, A. D. 378. (In Ezek. c. xliv. Opp. III. 1023, ed. Mart.)

7. Faustinus, A. D. 384, *three* times. (De Trin. Lib. I. c. 2. § 5, in Migne's Patol. XIII. 54^{ab}.)

8. Augustine, Bp. of Hippo, A. D. 396, *three* times. (In Joan. Tract. xxxi. c. 3; xxxv. c. 5; xlvi. c. 3. Opp. Tom. III. P. ii. col. 1638, 1660, 1734, ed. Migne.)

9. Adimantus the Manichæan, A. D. 396. (Ap. Augustinum cont. Adimant. c. 9, § 1. Opp. VIII. 139, ed. Migne.)

10. Maximinus, the Arian bishop, A. D. 428, *twice*. (Ap. Augustini. Collat. cum Maximin. cc. 13, 18. Opp. VIII. 719, 728, ed. Migne.)

11. The author of the work against Virimadus ascribed to Idacius Clarus, A. D. 385, *three* times. (Adv. Virimad., in Max. Bibl. Patr. V. 731^a, 740^{bc}.)¹

12. Vigilus of Tapsa, A. D. 484, or the author, whoever he was, of Libri XII. de Trinitate. (De Trin. Lib. IV. in Max. Bibl. Patr. VIII. 783^a, or in Athanasii Opp. II. 615^a, ed. Montf.)

13. Junilius, A. D. 550. (De Part. Div. Legis, Lib. I. c. 16, in Migne's Patol. LXVIII. 22^c.)

14. Alcin, A. D. 780. (Comm. super Joan. in loc. Opp. I. 472, 473, ed. Froben., or in Migne's Patol. C. 752^c, cf. 753^a.)

Other Latin Fathers, as Paschasius Radbertus, Bruno Astensis, &c., might be cited to the same purpose; but it is useless to go any further.

III. The three following Fathers have quoted the passage with *both* readings, and their testimony may be regarded as

¹ Montfaucon ascribes this work, and also the first eight books of the one next mentioned, to Idacius the chronicler (A. D. 445). See his edition of Athanasius, II. 602, 603.

doubtful; namely, Origen, Basil the Great, and Cyril of Alexandria. The last, on the whole, favors Θεός; but as it seems not improbable that they all had both readings in their copies of the Greek Testament, we will consider their evidence together.

1. Origen, A. D. 230, according to the text of the Benedictine edition (De La Rue) has the reading Θεός twice; on the other hand, he has υἱός once, once υἱός τοῦ Θεοῦ, and once *unigenitus Dei Filius* in a work preserved only in the Latin version of Rufinus.¹

2. Basil of Caesarea, A. D. 370, according to the text of his Benedictine editors (Garnier and Maran), has Θεός once, and in another passage he mentions True Son, Only-Begotten God, Power of God, and Logos, as names given to Christ in scripture; but he twice quotes the text in question with the reading υἱός.¹

¹ Origen has Θεός, In Joan. Tom. ii. c. 29, and xxxii. c. 13 (Opp. IV. 89^b, 438^d, ed. De La Rue). In both these passages, however, the very literal version of Ferrari, made from a manuscript now lost, reads *unigenitus* alone, without either *Deus* or *Filius*. If he had υἱός in his Greek copy, the omission would be unimportant; but if he had Θεός, the neglect to translate it would be strange and inexcusable. — On the other hand, we have υἱός, Cont. Cels. Lib. II. c. 71. Opp. I. 440^f. Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἐώρακε πρότερον· ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. So De La Rue and Lommatsch, from two manuscripts; the earlier edition of Hoeschel, founded on a single manuscript, instead of ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός reads καὶ μονογενὴς γε ὢν Θεός. But this, it will at once be perceived, bears the marks of a marginal gloss, which, by one of the most common of mistakes in manuscripts, has been substituted for the text. Compare the similar gloss in Eusebius, De Eccles. Theol. Lib. I. c. 9, noticed above. Τὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ occurs, In Joan. Tom. vi. c. 2. Opp. IV. 102^d, as edited by De La Rue and Lommatsch from the Bodleian manuscript, which appears to be an excellent one; the earlier edition of Huët, which was founded on a single manuscript, reads υἱός Θεός. A little after, in two allusions to the passage, ὁ μονογενὴς is used alone. Opp. IV. 102^e, 114^e. — *Unigenitus Dei Filius*, In Cant. Lib. IV. Opp. III. 91^e.

² Basil reads Θεός, De Spir. Sanct. c. 6. Opp. III. 12^b. Comp. *ibid.* c. 8, p. 14^e, where he says: Οἷδε γὰρ [ἢ γραφή] τὸ ὄνομα ὑπὲρ πάντων ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ υἱὸν ἀληθινὸν λέγειν (al. λέγει), καὶ μονογενῆ Θεόν, καὶ δύναμιν Θεοῦ, καὶ σφύραν, καὶ λόγον. — On the other hand, he has υἱός, De Spir. Sanct. c. 11, Opp. III. 23^a, where the six manuscripts of Garnier appear to agree in this reading, though one of Matthaei's Moscow MSS. has Θεός (see Matthaei's Nov. Test. Graec. I. 780). He again has υἱός, apparently without any variation in the ten MSS. of Garnier, Epist. 234 (al. 400), c. 3. Opp. III. 356^b. Here Matthaei's Moscow MS. also reads υἱός.

3. Cyril of Alexandria, A. D. 412, as edited by Aubert, has *θεός* four times, and *υἱός* three times. His commentary on the passage, as printed, favors *θεός*, but its evidence is somewhat weakened by various readings.¹

The whole of the *external* evidence for the different readings of the passage in question, so far as I am acquainted with it, has now been stated. If one should look into Wetstein, and find apparently a considerable number of authorities which have not been noticed, he may be assured that they have all been carefully examined, and that they amount to nothing. The same is true of the vague references to "*alii permulti*," "*alii multi*," in the last edition of Tischendorf, and of similar references in other critical editions of the Greek Testament, all founded on Wetstein's note.² They relate without exception, not to quotations of

¹ Cyril reads *θεός*, Thes. Assert. xiii. and xxxv. Opp. V i. 137^b, 237^a. The correctness of *θεός* in his text in the last instance is confirmed by the citations of this passage of Cyril in Catenae, from which it has been printed in his Comm. on Luke ii. 7 in Mai's Nova Patr. Bibl. III. 123^f, and Migne's Patrol. Gr. LXXII. 487^a; also in the Catena published by Cramer (VI. 305) on Col. i. 16. He has *θεός*, moreover, in the Dialogue "Quod Unus sit Christus," Opp. V. i. 768^e. In his Comm. on John i. 18 he has *υἱός* in the text, Opp. IV. 103^e; but toward the end of his remarks he quotes the passage with the reading *θεός*, p. 107^b. He also says: 'Επιτηρητέον δὲ πάλιν, ὅτι μονογενῆ θεὸν ἀποκαλεῖ τὸν υἱόν, p. 105^b. But here the scholion in one of Matthaeci's Moscow manuscripts cites him as saying, 'Επιτηρητέον τοίνυν, ὅτι καὶ μονογενῆ ἀποκαλεῖ τὸν υἱόν, omitting *θεόν*. Still, the commentary on the whole confirms the reading *θεός*.

He has the reading *υἱός*, Thes. Assert. xxxv., and Adv. Nestorium, Lib. III. c. 5. Opp. V. i. 365^e, and VI. i. 90^b. This reading is also found twice in an extract which he gives from Julian, in his work against that emperor. Opp. VI. ii. 333^e.

In an *allusion* to John i. 18, we find *ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, ὁ ἐν κόλποις ὢν τοῦ πατρὸς*. Apol. adv. Orient. Opp. VI. 187^e.

² It may be worth while to say that the *Opus Imperfectum*, a Latin commentary on Matthew cited by Tischendorf and others as an authority for *θεός*, contains no quotation of John i. 18. It has the expression "unigenitus Deus" in the remarks on Matt. i. 20, v. 9, xix. 17, and xxiv. 41. The work is appended to Tom. VI. of the Benedictine ed. of Chrysostom.

It may be satisfactory to refer here also to the places where this expression occurs in some other writers, who have been erroneously cited as authorities for the reading *μονογενὴς θεός* in John i. 18. See Pseudo-Ignat. ad Philad. c. 6 (the larger recension); Const. Apost. iii. 17; v. 20; vii. 38, 43; viii. 7, 35; Arius ap. Athanas. de Syn. c. 15, Opp. I. 728^e, but not ap. Epiph. Haer. LXIX. c. 6,

the passage in question, but merely to examples of the phrase *μονογενῆς Θεός* or *unigenitus Deus*, employed without any allusion to John i. 18. After all that has been said, it will hardly be pretended that the mere use of this expression by a Greek or Latin Father affords any evidence that he read it in this passage. We might as well argue from the frequency of the expression *ὁ Θεός λόγος* in the writings of the Fathers from the third century downwards, or of *θεοτόκος* and *Deipara* applied to the Virgin Mary, or of "God the Son" in modern theological works, that these precise phrases must have been found in scripture by those who have so freely employed them. Though the phrase has now become unusual, there were good reasons for its popularity in ancient times. The Arians, who laid great stress on the fact that the Father was "unbegotten" and "without beginning," *ἀγέννητος* and *ἀναρχος*, were fond of calling the Son "the only-begotten God," because, while the term expressed his high dignity, it brought into view his derived existence. *Begotten* by an act of God's will, he could not, they argued, be eternal. The Orthodox, on the other hand, who saw no absurdity in the idea of eternal generation, were fond of the expression, because they regarded it as indicating his derivation from the *substance* of the Father, as it is explained in the Nicene Creed, *γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τοῦτέστιν, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ*. Both the Arians and the Orthodox freely applied the term *θεός* to Christ.

Before proceeding to consider the *internal* evidence for the different readings, it will be convenient to present the results of the preceding examination in a tabular form, so that one may see at a glance the authorities for each. The figures added to the names of the Fathers denote the time when they flourished.

Opp. I. 731^d, *πληρὴς θεός, μονογενῆς*; Asterius ap. Athanas. de Syn. c. 18, p. 732^b; Eunomius, Expos. Fid. c. 3, and Apol. cc. 15, 21, 26 (ap. Fabric. Bibl. Græc., Tom. VIII.); Greg. Naz. Epist. 202, ad Nectarium, Opp. II. 168^o; Gaudentius, Serm. xix., in Migne's Patol. XX. 990^b; Ferrandus, Epist. iii. cc. 2, 7, 9, 10, 11; v. 2, 5; vii. 12; in Migne, Tom. LXVII.

FOR THE READING *θεός*.FOR THE READING *υἱός*.*Manuscripts.*

*** B C* L, 83.

Manuscripts.

*** A C* X Δ, E F G H K M S U V Λ, 1. 69., and, with one exception, all the other cur-
sive manuscripts, several hundred in number,
which have been examined on the passage.

Versions.

Pesh. Syr., Harel. Syr.
(*margin.*), Copt., Aeth. (Rom.
ed.)

Versions.

Old Lat., Vulg., Curet. Syr., Harel. Syr.
(*text*), Jerus. Syr., Aeth. (Platt's ed.), Armen.

Greek Fathers.

Clem. Al.¹⁰⁴, Theod.¹⁰⁴,
Epiph.³⁰⁸, *three* times, and
one ref., Didym.³⁷⁰, *twice*,
and *one* ref. (?); Cyr. Al.⁴⁰,
four times, and *one* ref. (?),
but *υἱός* *three* times.

u'2'

Perhaps, 2d Syn. An-
cyr.⁸⁶⁴, *one* ref., and Greg.
Nyss.³⁷⁰, *one* ref., and *eight*
allusions, but both very
uncertain. (See above, pp.
854 - 857.)

Greek Fathers.

Iren.¹⁷⁸ *probably*, Hippol.²⁰⁰, 8d Syn. Ant.²⁰⁰,
Archel.²⁰⁰, Alex. Al.³¹², Euseb.³¹² *six* times, and
one *allus.*, Eustath. Ant.²⁰⁰, Athanas.³²⁶, *four* or
rather *seven* times, Pseud-Athan.^{4th cent.?}, Cyr.
Hier.³²⁰, *probably*, Julian³⁰² *twice*, Tit. Bostr.³⁰²,
Greg. Naz.³⁷⁰, Pseudo-Basil., Rufin. Syr.³⁰⁰,
Chrysost.³⁰⁰, *eight* times, Theod. Mops.⁴⁰⁷, Non-
nus⁴¹⁰ *probably*, Theodoret³²² *four* times, Pro-
clus⁴²⁴, Pseudo-Cyr.^{5th cent.}, Andr. Cret.⁶²⁵, Pseudo-
Caesarius^{7th cent.?}, Joan. Dam.⁷²⁰ *thrice*, Theod.
Stud.⁸¹² *twice*, Andr. presb.^{9th cent.?}, Caten. ed.
Cramer^{9th or 10 cent.}, Theoph.¹⁰⁷⁰, Euthym¹¹¹⁰, *thrice*,
Elias Cret.¹¹²⁰, Zach. Chrys.¹¹²⁷, Nic. Chon.¹²⁰⁰.

Latin Fathers.

None.

Latin Fathers.

Tert.³⁰⁰, Hilar.³⁵⁴ *seven* times, Phoebad.³⁵⁹, Vic-
torin. Afer³⁶⁰ *six* times, Ambrose³⁷⁴ *seven* times,
Jerome³⁷⁸, Faustin.³⁸⁴ *three* times, August.³⁸⁵,
three times, Adimant.³⁹⁵, Maximin.⁴²⁵ *twice*, Ida-
cius^{395 or 445} *three* times, Vigil. Taps.⁴⁰⁴, Junil.⁴⁴⁰,
Alcuin⁷⁸⁰, and others.

Wholly doubtful. Origen³⁰⁰, Basil the Great³⁷⁰. See the full account of
their readings above.

This exposition of the evidence makes it apparent that
Dr. Tregelles has been somewhat incautious in asserting
that *μωυουηνός* *θεός* is "the ancient reading of the Fathers
generally."

In estimating the external evidence, it is important to
consider the wide *geographical distribution* of the witnesses
for *υἱός*. They represent every important division of the
Christian world. The reading *υἱός* is attested by the Cure-
tonian, Hareclean, and Jerusalem Syriac; by the third Synod

206 226 271 272

at Antioch, Eustathius of Antioch, and Theodoret; by Titus of Bostra in Arabia; by Gregory of Nazianzus in Cappadocia, and Theodore of Mopsuestia in Cilicia; by the Armenian version; by Eusebius of Caesarea in Palestine, who paid particular attention to the text of the Gospels, and was commissioned by the emperor Constantine to procure fifty copies of the scriptures carefully written for the use of the churches at Constantinople; by Alexander and Athanasius of Alexandria; by Chrysostom and Proclus of Constantinople; by the Old Latin and Vulgate versions, and, apparently, the whole Western Church, without exception. On the other hand, the authorities for Θεός, besides being much more limited in number, are, so far as we know their locality, almost wholly Egyptian.¹

Comparing the readings in respect to *antiquity*, we find in favor of *viós*, before the middle of the fourth century, the Old Latin and Curetonian Syriac, Irenaeus (probably), Tertullian, Hippolytus, the third Synod at Antioch (A. D. 269), Arche-laus, Alexander of Alexandria, Eusebius, Eustathius of Antioch, and Athanasius; on the other side, we have during this period only the Peshito Syriac (if that version in its present form is so ancient), Clement of Alexandria (somewhat doubtful), the Excerpta Theodoti, and the Coptic version. In the period that follows, though the few manuscripts that support Θεός are of the highest character, the weight of the whole evidence must be regarded as preponderating against it.

We come now to the *internal* evidence. It is urged in favor of Θεός, that *μονογενής* naturally suggests the word *viós*, so that a transcriber might easily inadvertently substitute it for Θεός. This consideration appears to be of some weight.

It is also urged in favor of *μονογενής* Θεός, that it is entitled to preference as the more difficult reading, being one at which transcribers would naturally stumble as an unexamined expression. This argument, however, will not bear examination. In the first place, if transcribers were struck

¹ The Harclean Syriac in the margin represents the reading of one or two Greek manuscripts with which it was collated at Alexandria, A. D. 616.

with the expression as remarkable, it is not probable that they would intentionally alter it. They would be more likely to reverence it as containing a mystery. In the second place, though *μονογενῆς Θεός* may sound strangely to us, it was not a strange or harsh expression to copyists of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries. On the contrary, it was, as we have seen, a favorite phrase with many writers of this period, being used with equal freedom both by the Arians and their opponents. So far from stumbling at it, transcribers may have been led, by their very familiarity with the expression, to introduce it unconsciously into the text. Let us look at the passage in John. In the clause immediately preceding *ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός, θεὸν* had just occurred, bringing *θεός* before the mind of the copyist. Is it strange that in transcribing he should inadvertently connect this word with *μονογενῆς*, the combination being so familiar to him, the words *θε* and *γεν* being so similar in ancient manuscripts, and *θεός* being so much the more common of these two abbreviated words? Such a mistake, in some early manuscript or manuscripts, might have been easily propagated, so as to extend to the comparatively few authorities which exhibit the reading *θεός*. It is much more difficult to account for such an ancient and *wide-spread* corruption as must have taken place, if *θεός* proceeded originally from the pen of the Evangelist. If he *had* written *μονογενῆς θεός* in this passage, so remarkable an expression must have early attracted attention, and stamped itself ineffaceably, like the language in the first verse of his Gospel, upon the whole Christian literature. It would have been continually quoted and appealed to.

But there is another aspect of the internal evidence, which must strike every one who reads the passage in question with attention. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." Is it not evident that the introduction of the phrase "only-begotten God," after the use of the word "God" *alone* and *absolutely*, immediately before it, is a harshness which we can hardly suppose in any writer?

Does not the word "Father," in a sentence like this, almost necessarily imply that the correlative "Son" has just preceded? And is there anything analogous to this expression, "the only-begotten God," in the writings of John, or in any other part of the New Testament?

IN closing this discussion, the writer wishes to express his great respect for Dr. Tregelles, and the earnest desire that his life and health may be spared for the completion of the important work on which he has been so long engaged. No scholar of the present century, with the single exception of Tischendorf, has so high a claim on the gratitude of all who are solicitous to obtain the purest possible text of the original records of our religion. His labors for this object have displayed a patient, earnest, and self-sacrificing devotion worthy of the highest admiration. The reasons for differing from him in opinion in regard to the genuineness of *Θεός* in John i. 18, and for desiring a more complete and accurate statement of the evidence than he has given in this case, have now been laid before the reader, who will judge of the whole matter for himself.