Only-Begotten God (John 1:18)

The Protestant Church proclaims, 'Sola Scriptura!,' Latin for, 'scripture alone.' Their first statement of belief is, "The Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired and is God's revelation of Himself to man. It is a perfect treasure of divine instruction. It has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter. Therefore, all Scripture is totally true and trustworthy..." But, the majority, as will be illustrated, really do not believe, 'all,' the scriptures, which includes theologians, ministers and Bible translators; John 1:18 being a prime example. John 1:18 just does not fit into their preconceived or taught theology, causing them to rebel against what Yahweh has written, replacing it with what they would like it to say. Their rebellion, for over 200 years, will be illustrated. The fingerprints of our adversary are all over this corruption, whether the men who are taking part in this assault are deceived or just children of the adversary. I praise and thank Yahweh for those who did not rebel, such as Joseph Rotherham and the people who produce the NASB, along with others but rather took the unpopular theological position of writing Yahweh's words, as recorded in the text, rather than man's words.

This study can be as in-depth as one desires. As an investigator, one must only take into consideration the facts and not what people think of the facts. John 1:18 is as follows, "No one, hath seen, God, at any time: An Only Begotten God, The One existing within the bosom of the Father, He, hath interpreted him" (Rotherham). Many theologians do not like the phase, "Only-Begotten God," so they have changed it to, "one and only Son, who is himself God (NIV);" "unique One, who is himself God (NLT);" "the only God" (ESV)," to name only a few examples (Appendix A). The Greek words of the ancient text (175-200 AD) we are discussing are, 'monogenes theos.' Monogenes is mono, meaning alone and genes, meaning born or to be. "In the NT the term occurs only in Luke, John, and Hebrews. Isaac is monogenes in #Heb 11:7, and the son of the widow at Nain, {#Lu 7:12} the daughter of Jairus, {#Lu 8:42} and the demoniac boy {#Lu 8:42} are all only children." Theos means a god or goddess, a general name of deities or divinities. The Word Study Greek English New Testament (Greek New Testament UBS 3rd Edition) translates monogenes theos at "only [mono] born [genes] God [theos]." (Appendix B)

Theologians will call John 1:18 a controversy but they know it is not. An article written in 1861 written by Professor Ezra Abbot, titled, "ON THE READING "ONLY-BEGOTTEN GOD," IN JOHN 1.18; WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE STATEMENTS OF DR. TREGELLES," discussed the theologian's problem.

2 Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
3 Bibliotheca Sacra of Oct. 1861 by Ezra Abbot
"In John 1:18, 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 "the only-begotten Son," have the remarkable reading, "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 received by Lachmann into his text, had he been aware of the authorities by which it is supported."

He then ends his article by questioning the text, by stating, "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?" (Appendix C)

In 1876, Fenton John Anthony Hort, of the renown, Westcott & Hort, wrote a dissertation upon this very verse titled, "Two Dissertations on MONOGENES THEOS in Scripture and Tradition." His conclusion is that the phrase, 'monogenes theos (god)' is correct and the KJV's, 'monogenes huios (son),' is incorrect. He states, "The former of these Dissertations is an attempt to examine in some detail a single point of textual criticism, the true reading of a phrase occurring in a cardinal verse of the New Testament. Once only has the evidence been discussed with anything like adequate care and precision, namely in a valuable article contributed by Professor Ezra Abbot to the American Bibliotheca Sacra of October 1861. After having long had occasion to study the matter pretty closely, I am unable to accept the conclusions drawn by this eminent biblical scholar; and accordingly it seemed worth while to place on record the results of an independent investigation. My own opinion has not been formed hastily. Some years passed before increasing knowledge and clearness of view respecting the sources of the Greek text of the New Testament convinced me of the incorrectness of the received reading in John 1:18. This conviction did not however remove the sense of a certain strangeness in the alternative phrase transmitted by the best authorities; and for a considerable time I saw no better solution of
the difficulty than a conjecture that both readings alike were amplifications of a simpler original. It was a more careful study of the whole context that finally took away all lingering doubt as to the intrinsic probability of the less familiar reading [monogenes theos]." (Appendix D)

Nestle's Greek New Testament 4th Edition was published in 1904. The ADVERTISEMENT reads, "The text of this Greek Testament was in the main first published by the Bible Society of Württemberg at Stuttgart in 1898. It was prepared for that Society by Professor Eberhard Nestle, D.D., of Maulbronn, and he revised the several editions which followed the first one. By the kind permission of the Württemberg Society the British and Foreign Bible Society was permitted to adopt its latest text (the 4th) and to publish it in England under Dr Nestle's care in 1904. The text is the resultant of a collation of three of the principal recensions of the Greek Testament which appeared in the latter half of the 19th century, viz. those of Tischendorf, editio octava 1869–72 (as reproduced in the 4th edition by Oskar von Gebhardt, 1898); of Westcott and Hort, 1881 (impression of 1895); and of Bernhard Weiss, 1894–1900 (second edition 1902). The readings adopted in the text are those in which at least two of these editions agree..." John 1:18, in his Greek New Testament, reads, 18 Θεὸν οὐδὲς εὕρακεν πάντωτε: μονογενὴς Θεὸς [monogenes theos] ὃ ἐν εἴκ οὖν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. The Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum 28th Edition, published in the 1950's reads the same way.

Joseph Rotherham published his 1878 New Testament, from the Greek text of Tregelles, with John 1:18 reading, "No one has seen God at any time: an Only-Begotten God —The One existing within the bosom of the Father he interpreted [him]." His latest version, published in 1902, declares the same phrase. The ASV and the RSV of 1901 both read, only-begotten son, as does the KJV and the NKJV, even though the ancient Greek text stated otherwise. The present translations, other than Rotherham's Emphasized Bible, that are faithful to John 1:18 are:

No one has seen God at any time; the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father. He has explained Him. (NASB)

No man has seen God at any time; the only-begotten god who is at the Father’s side is the one who has explained Him. (New World Translation)

No one has seen God [His essence, His divine nature] at any time; the [One and] only begotten God [that is, the unique Son] who is in the intimate presence of the Father, He has explained Him [and interpreted and revealed the awesome wonder of the Father]. (AMP)

Notable manuscripts were discovery in 1952. They are called the Bodmer Papyri, two of which, P66 and P75, dating from 175–200 AD, contain monogenes theos in John 1:18. These manuscripts agree that the phrase, 'only-begotten god,' is the Word of Yahweh, yet
many theologians become stiff-neck to the things of Yahweh, when it contradicts what they desire to believe. Moses told Israel, "For, I, know thy perverseness, and thy stiff neck,—lo! while I am yet alive with you today, ye are, quarrelling, with Yahweh, and how much more after my death" (Deu. 31:27)? The woman caught in adultery, John 7:53-8:11, as is well known, is no part of the Gospel of John (also absent from the above two manuscripts), yet Bible translators leave it in their Bibles. The only-begotten god, in John 1:18, is in the text but the majority of the translators corrupt it, knowing all along it is the Word of Yahweh.

This behavior illustrates the spiritual contest, from the inside, we are in and it is only getting worse with, so-called Bibles, such as the NIV and NLT. For instance, even in the book titled, "A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament," (published in 2001) the discussion on whether the only-begotten god (monogenes theos) belongs in John 1:18, is still in question; they giving the phrase, 'almost certain,' acceptance. These individuals know the text but fight Yahweh to the bitter end, fully knowing Galatians 1:8, which states, "But, even if, we, or, a messenger out of heaven, announce a glad-message aside from that which we announced unto you, accursed, let him be!" They have chosen to be accursed by Yahweh, in order that they can be well pleasing to men. They state:

John 1:18 monogenes theos {B} [B means 'almost certain']

"With the acquisition of P66 and P75, both of which read theos, the external support of this reading has been notably strengthened. A majority of the Committee regarded the reading monogenes huios (son), which undoubtedly is easier than monogenes theos, to be the result of scribal assimilation to Jn. 3:16, 18; 1 Jn 4:9. The anarthrous⁴ use of theos appears to be more primitive. There is no reason why the article should have been deleted, and when huios (son) supplanted theos it would certainly have been added. The shortest reading, the monogenes, while attractive because of internal considerations, is too poorly attested for acceptance as the text. Some modern commentators take monogenes as a noun and punctuate so as to have three distinct designations of him who makes God..." Monogenes theos, in John 1:18, was recognized and recorded over 150 years ago, but these scholars still reject what Yahweh has written, even after manuscripts P66 and P75 witness to this very truth. These are the same scholars who unanimously agreed that the woman caught in adultery (John 7:53-8:11) has no part in the Gospel of John, but they decide to leave it in the text, enclosed within double square brackets.⁵ Yahoshua stated, "For this reason, in parables, unto them, do I speak,—because, seeing, they see not, and, hearing, they hear not,—neither do they understand (Mt. 13:13).

What are we to learn of this finding? Why does it really matter? How John 1:18 is translated identifies those who are attempting to be Yahweh's faithful scribes from those

---

⁴ refers to a word or group of words which appear without a definite article
⁵ pg. 187-189 2nd Edition
who agenda is not fidelity to the text but rather fidelity to the desires of men, making their Bibles (I can't call them translations because they are not) accursed, according to Galatians 1:8. The NIV and NLT Bibles are amongst the top four selling Bibles, while the NASB is number seven, comparing these four Bibles, we witness:

No one, hath seen, God, at any time: An Only Begotten God, The One existing within the bosom of the Father, He, hath interpreted [him]. (Rotherham)
No one has seen God at any time; the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him. (NASB)
No one has ever seen God, but the one and only Son, who is himself God and is in closest relationship with the Father, has made him known. (NIV)
No one has ever seen God. But the unique One, who is himself God, is near to the Father's heart. He has revealed God to us. (NLT)

What has been removed from the NIV and the NLT Bibles, not including the only begotten God, are the words begotten (genes),\(^6\) within (eis)\(^7\) and bosom (kolpos).\(^5\) Now this is what has occurred in just one verse, let alone all the damage that has occurred throughout their Bibles. The KJV and the NKJV have their own problem but not as severe at the above two. They have chosen to refuse the text and print only-begotten Son instead. The adversary's attack began with attacking Yahweh's words, in Genesis three and it continues today from the inside out, through Bibles, as is done in the NIV and NLT, that ignore the text and insert new doctrines, such as has been done in the NIV and NLT, which state, as the Word of Yahweh, "who himself is God," which has no textual bases. As the adversary worked with the Scribes and Pharisees, so also this same adversary is still working with men, which can be called a conspiracy, meaning a secret plan by a group to do something unlawful or harmful. Changing or removing Yahweh's text, 'only-begotten God,' from John 1:18, is unlawful, harmful and will be judged by our Lord and Savior!

\(^6\) born
\(^7\) The Cosmic and Soteriological Sense. In the NT eis expresses the living connection between divine and cosmic realities. In Greek thought the gods belong to the cosmos. Even dualism makes only a static distinction. Hades is another place: it is not God's world. Even in circles which speak of an ascent of the soul, eis plays only a minor role. Formally the OT speaks in a similar way. as though, when God comes down, he was simply changing place within the same reality. \(\text{cf. GE 18:21 EX 3:8}\) Yet his superiority over all creatures is strongly asserted, as in \#Ex 33:18ff. Isa 6; so that heaven cannot contain him \(#1Ki 8:27\) and his presence is the willed and gracious address of the covenant God. \(#1Ki 8:28ff\) Judaism thus develops an aversion to anthropomorphic statements and carries the divine transcendence almost to the point of straining the link between God and the world except for a firm belief in providence. Thus the LXX paraphrases \#Ex 15:3 24:10, Jubilees omits God's walking in the garden in its rendering of Gen. 3, Palestinian Judaism posits a series of heavens, and apocalyptic works begin to place greater weight on the preposition eis, e.g., in the coming of angels to the world, or in relation to apocalyptic vision. The NT inherits the distinction between the divine and human worlds but bridges the gulf with the concept of fulfillment in Christ. In this context eis takes on a new significance as follows. (TDNT)
\(^5\) 1) the front of the body between the arms
Appendix A

John 1:18 Bible Translations:
Only-begotten God

18 No one, hath seen, God, at any time: An Only Begotten God, The One existing within the bosom of the Father. He, hath interpreted him. (Rotherham Emphasized Bible)

18 No one has seen God at any time; the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him. (NASB)

18 No man has seen God at any time; the only-begotten god who is at the Father’s side is the one who has explained Him. (New World Translation)

18 No one has seen God [His essence, His divine nature] at any time; the [One and] only begotten God [that is, the unique Son] who is in the intimate presence of the Father, He has explained Him [and interpreted and revealed the awesome wonder of the Father]. (AMP)

Only-begotten God changed to a hybrid

18 No one has ever seen God. The only Son, God, who is at the Father's side, has revealed him. (New American Bible)

18 No one has ever seen God. It is God the only Son, who is close to the Father’s heart, who has made him known. (NRSV)

18 No one has ever seen God; the only God, who is at the Father's side, he has made him known. (ESV)

18 No one has ever seen God, but the one and only Son, who is himself God and is in closest relationship with the Father, has made him known. (NIV)

18 No one has ever seen God. But the unique One, who is himself God, is near to the Father’s heart. He has revealed God to us. (NLT)

18 No one has ever seen God. But God the only Son is very close to the Father, and he has shown us what God is like. (NCV)

18 No one has ever seen God. The only one, himself God, who is in closest fellowship with the Father, has made God known. (NET Bible)

Only-begotten Son

18 God no one hath ever seen; the only begotten Son, who is on the bosom of the Father -- he did declare. (YLT)

18 No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. (KJV)

18 No one has seen God at any time. The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He has declared Him. (NKJV)
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τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. 19 Καὶ the lap of the father that one explained. And
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.

Ωδὸν θαλάκεν τάπτος: ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός [οι. δεδι], ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ἦκενος ἐξεγήσατο.

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 υἱός, "the only-begotten Son," have the remarkable reading μονογενὴς Σίος, "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 μονογενής Σέος, 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 Σέος.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 μονογενὴς Σεός 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 plus quam 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 μονογενὴς Σεός, there are but four who quote or refer to the passage with this reading only; four quote it with both readings; nine quote it with the reading viōs or filius only, except that in one of the quotations of Titus of Bostra viōs Σεός occurs; 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; and twenty-five do not quote or allude to it at all. Of the particular passages referred to by Wetstein, a great majority have no bearing whatever on the subject, but merely contain the expression μονογενὴς Σεός 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, Alcin."

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 viōs or filius. Indeed, in some of these passages we do not find even this expression, but only the term γενήτως [al. γενήτως] ἴησος, 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 μωνογενής ἴησος, 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 ἴησος, I produced, as the result of original investigation, quotations of the passage, supporting the reading viōs, 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. Epiphanius,' see Epiphanius, Haeres. LXIV. c. 7, Opp. I. 581b, or Origen, Opp. II. 526a; 'Eusebius, D. IV. 2,' i.e. Dem. Evang. Lib. IV. c. 2; 'Prudentius in Apotheosi,' viz. line 895; 'Claudianus Mamert. de statu animae i. 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 Ἀνάθεμα, 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 reexamination 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 μονογενὴς Ἀνάθεμα and what uphold μονογενὴς νοσ. 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 μονογενὴς Ἀνάθεμα 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 Ἀνάθεμα 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 Ἀνάθεμα. 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 Ἱερός, 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 Ἱερός 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. 766, for the reading Ἱερός. The reference should have been to p. 769 instead of p. 766. 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 μονογενῆς Ἱερός (an error which originated, I believe, in revising the proofsheet 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 flius (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 Phoebadins 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 υἱὸς, 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 υἱὸς 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 μονογενὴς Θεός.


Lines 5, 6. “Eus. c. Mcl. 67⁴. ὁ μονογ. υἱὸς ἢ μονογ. Θεός.” This should be quoted with the context, τοῦ εἰς ἀγγελισμοῦ διάρρηξης ἡμῶν αὐτοῦ υἱὸς μονογενὴς εἶναι διδαχὸς ὡς ἢ τὴν ἡμῶν σεβομένη τὸν τέκτονα τὸν μονογενῆς υἱὸς, ὁ μονογενὴς Θεὸς, ὃς ἢ τὸν κάλλιον, 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 υἱὸς, where five other places are cited, in which Eusebius has expressly quoted the passage with this reading.

Line 6. “Eus. c. Mcl. 124c. Θεὸς δὲ καὶ μονογενῆς.” 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 God over all.”

Ibid. “Hil. 1124c 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 Ancyranse 2e [2nd] sp. Epiph. . . . Haer. lxxii. 8 (i. 854*)." 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: δ θεός [sc. Ιησου Χριστου] γιος θεος του λεγον μονογενευς θεον . . . φησι. 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.


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 Pel. 6. iii. 95 (sp. 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 μονογενευς γιος θεος εισηγαγας, φησι, 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 μονο-γενευς θεος, unigenitus Deus, tanquam nomen Jesu in Scriptura tributum; e.g., Greg. Nysa. 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 Nysaen. 4. None of the writers named speak of it as "applied to Jesus in Scripture," except Gregory Nysaen; and his assertion, as I shall show, is very poor evidence that he ever found it there.

Authorities cited for the reading μονογενευς vidis.

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 μονογενὴς Σεός, 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 Σεός;¹ and, on the other side, the fact (already mentioned in Tischendorf's last edition of the Greek Testament), that


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

Line 33. Dele "123h." There is no reference here to John i. 18.

Line 34. Insert among the references to Hilt., "799e," and for "852b" read "852e."

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 "Athenasius," which is out of place, read "Athenasius. I. 219e (diserte), 227d, 530d, 538e (dis.) ; cf. 529p, 651d, 634e, 635e, ed. Benedictus." Athenasius quotes the passage four times, twice commenting on the word μός, and refers to it in three other places in such a way as to show, in each of them, that he unquestionably read μός.

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 quae Alexandriæ 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 υιός. 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 μονογενής Σεός as compared with that for μονογενής υιός. The testimony of the Greek manuscripts is first to be considered. It is here important to observe, that the words υιός and Σεός in the abbreviated form in which they are written in the most ancient codices (γς, ζς), differ in but a single letter, so that one might easily be substituted for the other through the inadvertence of a transcriber.
The reading Ἱερός is found in the MSS. α' B C* L, 33; only five in number, but three of them of the highest antiquity, and all of great value. α, 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 ὅς in 1 Tim. iii. 16.

The reading viōs, on the other hand, is found in α* A C*** E F G H K M S U V X ΔΔ, 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. α* 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 Ἱερός is remarkable; but some circumstances may lessen its apparent weight. The testimony of α, 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.
alterations which it 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 διοργανίζως, or a very early corrector, altered the reading of it from ἡς to viος, 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 ὅ ὅν before εἰς τὸν κόλπον. Another circumstance may be regarded as weakening in some measure the authority of B C L in this passage. They all agree in reading μονογενής ἡς instead of ὅ μονογενής viος. 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 ἡς, 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. 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 Ἁeos:—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 vióς:—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 vióς. 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 favor Ἁeos; 2. of those which support vióς; and, 3. of a few which 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 Ἁeos.

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

---

1 See his Introd. to Textual Criticism, pp. 285, 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 μονογενὴς υἱὸς Σεías, "the only-begotten Son, who is God." He does not comment on the passage, in either case, in such a way as to show how he read it; and ὡς 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 Σείos, both on account of its high antiquity, and because it is express: — ἀντικρὺς Σείον αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ λέγων, Ὅ μονογενῆς Σείος, ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦ πατρός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

3. Epiphanius, Bp. of Constantia or Salamis in Cyprus, A.D. 368, has quoted the passage three times with the reading Σείος. (Haer. LXXV. c. 5, bis, and LXX. c. 7. Opp. I. 612e and 818e ed. Petav.) In the remark, however, which follows the quotation in the first passage, Σείος and νιός are interchanged: — Καὶ φησι, Ὅ μονογενῆς Σείος ὁ μὲν γὰρ λόγος ἐστιν ἐκ πατρὸς γεννησείς, ὁ πατὴρ δὲ οὐκ ἐγεννηθῇ διὰ τούτο μονογενῆς νιός. He also speaks of John as "calling Christ only-begotten God:" — Μονογενὴς Σείον αὐτῶν φάσκων. . . . Περὶ πατρὸς γέγραπται, ἄλλων δὲ Σείον περὶ νιόν δὲ, ὅτι μονογενῆς Σείος. (Anecorat. c. 3. Opp. II. 8.) A little before, however, in a quotation of John i. 18, ὁ μονογενὴς is given

---

1 Kai τότε ἐπανειλώς τὸν κόσμον τοῦ πατρός, ὅ ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς Σείος μόνος ἐξηγήσατο. — Quis dives salveretur, c. 37. p. 956.
without either ἴως or ὑὼς. But here the context renders it probable that ἴως 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 ἴως. (De Trinit. Lib. I. c. 26, and Lib. II. c. 5; pp. 76, 140 ed. Mingarel., or in Migne’s Patrolog. Graeca, XXXIX. 393ᵃ, 495ᵇ.) He also says, ὅ ὑὼς κέκληται μονογενής ἴως λόγος, καὶ εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ. (Ibid. Lib. I. c. 15. p. 27, or col. 313ᵃ ed. Migne.) But here it may be doubted whether a comma should be placed after μονογενής, or after ἴως, 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 ἴως 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 ὑὼς; the last, perhaps, ἴως; 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 ἴως, 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 ἴως 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: Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῆς ἀληθείας ἴως. Εἶ δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὡς λέγει τῷ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης, ὁ μονογενὴς, ὁ ὅπως ἔσται κύριος τοῦ πατρὸς, αὕτη ἐκ θησαυροῦ. Εἶπε αὐτῷ τὸν ἅγιον περὶ ταύτης τῆς, κ. τ. λ.—Ancorat. c. 2, p. 76ᵃ. Here Εἶ δὲ must be wrong unless the whole conclusion of the sentence has been lost. Perhaps we should substitute οἴθε (comp. Basil. de Spir. Sanct. c. 8, p. 14ᵇ) or οἴθατε, though οἴθε 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.’

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 ιος, 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, ὦς Θεὸς μὲν, καὶ νῦν Θεὸν, ὦς ἄνδρωπος, καὶ νῦν ἄνθρωπον. (Cap. 9. p. 355* ap. Epiph.) So Eusebius says that Christ is τοῦ Θεοῦ μονογενῆς νῦς, καὶ διὰ τοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ (Dem. Evang. Lib. V. c. 4. p. 227*), and an indefinite number of passages might be quoted to the same purpose.

2. In one place Gregory of Nyssa (A. D. 370) says: Εἰπη- ταί παρὰ τῆς γραφῆς περὶ τοῦ ἐν ἁρχῇ δυτοῦ λόγου, ὅτι ὁ μονογενὴς Θεός, πρωτότοκος πᾶσις κτίσεως. (De Perf. Christ. Forma. Opp. III. 291.*) 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

be 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 impudence 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 firstborn of the new creation, . . . . and only-begotten Son, crowned with glory and honor," etc. 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. 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 δὲν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρὸς eight times in connection with the expression δ μονογενὴς Θεός, twice in connection with the phrase δ μονογενῆς υἱός; and once with the phrase δ ἐν ἰδίοις τοῖς Θεός. For examples and references see below. The

---

On the Readings of John i. 18

expression ὁ μονογενὴς 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.


¹ O μονογενὴς ὁλός, ὃ ἐν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρός, ὃ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐν, κ. τ. λ. — Epist. ad Flavian. Opp. III. 688a. See also Contra Eunom. Orat. II. Opp. II. 466c.


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 Patroil. LXV. 272b. "De Deo unigenito, qui est in sinu Patris, ut dixi, omnia haece personaliter accipe.” De Fide, c. 20, col. 681b, ed. Migne.


3. With unigenitus alone. “Quis unigenitus, qui est in sinu Patris, secundum quod caro est, plenus est gratiae,” etc. De Incarnat. c. 18, col. 583a.

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 *viōs*. 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 *Filiius*; 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 *viōs*.\(^1\)


3. The Third Synod at Antioch (A.D. 269), in their Epistle to Paul of Samosata. (Concilia, ed. Coleti, I. 869; 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. Theodoret 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 *viōs* not less than six times. In one case, indeed, which has already been briefly noticed, the words ἡ μονογενῆς Σεός are added after ὁ μονογενῆς *viōs*, and

---

on this ground Dr. Tregelles claims his authority in support of the reading Σεός. 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 οὗς, there really appears to be no room for doubt. The facts are given below.1

1 Eusebius quotes John i. 18 with the reading οὗς, De Eccles. Theol. Lib. I. c. 20. § 4, 5. p. 86ab. In the remarks which follow the last quotation, he repeats the expression ὁ μονογενὴς οὗς, and uses the words οὗς καὶ οὗς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα τούτο πατρὸς in such a way as to afford strong confirmation of that reading. A little further on (p. 86c) he enumerates the apppellations given to Christ by the Apostle John, in their order, in such a manner as to demonstrate that he read οὗς in John i. 18. He calls upon us to observe how the Evangelist, μετὰ τὴν δυσμᾶτα Ἴηγον (John i. 1), καὶ θεὸν τοῦ αὐτῶν λευκῶν (ver. 1), καὶ φῶς ἐποίησαν (ver. 7), καὶ μονογενὴς φανερόν (ver. 14), καὶ Χριστὸς ἐμφανίσθη (ver. 18), οὐκ ἔτι λέγον δυσμᾶτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν λοιπὸν ἑτορεί τὸν σωτῆρα οὐ λέγον ἐκ τοῦ ἐποίησεν, ἄλλα οὗς, καὶ μονογενὴς, 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 Σοῦ to Christ, is in the passage in question. Eusebius must, therefore, have read οὗς in John i. 18; and the arbitrary hypothesis that in all his apparent quotations of the passage with this reading, Σεός has been changed to οὗς by transcribers, falls to the ground. Eusebius also reads οὗς, De Eccles. Theol. Lib. I. c. 20. § 7. p. 29a; Lib. II. c. 23. p. 142v; and Comm. in Psalm. lxiii. 11, in Montfaucon’s Coll. Nova, I. 440. We may add his Comm. in Is. vi. 1, where we find δ μονογενὴς οὗς, ὃν ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον τοῦ πατρὸς, though not introduced as a formal quotation (Montf. Coll. Nova, II. 3742). It may here be observed that no various reading affecting the word οὗς 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. Graecae, Tom. XXIV.

Let us now examine the passage on which Dr. Tregelles relies, De Eccles. Theol. Lib. I. c. 9. p. 674. Here the quotation is introduced by the assertion that the Evangelist “expressly teaches that Christ is the only-begotten Σοῦ 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 διὰ τὴν αὐτὸν οὗς διὰ τὸν κόσμον σπέρμα τῆς μονογενὸς οὗς, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας. Under these circumstances, an impartial judgment will probably think that no clause more clearly betrayed itself as a marginal gloss, than the words οὗς μονογενὴς Σεός 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, ἄλλως μονογενῆς Σεός.” The only passage that I have found in Eusebius which might seem at first view to counterbalance the reading μονογενῆς Σεός is in his treatise De Eccles.
7. Eustathius, Bp. of Antioch, A. D. 320. (De Eneas-
trimytho, c. 18, in Galland. Bibl. Patr. IV. 563*; or Migne's
Patrol. Gr. XVIII. 652*.)

8. Athanasius, Bp. of Alexandria, A. D. 326, has expressly
quoted John i. 18 with the reading *uía 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. Pseudepigraphic, fourth cent.? (Contra Sabellian. c.
2. Opp. II. 384.)

10. Cyril of Jerusalem, A. D. 350, probably. He has no-
where expressly quoted the passage, but *alludes to it as fol-
ows:—Πιστεύωμεν τολμήν εἰς ἑαυτὸν πατέρα . . . δι' ἅδρωπῶν
μὲν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν, δ' ἐμφανείς δὲ μόνος ἑξηγήσατο. (Cat. VII.
c. 11. Opp. p. 117 ed. Tout.) Here the omission of *uiós
after ἐμφανείς 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 ἑως
in this passage, it is improbable that he would have neg-
lected 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 ex-
presses it, that ἑως ἑως ἐγεννησεν. 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 (χρησιτίκως &c) 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 (δ' ἐν πατρὶ μόνες ἐγεννησεν ὁ ὑιός, δ' ἐν ἐν τῷ
κόσμῳ 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 *uiós.

1 The direct quotations of Athanasius are, De Decret. Nic. Synod. c. 13: Περί
δε τοῦ κυρίου εὐαγγελίζομεν λέγει ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, δ' ἐν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, κ. τ. λ.
26. p. 638*: Παλαι δὲ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰρημένον, ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός, δ' ἐν εἰς
τὸν κόσμον, κ. τ. λ. δείκνυς τὸν υἱὸν ἄει εἶναι. *Ὁ γὰρ λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς υἱὸν, τοῦτο χείρι ὁ Δαβὶς ἐφάλλει λέγων. ἶνα τι διοτρέφει τὴν χείρα σου . . . . . ἐκ
μέσον τοῦ κόσμου σου (Psalm lxvii. al. lxxiv. 11). ὁ δὲ χείρι ἐν τῷ
κόσμῳ, καὶ δ' υἱός εἰς κόσμον, κ. τ. λ. The references to the reading *uíos, which
in this case are as explicit as quotations, are found in Orat. IV. cont. Arian. c.
16. p. 628*4; ibid. c. 20, p. 631*4; and c. 23. pp. 634*4, 635*.
he read μουρογένης ζεός 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.


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


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 Basilii Magni Opp. I. 359 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. 166b, ed. Venet. 1728.)

16. Chrysostom, A. D. 398, not less than eight times. In several of these instances he so comments on the word νίς 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. Εἰρηκὼς ἐναύδα ὁ βαπτίστης ὡς ἴνος ἵνα 2[Plaintext]

---

1 Ibid. c. 11, ap. Galland. Bibl. Patr. V. 338d, or Migne, XVIII. 1240d. Here ζεός may have been added by Titus from John i. 1 to indicate, as he says in the following sentence, that the νός was νός γρήγορος δειος τῷ γεγονηκότι. Compare the insertion in the next sentence to this, where he quotes Matt. iii. 17 (or xvii. 5) thus: Οὗτος ἢνος ὁ νός μου ὁ μουρογήνης καὶ ἀγαπητός, εἰ δὲ λόγῳ 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. 475ab, 476b, 481a; III. 470b; VI. 64b, 264d; VIII. 84b, 86e, cf. 87bc, 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 ζεός, and that transcribers have substituted νός. I may also remark that neither Savile nor Montfaucon have noted in their manuscripts, any of these instances, any various reading affecting νός.
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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 Ἡσός, which he would hardly have failed to express, had he found it in the original. He uses μονογενής alone, which implies νιός.


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. In this work (cap. 6) John i. 18 is quoted with the reading νιός.


23. Pseudo-Caesarius, seventh century? (Quaest. et Respons., Dial. I. Resp. 4, ap. Galland. Bibl. Patr. VI. 89.) 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.


1 Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Test., p. 232, note †.
25. Theodore Studites, A. D. 813, twice. (Antirrhet. III. 14, and Epist. II. 56. Epist., etc., pp. 1084, 349, 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 Catenae, VIII. 134.)
27. The Catena on John i. 18, published by Cramer. (Cramer's Catenae, II. 189.)

It is hardly worth while to go lower than this, but two or three more writers may be added for completeness.
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, 130, 165, 176.)

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:

2. Hilary of Poitiers, A. D. 354, at least seven times.
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(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. 520a, 799e, 831c, 852a, 873b, 874b, 905c, ed. Bened.)

3. Phoebeadius (or Phaebeadius), Bp. of Agen in Gaul, A.D. 359. (Cont. Arian. c. 12, in Galland. Bibl. Patr. V. 253, or Migne’s Patrol. XX. 214.)


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 Fili, nisi proprietatis extrinsecus virtus per exceptionis significantiam adderetur. Praeter Filium enim, et unigenitum cognominans, suspicionem adoptionis penitus exsequitur.”

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. & aw), 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 significationem . . . . . . . id ipsum unigenitum Deo esse proprium Evangelica testamentur: 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.
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(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\textsuperscript{a}, 527\textsuperscript{f}, 1274\textsuperscript{d}, 1286\textsuperscript{b}; II. 501\textsuperscript{c}, 603\textsuperscript{f}, 875\textsuperscript{e}, ed. Bened.)


7. Faustinus, A. D. 384, three times. (De Trin. Lib. I. c. 2. § 5, in Migne's Patrolog. XIII. 54\textsuperscript{a}.)

8. Augustine, Bp. of Hippo, A. D. 396, three times. (In Joan. Tract. xxxi. c. 3; xxxv. c. 5; xlvii. c. 3. Opp. Tom. III. P. ii. col. 1638, 1660, 1734, 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\textsuperscript{a}, 740\textsuperscript{f}.)\textsuperscript{1}

12. Vigilius 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\textsuperscript{a}; or in Athanasii Opp. II. 615\textsuperscript{a}, ed. Montf.)

13. Junilius, A. D. 550. (De Part. Div. Legis, Lib. I. c. 16, in Migne's Patrolog. LXVIII. 22\textsuperscript{a}.)

14. Alcinus, A. D. 780. (Comm. super Joan. in loc. Opp. I. 472, 473, ed. Froben, or in Migne's Patrolog. C. 752\textsuperscript{a}, cf. 753\textsuperscript{b}.)

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

\textsuperscript{1} Montfaucon ascribes this work, and also the first eight books of the one next mentioned, to Idavius 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 Ἰησοῦς; 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 Ἰησοῦς twice; on the other hand, he has υἱός once, once υἱὸς τοῦ Σεοῦ, 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 Ἰησοῦς 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 Ἰησοῦς, In Joann. Tom. ii. c. 29, and xxxii. c. 13 (Opp. IV. 89b, 436d, 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 υἱὸς in his Greek copy, the omission would be unimportant; but if he had Ἰησοῦς, 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. 440º. Θεὸς οἴδαι, λέαρχα πάσοτε: ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ κατήργητος Εὐαγγελίσατο. So De La Rue and Lommatzsch, from two manuscripts; the earlier edition of Hoeschel, founded on a single manuscript, instead of ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός reads καὶ μονογενὴς γε ἐν Ἰησοῦ. 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. Ἰησοῦς τοῦ Σεοῦ occurs, In Joann. Tom. vi. c. 2. Opp. IV. 102d, as edited by De La Rue and Lommatzsch from the Bodleian manuscript, which appears to be an excellent one; the earlier edition of Huet, which was founded on a single manuscript, reads υἱός Ἰησοῦς. A little after, in two allusions to the passage, ὁ μονογενὴς is used alone. Opp. IV. 102º, 114º. — Unigenitus Dei Filius, In Cant. Lib. IV. Opp. III. 91º.

² Basil reads Ἰησοῦς, De Spir. Sanct. c. 6. Opp. III. 12b. Comp. ibid. c. 8, p. 14º, where he says: Οἶδε γὰρ [ἡ γραφὴ] τὸ θεόν ὑπὲρ τῶν θεόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ υἱὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγει (ὑμ. λέγει), καὶ μονογενὴς Ἰησοῦς, καὶ δύοσμα Σεοῦ, καὶ σοφίας, καὶ λόγου. — On the other hand, he has υἱός, De Spir. Sanct. c. 11, Opp. III. 23a, where the six manuscripts of Garnier appear to agree in this reading, though one of Matthaei’s Moscow MSS. has Ἰησοῦς (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. 358º. Here Matthaei’s Moscow MS. also reads υἱός.
3. Cyril of Alexandria, A.D. 412, as edited by Aubert, has Ἰεῶς four times, and ἠιός three times. His commentary on the passage, as printed, favors Ἰεῶς, 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 read Ἰεῶς, Thes. Assert. xiii. and xxxv. Opp. V i. 137b, 237b. The correctness of Ἰεῶς 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. 129a, and Migne's Patrolog. Gr. LXXII. 487a; also in the Catena published by Cramer (VI. 305) on Col. i. 16. He has Ἰεῶς, moreover, in the Dialogue "Quod Unus sit Christus," Opp. V. i. 768b. In his Comm. on John i. 18 he has ἠιός in the text, Opp. IV. 103b; but toward the end of his remarks he quotes the passage with the reading Ἰεῶς, p. 107b. He also says: Ἐπισταρχίας δὲ πάλιν, διὰ μονογενῆ Ἰεῶς ἄνωταλικῆ τῶν ἠιῶν, p. 105b. But here the scholion in one of Matthew's Moscow manuscripts cites him as saying, Ἐπισταρχίας πάλιν, διὰ καὶ μονογενῆ ἄνωταλικῆ τῶν ἠιῶν, omitting Ἰεῶς. Still, the commentary on the whole confirms the reading Ἰεῶς.

He has the reading ἠιός, Thes. Assert. xxxv., and Adv. Nestorium, Lib. III. c. 5. Opp. V. i. 353c, and VI. i. 90b. This reading is also found twice in an extract which he gives from Julian, in his work against that emperor. Opp. VI. ii. 332b.

In an allusion to John i. 18, we find ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Ἰεῶς λόγος, ὁ ἐν κόλπω ἐν τούτῳ πατρός. Apol. adv. Orient. Opp. VI. 187c.

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 Ἰεῶς, 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 μονογενῆς Ἰεῶς 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; Arians ap. Athanas. de Syn. c. 15, Opp. I. 728a, but not ap. Epiph. Haer. LXIX. c. 6,
the passage in question, but merely to examples of the phrase μονογενὴς Σεός 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 Σεός λόγος in the writings of the Fathers from the third century downwards, or of Θεότοκος 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 ἀαρχός, 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, γεννηθείς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενὴς, τούτων, εἰς τὸς οὐσίαν τοῦ πατρὸς, Σεόν ἐκ Σεός. Both the Arians and the Orthodox freely applied the term Σεός 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.

FOR THE READING ἰδίσ.

**Manuscripts.**

α* B C* L, 83.

**Versions.**


**Greek Fathers.**

Clem. Al. 254, Theod. 354, Epiph. 253, three times, and one ref., Didym. 251, twice, and one ref. (?); Cyr. Al. 250, four times, and one ref. (?), but ἰδίσ. three times.

Perhaps, 2d Syn. An- cyr. 251, one ref., and Greg. Nyss. 250, one ref., and eight allusions, but both very uncertain. (See above, pp. 854–857.)

**Latin Fathers.**

None.

**Greek Fathers.**


**Latin Fathers.**

Tert. 250, Hilar. 250, seven times, Phoebed. 250, Vic- torin. Afes 250, six times, Ambrose 250, seven times, Jerome 250, Faustin. 250, three times, August. 250, three times, Adimant. 250, Maximin. 250, twice, Idas- iacus 250, three times, Vigil. Taps. 250, Junil. 250, Alcuin 250, and others.

**Wholly doubtful.** Origen 250, Basil the Great 250. 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 μονογγές Σεβίς 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 ἰδίσ. They represent every important division of the Christian world. The reading ἰδίσ. is attested by the Curetonian, Harclean, and Jerusalem Syriac; by the third Synod
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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 ἕν ὅσ, besides being much more limited in number, are, so far as we know their locality, almost wholly Egyptian.  

Comparing the readings in respect to antiquity, we find in favor of ἕν ὅσ, 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), Archeaus, 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 ἕν ὅσ 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 ἕν ὅσ, that μονογενής naturally suggests the word ἕν ὅσ, so that a transcriber might easily inadvertently substitute it for ἕν ὅσ. This consideration appears to be of some weight.

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

---

1 The Harlean 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 μονογενής Σεός 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 μονογενής υἱός, ἔδωθα had just occurred, bringing Σεός before the mind of the copyist. Is it strange that in transcribing he should inadvertently connect this word with μονογενής, the combination being so familiar to him, the words ὅτι and ἔδωθα being so similar in ancient manuscripts, and Σεός 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 Σεός. It is much more difficult to account for such an ancient and wide-spread corruption as must have taken place, if Σεός proceeded originally from the pen of the Evangelist. If he had written μονογενής Σεός in this passage, so remarkable an expression must have early attracted attention, and stamped itself ineradicably, 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 Ἁeos 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.
Appendix D

ON THE WORDS

ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΕΟΣ

IN SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

The purpose of this Dissertation is to investigate the true reading of the last verse in the Prologue to St John's Gospel (i 18). The result, I think it will be found, is to shew that μονογενής θεός should be accepted in place of the received reading ὁ μονογενής θεός, alike on grounds of documentary evidence, of probabilities of transcription, and of intrinsic fitness. The reading of three primary Greek MSS. has been known only within the last half-century; so that naturally this verse has not shared with other disputed texts of high doctrinal interest either the advantages or the disadvantages of repeated controversial discussion; and thus it offers a rare opportunity for dispassionate study. The history of the phrase μονογενής θεός in early Greek theology, of which I have attempted to give a rude outline, has also an interest of its own.

The verse stands as follows in the better MSS.: 

θεόν οὐδεὶς ἐσώρακεν πάντωτε· μονογενής θεός ὁ ὦν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἔξηγήσατο.

II. 1
ON THE WORDS ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΕΟC

The Documentary Evidence for μονογενὴς θεὸς consists of Manuscripts: ΝΒC* L 33 (Ν* omits the following ὅ ὅν; Ν and 33 prefix ὅ).

Versions: the Vulgate ('Peshito') or Revised Syriac; the margin of the Harclean Syriac; the Memphitic; and one of the two Æthiopic editions (the Roman, reprinted in Walton's Polyglott), in accordance with one of the two earlier British Museum MSS., a third of the MSS. yet examined having both readings¹. The article is prefixed in the Memphitic rendering. The Thebaic and the Gothic versions are not extant here.

ὁ μονογενὴς νῦν is found in Manuscripts: AC*EFGHKMSUVXΓΔΔΠΙ and all known cursive s except 33.

Versions: the Old Latin (q has u. filius Dei); the Vulgate Latin; the Old Syriac; the text of the Harclean Syriac; the Jerusalem Syriac Lectionary; the Armenian; and Mr Pell Platt's Æthiopic edition, in accordance with many MSS.

The Patristic evidence, though remarkable on any possible view, admits of various interpretation on some points. The grounds for the chief conclusions here stated will be found in a note at the end: it must suffice here to mark the limits of doubtfulness as clearly as the circumstances permit.

The reading μονογενὴς θεὸς, with or without ὅ, in direct quotations from St John or clear allusions to his text, is attested as follows. Two independent reports of VALENTINIAN doctrine furnished by Clement of Alexandria (Exc. ex Theodoto, p. 968 Pott.: a paraphrastic allusion a little later has νῦν by a natural combination, see p. 32), and Irenæus (p. 40 Mass.: corrupted in the inferior MSS. of both Epiphanius, who supplies the Greek, and the old translation, which in this allusion is faithfully literal). IRENAEUS himself at least once (256), and I strongly suspect two other times (255, 189): in all three places the original Greek is lost. CLEMENT himself twice (695, 956: in the second place, where the language is paraphrastic,

¹ It is impossible to convey a true impression of the Æthiopic evidence in few words. Some particulars will be found in Note C.
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Clement has ὁ μ. νίὸς θεὸς, as in a still looser paraphrase at p. 102 he has ὁ μ. ...λόγος τῆς πίστεως). Origen at least three times (on John i 7 [the commentary on i 18 itself is lost], iv. p. 89 Ru.; on John i 19, p. 102, the reading of two MSS. only is recorded, and they vary suspiciously between ὁ μ. νίὸς θεὸς and ὁ μ. νίὸς τῶν θεῶν; in an indirect reference shortly afterwards τῶν μ. stands without a substantive;] on John xiii 23, p. 439; c. Cels. ii 71, p. 440, certainly in two MSS., apparently in all except two closely allied MSS., from which De la Rue introduced νίὸς). Eusebius twice, once as an alternative not preferred by himself (De Eccl. Theol. p. 67, ὁ μονογενὴς νίὸς, ἡ μονογενὴς θεὸς), and in one other exceptional but seemingly unsuspicous place, p. 174. Epiphanius three or four times (Anchor. p. 8 [the clear statement here confessedly leaves no doubt as to the quotation at p. 7, hopelessly mangled in the printed text]; Panar. 612, 817). Basil at least twice (De Sp. Sanct. 15, 17, pp. 12, 14 Garn., quotation and statement confirming each other, as the Benedictine editor notes, adding that earlier editions, unsupported by any of his six MSS., read νίὸς; the quotation with νίὸς at p. 23, which has no note, may therefore be only an unwary reprint). Gregory of Nyssa ten times, always somewhat allusively, as is his usual manner in citing Scripture, (c. Eunom. i 11 p. 432 [469 Migne]; 447 [493]; 478 [540]; iii 506 [581]; vi 605 [729]; viii 633 [772]; ix 653 [801]; x 681 [841]; De vit. Mos. 192 [i 336]; Hom. xiii in Cant. 663 [i 1045]: on the other hand νίὸς is printed twice, c. Eun. ii 466 [521]; Ep. ad Flav. 648 [iii 1004]). The (Homoean) Synod of Ancyra in 358 (in Epiph. Pan. 851 c: the allusion here is reasonably certain1). Didymus three times (De Trin. i 26 p. 76; ii 5, p. 140 [cf. i 15, p. 27]; on Ps. lxvi 14, p. 597 Cord. [with absolute certainty by the context, though νίὸς is printed]: an allusion on Ps. cix 3, p. 249 Cord. or 284 Mai, drops the substantive). Cyril of Alexandria (ad l.

---

1 The laxity of a reference to Prov. viii 25 (νίὸν for γεννᾷ με) in the same sentence was unavoidable, and it was guarded by ample previous exposition (852 BC, 853 B—D): here it would have been gratuitous and misleading.
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p. 103 [without ὁ] by Mr Pusey’s best MS. and repeated references in the following comment), and in at least three other places (Thes. 137, [without ὁ] 237; Dial. quod Unus, 768: twice (Thes. 365; Adv. Nest. 901) Aubert’s text has νίος, which will probably have to give way, as it has had to do in the commentary2. To these might perhaps be added the emperor JULIAN (p. 333 Spanh.), for though the full quotation and one subsequent reference have νίος, another has θεός, which the argument seems on the whole to require.

The patristic evidence for [ὁ] μονογενὴς νίος has next to be given. Irenaeus twice, but only in the Latin translation (see above), and exactly in the Old Latin form, with nisi inserted before unigenitus, and once with Dei added to Filius, so that we seem to have the reading of the translator, as often, not of Irenaeus. HIPPOLYTUS (c. Noetum 5) without ὁ: all depends on Fabricius’s editing of a modern copy of a single Vatican MS., and the context is neutral. An EPISTLE from certain bishops at ANTIOCH (260—270 A.D.) to Paul of Samosata (Routh, R. S. iii 297), again dependent on a single MS., unexamined for some generations, and with the detached phrase τὸν μονογενὴν νίον τοῦ θεοῦ θεόν occurring not long before. The Latin version of the “ACTS” of the disputations between ARCHELAUS and Mani, c. 32, where again the inserted nisi shews the impossibility of deciding whether author or translator is responsible. EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA six times, De Eccl. Theol. p. 67 (with θεός as an alternative, see above), 86, 92, 142; in Ps. lxxiv. p. 440 Mont.; in Es. vi. p. 374. Eu-

1 In this case the text is also Pusey’s (p. 170); but it rests on a single MS. of the fifteenth century: it is followed in a few lines by ὃ γε μὴ ἐν κόλπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς μονογενῆς θεοῦ λάγος.

2 In the ‘Dialogues’ of an unknown CESARIUS (Inter. 4, post Greg. Naz. iv 864 Migne), probably of the fifth if not a later century, the context implies θεός, though νίος is printed. The apparent conflict of text and context has been lately pointed out by Prof. Abbot, who still regards the reading as only doubtful. The possibility of reconciling with the actual language an inferential argument from John i 18 containing νίος seems to me infinitesimal: but I am content to leave Cesarius in a note.
Stathius, De Engastr. p. 387 All. Alexander of Alexandria, Ep. ad Alex. in Theodoret, H. E. i 3; but with the detached phrase τοῦ μονογενοῦς θεὸν on the next page. Athanasius seven times (Ep. de Decr. Nic. 13, 21; Or. c. Ar. ii 62; iv 16, 19, 20, 26). Gregory of Nazianzus, Orat. xxix 17. Basil of Caesarea, Ep. 234, p. 358, besides one of the three places in the De Spiritu Sancto already mentioned, where at least one Moscow MS. has θεὸς: but the evidence adduced above casts doubt on both places. Gregory of Nyssa twice (see p. 3); but the reading is most suspicious. Titus of Bostria (adv. Man. p. 85 Lag.: but p. 93 δ. μ. vιός θεός). Theodore of Mopsuestia (ad l. bis in Mai, N. P. B. vii 397 f.). Chrysostom ad l., and later writers generally. On Julian see p. 4.

It is unsatisfactory that so much of the patristic testimony remains uncertain in the present state of knowledge; but such is the fact. Much of the uncertainty, though not all, will doubtless disappear when the Fathers have been carefully edited. In familiar passages scribes, editors, and translators vie with each other in assimilating biblical quotations to the texts current among themselves; and from the nature of the case the process is always unfavourable to ancient readings, whether true or false, which went out of use comparatively early. It would therefore be absurd to treat the uncertainty as equally favourable to both readings. Where we have a Greek original, without various reading noted, and without contradictory context, vιός has a right to claim the authority provisionally, in spite of private suspicions: but it would be unreasonable to concede to vιός any appreciable part in Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus, or Cyril—I ought to add, in Irenaeus or Basil—notwithstanding the variations already mentioned. Serious doubt must also rest on an isolated vιός in a neutral context, when, as in the case of the Epistles of the Antioch bishops and of Alexander, μονογενῆς θεός is found at no great distance, though without any obvious reference to John i 18: the doubt is not removed by the fact that one or
two Latin Fathers\(^1\) have *unigenitus Filius* in their quotation, and *unigenitus Deus* often elsewhere.

To gather up the documentary evidence with the usual abbreviations, we have

\[\text{\theta}eos\ NBC*L 33\]
Memph. Syr.vulg. Syr.hcl.mg. [?Aeth.]
*VALENTINIANI. Iren. *Clem. *Orig. [Euseb.]
 Cf. Caes.

\[\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\ amateur\&c. [? D]\]
*Ath. †Eust. †Alex.Al. [??Bas.] Greg.Naz. [??Greg.

Testimonies marked with * prefixed are clear and sufficient: those marked with † depend on a single quotation, with a neutral context. The Latin Fathers, as almost always, attest only what was read in the Latin versions: all Latin authorities have *unicus Filius* or *unigenitus Filius*, q adding *Dei*.

Against the four best uncial \(\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\) has no tolerable uncial authority to set except \(\Lambda\) and \(X\), of which even \(\Lambda\) is in the Gospels very inferior to any one of the four, much more to their combination, and it is here deserted even by Syr.vulg., its usual companion, while 33 is approached by no other cursive. Manifestly wrong readings of AX and their associates abound hereabouts as everywhere: see i 16, 21, 26 bis, 27 quater, 30, 31, 39, 42, &c.: when D is added, wrong readings still recur, as iii 34; iv 2, 21, 25, 36, 37, 39, 42, 52, &c. The solitary position of 33 among cursive s here arises from the peculiarity of its position generally, and not merely from its comparative excellence, great as that is. The good readings supported by the

\(^{1}\) Hilary and Fulgentius. The latter twice quotes the text with *unigenitus Deus*, but doubtless not from a Latin copy of the Gospels.
other good cursive of the Gospels are, with rare exceptions, found likewise in the authorities called ‘Western’, such as D and the early Latins; that is, their ancient element is almost wholly ‘Western’, for good and for evil: the ancient element in 33 on the other hand can be only in part ‘Western’, for it abounds in true ancient readings which, as here, have little or no ‘Western’ authority. That the Old Syriac has νίσας is quite natural, when it has so many early ‘Western’ readings: what is really singular is the introduction of θεός at the revision, when few changes came in at variance with the late Antiochian text (Theodore, Chrysostom, &c.) ; and as θεός is not an Antiochian reading, its support by the Syriac Vulgate acquires especial weight. Among early versions this and the invaluable Memphitic more than balance the Old Latin and Old Syriac, which so often concur against BCL Memph. in wrong readings of high antiquity, as i 4, 24, 26, 38, 42; iii 8, 25; iv 9. In the later versions νίσας has no doubt the advantage.

The Ante-nicene Fathers follow the analogy of the versions. With the exception of the Antioch epistle, νίσας occurs in writers with a predominantly Western type of text, Hippolytus and Eusebius (compare the gloss in iii 6 at p. 72 of the De Ecc. Thk.) ; while Irenæus leaves their company to join Clement and Origen in behalf of θεός. After Eusebius the two readings are ranged in singular conformity with the general character of the respective texts generally. Cyril of Alexandria, Didymus, Epiphanius, are almost the only Post-nicene writers in whom we find any considerable proportion of the true ancient readings of passages corrupted in the common late text, while Basil and Gregory of Nyssa have also a sprinkling of similar readings, a larger sprinkling probably than Athanasius or Gregory of Nazianzus, certainly than Theodore, Chrysostom, or their successors. Thus it comes out with perfect clearness that νίσας is one of the numerous Ante-nicene readings of a ‘Western’ type (in the technical not the strictly geographical sense of the word) which were adopted into the eclectic fourth century
text that forms the basis of later texts generally. As far as external testimony goes, θεός and νίως are of equal antiquity: both can be traced far back into the second century. But if we examine together any considerable number of readings having the same pedigree as νίως, certain peculiar omissions always excepted, we find none that on careful consideration approve themselves as original in comparison with the alternative readings, many that are evident corrections. No like suspiciousness attaches to the combination of authorities which read θεός. Analysis of their texts completely dissipates the conjecture, for it is nothing more, that they proceed from an imagined Egyptian recension. The wrong readings which they singly or in groups attest can be traced to various distant origins, and their concordance marks a primitive transmission uncorrupted by local alterations. Such being the case, θεός is commended to us as the true reading, alike by the higher character of the authorities which support it, taken separately, and by the analogy of readings having a similar history in ancient times.

External evidence is equally decisive against the insertion of ὅ, omitted by the four uncials, one passage of Origen probably (c. Cels. ii 71), and two of Cyril (ad l. and Thes. 257). On such a point the evidence of versions and quotations is evidently precarious.

Probabilities of Transcription will doubtless be easily recognised as favourable to θεός. Μονογενὴς θεός is an unique phrase, unlikely to be suggested to a scribe by anything lying on the surface of the context, or by any other passage of Scripture. Μονογενὴς νίως (the reading of Hippolytus and of Eusebius once, in Ps.), and still more ὅ μονογενὴς νίως, is a familiar and obvious phrase, suggested by the familiar sense of μονογενὴς in all literature, by the contrast to τοῦ πατρῶς in the same verse (and παρὰ πατρῶς in 14), by two other early passages of this Gospel (iii 16, ὅστε τὸν νίων τὸν μονογενὴν ἔδωκεν, and iii 18, ὅτι μὴ πεπιστευκέν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονο-
γενοῦσιν ὑιὸν τοῦ θεοῦ), and by a passage of St John's first Epistle (iv 9, ὅτι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενὴν ἀπέσταλκεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον). The always questionable suggestion of dogmatic alteration is peculiarly out of place here. To the Monogenes in the Ogdoad of the Valentinians, among whom by a mere accident we first meet with this and other important verses of St John, θεὸς could be only an awkward appendage: the Valentinians of Clement take it up for a moment, make a kind of use of it as a transitional step explaining how St John came to give the predicate θεὸς (in i 1) to Logos, whom they anxiously distinguish from Monogenes (= Arche), and then pass on to their own proper view, in which Sonship alone appears as the characteristic mark of Monogenes; while the Valentinians of Irenæus content themselves with reciting the bare phrase (Ἰωάννης... Ἀρχὴν τινὰ ὑποτίθεται τὸ πρῶτον γεννηθέν [sic] υπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ δὲ καὶ Τίόν, καὶ Μονογενὴ θεόν κέκληκεν, ἐν φιλότα πάντα ὁ Πατὴρ προέβαλε σπερματικῶς) and leaving it, justifying i 1 by the general remark τὸ γὰρ ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθέν θεὸς ἐστὶν, but not otherwise referring again to any θεὸς except Him whom St John, they say, distinguishes in i 1 from Arche (= Son) and Logos. Neither in the Valentinian nor in any other known Gnostical system could there have been any temptation to invent such a combination as μονογενής θεὸς. Nor is it easy to divine what controversial impulse within the Church could have generated it in the second century; for the various doctrinal currents of that period are sufficiently represented in later controversies of which we possess records, and yet there is, I believe, no extant writer of any age, except that very peculiar person Epiphanius¹, who makes emphatic controversial appeal either to θεὸς per se, or to θεός as coupled with μονογενής, or (with a different purpose) to μονογενής as coupled with θεὸς, whether in this verse or in the derivative detached phrase mentioned hereafter. The whole verse, with either

¹ Also Cesarius, if the printed υἱὸς is wrong. The emperor Julian may be added, as finding matter of accusation against St John in this verse, if I am right in surmising that μονογενής θεὸς was the reading before him.
reading, soars above the whole extant theology of the second century antecedent to the great Catholic writers at its close: but I could almost as easily believe that that age invented St John's Gospel, as some learned persons say it did, as that it invented μονογενῆς θεός. Once more, assuming μονογενῆς θεός to have obtained a footing in MSS., we cannot suppose that it would gain ground from ὁ μονογενῆς θεός in transcription, unless we trust modern analogies more than actual evidence. The single fact that μονογενῆς θεός was put to polemical use by hardly any of those writers of the fourth century who possessed it, either as a reading or as a phrase, shews how unlikely it is that the writers of our earliest extant MSS. were mastered by any such dogmatic impulse in its favour as would overpower the standing habits of their craft.

The only other possible explanation is pure accident. The similarity of ΥC to ΘC, though doubtless greater than that of the words at full length, is hardly strong enough to support a word forming a new and startling combination, though it might be able to cooperate in a transition to so trite a term as μονογενῆς θεός. But a still more serious objection to this suggestion is the absence of the article in what we must consider the primitive form of the reading, μονογενῆς θεός. Supposing for the sake of argument that ΥC might pass into ΘC, the change would still have left ὁ standing ten letters back, and there would have been as little temptation to drop ὁ before θεός as before θεός, as is shown by the profuseness with which the Fathers (and their scribes) supplied it subsequently. On the other hand the known boldness of 'Western' paraphrase would have had little scruple in yielding to the temptation of inserting ὁ after changing θεός to θεός, whether immediately or after an interval in which the article remained absent.

Thus, on grounds of documentary evidence and probabilities of transcription alike, we are irresistibly led to conclude that μονογενῆς θεός was the original from which ὁ μονογενῆς θεός and ὁ μονογενῆς proceeded. More than this no evidence from without can establish: but in a text so amply attested as that
of the New Testament we rightly conclude that the most original of extant readings was likewise that of the author himself, unless on full consideration it appears to involve a kind and degree of difficulty such as analogy forbids us to recognise as morally compatible with the author's intention, or some other peculiar ground of suspicion presents itself.

This is perhaps the best place to mention a third reading to which Griesbach was somewhat inclined (it must be remembered that BC were as yet assumed to agree with most MSS. in reading τίός, and Ν was unknown), and which at one time seemed to me probable, namely ὁ μονογενής without either substantive. It is supported however by neither MS. nor version except the Latin St Gatien's MS., but by a few quotations in Greek and Latin Fathers, almost wholly writers who use one or other of the fuller readings elsewhere; the only considerable exception being Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat. vii 11). It is doubtless common to find different authorities completing an originally elliptic or condensed expression in different ways. But the stray instances of ὁ μονογενής and Unigenitus are sufficiently explained by the extreme frequency of this simple form of phrase in the theological writings of the fourth and fifth centuries. Nor, on an attentive scrutiny, does it commend itself even as a conjecture, these unsubstantial shreds of authority being discarded. To those indeed who justly recognise the conclusiveness of the evidence which shews that μονογενής θεός cannot be a corruption of ὁ μονογενής τίός, yet are unable to believe that St John wrote it, ὁ μονογενής affords the best refuge. In sense it suits the immediate context, having in this respect an advantage over ὁ μονογενής τίός; though it seems to me to fail in relation to the larger context formed by the Prologue, and to lack the pregnant and uniting force which I hope to shew to be possessed by μονογενής θεός. But serious difficulties as to transcription have to be added to the want of external evidence. It is as inconceivable that θεός should have been supplied to complete ὁ μονογενής in the second century, with the further omission of the article, as that ὁ μονογενής τίός
should have been altered to μονογενὴς θεός. Nor is the case improved by supposing accidental errors arising out of similarity of letters, CO becoming CЄћO, and O being lost after Ė. It would be an extraordinary coincidence either that both slips of the pen should take place at the same transcription, though separated by ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗϹ; or that two corruptions of the same clause should take place at different times, yet both before the earliest attested text of the New Testament. And again to suppose μονογενὴς without ὅ to be the true reading would only change one difficulty for another: μονογενὴς without either article or substantive, followed by ὅ ὅν, and caught up by εἰκόνος, would be harsh beyond measure. Thus the conjectural omission of the substantive produces no such satisfying results as could for a moment bring it into competition with the best attested reading, except on the assumption that the best attested reading is impossible.

Accordingly the field of criticism is now in strictness narrowed to the alleged impossibility of μονογενὴς θεός. It will however be well for several reasons to examine the readings on their own positive merits, without reference to the strong assertions of private and overpowering instinct by which criticism is sometimes superseded. We have therefore, thirdly, to consider Intrinsic Fitness.

St John’s Prologue falls clearly and easily into three divisions:

(a) 1. The Word in His Divine relations in eternity antecedently to creation.

(β) 2—13. The Word in His relations to creation, and especially to man, chiefly if not altogether antecedently to the Incarnation.

(γ) 14—18. The Word as becoming flesh, and especially as thereby making revelation.

(The two digressions 6—8, 15, in which the Baptist’s office of witness is put forth in contrast, do not concern us here.)

The first division ends with the simple affirmation that the Word, who was πρὸς τὸν θεόν, was Himself θεός. In the
second division, after the initial ὅτος which reintroduces the second clause of verse 1, His original name is not repeated: He is presented as the universal Life, and as the Light of mankind; coming into the world, and ignored by it; visiting His own special home, and receiving no welcome there, though in a manner accepted elsewhere: so ends the history of the old world. The third division pronounces at once the name unheard since verse 1, but now as part of the single stupendous phrase ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο, and adds the visible sojournning of the Word ‘among us’, whereby disciples were enabled to behold His glory. This glory of His is further designated, by a single phrase which is a parenthesis within a parenthesis, as being “a glory as of an only-begotten from a father”. Neither the Son nor the Father, as such, has as yet been named, and they are not named here: there is but a suggestion by means of a comparison (the particle ὡς and the absence of articles being mutually necessary), because no image but the relation of a μονογενὴς to a father can express the twofold character of the glory as at once derivative and on a level with its source. Then the interrupted sentence closes in its original form with the description πλήρης χαρίτος καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, followed, after the interposition of the Baptist’s testimony, by a notice of this fulness of grace as imparted to Christians, and its contrast with the preceding Law. Finally verse 18 expounds the full height of this new revelation. Now, as truly as under the Law (Ex. xxxiii 20; Deut. ix 12), Deity as such remains invisible, although the voice which commanded has been succeeded by “the Truth” which was “beheld”. Yet a self-manifestation has come from the inmost shrine: One of whom Deity is predicable under that highest form of derivative being which belongs to a μονογενὴς, not one of imperfect Deity or separate and external place but He who in very truth is εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς,—He, the Word, interpreted Deity to the world of finite beings.

Part of this meaning is undeniably carried by the common reading ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς; but incongruously, and at best only
a part. Here as in v. 14 special force lies in µουσις in
contrast to the share possessed by one among many brethren;
and for this purpose νιός adds nothing, if indeed it does not
weaken by making that secondary which was meant to be
primary, for other ‘children of God’ had just been mentioned
(vv. 12, 13). There would also be something strangely abrupt in
the introduction of the complete phrase ὁ µουσις νιός, as a
term already known, which ill suits the careful progress of
St John: the leap from ὁς µουσανός παρὰ πατρός would be
too sudden; the absence of any indication identifying ὁ νιός
with the Word would be dangerously obscure, while the article
would mar the integrity of the Prologue by giving its crowning
sentence a new subject in place of ὁ λόγος; and in any case
a designative name would serve the argument less than a
recital of attributes. This last point comes out more clearly
as we follow the exquisitely exact language of the whole verse.
The ruling note is struck at once in θεόν, set before οἱδεῖς in
emphatic violation of the simple order which St John habitually
uses: and further θεόν has no article, and so comes virtu-
tually to mean ‘One who is God’, ‘God as being God’, and
perhaps includes the Word, as well as the Father1. In
exact correspondence with θεόν in the first sentence is µου-
σις θεός in the second. The parallelism brings out the
emphasis which the necessary nominative case might other-
wise disguise, and a predicative force is again won by the
absence of the article. St John is not appealing to a recog-
nised name, as an inserted article would have seemed to imply,
but setting forth those characteristics of the Revealer, already
described (v. 14) as ‘the Word’, which enabled Him to bring
men into converse with ‘the Truth’ of God, though the be-
holding of God was for them impossible. It needed but a
single step to give the attribute µουσις to Him whose glory
had been already called a glory as of a µουσις from a father.
It needed no fresh step at all to give Him the attribute θεός,
for He was the Word, and the Word had at the outset been

declared to be ὥς. The two elements of the phrase having thus been prepared, it remained only to bring them together, associating Deity with Him as Son (for that much is directly involved in the single term μυνογενής) as expressly as it had been already associated with Him as Word; and then the combination is fixed and elucidated by the further description ὁ ὤν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός. It begins with the article, for now that One has been called μυνογενής θεός,—and in One alone can both attributions meet,—there is no longer need for generality of language; we exchange “One that is—” for “He that is—”. In like manner now that He has been set forth as actually μυνογενής as well as θεός, it has become right to speak definitely of τοῦ πατρός. The connecting phrase ὁ ὤν εἰς τὸν κόλπον is a repetition of ὁ λόγος ἐν πρέσ τὸν θεόν, translated into an image appropriate to the relation of Son to Father.

Thus St John is true to his office of bringing to light hidden foundations. The name ‘The Word’, in which he condenses so much of the scattered teaching of our Lord and the earlier apostles, leads gradually, as he expounds it, to the more widely current idea of Sonship, which after the Prologue he employs freely; and yet is not lost, for ἐξηγήσατο suggests at once the still present middle term of v. 1 through which μυνογενής has become linked to θεός. The three salient verses of the Prologue are 1, 14, 18. These by themselves would suffice to express the absolute primary contents of St John’s ‘message’: the intervening verses are properly a statement of the antecedents of the Gospel, and of its meaning as illustrated by its relation to its antecedents. Verse 1 declares the Word to have been ‘in the beginning’ θεός; verse 14 states that the Word, when He became flesh, was beheld to have a glory as of a μυνογενής; verse 18 shews how His union of both attributes enabled Him to bridge the chasm which kept the Godhead beyond the knowledge of men. Without μυνογενής θεός the end

---

of the Prologue brings no clear recollection of the beginning: 
\( \text{θεός} \) is the luminous word which recites afresh the first verse 
within the last, and in its combination with \( \text{μονογενής} \) crowns 
and illustrates the intervening steps.

It is therefore vain to urge against the phrase that it is 
unique in the New Testament. The whole Prologue is unique, 
and \( \text{μονογενής} \ \text{θεός} \) seems to belong essentially to a single de-
finite step in the Prologue. No writer except St John applies 
\( \text{μονογενής} \) to our Lord at all, and he only in the three other 
closely connected places already cited. In each of them there 
exists a distinctly perceptible reason why \( \text{νίκης} \) should be intro-
duced; and moreover there were obvious objections to the 
employment by St John of the definite title \( \text{ο \ μονογενής} \ \text{θεός}, \) 
that is, with the article. If we examine the combination dis-
passionately, it is hard to see in it anything inconsistent with 
the theology of St John, unless the idea of an antecedent 
Fatherhood and Sonship within the Godhead, as distinguished 
from the manifested Sonship of the Incarnation, is foreign to 
him. This idea is nowhere enunciated by him in express 
words; but it is difficult to attach a meaning to \( \text{ο \ αυθεν \ τόν} \ \text{κόλπον του θεού} \text{πατρός} \) on any other view, and it is surely a natural 
deduction from the Prologue as a whole (with either reading) 
except on the quaint Valentinian theory that the subjects of 
vv. 14 and 18 are different, while it seems impossible to divine 
how he can have otherwise interpreted numerous sayings of our 
Lord which he records. The paradox is not greater than in the 
other startling combination \( \text{ο \ λίγος} \ \text{σάρξ} \ \text{εγένετο}, \) the genuine-
ness of which no one affects to question, though its force has 
been evaded in different directions in all ages.

The sense of \( \text{μονογενής} \) is fixed by its association with \( \text{νίκης} \) 
in the other passages, especially v. 14, by the original and 
always dominant usage in Greek literature, and by the pre-
vailing consent of the Greek Fathers. It is applied properly 
to an only child or offspring; and a reference to this special 
kind of unicity is latent in most of the few cases in which 
it does not lie on the surface, as of the Phoenix in various
of the Prologue brings no clear recollection of the beginning: θεός is the luminous word which recites afresh the first verse within the last, and in its combination with μονογενὴς crowns and illustrates the intervening steps.

It is therefore vain to urge against the phrase that it is unique in the New Testament. The whole Prologue is unique, and μονογενὴς θεός seems to belong essentially to a single definite step in the Prologue. No writer except St John applies μονογενὴς to our Lord at all, and he only in the three other closely connected places already cited. In each of them there is a distinctly perceptible reason why νικός should be introduced; and moreover there were obvious objections to the employment by St John of the definite title ὁ μονογενὴς θεός, that is, with the article. If we examine the combination dispassionately, it is hard to see in it anything inconsistent with the theology of St John, unless the idea of an antecedent Fatherhood and Sonship within the Godhead, as distinguished from the manifested Sonship of the Incarnation, is foreign to him. This idea is nowhere enunciated by him in express words; but it is difficult to attach a meaning to ὁ ὁν eis τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς on any other view, and it is surely a natural deduction from the Prologue as a whole (with either reading) except on the quaint Valentinian theory that the subjects of vv. 14 and 18 are different, while it seems impossible to divine how he can have otherwise interpreted numerous sayings of our Lord which he records. The paradox is not greater than in the other startling combination ὁ λίγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, the genuineness of which no one affects to question, though its force has been evaded in different directions in all ages.

The sense of μονογενὴς is fixed by its association with νικός in the other passages, especially v. 14, by the original and always dominant usage in Greek literature, and by the prevailing consent of the Greek Fathers. It is applied properly to an only child or offspring; and a reference to this special kind of unicity is latent in most of the few cases in which it does not lie on the surface, as of the Phoenix in various
authors, the μονογενής οίρανός of Plato (Tim. 31 b) as made by the ‘Father’ of all (28 c), and the μονογενής κόσμος of writers who follow him. Instances are not entirely wanting in which μονογενής is used of things that are merely alone in their kind (as if from γένος, and in its widest sense); but this rare laxity of popular speech, confined, if I mistake not, to inanimate objects, cannot be rightly accepted here. It finds indeed some support from Gregory of Nazianzus (Orat. xxx 20 p. 554 A) and Ammonius (on iii 16 in the catena): but Basil’s simple rendering (adv. Eun. ii 20 p. 256 A) ὁ μόνος γεννηθεὶς, put forward in opposition to Eunomius’s arbitrary invention ὁ παρὰ μόνου γενόμενος, (compare Athanasius’s negative definition, Or. c. Ar. ii 62 p. 530 A, ὁ γὰρ τοῦ μονογενῆς οὐκ ὄντων ἄλλων ἀδελφῶν μονογενῆς ἔστιν,) expresses the sense of the greater writers of different ages¹, though they sometimes add ἐκ μόνου to μόνος. While however the idea conveyed by the verb itself in the paraphrase μόνος γεννηθεὶς belongs essentially to the sense, the passive form goes beyond it, as perhaps even in unigenitus, and the narrower sense of the English verb in ‘only-begotten’ departs still further from the Greek. If ὁ μ. υἱός were the true reading, it would on the whole be a gain to adopt ‘the only Son’ from Tyndale in iii 16, 18, and from the English Apostles’ Creed, where ‘only’ represents the μονογενῆς of this or the other like passages, as ‘only-begotten’ represents it in the ‘Nicene’ Creed of the English Communion Service. But no such expedient is possible with μονογενῆς θεός; and so the choice lies between some unfamiliar word, such as ‘sole-born’, and the old rendering which certainly exaggerates the peculiarity of the Greek phrase, though it may be defended by imperfect analogies from other passages of the New Testa-

¹ A few out of the many somewhat later patristic illustrations of the true sense are collected, not without confusion in the appended remarks, by Petau de Trin. ii 10 10 ff.; vii 11 3 ff. Cyr.Al. Thes. 239 f. is specially clear: μονογενῆς...ὅτι τὸ μόνον τοῦτον εἶναι καρπὸν πατρικόν: again ὃς μόνος φυσικῶς γεννηθεὶς: again ὃς μόνος φυσικῶς γεννηθεὶς: again εἰ δὲ μηδὲς πάντως μονογενῆς τὸ μόνον ἔργον κέκληκε, πῶς ὁ υἱὸς ὃς γενόμενος ἄλλῳ οὐχ ὃς γεννηθεὶς μονογενῆς νοηθήσεται.
ment. A change of a different kind however seems absolutely required, either the insertion of 'One who is', or the resolved rendering 'An Only-begotten who is God, even He who &c.': without some such arrangement the predicative force of μονογενής θεός is lost, and the indispensable omission of the English article becomes perilous.

But these matters of translation do not affect, though they illustrate, the primary question as to St John's own Greek text. I have, I trust, now given sufficient reasons for concluding not only that μονογενής θεός presents no such overwhelming difficulty as to forbid its acceptance notwithstanding the weight of evidence in its favour, but that the whole Prologue leads up to it, and, to say the least, suffers in unity if it is taken away.

All these considerations are entirely independent of the truth of any theological doctrines which have been deduced, or may be deduced, from St John's text. When it is urged that certain words are incongruous with the context and with St John's teaching generally, it becomes legitimate and perhaps necessary to discuss their genuineness on grounds of sense; and not the less legitimate where, as in this case, the sense is manifestly theological, the criterion for the present purpose being not doctrinal truth but doctrinal congruity. Since however it is matter of fact that a fear of theological consequences is acting in restraint of dispassionate judgement, and that in opposite quarters, I feel justified in appending to the critical discussion a few remarks on the treatment of μονογενής θεός in ancient times, which may at least suggest some diffidence in relying on the infallibility of modern instincts.

The list already given of Fathers who read [ὁ] μονογενής θεός in their text of John i 18 takes no account of the much more widely diffused use of the phrase [ὁ] μονογενής θεός without a biblical context. Professor Ezra Abbot justly points out that
the phrase in itself affords no sufficient evidence as to the reading of St John followed by those who employ it, since it is a favourite with one or two who undeniably read ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός when they quote the Gospel. Yet it is equally true that this widely spread usage bears an indirect testimony which may be fitly noticed here, partly by its mere existence, partly by its probable connexion with public formularies.

Origen's voluminous remains contain the detached phrase μονογενὴς θεὸς eight or ten times, usually softened by the addition of λόγος or in some other way. It lurks in one place in the Antioch Epistle against Paul of Samosata (ὅν οὐκ ἄλλον πεπείσμεθα ἢ τὸν μονογενὴν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ θεόν, p. 202), and ought, I suspect, to be restored to another (τούτων δὲ τῶν υἱῶν, γεννητῶν μονογενῆς τρὶς υἱῶν τε, εἰκόνα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου θεοῦ τυγχάνοντα,...πρὸ ἀιώνων δυνα ὁ προγνώσει ἄλλα οὐσίᾳ καὶ ὑποστάσει, θεὸν θεοῦ υἱῶν, p. 290), where the second υἱὸν cannot be sustained by any punctuation, but must either be omitted or, with better reason, exchanged for θεόν. With these exceptions it is, I believe, absent from the extant Ante-nicene literature, notwithstanding the diffusion of the corresponding biblical text. The absence of this reading from good secondary MSS. and from almost all the later versions shews how rapidly it was superseded in the fourth and fifth centuries; yet we encounter the phrase itself on all sides in this period, and certainly not least abundantly in the latter part of the fourth century. Without attempting an exhaustive list, it may be useful to set down the following names and references, partly taken from Wetstein and other critics, partly from my own notes. Athanasius (c. Gent. 41 p. 40 c, διὸ καὶ ὁ τούτων λόγος ὁν καὶ οὗ σύνθετος, ἄλλες καὶ καὶ μονογενής θεὸς, ὁ καὶ ἐκ πατρός οὐα παρηγάθῃς ἀγαθῆς ἀγαθὸς προελθὼν; c. Apollo. ii 5 p. 944 A, οὐχὶ ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ δύνατο, ὡς ύμεῖς συκοφαντοῦντες λέγετε, διασύνροστε τοῦ τῶν Χριστιανῶν μυστήριον, ἄλλα θεοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς

1 The few Greek writers coming under this description, all of whose quotations with υἱὸν are either solitary or otherwise doubtful, cannot properly be taken into account.
[i.e. One who is God, even ὁ μονογενὴς θεὸς] εὐδοκήσαντος τῷ πληρωματί τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ την τοῦ ἀρχετύπου πλάσιν ἀνθρώπου καὶ ποίησιν καὶν ἐκ μήτερα παρθένου ἀναστήσαντοι ἐξαιτῶν φυσικῆ γεννήσει καὶ ἀλητῶ ἐνώσει; Arians (ap. Ath. de Syn. 15 p. 728 E, λοιπὸν ὁ νόσ...μονογενὴς θεὸς ἐστὶ; Epiph. Haer. 732 A, ὁ νόσ...θελήσατι καὶ βοηθήσῃ ὑπόστη πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰῶνων πλήρης θεὸς μονογενῆς ἀναλλοίωτος; Alexander the bishop of Alexandria with whom Arians came into conflict (i.e. p. 734 Noess. ἡ τοῦ μονογενοῦς θεοῦ ἀνεκδιδηγητὸς ὑπόστασις); Marcellus (ap. Eus. c. Marc. i 4 p. 19 c); Asterius (ap. Ath. Or. c. Ar. ii 37 p. 505 c [v. l]; de Syn. 18 p. 732 b); Theodorus of Heraclea (on Isaiah in Mai, N. P. B. vi 226); Eusebius [of Emesa, by Thilo's identification] (de fide &c. [Latine] in Sirmondi Opp. i 3 b, 16 d, 22 a); Rufinus of Palestine (Latine in Sirmondi Opp. i 274 ff. ce. 39, 52, 53, and with Verbum often); the Synod of Ancyra (ap. Epiph. Haer. 854 c); Epiphanius (Haer. 755 c, 817 c, 857 a, 912 a, 981 a); Cyril of Jerusalem (xi 3, θεὸν μονογενῆ); Eunomius (Apol. 15, 21, 26; Expos. Fidei 2 bis); Basil (Ep. xxxviii 4 p. 117 c; de Sp. S. 19 p. 16 c; 45 p. 38 b; c. Eun. ii 1 p. 238 c; also ὁ μ. νόσ καὶ θεὸς, i 15 p. 228; 26 p. 237 b); the Apostolic Constitutions (iii 17; n 20 § 5; vii 38 § 3; 43 § 1; viii 7 § 1, 35); the interpolator of the Ignatian Epistles (ad Philad. 6); Gregory of Nazianzus (Ep. 202 p. 168 c); Gregory of Nyssa repeatedly and in various writings (Professor Abbot counts 125 examples in the treatise against

1 It has been urged that πλήρης invalidates the reference. On the contrary the sense is that before χρόνων and αἰῶνων the Son attained that full height, subject to no change, which is expressed by μονογενὴς θεὸς.

2 Marcellus seems to be quoting a Creed, but in such a manner as to make its language his own. Τέγραφε γάρ, says Eusebius (c. Marc. 19 c) πιστεύειν εἰς πατέρα θεόν παντοκρατόρα, καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐδὲν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενὴ θεόν, καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον καὶ φησιν ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν μεριθηκέναι τοῦτον τὸν τῆς θεοσβελας πρῶτον. Quite different in form is the Creed presented by him to Julius of Rome (Epiph. Haer. 886), the suspiciously Western character of which is well known. In the epistle to Julius (835 v) he uses the phrase εἰς θεός καὶ ὁ τοῦτον μονογενῆ νόσος λόγος, where the added λόγος probably implies θεός, itself excluded by τοῦτον.
Eunomius alone); Didymus (De Trin. i 25 p. 68 Ming.; i 26 p. 72; with καὶ νῦς, i 18 p. 53; 26 p. 76; with νῦς καὶ interposed, i 16 p. 40; with λόγος, i 26 p. 75); the ‘Macedonian’ interlocutor in an anonymous Dialogue on the Trinity (Ath. Opp. ii 509 B'); Isaac ‘ex Judaeo’ (Sirmondi Opp. i 406 ABC); Cyril of Alexandria repeatedly; Andrew of Samosata (Ap. Cyr. Al. Ap. adv. Or. p. 290 Pusey [ix 333 Migne]); Theodoret (Repr. xii Capp. Cyr. 12 with λόγος; c. Nest. iv 1047 Schulze); Theodotus of Ancyræ, once with λόγος, once without (post Cyr. Al. x 1336 f. Migne); Basil of Seleucia (Hom. i p. 5 A; cf. xxv p. 139 d); Isidore of Pelusium (Ep. iii 95); even John of Damascus in compound phrases, perhaps following the Henoticum of Zeno (see p. 24 n. 1); Hilary in peculiar abundance in different writings (a single typical instance will illustrate his use: “Deus a Deo, ab uno ingenito Deo unus unigenitus Deus, non dii duo sed unus ab uno,” de Trin. ii 11); the fragments of a Latin Arian commentary on St Luke (in Mai S. V. N. C. iii 2 191, 199) and of Latin Arian sermons (ib. 217: cf. per filium unigenitum Deum in the Arian Primus capitulus fidei catholicae, ib. 233); the Latin Opus Imperfectum on St Matthew a few times (e.g. i 20 bis, 25) &c. The chief apparent exceptions are the later Antiochian school of Greek writers, and Ambrose and his disciple Augustine among Latin writers. Yet the subsequent theologians of North Africa by no means eschew the phrase, and it is of frequent occurrence in the

1 The ‘Orthodox’ interlocutor neither objects to the term nor uses it himself.

2 So in Pusey’s text of Cyril (Apol. adv. Theodoret. p. 492) with (apparently all) the Greek MSS. and the Syriac and Latin versions. Prior editions (as Schulze of Theodoret v 66 and Migne of Cyril ix 449 c) substitute τοῦ θεοῦ for θεός, apparently without authority.

3 In his Exposition of the Nicene Creed. But the context leaves it doubtful whether he assumed the combination to be already in the Creed, or only took its elements from the Creed.

4 Ο μονογενὴς νῦς καὶ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θεός (De fid. orth. i 2 p. 792 c Migne; iii 1 p. 984 A); ὁ μ. νῦς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θεός (iii 12 p. 1029 b); ὁ μ. νῦς καὶ θεός (i 2 p. 793 b). In the third passage θεός might be independent of μονογενής; not so, I think the context shews, in the others.
writings of Fulgentius in particular. Even in the days of Alcuin and Theodulphus it is not extinct.

In the later times the tradition doubtless passed directly from writer to writer: but this explanation will hardly account for the wide and various acceptance found by μονογενὴς θεὸς in the fourth century, combined with the almost complete absence of attempts to argue from it by any of the contending parties. This remarkable currency arose, I cannot but suspect, from its adoption into Creeds. We look for it of course in vain in Latin Creeds¹, for Latin Christendom from the earliest times known to us did not possess the fundamental reading in the Gospel: Hilary must have learned it, as he learned much else, from his Greek masters. Among the very few Greek Creeds belonging clearly to the second or third century of which we have any knowledge, we can identify μονογενὴς θεὸς only in that of Antioch, incorporated with the remarkable exposition of Lucianus (Sozom. H. E. iii 5 9; vi 12 4), who suffered martyrdom about 311. Here we read καὶ εἰς ἑνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ θεόν, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ, ἶδιον ἑξ’ ὅλων κ.τ.λ. (Graece ap. Ath. de Syn. 23 p. 736 a; Socr. H. E. ii 10; Latine ap. Hil. de Syn. 28 p. 478 c: cf. Bull Def. Fid. Nic. ii 13 4—7). The word θεόν after μονογενῆ was perhaps not in the earliest forms of this Creed (see pp. 24, 26): but there is no reason to doubt that it stood there in the time of Lucianus, of whose amplifications there is no sign till further on. In the passage of Marcellus of Ancyra referred to by Eusebius (about 336), in which he apparently follows some Creed (see p. 20), we have already found the identical Antiochian phrase τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ θεόν. The exposition of Lucianus was one of the four formularies brought forward at Antioch in 341: another, perhaps a modification of the local Creed of Tyana, the see of Theophronius who recited

¹ One elaborate private formulary, long attributed to Jerome or Augustine, the Confession of Pelagius (Hieron. Opp. xi 202 Vall.), has verum Deum unigenitum et verum Dei filium.
it, has in like manner, καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ θεὸν λόγον, δύναμιν καὶ σοφίαν, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων θεὸν τελειοῦ ἐκ θεοῦ τελείου, καὶ ὅτα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐν υποστάσει κ.τ.λ. (ap. Ath. de Syn. 24 p. 737 b). Once more the formulary of the Synod of Seleucia in Isauria held in 359 declares, πιστεύομεν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννηθέντα ἀπαθῶς πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, θεὸν λόγον, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ μονογενῆ, φως, ζωὴν, ἀληθείαν, σοφίαν, δύναμιν, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ. (ap. Ath. de Syn. 29 p. 746 c; Epiph. Haer. 873 b, c; Socr. H. E. ii 40). The influence of the two latter documents would probably be limited and temporary: but the details of their language, so far as it was not shaped by current controversy, must have been inherited directly or indirectly from formularies now lost, matured before the outbreak of the Arian disputes. Nay the original Nicene Creed itself appears to embody the phrase, though in a form which admits of being interpreted either as a deliberate retention or as a hesitating and imperfect obliteration of an earlier statement of doctrine (see Note D). Indeed it occurs once without any ambiguity, as a friend points out, in what purports to be a copy of the Nicene Creed included in a memorial from Eustathius of Sebastia and other representatives of the Asiatic Homœousians proffering their communion to Liberius of Rome, and expressly accepted by him as the Nicene Creed, shortly before his death in 366. This copy differs in nothing but two or three trivial particles from the usual ancient form except in the words καὶ εἰς ἑνα μονογενὴ θεὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, and the omission of μονογενῆ from its accustomed place in the next clause (ap. Socr. H. E. iv 12). In the familiar Creed usually regarded as the Constantinopolitan recension of the Nicene Creed μονογενῆς θεὸς was undoubtedly wanting, for reasons explained in Dissertation II. But finally in 451 it stands included, though with the old Alexandrine addition λόγον, in the carefully chosen last words of the Definition of Chalcedon: οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἡ διακομοιμενον,
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ἀλλ' ἔνα καὶ τὸν αὐτόν, υἱὸν καὶ μονογενὴς θεὸν λόγον, κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν (“sed unum eundemque Filium et unigenitum Deum Verbum Dominum Jesum Christum,” in Mansi’s primary old version), καθάπερ ἀνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτού καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἔξεπαιδευε, καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον. It is true that Evagrius (H. E. ii 4), Agathô (in Mansi Conc. xi 256), and the third Council of Constantinople in 680 omit καὶ so as to bring υἱὸν and μονογενῆ into combination, as also most Latin versions omit et, some further making transpositions: but the reading of the best authorities is sustained not only by its less obvious character but by the unquestionable separation of υἱὸν from μονογενῆ a few lines above, in the sentence πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' εσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ δὲ ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἄνθρωπότητα, ἔνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν, υἱόν, κύριον, μονογενῆ.

At this point a possible suspicion requires notice, whether μονογενῆς θεὸς may not owe its origin to Creeds, and have passed from them into the text of St John. The authority of a Creed might doubtless succeed in importing a difficult and peculiar reading, the introduction of which in any other way would be inconceivable. But the facts already stated are as fatal to this as to all other suggested explanations of a change from ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ μονογενῆς θεοῦ; and the evidence of Creeds does but corroborate the other evidence. I do not press the late date, the close of the third century at Antioch, at which we first find μονογενῆς θεὸς actually standing in a Creed. The Creed of Antioch in that form might be of earlier date: and the same may be said of any Creeds which may have supplied materials at Nicea in 325, at Antioch to Theophronius in 341, and at Seleucia in 359, though these might also belong in their corresponding form to Lucianus’s or even to the next generation. But

---

1 The Henoticon of the emperor Zeno, promulgated in 482, begins its final confession with the words Ὁμολογοῦμεν δὲ τῶν μονογενῆ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸν καὶ θεὸν, τῶν κ.τ.λ. (Evagr. H. E. iii 14).
conjectures of this kind will not avail unless we are prepared to
go so far as to say that μονογενὴς θεός stood in several distant
Creeds towards the close of the second century, or that it stood
in some one leading Creed near the beginning of the second
century, for nothing less would account for its presence in such
various biblical texts. Ptolemæus (see p. 30) speaks either from
Italy for himself in the third quarter or at most a few years
later, or from Alexandria or Rome for his master Valentinus in
the second quarter of the century; Irenæus from Asia Minor or
(less probably) Gaul; Clement and the Memphitic version from
Alexandria; Origen a little later from Alexandria and probably
also Palestine. It would not be easy to trace these scattered texts
to Alexandria, the only imaginable single centre, at that early
period: but if it were, we should find ourselves still confronted
by two weighty facts. First, there is not a trace of theological
activity at Alexandria, except that of the 'Gnostic' chiefs, till
the Catechetical School of the Church (Athenagoras, Pantænus,
Clement) arose in the last third of the century, which is too late
for our purpose; if such existed, some record of it must have been
preserved by Eusebius, who had a special interest in Alexandria,
and has given us a tolerable roll of contemporary writers from
other parts of the East. Secondly, little as we know of the Creed
of Alexandria, it happens that that little suffices to shew that it
did not contain μονογενὴς θεός. There is no trace of the words
in the rule of faith expounded in Origen's early work De Princi-
pios (Preface to Book i § 3 f.), though in various places where
he speaks in his own name (as in i 2; ii 6) there are suspicious
signs that the translator Rufinus had them before him. But
even in the days of Arius μονογενὴς θεός is clearly absent from
the Alexandrian Creed as recited by Alexander, notwithstanding
his own use of the term; for the evidently ancient words
καὶ εἰς ἑνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν νῖν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν
μονογενῆ, γεννηθέντα κ.τ.λ. Thus all external evidence fails to
sustain a derivation from Creeds in the second century: if we
are to consider intrinsic probabilities, it must be repeated that
the invention of the phrase in the first half (and more) of the
century is at variance with all that we know of any of its theologies: and as for the Creeds of the Church, that in those early days of elementary simplicity they should admit such a combination without direct Scriptural warrant would contradict all that we know of their manner of growth. Whether it could have been so admitted in the third century, with the theology of which it easily associates itself, is highly questionable; but that is not the period with which we have to deal. Yet even in the third century, as has been shown, the usage is cautious and tentative, by no means such as we should expect with words freely pronounced in Creeds. Origen quotes the verse almost half as often as he employs the phrase, and in a majority of cases he adds to the phrase some tempering word. At Antioch, where alone else it appears, it is conceivable that the Creed had an influence, though hardly if unsupported by Greek MSS., in changing the reading of the Syriac version; but the converse is equally possible. It is only in the fourth century that the phrase pervades the greater part of the extant literature: and the cause surely is that, though μονογενὴς θεός as a reading was being swept out of biblical MSS. by the same accidental agencies of transcription which removed hosts of Antenicene readings of no doctrinal moment, as a formula it had at last established itself in widely known Creeds. We cannot look to Creeds as the sources of the reading without inverting history.

The one historical demerit then, if demerit it be, which attaches to the combination μονογενὴς θεός is that each of the great parties in the fundamental and necessary controversies which began in the days of Constantine was willing to pronounce it, and that it has never itself become a watchword of strife. It was not avoided by Arius or his successor in the next generation, Eunomius, though neither of them inserted it in his own shorter Creed (see the letter of Arius and Euzoius to Constantine, in Socr. H. E. i 26; Sozom. H. E. ii 27, without even μονογενὴς; and the Confession in Eunomius's Apologeticus, c. 5, καὶ εἰς ἕνα μονογενῆ νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ, θεὸν λόγον), by the
Latin Arian commentator on St Luke, or by the author of the *Opus Imperfectum*, usually classed as an Arian. It appears sporadically in various quarters in the intermediate movement, commonly called Semi-Arianism, which, however inconsequent in thought, retained much of the letter of Antenicene language; while on the other hand it was not used spontaneously by Eusebius, who habitually followed his MS. or MSS. in reading *vios* in St John. It is uttered but sparingly and guarded by Athanasius, once in youth and once in old age, probably for a similar reason\(^1\); for he seems hardly likely to have shrunk from it on grounds of doctrine or feeling, when we remember that he speaks of *τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ γέννησιν* (*Or. c. Ar. i* 28 p. 432 c) and that the phrase in which he most loves to clothe his characteristic teaching is *εἰδιον τής τοῦ πατρός ουσίας γέννημα*. Once more we find *μονογενὴς θεῖς* in Marcellus, the blind violence of whose antagonism to Arius conducted him to a position of his own. Hilary, the wisest as well as the most successful champion of the cause of Athanasius in the West, employs it with startling freedom, evidently as the natural expression of his own inmost thought. Among the greatest of the theologians who continued and developed the same line of tradition in the East are confessedly Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus, and Cyril of Alexandria; and to none of these, widely as they differ from each other, is *μονογενὴς θεός* strange, while with two of them its use is habitual. Finally, with an accompaniment which guards but does not neutralise it, it obtains a place in the definition of the last of the ‘four’ primary Councils.

This great variety of belief among those who have received *μονογενὴς θεός* into their theological vocabulary suggests at once that its utility is not that of a weapon of offence or defence. Experience has shown that it is possible to affix a con-

---

\(^1\) Sometimes (as *de Decr. 16* p. 221 e; *Or. c. Ar. ii* 47 p. 515 e; *Ep. ad Afr. 5* p. 895 A, c) he has the derivative form [ὁ] *μονογενὴς λόγος*, which occurs in a passage of Origen quoted by him *De Decr. 27* p. 233 c, and is not rare elsewhere.
siderable range of meaning to words which simply express either Deity or Sonship, and even, as here, to a combination of the two predicates in the same subject. But it is rarely by the literal and apparent cogency of single texts that deliberate convictions have ever been formed: power in producing belief is not to be measured by convenience in argument. Understanding as I do both terms in the highest sense, and holding that the doctrine of perfect and eternal Sonship within the Godhead, for which Origen and Athanasius contended, and which the Nicene and 'Constantinopolitan' Creeds explicitly set forth, is fundamental truth, I cannot affect to regret that a reading of St John's words which suggests it, though it does not prove it, is established as genuine by a concurrence of evidence which I could not disregard without renouncing critical honesty. Perhaps the words may prove in due time instructive, thus much may be said without presumption, both to us who receive the doctrine and to those who as yet stumble at it.

It does not however follow that good results would now arise from a resuscitation of the ancient formula detached from the context of the Gospel. To employ it with the article prefixed would open the way to serious evil; while without the article it requires arrangements of diction which could seldom be contrived in common usage, and which incautious writers would be perpetually tempted to discard. The danger of the article is somewhat less in Greek than in English: nevertheless it must have been a dread of possible misuse that induced the Greek theologians so often to temper the article, as it were, by adding afterwards λόγος, νῦν, or some other term which fixed the denotation of θεός without lowering its sense or suggesting 'division'.

Yet these considerations can have no place in determining the text of St John. Taught by himself to "believe on the name of the Only-begotten Son of God", we do well to adhere to the name thus entrusted to us: but we need not shrink
from accepting and trying to interpret his other language in the single instance when he is led—not to put forward another name but—to join two attributes in unwonted union, that he may for a moment open a glimpse into the Divine depths out of which his historical Gospel proceeds.
NOTE A

The details of early Greek Patristic Evidence

The earliest known Greek reference to John i 18 occurs in two independent accounts of Valentinian doctrine, furnished by Irenæus and Clement respectively. The Valentinianism sketched by Irenæus in his first book is commonly recognised to be that of Ptolemæus, who apparently belongs to the generation succeeding the middle of the second century. He cannot at all events be later than the episcopate of Eleutherus, about 175—190, under which Irenæus wrote (p. 176 Mass.). “They further teach”, Irenæus says (p. 40), “that the First Ogdoad was indicated (μεμηνυκέναι) by John the Lord’s disciple, these being their words: ‘John, the Lord’s disciple’, intending to give an account of the genesis of the universe whereby the Father put forth (προέβαλεν) all things, supposes a certain Ἀρχή, the first thing gendered by God (τὸ πρῶτον γεννηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ), which he has also called (κέκληκεν) Son and μονογενὴς θεός, in

1 The recent criticisms of Heinrici (Die Valentinianische Gnose und die heilige Schrift) and Lipsius (Protestantische Kirchenzeitung of Feb. 22 1873, pp. 182 ff.: cf. Quellen d. ältesten Ketzergeschichte 90) have not thrown so much light on the mutual relations of these two accounts as might have been hoped for from such otherwise instructive investigations. It seems clear that neither Clement drew from Irenæus nor Irenæus from Clement, nor both from a common immediate source. More than this it would be rash to assert at present.

2 The text followed up to this point is that of the Greek extract preserved in Epiphanius (p. 196 Pet.), which shews no sign of amplification here. The old Latin version has omitted some words, including those which mark the quotation as verbal; while at the end of the quotation it adds “Et Ptolemæus quidem ita,” omitted by Epiphanius. But both texts imply a Valentinian appeal to “John the Lord's disciple” for what follows.

3 There is no reason to change quod etiam nunc (al. q. e. me) of the MSS, to quod etiam Nun with Erasmus,
whom (or which) the Father seminally put forth all things.\(^1\) “The Valentinian writer proceeds to treat St John’s Prologue, clause by clause, as a commentary on his theory that Λόγος was derived from Ἀρχή, and Αρχή from Θεός, all three being nevertheless intimately united; and endeavours to extract the personages of his Ogdoad from St John’s terms. From i 14 he obtains the first Tetrads, Pater and Charis, Monogenes and Aletheia; and there he stops, the second Tetrads having been already found in i 1—4, so that i 18 is not quoted in so much of the passage as Irenæus transcribes. But the simple term Monogenes, required as a masculine synonym of Arche to make a syzygy with Aletheia, is distinctly taken from i 14; so that when the writer parenthetically attributes to St John two other designations of Arche, Son and μονογενὴς θεός, neither of which is convenient for his present purpose, he cannot mean only that they are fair deductions from language used in i 1—14, but must have in view some literal use by St John elsewhere; that is doubtless i 18; iii.16, 18.

The same result presents itself at once in the Valentinian statements of doctrine, partly copied, partly reported by Clement of Alexandria in the Excerpta found at the end of the Florence MS. of the Stromates, and now reasonably supposed to belong to his lost Hypotyposes (Bunsen, Anal. Antenic. i 159 ff.). “The Valentinians”, he says, (p. 968 Pott.; p. 210 Buns.) “thus interpret” Jo. i 1: “they say that Arche is the Monogenes, who is likewise called (προσαγορεύεσθαι) θεός, as also in what follows he [John] expressly signifies Him to be

whose conjecture is adopted by later editors. Quod etiamnune (or etiamnum) is a natural rendering of δε δὴ καί: and though Νοῦς occurs in Clement’s parallel exposition, and has been noticed already by Irenæus (p. 5), it could have no place among the terms enumerated as taken from St John, and it is absent from the context which follows.

\(^1\) So in the Venice MS. (the best) of Epiphanius δὲ δὴ καὶ νῦν καὶ μονογενὴς θεόν κέληκεν; the common text inverting καὶ and μονογενὴς. The true order is retained in the Latin, “et Filium et Unigenitum Deum”, though in some of the inferior MSS. and in the editions Domini (Dūi) has been substituted for Deum (Dūi), as read by others, including the Clermont and Arundel MSS., the two best, and representatives of different families.
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θεός (όσι καὶ εὖ τοῖς ἔξης ἀντικρυς θεῶν αὐτῶν δηλοῖ), saying ὁ μονογενὴς θεός ὁ ὦν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκείνος ἐξηγήσατο." The word 'expressly' was doubtless used because the writer considered the Deity of Arche, though not explicitly stated by St John, to be obviously included in the attribution of Deity to Logos (θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος), since Logos was derived from θεός not directly but through Arche1: but this preliminary inference only throws into clearer relief the coupling of the Monogenes with θεός by the Evangelist himself in i 182. When then in what follows reference is made to the Father's 'putting forth' of the Monogenes, who is further identified with the Son (τοῦτ’ ἐστιν ὁ νῦς, ὅτι δὲ νῦσ ὁ πατήρ ἐγνώσθη), we have at once in the combined designations a sufficient explanation of the appearance of νῦς in a succeeding allusion to i 18 (καὶ ὁ μὲν μειών γνώσης νῦς εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν ἐνθύμησιν διὰ τῆς γνώσεως ἐξηγεῖται τοῖς αἰῶνις, ὡς ἄν ὑπὸ τοῦ κόλπου αὐτοῦ προβληθείς), without supposing νῦς to have stood here in the writer's text of St John. The Hypotyposes were probably written in the early years of the third century, certainly not later3. If all the Valentinian Excerpts belong to the 'Eastern School' mentioned in the obscure title (cf. Hippol. Haer. vi 35), the coincidence with the Valentinianism in Ireneus would bring the evidence as to St John's reading far back, perhaps to the second quarter of the second century; for Ptolemaeus is named by Hippolytus (l.c.) as belonging to the

---

1 So the writer in Ireneus (p. 41). 'Εν γὰρ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ εἰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ ἀρχῇ, ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ εἰ τῇ ἁγίᾳ ὁ λόγος. Καλῶς οὖν εἰπὼν 'Εν ἁγίᾳ ἡ ὁ λόγος, καὶ γὰρ τῷ νῦσ καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐκεῖνος ἀκολουθεῖ, γὰρ εἰς τὸν θεόν, καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἁγία καὶ Θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος ἀκολουθεῖ, τὸ γὰρ ἐν θεὸν γεγένηθη θεὸς οὕτως. οὕτως ἦν εἰς ἁγίᾳ παρὰ τὸν θεὸν, καὶ γὰρ τῇ προβολής τάξει.

2 The next sentence appears to contain a retrospective argument justifying the ascription of Deity to the Logos, as in i. 1, by the subsequent ascription of Deity to the Monogenes (=Archelin nomine), as in i. 18, which would imply the presence of θεός in each verse. But in other respects the language is obscure, and probably corrupt.

3 Without referring to the Hypotyposes, which must be a late work, Heinrici (l.c. 12 f.) places the Excerpts and the cognate Eclogae Prophetae in Clement's youth, about 170—180. His argument is not convincing.
other or 'Italian' School, and thus the coincidence would have
the coincidence would have to be traced to Valentinus as the common source of both schools.
But this assumption cannot be trusted, and we must be content
take Clement's author as probably belonging to the same
period as Ptolemaeus.

Irenæus himself thrice quotes i 18, "Deus qui fecit terram...
lic et benedictionem esca... per Filium suum donat humano
generi, incomprehensibilis per comprehensibilem et invisibilis
per visibilem, cum extra eum non sit sed in sinu Patris exsistat.
Deum enim, inquit, nemo vidit unquam nisi unigenitus Filius
Dei qui est in sinu Patris, ipse enarravit. Patrem enim invisi-
bilem existentem ille quia in sinu ejus est Filius omnibus
enarrat" (p. 189). "Deus...qualis et quantus est, invisibilis
et inenarrabilis est omnibus quae ab eo facta sunt, incognitus
autem nequaquam, omnia enim per Verbum ejus discunt,...
quamadmodum in evangelio scriptum est, Deum nemo vidit
unquam nisi unigenitus Filius qui est in sinu Patris, ipse enar-
ravit. Enarrat ergo ab initio Filius Patris, quippe qui ab initio
est cum Patre, &c." (p. 255). "Manifestum est quoniam Pater
quidem invisibilis, de quo et Dominus dixit, Deum nemo vidit
unquam. Verbum autem ejus...claritatem monstrabat Patris...
quemadmodum et Dominus dixit, Unigenitus Deus qui est in
sinu Patris, ipse enarravit" (p. 256). The Greek original being
lost, the text may be due either to Irenæus or to his translator,
who frequently transcribes an Old Latin version of the New
Testament when he comes to a quotation, even in cases where
the extant Greek shews that Irenæus had other readings.
Now the two former quotations coincide exactly (waiving Dei')
with most Old Latin authorities2; even to the insertion of the
characteristic nisi: the Deus of the third quotation is unknown
to Latin texts of St John, and therefore doubtless represents
the Greek. The only question that can reasonably arise is

---

1 Itself found in q.
2 Not it is true the oldest. But this is of no consequence except on Mass-
   uet's groundless theory that Irenæus was known to Tertullian through the
   translation. There is no real evidence, as Dodwell has shown, for an earlier
date than the fourth century.
whether Irenæus followed different texts in different places, or *Filius* was introduced by the translator. But the close proximity of the two latter quotations is unfavourable to the supposition of a variation in the original Greek, and the addition of *Dei* after *Filius* in the first passage savours of a corrective combination of a Latin *Filius* with a Greek *θεός*. In neither case is the context available as evidence; for though it contains references to sonship, they are such as might easily be founded on the single word *μονογενὴς*. Irenæus therefore read *μονογενὴς θεός* at least once, and there is no solid evidence that he ever read otherwise.

Hippolytus the disciple of Irenæus, in the fragment against Noetus now generally recognised to be the close of a larger work, which is almost certainly the lost early *Syntagma* against Heresies, has the following sentence: 'Ορῶν δὲ τὸν θεὸν οἶκ' εἰς εἰ μὴ μόνον δὲ παῖς καὶ τέλειος ἀνθρώπος καὶ μόνος διηγησάμενος τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ πατρὸς· λέγει γὰρ καὶ Ἰωάννης Θεόν οὐδεὶς ἐσφάκεν πῶς πότε, μονογενῆς νῦς ὁ ὁν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτὸς διηγήσατο (c. 5 p. 47 Lag.). It is to be regretted that the text depends on Fabricius's editing of a modern copy of a single Vatican MS.; and the context is neutral. There is however no sufficient reason for doubting that Hippolytus read *νῦς*, but without the preliminary article. The *Syntagma* must have been written in the last decade of the second century: the later Hippolytean remains are barren of evidence.

Clement himself quotes the whole verse once only (Strom. v p. 695), and then reads ο ὁ μονογενῆς θεός. He adds that St John gives the name κόλπος θεοῦ to τὸ ἀόρατον καὶ ἄρρητον, and this remark explains the combination of τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς with

---

1 Compare the similar case of Origen, pp. 35 f., 38.
3 So Lipsius, Q. Ep. 38—43, and much better Q. Ketz. 137 ff. Harnack (Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol. 1874 191 ff.) places it in the following decade; but, after Volkmann, he refers the fragment against Noetus to a supposed treatise against all Monarchians, for which, if I understand him rightly (p. 183), he accepts the date assigned by Lipsius to the *Syntagma*.
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ἐξηγήσατο in a sentence in his tract De divite salvando (p. 956), θεός τὰ τῆς ἁγάπης μυστήρια, καὶ τότε ἐποπτεύεσθαι τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, διὸ μονογενής νῦς θεός μόνος ἐξηγήσατο· ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεός ἁγάπη καὶ δὲ ἁγάπην ἡμῶν ἀνεκράθη· καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀρρητόν αὐτοῦ πατήρ κ.τ.λ. Here νῦς and θεός stand side by side, and it may be that the two readings are combined: but it is more likely that νῦς was inserted simply to soften the peculiar combination ὁ μονογενὴς θεός; just as elsewhere Clement (Exc. Theod. p. 969), in controverting the Valentinian interpretation already cited, inserts λόγος, perhaps from the familiar Alexandrine form θεός λόγος founded on John i 1: ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἐν ταυτότητι λόγον θεόν ἐν θεῷ φαμέν, δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός εἶναι λέγεται, ἀδιάστατος, ἀμέριστος, εἰς θεός· πίστα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο κατὰ τὴν προσεχὴ ἐνεργείαν τοῦ ἐν ταυτότητι λόγου...οἶτος τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός ἐξηγήσατο, ὁ σωτὴρ. And the process is carried a step further in an allusion which drops θεός but retains λόγος (Paed. i p. 102): πᾶς γὰρ οὐ φιλεῖται δὲ ὁ μονογενὴς ἐκ κόλπων πατρός καταπέμπεται λόγος τῆς πίστεως; It will be observed that there is no trace of νῦς except in the passage from the tract De divite, where the subject, ἁγάπη, would have rendered the introduction of λόγος inappropriate.

Origen’s extant quotations of the verse are confined to his commentary on St John’s Gospel and his treatise against Celsus. Commenting on John i 7, he transcribes the whole passage 15—18 (iv 89 Ru.), reading ὁ μονογενὴς θεός. Unfortunately we do not possess his exposition of the passage itself, his third, fourth, and fifth tomes being lost. The sixth tome begins, after the preface, with i 19, treating the ‘witness of John’ as a second witness of his, that is, of the Baptist, and arguing against Heracleon who had attributed v. 18 (though strangely not 16, 17) to the Evangelist. He thus sets up a former witness of John, as ἄρξαιμενης ἀπὸ τοῦ Οὐτοῦ ἦν δὲ εἰσπον Ὁ ὁπίσω μον ἑρχόμενος, καὶ ληψοῦσα εἰς τὸ Ὁ μονογενὴς νῦς τοῦ

1 The same combination occurs, as we shall see (pp. 43 f.), in early Latin authorities.
ON THE WORDS ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΕΟΣ

θεοῦ (or νῦς θεὸς) ὁ ὦν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἑκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο (iv 102). The variation of reading is here significant. The Benedictine text adopts νῦς τοῦ θεοῦ from the Bodleian MS.¹, while Huet reads νῦς θεὸς² with the Paris MS. It is hard to believe that in a verbal citation of this kind Origen would have inserted the superfluous τοῦ θεοῦ, and νῦς τοῦ θεοῦ is quite like a scribe’s correction of νῦς θεὸς; while this phrase is too peculiar to have been substituted for νῦς τοῦ θεοῦ, yet might easily be written by Origen, either as a combination of the two alternative readings which certainly existed in his time, or to provide against possible misinterpretation. No inference can be drawn from the loose form of expression a few lines further down, when he pleads for the consistency of supposing τὸ τῶν μονογενῆς εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὄντα τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν ἐξήγησιν αὐτῷ (the Baptist) καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος εἰληφόσι παραδεδωκέναι. In his 32nd tome the description of St John as reclining ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ occasions the remark that he ἀνέκειτο ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ λόγου, ἀνάλογον τῷ καὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρὸς, κατὰ τὸ Ὄ μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὦν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἑκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο (iv 438), where the selection of the term λόγος confirms what appears to be the reading of all the MSS. Again in the second of the books against Celsus (c. 71 i 440 Ru.), which are transmitted in a different set of MSS. from those of the commentary on St John, we find: Ἐπίδαξε δὲ ἡμᾶς τὸ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ὅσις ἢν ὁ πέμψας ἐν τῷ Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἶ μὴ ὁ νῦς καὶ τῷ Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πῶς ποτὲ ὁ μονογενὴς γε ὁ νῦς θεὸς ὁ ὦν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἑκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο ἑκεῖνος θεολόγων ἀπήγγειλε τὰ περὶ θεοῦ τοῖς γηγείοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς. Such is the reading of one of

¹ Prima facie the lost Venice MS. used by Ferrari for his Latin version might appear to have read the same, as Ferrari has Filius Dei. But it is morally certain that he would have rendered νῦς θεὸς likewise by Filius Dei; since in the two other quotations, where there is no νῦς to help him, he gets rid of θεὸς by simple omission, adding nothing after Unigenitus.

² The silence of the collator of the Barberini MS. favours this reading, as he can have had no other standard than Huet’s edition. But the collation is evidently too imperfect to be trusted negatively.
Höschel's two MSS., confirmed by Gelenius's Latin version, *Unigenitus quippe Dei Deus*; Höschel's other MS. merely substituting *καὶ μονογενῆς* for *ὁ μονογενῆς*. The Benedictine text has the received reading *ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός*, but only on the authority of the Basel and Paris MSS., two closely related representatives of a single archetype, abounding in excellent readings but also in manifest corruptions. The silence of De la Rue as to his other MSS. (about six) implies the absence of at least any recorded difference from Höschel's readings. The combination of *θεολογῶν* with *τὰ περὶ θεοῦ* in the closing paraphrase moreover suggests the presence of *θεοῦ* following on the initial *θεῶν*. To these four quotations may be added the following places,—the list is doubtless not exhaustive,—where the detached phrase is used. *Τῶν τετιμημένων ἀπὸ θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς θεοῦ λόγον μετοχῆ θεότητος διὰ τούτου δὲ καὶ ὄνυματι* (Cels. iii 37 p. 471 Ru.). Πῶς δὲ ἀκούειν περὶ μονογενοῦς θεοῦ υἱόν τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ πρωτοτόκου πόσης κτίσεως (Cels. vii 43 p. 725). *Τὸ πρωτότυπον πάντων ἀγαλμάτων, τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀπόρου, τὸν μονογενή θεάν* (Cels. viii 17 p. 755). "Τίμωνος γὰρ εἰς μόνον τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι λέγομεν θεὸν καὶ τὸν μονογενὴν αὐτοῦ λόγον καὶ θεόν· καὶ ἤμυνομέν* γε θεόν καὶ τὸν μονογενὴν αὐτοῦ ὡς καὶ ἤλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἀστρα καὶ πάσα ἡ οὐρανία στρατία· ἤμυνοι γὰρ πάντες οὕτω, θείος ὄντες χορὸς, μετὰ τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις δικαίων τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεόν καὶ τὸν μονογενήν

---

1 'О...γε ἄν singles out μ. or μ. θ.
2 Origen can hardly be introducing here the language of an actual hymn, as the context shows. Celsus has been rebuking the Christians for their scruples against consenting to join in a meal to a heavenly body or a goddess, ἐὰν δὲ κελεύῃ τις εὐφημίσαι τὸν ἦλιον ὢς τὴν Άθραῖν, προθυμιάτατα μετὰ καλοῦ παῖδος εὐφημίσαι οὕτω τοῖς εὐθέων μάλλος δόξος τῷ μέγαν θεῷ ἐὰν καὶ τοιοῦτο ὦ μνήσασθαι. The reply is Οὐ περιμένομεν εὐφημίσαι τὸν ἦλιον τὸν κελεύσας, οὐ μαθόντες οὐ μόνον τοὺς τῇ διατέξει ὑποτεκαμένους εὐφημεῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἱεροῦς εὐφημοῦμεν οὐν ἦλιον ὡς καλὸν θεοῦ δημιουργία, καὶ τοὺς νόμους φόλασσων θεοῦ, καὶ ἀκούου τῶν Ἀνείετε τῶν κερίων, ἤλιος καὶ σελήνη (Ps. cxlviii 3), καὶ ὅσον δόμας ὑμνοῦν τὸν τε (so read for ἰμνεῖτε τὸν and ὑμοῦντα τῶν of the MSS.) πατέρα καὶ τὸν ὑμνούργον τῶν παντὸς Ἀθραῖν μέντοι μετὰ ἤλιον πασομείνην κ.τ.λ...πολλῷ μᾶλλον οὐ χρή μνήσεις καὶ οὐ δεῖν δοξάσαι τῇ Ἀθράῖν, εἰ γε οὐδὲ τῶν τυλικοῦν ἠλιον προσκυνεῖν ἤλιον θείου, καὶ εὐφημοῦμεν αὐτῶν. Then follows the passage in the text, as an answer to Celsus's second sentence.
avtov (Cel. viii 67 p. 792): for λόγον καὶ θεὸν Hoeschel has θεὸν λόγον, probably rightly. "Qui enim &c., et qui in medio etiam nescientium se consistit, Unigenitus Dei est Deus Verbum et sapientia et justitia et veritas &c.: secundum hanc divinitatis suae naturam non peregrinatur &c." and after a few sentences, "Speciem autem dicimus Verbi et sapientiae et veritatis et justitiae et pacis et omnium quidquid est Unigenitus Deus" (In Matt. Com. Ser. 65 iii 883). "Unigenitus ergo Deus Salvator noster, solus a Patre generatus, natura et non adoptione filius est. ... Sed [Deus] ... factus est Verbi pater, quod Verbum in sinum Patris requiescens annuntiat Deum quem nemo vidit unquam, et revelat Patrem quem nemo cognovit nisi ipse solus, his quod ad eum Pater caelestis attraxerit" (quoted from the second book on St John in Pamph. Apol. pro Orig. c. 5)

Lastly the most plausible instance of a seeming testimony to the reading viós in any form of Origen’s writings is in Rufinus’s version of the commentary on Canticles: "Possimus...etiam hoc addere quod promurale (Cant. ii 14) sinus sit Patris, in quo positus unigenitus Filius narrat omnia et enuntiat ecclesiae suae quaeecunque in secretis et in absconditis Patris sinibus continentur: unde et quidam ab eo edoctus diebat Deum nemo vidit unquam: Unigenitus Dei Filius qui est in sinus Patris ipse enarravit" (iii 81). Yet here too the evidence doubly breaks down. Had Filius stood alone, the Greek quotations would have suggested that, as in many undoubted cases of doctrinal phraseology, the translator’s very free hand introduced the Latin reading. But we have Dei Filius, that is, one more instance of a disguised θεὸς.

1 Two pages earlier Pamphilus quotes from the fifth book on St John the single sentence, "Unigenitus Filius Salvator noster, qui solus ex Patre natus est, solus natura et non adoptione filius est." If, as seems probable (for the manifestly incomplete state of our second book renders superfluous the natural suggestion that it may be a corruption of ν), the two passages are distinct, no allusion to John i 18 is perceptible here. If they are identical, the words that follow in the longer quotation suggest that Unigenitus Deus rather than Unigenitus Filius is the true reading, though ὁ μονογενὴς viós θεὸς is also possible; in any case their own reference to i 18 contains not Filius but ὁ θεὸν, which implies θεὸς.
The first five books of Origen on St John were written about the second decade of the third century, the sixth not long afterwards, the later books, including the 22nd and therefore doubtless the 32nd, after 235, the treatise against Celsus between 244 and 249. Thus our quotations cover a long period, and proceed alike from Alexandria and from Palestine.

The epistle addressed to Paul of Samosata by certain bishops assembled at Antioch between 260 and 2701 quotes the verse with νίως and the article (ap. Routh R. S. iii 297). The doubts which have been raised as to the genuineness and age of the epistle appear to be unfounded. Its theology fits well into the third century; while the text of its quotations from the New Testament is mostly good, and entirely free, John i 18 excepted, from early ‘Western’ readings. As in the case of Hippolytus, the text of the epistle appears to rest on a single Roman MS. Two other passages probably contain the phrase μονογενὴς θεός, as has been already noticed (p. 19); but it has become detached from John i 18; and there is at present no sufficient reason to doubt that δ’ μονογενὴς νιως was read there.

The Acts of the disputation alleged to have been held in Mesopotamia between Archelaus and Mani should perhaps be noticed here, though it is doubtful whether they belong to the last quarter of the third century or the first quarter of the fourth. The ancient Latin translation has (c. 32) “Dominum nemo vidit unquam nisi unigenitus Filius qui est in sinu Patris”; where once more the presence of the Latin insertion nisi throws some doubt on the whole reading: elsewhere the quotations shew clear traces of modification, though not of transcription, from Latin texts of the New Testament. This part of the Acts has been printed only from a Vatican copy of a Monte Cassino MS.

In Eusebius of Caesarea we have the last virtually Antenicene writer, that is, whose training belongs to the days before

---

1 It is unnecessary here to attempt greater definiteness, the chronology of the proceedings against Paul being singularly difficult.
Constantine. The clearest evidence for our purpose is furnished by two of his latest treatises, those against Marcellus, written in 336. Both treatises abound in the detached phrase ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς; but there is no reference to John i 18 till a few pages after the beginning of the second and longer work, De ecclesiastica theologia, where Eusebius says τὸν τε εὐαγγελιστὸν διαρρήκτην αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ εἶναι διδάσκοντος, δὲ ἄν ἔφη Θεόν συνδεῖς ἐάρακε πῶς τοτε ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς, ἢ μονογενὴς θεὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο (p. 67 D). No one can doubt that Eusebius here adopts the reading υἱὸς: but it is wholly arbitrary to reject the clause ἢ μονογενὴς θεὸς as a gloss of scribes. It would be difficult to find any similar interpolation of theirs in a scriptural quotation, especially if it introduced for once a reading which elsewhere they persecute. It is more likely that Eusebius, familiar as he must have been with the reading θεὸς through his Origenian lore, took advantage of this first quotation to indicate in passing that, while he adhered to his own reading, he did not care to rest his case upon it. Accordingly, having thus appealed to "the evangelist", he goes on at once to claim the yet greater authority of "the Saviour Himself" whom he supposes to have spoken John iii 16, which contains τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ. At p. 86 A he again quotes the verse, with a context which confirms υἱὸς, and again at p. 142 C, with a neutral context; and υἱὸς recurs for the fourth time in a clear allusion at p. 92 D. On the other hand in a solitary passage the sentence ὁ δὲ ἔπεκείνα τῶν ὅλων θεῶν καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ...μίνος εἰκότως ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων

1 It has been urged in favour of this conjecture that in a quotation of 1 Tim. i 15 by Origen (c. Cels. i 63 p. 378 R.), Hoeschel's text has πιστὸς ὁ λόγος ὁ τῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ θεὸς ἵλθον εἰς τῶν κόσμων ἀμαρτωλοὺς σώσαι. Such a wild collocation as the supposed "gloss" is evidence of nothing. It can be only a blunder of a scribe or the editor, probably O ΟἽ HAGEN for EICHAEGN.

2 Marcellus (see pp. 20, 22) used the phrase τὸν μονογενὴς θεὸν (Eus. c. Marc. p. 19 c); and his theological tendency was to evade the idea of Divine Sonship. On both grounds there would be force in a refusal of Eusebius to haggle about the various reading.
καὶ διὰ κ.τ.λ. θεὸς ἀνείρηται παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ φάντα (Eph. iv 6) is continued by καὶ μόνος μὲν αὐτὸς εἰς θεὸς καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ᾿Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ χρημάτιζοι ἂν, ὁ δὲ νῦς μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ δὲ παράκλητον πνεῦμα οὕτε θεὸς οὕτε νῦς (p. 174 ff.). It is vain to urge that χρημάτιζοι ἂν is not the same as ἀνείρηται παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ, where the title maintained for the Son is found verbally in a single verse of Scripture, and where the preceding title is likewise transcribed from Scripture (2 Cor. i 3 &c.) with the exception of the word εἰς used just above. Corruption of text is also unlikely, as νῦς could hardly stand here in both subject and predicate, to say nothing of intrinsic improbability. Doubtless therefore Eusebius did on this occasion for a special purpose avail himself of the reading to which he habitually preferred another. It probably never occurred to him that one of the two must be right, and the other wrong: an inability to part absolutely with either of two respectable traditions is not unusual in his writings. Lastly νῦς stands, with neutral contexts but probably rightly, in two of Eusebius’s Commentaries, on Psalm

1 Indeed εἰς has so little force here, as an adjunct, that it becomes suspicious. It may represent ὁ (ΕΙΣΙΩΣ for ΟΘΣ); or Eusebius may have written εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ [1 Cor. viii 6, quoted p. 93] καὶ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ., the intervening words ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ θεὸς being lost by homoeoteleuton.

2 The concluding words οὕτε θεὸς οὕτε νῦς are probably all in antithesis to the second clause ὁ δὲ νῦς...πατρὸς; and, if so, they imply θεὸς, whether they refer to the alternative readings (as at p. 67 ν), or simply take up νῦς from the beginning of the clause. But it is not impossible to take οὕτε θεὸς as in antithesis to the first clause καὶ μόνος...χρημάτιζοι ἂν.

3 Passages like the following show that it could not have been a stumbling-block to his own mind on the score of doctrine, though ὁ μονογενὴς νῦς had a sharper edge against Marcellus: indeed the first (on which more hereafter) substantially contains it. Καὶ τῷ πατρὶ ὁ ὦν διὰ παντὸς σωζότα, καὶ οὐκ ἄγνωστον δυτα γεννώμενον δ’ εἰς ἄγγελου πατρός, μονογενὴ δυτα λόγον τε καὶ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ (Dem. Ev. iv 3 p. 149 a). Διὸ δὴ εἰς θεὸς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ κηρύττεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐστώ ἐπεισδ θλῖν αὐτοῦ εἰς δὲ καὶ μονογενῆς τοῦ θεοῦ νῦς, εἰκὼν τῆς πατρικῆς βοήθειας, καὶ διὰ τούτο θεός (Eccl. Th. p. 62 a). Τὸ γὰρ πρόσωπον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου καὶ ή θεότης τοῦ μονογενοῦς νῦς τοῦ θεοῦ θυγατὴ φύσει οὐκ ἄν γένεσθαι καταληπτή (Comm. in Es. 375 ν).
lxxiv (lxxiii) I1 without the article, and on Isaiah vi I2 with the article.

1 In Montfaucon, Coll. No. Patr. i 440. A freely condensed extract in Corder's Catena, π 535, has the article.

2 In Montfaucon, ib. π 374. The comment of Procopius, p. 91, founded here chiefly on Eusebius but perhaps also on Origen, has ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος ὁ ὃν κ.τ.λ.
NOTE B

The details of Latin evidence

The Latin patristic evidence is properly speaking only a branch of the evidence of Latin versions. So far as it refers clearly to St John's own text, it supports vis exclusively. Tertullian's citations, all occurring, as is not unnatural, in the single treatise against Praxeas, are in no case quite verbal; but they leave no reasonable doubt. He says (not to quote references to the first clause only), "Apud nos autem solus Filius Patrem novit, et sinum Patris ipse exposuit, et omnia apud Patrem audivit et vidit"; &c. (c. 8); "Deum nemo vidit unquam: quem Deum? Sermonem? Atquin, Vidimus et audivimus [et contractavimus] de sermone vitae, praedictum est: sed quem Deum? scilicet Patrem apud quem Deus erat Sermo, unigenitus Filius qui sinum Patris ipse disseruit" (c. 15, some early editors for sinum reading est in sinu, and Rigaut [1634, ? on MS. authority] simply in sinum); "Hujus gloria visa est tanquam unici a patre, non tanquam Patris: hic unius (?) Unicus sinum Patris disseruit, non sinum suum Pater, precedit enim, Deum nemo vidit unquam" (c. 21). Cyprian does not quote the verse; but had he read Deus, he would probably have used it in his Testimonies (ii 6) under the head Quod Deus Christus, the texts of which from the New Testament are Matt. i 23; Jo. i 1; (x 34—38;) xx 27 ff.; Apoc. xxi 6 f. The same may be said of Novatian (de Regula Fidei ii, 13, 14, 18, &c.), and is probably to be inferred from the only pas-

1 Pamèle's reading unus, which is probably likewise conjectural, deserves mention, as it might represent eis (see next note): but Unicus makes as good sense, and was more likely to be altered.
sage in which he alludes to this clause, being part of an argument to shew that Christ is *idem Angelus et Deus*: "Manifeste apparat non Patrem ibi tunc loquutum fuisse ad Agar, sed Christum potius, cum Deus sit; cui etiam angeli competit nomen, quippe cum *magni consilii Angelus* factus sit, angelus autem sit dum *exponit sinum Patris*, sicut Joannes edicit: si enim ipse Joannes hunc eundem, qui *sinum exponit Patris,* *Verbum* dicit *carnem factum esse*, ut *sinum Patris* possit *exponere*, merito Christus non solum homo est sed et angelus; nec angelus tantum sed et Deus per scripturas ostendit, et a nobis hoc esse creditur" (c. 18). It will be observed that to both Tertullian and Novatian the last words of the verse must have stood as *sinum Patris [ipse] exposuit* (Tert.¹ Nov.⁴) or *sinum Patris ipse disseruit* (Tert.⁵, perhaps his own rendering, as it occurs nowhere else), and we have the same construction with a different Latin verb in a, the oldest of existing Old Latin MSS., which reads "Deum nemo vidit umquam nisi unicus Filius solus sinum Patris ipse enarravit." These primitive forms of the Old Latin rendering were smoothed away by degrees. The inserted *nisi*, probably derived from vi 46, vanishes only in the Vulgate and one or two other late revisions (f q). *Unicus*⁶ is exchanged for *unigenitus*, and *sinum* for *qui est in sinu*, with hardly an exception. *Solus* lingers only in

¹ Tischendorf calls attention to the coincidence of this part of the rendering of *a* (he might have added Tertullian and Novatian) with the omission of *δ ω* in *K*, suggesting that *el* was read as *eis*: and apparently with good reason, for *K* has readings hereabouts in common with what must have been the original of the Old Latin in an early form, and *solus* stands for *eis* in many authorities in Mark ii 7, and several in x 18, both passages having a similar turn. The correction was probably suggested by *ἐξεγέρσατο*, for transitive verbs used absolutely are always a distress to scribes and translators. As we have seen, Clement likewise supplies τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς in interpretation.

² There is no Greek authority of any kind, as far as I am aware, for *nisi*: it might of course be introduced from vi 46 in Latin as easily as in Greek.

³ Retained only, it would seem, by the Manichean Adimantus as cited by Augustine (c. Adim. v i 2 t. viii p. 120 bis). *Sinum Patris* gives place altogether to *in sinu Patris* (in Patre c). But negative statements as to the Latin quotations could not be made quite confidently without disproportionate labour.
mm, and probably other revised MSS. of the same group. The final verb is represented pretty constantly\(^1\) by *enarravit*, varying occasionally (after *ipse*, it will be remembered) into *narravit*. The final form, as it stands in the present MSS. of the Vulgate, answers exactly to the prevalent Greek text: "Deum nemo vidit umquam; unigenitus Filius, qui est in sinu Patris, *ipse\(^2\)* enarravit." This statement includes the Latin Fathers of the fourth and following centuries, and it is needless to give references: various types of Old Latin are represented, as the names of Victorinus, Vigilius, Hilary, Ambrose, and Augustine will sufficiently shew.

\(^1\) Adimantus (l. c.) has *adnuntiavit*: Victorinus once (*adv. Ar. i* 2) *exposuit* with Tertullian and Novatian, elsewhere *enarravit*.

\(^2\) *Ipse* similarly represents *ἐκάθεν* in ix 37, and in scattered authorities elsewhere. Like *αὐτός*, which is to be found in Greek quotations but not MSS., it was evidently suggested by the apparent sense.
Dr Wright has most kindly ascertained the texts of the two MSS. at Cambridge, and of the nineteen in the British Museum. They singularly illustrate the truth of Dr Tregelles's account of the Æthiopic version (Horne's Introduction iv 319 f.), which has been questioned of late, being all paraphrastic, and exhibiting no less than 12 combinations of readings, owing in part to the addition of pronouns, and the insertion of conjunctions in various places. Nineteen MSS. are of the 17th century or later: of the remaining two, ascribed to the fifteenth, one (B.M. Or. 523) agrees prima manu with the Polyglott. The accusative particle is here prefixed to μονογενὴς θεὸς, doubtless owing to a misinterpretation natural in a language incapable of expressing μονογενὴς otherwise than by a word like unīcus (wahed), since it was not to be supposed that “the only God” denoted the Son. To μονογενὴς θεὸς (or -νη θνω) six other MSS. add vīōs followed by wahed, which in this second place probably stands for μόνος or eīς; two of them (including the other 15th century copy, B.M. Or. 507) having μονογενὴς θεὸς, the other four the accusative form. This interpolation supplied another possible construction for the accusative unīcum Deum: it could be taken either simply in apposition to the previous θεὸν (Deum nemo vidit unquam, unīcum Deum: [Filius unicus] qui &c.), or as the object of ἐξηγησατο (unīcum Deum [Filius unicus] qui est in sinu...enarravit), or as the object of an intermediate clause (unīcum Deum [sc. vidit] Filius unicus (or unus): qui est &c.): all three constructions seem to be indicated by punctuation and conjunctions in different MSS. An eighth MS.
omits μουργενής, retaining θεὸς viōs wahed. The remaining thirteen likewise omit θεὸς. The probable sequence was as follows, the position of the second wahed in all known MSS. being fatal to other interpretations of the facts which might be suggested. The original text (preserved now, as far as the MSS. yet examined shew, only with the accusative modification) had μουργενής θεὸς, the Memphitic reading. With this was next combined the alternative reading viōs, accompanied by wahed, either a relic of the early reading mentioned in Note B or a like but independent interpolation: similar couplets of readings originally alternative are not uncommon in this version. The first wahed would then be dropped as a needless superfluity in MSS. which escaped the accusative prefix: and lastly the further omission of θεὸς would reduce the phrase to a familiar shape. The evidence is not very important; but its history is instructive.

The verse is closed by a gloss from Heb. i 2 in one of the seventeenth century MSS. which omits μουργενής θεὸς (B.M. Or. 521).

1 It is possible, but much less likely, that the Ἁθιopic had originally the double reading, and that viōs wahed was then omitted in some MSS.
NOTE D

Unicus and unigenitus among the Latins

The varieties in the Latin rendering of μονογενής in the New Testament are sufficiently interesting to be given in full. Sabatier’s references have of course been freely used.

I Passages referring to our Lord

John i 14 δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός.

A unici (a patre) Tert.3 (Prax. 21) Fr.Arian.(Mai, S.V.N.C.
iii 2 228) Hil.3 (Trin. i 10 in comment.).
unici (patris sic) e.
unici filii (a patre) a.
unici nati (a patre) Oros.1 (Ap. de arb. lib. 613 Hav.).

B unigeniti (a patre) b c f vulg. Tert.3 (Prax.16) Novat.
(Reg. Fid. 13) Hil.3 (Trin. i 10 text) Amb.1 (i 1204 F)
Iren. lat.3 (42, 315) Aug. (ad l. &c.) Hieron.1 (Eph. v
33) &c.

John i 18 ὁ μονογενής υἱὸς ὁ ὁν ἐις τὸν κόσμον τοῦ πατρός.

A unicus (filius) a Adimant.1 (ap. Aug. viii 120).
unigenitus (filius) b c e f Tert.1 (Prax.15: cf.7) Hil. (Ps.

John iii 16 τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν.

A (filium suum) unicum a b d e m g1 gat mm mt Tert.4 (Prax.
21) Rebapt.1 (13) Fr.Arian. (226) Lucif. (151 Col.)
Hil.cod. al.3

B (filium suum) unigenitum c f f f vulg. Hil.1 (Trin. vi 40 od.)
Amb. (ii 406, 626) Aug. &c.

John iii 18 τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς νίκε τοῦ θεοῦ.
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A unici (filii Dei) a d Tert.(l.c.) Cyp.(Test. i 7; iii 31) (Fr. Arian. 226) Lucif.(l.c.)
B unigeniti (filii Dei) b c e f f m vulg. Iren.lat.(325) Amb. (i 762) Aug.(ad l.) Vig.(Trin.213 Chif.) &c.

1 John iv 9 τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενὴν ἀπέσταλκεν ὁ θεός.
A (filium suum) unicum m Lucif.(140).
B (filium suum) unigenitum vulg. Aug.(ad l.)

II Other passages

Luke vii 12 μονογενῆς υἱὸς (or u. μ.) τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ.
A (filius) unicus all, including Amb. (waiving order).
Luke viii 42 θυγάτηρ μονογενῆς ἦν αὐτῷ.
A (filia) unica all, including Amb. (waiving order).
Luke ix 38 τὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆς μοι ἔστιν (or ε. μοι).
A unicus (mibi est) all (waiving order).
Heb. xi 17 τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερεν ὁ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀναδεξάμενος.
A unicum (without filium or suum) d Ruf.[Orig.](In Gen. Hom. i 1, ii 81 Ru.) Aug.(C.D. xvi 32).
B unigenitum vulg.

In the canonical books of the Old Testament יִהְיָל, the only Hebrew original of μονογενῆς, is uniformly rendered by unigenitus in the Vulgate where an only son or daughter is meant (Gen. xxii 2, 12, 16; Jud. xi 34; Prov. iv 3; Jer. vi 26; Am. viii 10; Zech. xii 10). Singularly enough the LXX has ἀγαπητός (ἀγαπώμενος Prov.) in all cases but that of Jephthah's daughter, though μονογενῆς was used by one or more of the other translators in at least five of the other places (no record being known for Gen. xxii 16; Zech.). But at least some form of the LXX must once have had μονογενῆς for Isaac¹ (the

¹ Gregory of Nyssa (De Deit. F. et Sp. S. iii 568 Migne) has Gen. xxii 2 Λαβᾷ μου, φησί, τὸν υἱὸν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν, τὸν μονογενῆ, where μονογενῆς, if only a gloss on ἀγαπητόν, must at least have been found by Gregory in his MS., for he remarks in his comment πῶς ἀνεγερεῖ τὸ φίλτρον καὶ υἱὸν ἀγα- πητόν καὶ μονογενῆ καλῶν, ως ἄν διὰ τῶν τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων κ.τ.λ. This case
Vatican MS is wanting here), for we have clear Old Latin authority accidentally preserved for unicus in Gen. xxii. 2, 12 and Judges, though most Old Latin quotations follow ἀγαπητός. Unicus is also the Old Latin word in three of the four remaining passages, all peculiar, Ps. xxii (xxi) 21; xxxv (xxiv) 17 (solitarius Hier.); xxv (xxiv) 16 (solus Hier.). In the Apocrypha the uniform unicus of the Old Latin was not disturbed by Jerome; Tob. iii 15; vi 10 cod.; viii 17 or 19 (duorum unicornum, Tobias and Sarah); and even Sap. vii 22.

Thus throughout the Bible unicus is the earliest Old Latin representative of μονογενῆς; and unigenitus the Vulgate rendering of ἴδιος, however translated in Greek, except in St Luke and the Apocrypha, where Jerome left unicus untouched, and the four peculiar verses from the Psalter (lxviii [lxvii] 7, and the three already mentioned), in which he substituted other words. But unicus had been previously supplanted by unigenitus in one or more forms of the Old Latin in all the five passages where it has reference to our Lord, all occurring in St John’s writings; and in the Prologue of the Gospel the change took place very early.

These facts would prove, if any proof were needed, that ἴδιος was the reading of the MS. or MSS. from which the Old Latin version was originally made; for unicus Deus⁴ could never renders it not unlikely that Irenaeus is following a similar double reading when he speaks of Abraham (233) as τὸν ἴδιον μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγαπητὸν παρα- χωρήςας θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ, ὥσα καὶ ὁ θεός εὐδοκήσας...τὸν ἴδιον μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγα- πητὸν θυσίαν παρασκεύασεν κ.τ.λ. In Jud. xi 34 the Alex. and other MSS add to μονογενής without a conjunction αὐτῷ ἀγαπητῷ, and others αὐτῷ ἀγα- πητῷ, περιψυκτος αὐτῷ.

¹ In Dr Swainson’s History of the Creeds attention is called to a “not infrequent punctuation” of MSS. by which unicum is strangely separated from the preceding Filium ejus and joined to the following Dominum nostrum (pp. 163, 166, 365). He points out that this construction occurs in two sermons wrongly attributed to St Augustine: in one (240 in t. v p. 394 Ap.) it is at variance with the interpretation, and must be due to a scribe; in the other (t. vi p. 279 Ap.), a very late cento, it belongs to an extract from Ivo of Chartres, a pupil of Lanfranc. It is indeed, I find, as old as Rufinus, for he labours (Com. in Symb. 8 p. 71) to justify it, though evidently preferring (6 ff.) to take unicum with Filium. But unicum Dominum nostrum can hardly be more than a Latin
have been a designation of our Lord, and moreover it was actually applied to the Father in the Creed of Carthage in Tertullian’s time (De Virg. vel. 1; Adv. Prax. 2 f.). But they also give additional interest to the almost uniform rule that unicus belongs to native Latin Creeds, unigenitus to comparatively late Greek Creeds translated into Latin, both alike having but one original, the μονογενὴς of St John’s third chapter, if not also his first. It is needless to enumerate the various forms of what we call the Apostles’ Creed, which have been several times collected. They all have unicus¹, (mostly in the order Filium ejus unicum as John iii 16, but the Aquileian form given by Rufinus² unicum Filium ejus as iii 18, and the Poictiers form used by Venantius Fortunatus [Hahn, Bibl. d. Symb. 33; Heurtley, Harm. Symb. 55] unicum Filium only) with the exception of two peculiar Gallican documents, closely related to each other, which have unigenitum sempiternum (Hahn, 35f.; Heurtley, 68f.)³. In Tertullian we have seen unigenitus (cf. De An. 12; Scorp. 7), possibly a word of his own coinage, side by side with unicus. But the influence of the Creed remained strong: a century and a half later Lucifer seems to have only unicus, which he repeats incessantly. Augustine vacillates between the Creed and his Latin MSS of the ‘Italian’ revision. Writing de Fide et Symbolo in 393 he puts unigenitus into the Creed but promptly explains it by the equivalent to which his hearers were more accustomed

1 So also the Latin original of the Sirmium formulary of 357 (Hil. De Syn. 11 p. 466 a), notwithstanding the Greek cast of its language.

2 This order cannot be safely assumed for the Roman and ‘Eastern’ forms to which he sometimes refers.

3 In the Te Deum we have verum et unicum Filium in the common text, probably rightly: but in the present state of knowledge unigenitum must be admitted as an alternative reading. The Gloria in excelsis has Domine Fili Unigenite Jesu Christe, without apparent variation.
"credimus etiam in Jesum Christum Filium Dei, Patris unigenitum, id est unicum, Dominum nostrum: c. 3 t. vi p. 153 A", and twice afterwards repeats unigenitus. Nearly thirty years later in the *Enchiridion* he employs unicus (34, 35, 36 bis) till he has to quote John i 14, when he takes up for a moment the unigenitus of his version (36 s. f.), but in the next sentence slips back to the Creed by again combining both words, unigenitus id est unicus: and in the rest of the treatise he uses only unicus when commenting on the Creed (38, 56), unigenitus only with *Verbum* (41) or else absolutely (49, 56, 103, 108). But the influence of the Greek controversies of the fourth century upon Latin theology, the convenience of the antithesis to ingenitus, and the revision of Latin biblical texts secured the ultimate victory for the more explicit term unigenitus, except in the Creed itself. It is the word adopted in several private formularies, all imbued with the results of Greek thought; those of Pelagius (but with *Deum*, Hieron. Opp. xi 202 Vall.), Auxentius of Milan¹ (Hil. Lib. c. Aux. 14: cf. Caspari, Quellen u. s. w. ii 301), and Ulphilas (in Caspari 303).² And from the fourth century onwards it is the constant rendering of μονογενής in all the Latin translations of Greek Creeds or other formularies, with hardly any exceptions and those in secondary authorities. Thus ten out of the eleven versions, or recensions of versions, of the original Nicene Creed collected by Walch (*Bibl. Symb.* 80 ff.) have *natum ex Patre unigenitum*, the eleventh³ omitting the word: and five⁴ out of the seven ver-


² Another attributed to Damasus and several other Fathers (Hahn 185) has unigenitus, but it appears to be a translation.

³ As given by Lucifer (*De non parc.* p. 204 Col.). Singularly enough unicus occurs in what can be only a quotation from the Nicene Creed following on the already cited use of unigenitus by Augustine in the *De fide et symbolo* (6 p. 154 e): "naturalis ergo Filius de ipsa Patris substantia unicus natus est, id existens quod Pater est, Deus de Deo, lumen de lumine." So also Gregory of Elberas, if he is the author of the treatise *De fide orthodoxa* in the Appendix to Ambrose's works (ii 345).

⁴ Dionysius Exiguus omits; the Code of Canons &c. of the Roman Church printed with Leo's works substitutes unicum.
sions or recensions of the ‘Constantinopolitan’ Creed, as quoted by Hahn (113), have *Filium Dei unigenitum*. The two renderings of *μονογενὴς* were unconsciously retained by Latin Christianity in the two Creeds throughout the Middle Ages, and the double tradition is still preserved by corresponding renderings in our own tongue.
NOTE E

On μονογενής θεος in the Nicene Creed

The second part of the original Nicene Creed begins thus:

καὶ εἰς ἑνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τοῦτ’ ἐστίν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός, θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεόν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ.

Then follows the recital of the Incarnation.

If now we withdraw the parenthetic clause τοῦτ’ ἐστίν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός, the words μονογενῆ and θεόν become contiguous. Is this contiguity accidental, so that μονογενῆ alone goes with γεννηθέντα, and a new clause in apposition is formed by θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ, or should the eight words γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μονογενῆ θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ be all read continuously, so that μονογενῆ belongs to θεόν? Neither alternative presents any grammatical difficulty; and thus the question must be decided by analogy and sense. The first step evidently is to investigate the probable origin of the passage. The enquiry must occupy a space disproportionately great if μονογενῆς θεός alone be considered: but it has to do with matters of sufficient historical interest to reward minute examination on other grounds.

It is certain (1) that the bulk of the Nicene Creed was taken from earlier formulaires, one or more; and (2) that the three\(^1\) clauses τοῦτ’ ἐστίν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, and ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ were novelties introduced by the Council with the special purpose of excluding ambiguity.

\(^1\) Three for some purposes, howsoever the second and third may be grammatically related.
Athanasius in his old age, nearly half a century later, explained how the introduction of the new phrases had arisen (De Decr. Nic. Syn. 19 ff.; Ad Afr. 5 f.), and justified them, as he or others had evidently done at Nicæa, by reference to similar language of Theognostus, Dionysius of Rome, and Dionysius of Alexandria respectively (De Decr. 25 f.): and this anxious appeal to theological writers sets in strong relief the absence of authority derived from public Creeds. In a different quarter the unwonted language of the three clauses elicited from Eusebius a somewhat reluctant apology in the epistle which he addressed to his own diocese shortly after the Council (Ep. ad Caes., preserved by Athanasius De Decr. pp. 238 ff. and Socrates H. E. i 8). The testimony thus doubly borne renders it highly unlikely that the Nicene Creed contained other novelties not mentioned; and however modified in arrangement, the whole of its remaining contents may be assumed to have been taken from Creeds already in use.

The scattered and confused memorials of the Council afford little information as to the Creeds brought forward in the course of the discussions. Theodoret (H. E. i 6) mentions an exposition (ὑπαγορεύσαντες δὲ πίστεως διδασκαλίαν) which was presented to the assembly by the small group of bishops comparatively friendly to Arius, led by Eusebius of Nicomedia; and which was at once torn up. Eustathius of Antioch, an eyewitness, cited in Theodoret's next chapter, tells the same story of "the writing (γράμμα) of Eusebius's blasphemy," meaning evidently the same document¹, which was probably an elaborate private statement of doctrine. From the above-mentioned pastoral letter of Eusebius of Cæsarea, the leader of the middle party, we learn more. Its purpose is to explain the circum-

¹ Identical also, it would seem, with the "epistle" of Eusebius of Nicomedia from which Ambrose (De Fide iii 125) cites a sentence as having furnished the term ὑπαγορεύτως to his opponents. What is said by Philostorgius (H. E. i 7), or rather by Photius abridging his words, about the winning over of Hosius and other bishops by Alexander at Nicomedia before the Council has no necessary reference to the term itself.
stances which had led him after some hesitation to subscribe the Conciliar Creed, as he was afraid that incorrect rumours might cause misunderstanding. "We first," he says, "transmit to you the writing concerning the faith which was put forward by us, and then the second, which they have published after putting on additions to our expressions. Now the writing presented by us, which when read in the presence of our most religious emperor was declared to have a right and approved character (εῶ τε ἔχειν καὶ δοκίμως ἀποφανθέν), was as follows. "‘As we received from the bishops before us both in our first catechetical instruction and when we were baptized, and as we have learned from the Divine Scriptures, and as ‘we both believed and taught in the presbyterate and in the office of bishop itself, so now likewise believing, we offer to you our faith; and it is this.’" Eusebius then transcribed a Creed, to which he added a few lines of explanation and protestation. When "this faith," he tells his diocese, had been set

1 This is not the place to examine the characters and beliefs of the actors in the great Council. But it is worth while here to observe that though Eusebius differed on a grave point of doctrine from Athanasius, and probably yet more from Athanasius's non-Alexandrine allies, the difference which determined the attitude of the two men respectively in regard to the proceedings of the Council was not of doctrine but of policy. When the policy of Eusebius had at length been clearly overruled, he had to decide how he could most nearly conform to its spirit; by giving in his adherence to the conclusion of the majority, or by recording his protest against it. He decided that the former course was the best now open, provided that he could receive sufficient assurance that the new terms were not meant to carry a sense inconsistent with his own belief, misgivings having perhaps been raised in his mind by wild language on the part of such men as Marcellus. The assurance was given, his conscience was relieved, and the accession of his name furnished a guarantee that the new Creed was not to be understood as a rejection of the elder theology. It was quite consistent with this decision that he should desire, on public and on private grounds, to be known as still regretting the eclipse of the policy which he represented.

2 Διεσεμψάμεθα ἵμαν πρῶτον μὲν τὴν ὅφει ἡμῶν προταθέσαν περὶ τῆς πίστεως γραφήν, ἐπείτα τὴν δευτέραν, ἴν ταῖς ἴμετέραις φωναῖς προσθήκας ἐπιβαλὼν τότε ἐκδεδώκασιν.

3 The defensive tone of this document implies accusations flung about in the previous debates. The later controversy with Marcellus may well have had a prelude at Nicea; nor is it likely that the animosity of Eustathius (Socr. i 23) began after the Council.
forth by him (ταύτης ὡς ἡμῶν ἐκτεθείσης τῆς πίστεως), there was no room for gainsaying. The emperor, followed apparently by others, declared his entire agreement with it, and "urged all the bishops to give their assent to it and to subscribe to its articles and to express concurrence with them in this very form, with the insertion of the one single word ὀμοουσίως"; which word he proceeded to interpret by rejecting various erroneous senses. Such, Eusebius says, was the wise discourse of the emperor; "but they, under pretext of the addition of ὀμοουσίως, have made the following writing," i.e. the Nicene Creed. He then relates how, as soon as the Creed had been propounded, he or his party (the pronouns 'we' and 'they' are throughout ambiguous) enquired minutely about the intended meaning of the new phrases, and on receiving satisfactory answers thought it right to give consent, having peace always in view.

From this narrative it plainly appears that Eusebius presented a declaration of his own faith as his namesake of Nicomedia had done; that the kernel of this private declaration was a public Creed, the same with which he had been conversant in his own Church at all stages of his life; the Creed therefore of Cæsarea from at least the latter part of the third century; that

---

1 This seems to be involved in the words αὐτὸς τε πρῶτος ὁ...βασιλεὺς, although no second corresponding clause is extant. The shape of Constantine's proposal was probably suggested by the debates which had followed the reading of the exposition by Eusebius of Nicomedia. But much may have been due to the advice of Hosius, who enjoyed his special confidence, and who, whatever he may have taken place at Nicomedia (see p. 55 n.1), had doubtless not returned without instruction from his previous confidential mission to Alexandria (Eus. V. Const. ii 63—73; Socr. i 71; Soz. i 16 5).

2 Such must be the force of the evidently careful though ungainly language, καὶ ταύτη τούτως πάντας συγκαταθέθαι οὐγράφων τούτως ὀδηγοῦσα καὶ συμφωναίνων τούτως αὐτῶς παρεκκελέστα, ἐνώ μένω προτεγγραφέντος ἰδίατος τοῦ ὀμουσίων. Following ὀγράφων, and joined with τοῦτος αὐτοῖς, συμφωνῶν must as usual denote some express act of agreement or compact.

3 Καὶ δὲ μὲν σοφότατος ἡμῶν καὶ εὐσεβέστατος βασιλεὺς τοιαῦτε ἐφιλοσοφήσει οἱ δὲ προφάσει τῆς τοῦ ὀμουσίου προσθήκης τὴν τὴν γραφὴν πεποιηκαίν. Late usage would allow προφάσις to express the mere connexion of facts without implication of motive: but the equally common stricter sense is suggested by the context, as also by the form of the sentence.
Constantine advised the Council to be satisfied with adopting this Creed as it stood, inserting only the term ὁμοόνωμος, this addition being evidently proposed in consequence of a previous discussion; that the Council, under colour of following the advice, did in effect go much further in the way of composition, so that the resulting document could be called a “writing” which they “made”; and yet that it might with equal correctness be described as the Creed of Cæsarea with additions.

The truth of the principal statements is confirmed by historic probability and by internal evidence. An appeal to a venerable existing document, such as the traditional Creed of Cæsarea, was exactly in the spirit of the conservative policy espoused by Eusebius; nor could he easily find a better resource in endeavouring to draw to his side the greater part of the Council. In like manner the adoption of this Creed as a basis by the Council would naturally ensue, in approximate compliance with the emperor’s recommendation. The Creed which Eusebius transcribes is simple in form, unlike the personal profession which encloses it.1 Echoes of its phrases can moreover be distinctly identified in references made by Eusebius elsewhere to a testimony of “the Church [of God]”, which must be a public Creed, and is not the Nicene.2 Its verbal coincidences with

1 By a curious oversight Paln (46 ff.) has included in the Creed part of this personal profession, and so been led to unfounded doubts as to the public character of the Creed as it stands.

2 These coincidences appear to have been overlooked. The variations are only of order, and that among complete clauses, and they have no perceptible significance. The passages are as follows: Οὗ ἐκκλησία ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας εὐαγγελικῷ κηρύγματι σεμνύνεται, ἕνα μὲν τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεόν ἔχειν αὐχοῦσα ἑνα δὲ καὶ νῦν μονογενῆς, θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν ἐπιγραφομένη (De Ecc. Theol. p. 62 c). Διά τοῦ τοῦτον ἀπάντων ἀποδαιροῦσα τῆν πλάνην ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ ἑνα θεόν κηρύττει, αὐτὸν εἰναι καὶ πατέρα καὶ παντοκράτορα διδάσκοντα, ...οὕτω καὶ νῦν θεοῦ μονογενῆ Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν παραδώσει, τὸν πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατέρος γεγονότα γεγεννημένον, οὐ τόν αὐτὸν δυνα τῷ πατρὶ, καθ’ ἑαυτὸν δὲ δυνα καὶ γυνα, καὶ ἀληθῶς νῦν συγνώματα, θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ, καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτός, καὶ ἰωὴ ἐκ ἰωῆς (p. 66 a, p). Διὸ πιστεύειν παρελθέντα ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἑνα θεόν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ θεοῦ νῦν (p. 108 n). Another probable trace occurs in the Demonstratio Evangelica, p. 215 b,
the Nicene Creed, as is well known, are at least too large to be accidental.

But it is equally certain that one or more other Creeds furnished their quota to the result. Prominent among the leaders of the majority were the representatives of important sees, as Eustathius of Antioch, Hellanicus of Tripolis, Macarius of Jerusalem, and Marcellus of Ancyra, not to speak of Alexander of Alexandria; and there would be an obvious fitness on such an occasion in combining with the Cæsarean confession well chosen forms of language consecrated by the use of other great churches. Indeed two of these sees possessed rights which their bishops could not willingly compromise by allowing Cæsarea to furnish alone a standard for universal use, merely because Eusebius was in favour with the emperor: all Palestine was subject to the supremacy of Antioch; and the metropolitan jurisdiction of Cæsarea over the rest of Palestine was balanced by privileges peculiar to Jerusalem, which were ratified by the seventh canon of the Council. The silence of Eusebius as to the employment of any additional Creeds by the Council is of little moment, for his narrative is palpably incomplete, though sufficient for his purpose of shewing first how he had made the best stand he could for the old Creed of his church, and then how it was that he had nevertheless in good faith subscribed the Conciliar Creed. It is at least possible that the omission of certain phrases used at Cæsarea, as elsewhere, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως (Col. i 15) and πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων (1 Cor.

\[ \text{άλλῳ ὦς μονογενὴς υἱὸς μονὸς πρὸ \} \\
\text{πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς} \} \\
\text{γεγεννημένος:} \text{and doubtless others might be found.} \]

1 At the end of these Dissertations will be found the Creed of Cæsarea in full, and also the Nicene Creed printed so as to show its coincidences with the Cæsarean base by diversity of type. The concordances and differences are exhibited in another way by Dr Swainson, pp. 65 f.

2 The prominent part taken by Macarius against the Arians in the Council is attested by Theodoret (H. E. i 18; cf. 2, 4) and Sozomen (H. E. i 13 2; ii 20): he was moreover apparently on terms of friendship with Constantine and Helena (Sozom. ii 1 7; 4 7; Theodoret i 15 f.; Euseb. V. Const. iii 29 ff.).
ii 7: cf. Eph. iii 11; Heb. i 2), arose from a dread of their lending themselves too easily to suspected interpretations. But the insertions and alterations in the latter half of the Creed all correspond with fair exactness to extant phraseology of Syrian and PalestinianCreeds\(^1\), though they cannot be traced to any one of the very few extant formularies. It is of course possible that other lost formularies of a similar type may likewise have supplied materials\(^2\).

These facts enable us to understand the manner in which the Council changed those articles of the Creed that touched on the immediate subject of controversy. The Cæsarean Confession ran,

_..._.

Not only were the phrases mentioned above omitted, and

\(^1\) Apostolic Constitutions and Jerusalem (compare Antioch in all forms) τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο for καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα; Ap. Const. insertion of τὰ τῶν ὑψανθί γείμα; Antioch (at least Cassianus and Eusebius of Doryleum have δὶ ἡμᾶς) insertion of δὶ ἡμᾶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων; Ap. Const. and Antioch (Lucianus and Eus. Doryl.) insertion of κατελθόντα; Jerusalem ἐναθρωπήσαντα for ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευόμενον; Ap. Const., Jerusalem, and Antioch (Lucianus and Cassianus) εἰς τῶν οὐρανῶν for πρὸς τὸν πατέρα; Jerusalem ἐφάνειον for ξένητα πάλιν (ἐν δίδορι being likewise omitted by Cassianus); and Ap. Const. and Antioch (Lucianus) τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα (at least these Creeds have τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον) for ἐν ἄγιον πνεῦμα. In the above enumeration 'Eusebius of Doryleum' means the author of the Διαμαργυρία against Nestorius, printed in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (Mansi Conc.

\(^2\) It would be rash to assume that there were no clauses on the Church, Baptism, &c. in the Cæsarean or other similar formularies. It is more likely that Eusebius presented only so much of his native Creed as related to the Persons of the Godhead, as sufficient for the special purpose of the Council; and that the Council kept within the same lines. Compare the language of the 'First' Formulary of the Synod of Antioch in 311 (ap. Ath. De Syn. 22 p. 735 ε), εἰ δὲ δὲ ἐπορεύεται πατερείς, οὗτος ἀναστάσεως καὶ ἐκ τῶν αἰωνίων. The Anathematism (doubtless suggested by a precedent in the closing exposition of Eusebius, as Mr Lumbly points out, p. 50), being evidently intended as part of the Creed, rounds off what would otherwise be an abrupt termination.
with them τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου and ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, but the surviving language reappeared in a different arrangement, including a new phrase 1 θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, in addition to the three clauses which were the special creation of the Council. This arrangement bears no trace of having been devised with the sole purpose of carrying the new clauses. The rather loose and clumsy order of the Cæsarean Formulary might seem to invite the substitution of a compact and methodical paragraph supplied out of other existing Creeds: and such a procedure would be in analogy with the course seen to have been pursued in the later articles. The first step would be to set the simple fact of our Lord’s Divine Sonship 3 in the forefront immediately after His name, in accordance with most precedents. Next would follow the declaration of the nature of His Sonship. Here even our imperfect evidence suffices to exhibit in outline what probably took place. The construction by which γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς is followed by a predicate, in this case μονογενῆ [θεόν], is borrowed from the Jerusalem Creed, which has in like manner τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων 3. Probably the con-

1 New, that is, in relation to the Cæsarean Creed, but doubtless taken wholly or in part from another source, for otherwise it would probably have been mentioned as new by Athanasius and Eusebius. The complete phrase occurs in the Expositio Fidei of Athanasius himself (c. 1 p. 99 b: cf. Or. c. Ar. iii 9 p. 558 c, διὶ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ πατρὸς ἀληθινοῦ ἐστι γέννημα); but so do similar forms not adopted at Nicaea, as ἀμετακτος ἐξ ἀμετάκτου, γέννημα ἐκ τελείου τελείου, τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἐκτὸς τὸν. On the presence of θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ in the Jerusalem Creed at this time see note 3.

2 The extrusion of the clause setting Him forth as the Word, and the transfer of the following clauses to the Sonship, would find justification in almost universal precedent.

3 Toutée, the editor of Cyril of Jerusalem, in an excellent dissertation on the Creed of Jerusalem (p. 80), conjectures θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ to have been introduced into the Creed from the Nicene Creed between 325 and the time, some quarter of a century later, when Cyril’s lectures were delivered. The supposition is surely gratuitous. The presence of πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων affords no grammatical argument, as our other evidence shows; the suggestion is sustained by no other Nicene echo in the Creed of Jerusalem; had anything been interpolated from the work of the great Council, it would hardly have been a phrase so little conspicuous or characteristic; and any early Creed might easily take it at once from 1 Jo. v 20.
struction is the same in the Antiochian Creed of Lucianus¹, τὸν γεννηθέντα πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ. But at all events the Antiochian diction passes with great facility into the Nicene. It stands thus:—

τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸν μονογενῆ θεόν, δὲ οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ, ὃλου ἐξ ὅλου, μόνου ἐκ μόνου, τέλειον ἐκ τελείου κ. τ. λ.

When once the evidently premature clause δὲ οὗ τὰ πάντα had been deferred till the place which it held at Cæsarea and Jerusalem alike, and the inconvenient² phrase πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων had been omitted, it was an obvious gain to shift μονογενῆ θεόν from its isolated position, now rendered doubly conspicuous by the removal of δὲ οὗ τὰ πάντα, deprive it of its dangerous article, and employ it, in strict analogy with St John’s own usage, as the chief predicate to γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, combining it with the already present θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ into the single phrase μονογενῆ θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ³.

The other alternative now claims attention. The simple τὸν μονογενῆ of Jerusalem may have been preferred to the τὸν

The exact date of Cyril’s lectures cannot, I think, be determined, but it seems to lie shortly before 350: see Pearson De Succ. ii 21 2; Tillemont viii 779 f.; Touttée Diss. cxv ff. The most probable year is 348, which is preferred by Touttée, though partly on untenable grounds.

¹ The doubt of course arises from the bare possibility of taking πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων as the sole predicate (ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς being excluded from direct predication by the sense), in which case θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ would become an addition in apposition. But this construction is virtually condemned, if I mistake not, by the order of the words. In both the local Creeds πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων seems to hold a weak place, as a secondary predicate only, though the places are not identical. The omission of these words at Nicæa, whether suggested by dogmatic prudence or not, was an undoubted gain as regards grammatical clearness. It may also be owing to a grammatical impulse that Hilary omits them in his version of Lucianus’ Creed (De Syn. 29 p. 478 c).

² See last note.

³ What follows hardly needs comment. θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ is succeeded by two clauses of similar form, as in both the Cæsarean and the Antiochian Creeds; but no actual phrases are borrowed from Antioch, and but one, φως ἐκ φωτὸς, retained from Cæsarea. The other, θεόν ἀληθινόν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, whether then first put together or not, had the advantage of taking up for better use what at Jerusalem had stood after γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς.
μονογενής θεόν of Antioch; and μονογενής may have been intended, when transposed, to stand alone after γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, with θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ as a fresh clause in apposition. It is impossible to disprove this rival supposition: but it is weighted with several improbabilities. First, it involves a somewhat wide departure from the real force of both the assumed precedents: in both of them the primary predicate to γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός is a strong term containing θεόν, in the one case θεόν ἀληθινόν, in the other, θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ. It is not likely therefore that both these phrases would be deposed into a secondary position, and their room occupied solely by an adjective not in itself implying Deity. Secondly, the bare phrase γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μονογενής is redundant and artificial, if μονογενής retains its true usual sense of an only son or offspring. The rare secondary sense (see p. 17) in which it casts off the idea of parentage, and comes to mean only “unique”, receives no support from Athanasius or, as far as I can discover, any writer of the Nicene generation. Thirdly, it is difficult to believe that a collocation so naturally suggesting the combination μονογενής θεόν to the many ears already familiar with it would have been chosen or retained except with the deliberate intention that it should be so understood. On the other hand the one tangible ground for supposing the

1 The circumlocution would be all the more improbable because the obvious form τοῦ γεννηθέντα (or τοῦ θεοῦ) τοῦ μονογενῆ was not only directly Scriptural (John iii 16; 1 Jo. iv 9) but stood already in the Creeds of Jerusalem and (by the easy omission of θεοῦ) of Antioch. But in the case of μονογενής θεὸν there would be no circumlocution, partly on account of the sense and the weight of the phrase, partly because of the need of introducing it only in a predicative position.

2 This seemingly stronger sense would in effect have served the purpose of the Council less; for no Arian would have hesitated to affirm the uniqueness of our Lord's Sonship. The point for which at least Athanasius repeatedly contends, as involving all else, is the strict and primary sense of the terms Father and Son; and this argument would have received no help from μονογενής as a Scriptural designation of the Son, if it did not by recognised usage imply actual parentage.

3 The transfer of unicum from Filiun to Dominum by transcribers of Latin Creeds (see p. 50 n. 1) can afford no real analogy for the skilful Greek theologians of Nicea.
two words to have been intended to belong to different clauses, namely the position of the Nicene parenthesis, requires careful consideration. But first, a few more words must be said in illustration of the continuous construction \( \gammaενυθέντα \ \varepsilonκ \ \tauον \ \piατρός \ \muονογενῆ \ \thetaεόν \ \varepsilonκ \ \thetaεοῦ. \)

Apart from the unfamiliarity of \( \muονογενῆ \ \thetaεόν \), the prevalent habit of treating \( \thetaεόν \ \varepsilonκ \ \thetaεοῦ \) as a complete and independent formula may probably at first disincline a reader to accept its suspension, so to speak, on a preliminary participle. The absolutely independent use of \( \thetaεόν \ \varepsilonκ \ \thetaεοῦ \) has undoubtedly sufficient authority in ancient theological writers; but on the other hand this use is virtually unknown in Creeds; for popular intelligibility the help of \( \gammaεγευμηνένον \ \varepsilonκ \ \tauον \ \piατρός \) or some equivalent was apparently felt to be needed. Setting aside the Creed of Cæsarea, where \( \thetaεόν \ \varepsilonκ \ \thetaεοῦ \) follows \( \tauον \ \thetaεοῦ \ \lambdaόγον \) with probably the same effect as to sense, and perhaps the Creed recited by Charisius of Philadelphia at Ephesus in 431, where \( \thetaεόν \ \varepsilonκ \ \thetaεοῦ \) follows \( \tauον \ \υίον \ \alphaυτοῦ \ \tauον \ \muονογενῆ \)\(^1\), I can find no exceptions; for it is impossible to count as such the highly technical Confession of Gregory Thaumaturgus (ed. Paris 1622 p. 1 Α, εἷς κύριος, μόνος εκ μόνου, θεὸς εκ θεοῦ, χαρακτήρ καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς θεότητος, λόγος ἐνεργής κ.τ.λ.), or the still more elaborate Exposition of Athanasius (p. 99 B), in which \( \thetaεόν \ \alphaληθινῶν \ \varepsilonκ \ \θεοῦ \ \αληθινοῦ \) is isolated among texts of Scripture\(^2\). On the other hand the rule is observed by the Antiochian baptismal Creed in all its extant forms\(^3\); the ‘Third’ Formulary of the

\(^1\) It is at least equally probable that here too \( \tauον \ \muονογενῆ \ \thetaεόν \ \varepsilonκ \ \thetaεοῦ \) should be taken together; and then \( \muονογενῆ \) would have the same effect as a participle.

\(^2\) A similar Exposition of uncertain authorship (ad cælé. Greg. Naz. i 906 &c.: of. Walch, Bibl. Symb. 172 ff.; Hahn, Bibl. der Symbole 185 ff.), has “Patrem verum qui genuit Filium verum, ut est Deus de Deo, lumen de lumine, vita ex vita” &c. Yet here too the aid is given by the context, though not formally by the grammar.

\(^3\) As represented by Lucianus, Eusebius of Doryleum, Cassianus. The last two writers doubtless represent the same form, which shews signs of Nicene influence: see Dissertation ii. I venture to cite Eusebius of Doryleum, although the words in question precede his express quotation from the μάθημα of Antioch. He certainly began to interweave the diction of
Synod of Antioch, by Theophronius; the ‘Fourth’ of the same (ap. Ath. De Syn. 23 p. 737 E, &c.; the ‘Fifth’ (A.D. 345), known as Ἐκθεσις μακρόστιχος (ap. Ath. ib. 26 p. 738 C &c.); the Formulary of the Synod of Philippopolis, miscalled ‘Sardica’, in 347 (ap. Hil. De Syn. 34, p. 482 D; the only probable construction in the lost Greek is a little disguised in the Latin version); the ‘First’ Formulary of the Synod of Sirmium in 351 (ap. Ath. ib. 27, p. 742 A &c.); the ‘Second’ in 357 (ap. Hil. ib. p. 466 A &c.); the ‘Third’ in 358 (ap. Ath. ib. 8 p. 721 C &c.), with the peculiar form γεγενημένου δὲ μονογενῆ, μόνον ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς, θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ, ὡμοίου τῷ γεγενήσαντι αὐτῶν πατρί, which was copied, with variations of perfect and aorist only, at the Synod of Nicē in Thrace in 359 (ap. Theodoret. H. E. ii 16 [al. 21]) and at that of Constantinople in 360 (ap. Ath. ib. 30 p. 747 A); and lastly by what is known as the ‘Constantinopolitan’ Creed. Hence abundant analogy leads to the conclusion that θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ, whether forming part of the direct predicate to γεγενημένα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς or not in the Nicene Creed, is at least dependent on it, so that on either construction ἐκ θεοῦ presupposes γεγενημένα: and when thus much is established, there can be no intrinsic difficulty, μονογενῆ and the parenthesis apart, in the closer construction which makes θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ part of the main predicate.

The chief external evidence for joining to γεγενημένα a

---

the Creed before he made formal appeal to it. The words are, ἂλλ' ἐνα τῶν πρὸς πάντων αἰῶνων γεγενημένα θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς, θεόν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, κ.τ.λ.

1 Cf. pp. 22 f. The words are, τῶν γεγενημένων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων θεόν τέλειον ἐκ θεοῦ τέλειον, καὶ ὡς πρῶτον θεόν ἐν ὑποστάσει, ἐκ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν κατέλθετο, κ.τ.λ. The position of πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων allows θεόν τέλειον κ.τ.λ. to be taken either predicatively or in apposition, though the former is the more probable construction, as two other participial clauses follow at once. For the present purpose the difference is immaterial.

2 We are not here concerned with the theological position of these various Synods, but solely with their incidental testimony to a traditional habit of language.

3 That is, in the clauses φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεόν ἀληθινόν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, as this Creed does not contain the simple θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ. In all the other Creeds cited, that of Theophronius excepted (note 1), θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ stands unmodified.
predicate containing θεόν has been already given, namely the probable analogy of the Creeds of Antioch and Jerusalem. To this must be added the Epistle to Paul of Samosata by the bishops assembled at Antioch in 260—270, if the correction already suggested is right. The whole sentence must be quoted here. Τοῦτον δὲ τῶν νῦν, ἑγεμνητῶν μονογενῆ νῦν (read θεόν), εἰκόνα τοῦ ἀοράτου θεοῦ τυγχάνοντα, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, σοφίαν καὶ λόγον καὶ δύναμιν θεοῦ πρὸ αἰώνων δύνα, οὐ προγενόμενον ἀλλ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὑποστάσει, θεόν θεοῦ νῦν, ἐν τε παλαίᾳ καὶ νέᾳ διαθήκῃ ἐγγενετές ὁμολογούμεν καὶ κηρύσσομεν. As soon as θεόν is substituted for the unmeaning second νῦν, the two preceding words acquire a clear force, the verbal γενεμητῶν being equivalent to a passive participle. Possibly however this ought not to be accounted independent evidence, but only as a reproduction of the Creed of Antioch. The second required combination, that of μονογενῆ with θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ, had undoubtedly an actual existence. In the Demonstratio Evangelica (p. 149 A) Eusebius speaks of our Lord as τὸ πατρὶ ὡς νῦν διὰ παντὸς συνόντα καὶ οὐκ ἀγεννητὸν δύνα γεννημένου δὲ ἐξ ἀγεννητοῦ πατρὸς, μονογενῆ ὑπὰ λόγον τε καὶ θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ. The position of τε proves a reference to two distinct forms, the familiar μονογενῆ λόγου, not seldom used by Eusebius (as by Athanasius), and μονογενῆ θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ: the only other grammatical construction, that which makes μονογενῆ and λόγου two distinct terms, would give λόγου an inappropriate position, imply an arbitrary distribution of the conjunctions; and enfeeble the

1 See pp. 4, 19, 39. Even if νῦν is right, which seems incredible, we should still have as the predicate of γενεμητῶν a combination of μονογενῆ with a substantive.

2 The construction of the Nicene Creed here advocated receives illustration, rather than direct confirmation, from the language of the Third Sirmian Formulary (quoted above, p. 65), adopted at Nicē in Thrace and at Constantinople in the two following years: it will be observed that μόνον ἐκ μόνου, an accepted gloss on μονογενῆ (see p. 17), occupies the place of the Nicene parenthesis. The parallel language of Cyril of Jerusalem (iv 7) is instructive, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ θεόν γεννηθέντα, τὸν ἐκ ζωῆς ζωῆς γεννηθέντα, τὸν ἐκ φωτὸς φωτὸς γεννηθέντα, τὸν ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα τῷ γεννηθέντι (iv 7); ὁμοίος γὰρ ἐν πάσιν ὁ νῦν τῷ γεγεννηθέντι, ζωὴ ἐκ ζωῆς γεγεννηθέντι, καὶ φως ἐκ φωτὸς, δύναμις ἐκ δύναμεως, θεός ἐκ θεοῦ (xiv 18: cf. 4).
whole of the last clause as a climax. The same form, slightly resolved, occurs a little earlier (p. 147 b), καὶ ἕνα τέλειον μόνον γεγονόντων θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ; and, slightly extended, in the Panegyric on Constantine (xii 7: cf. Theophan. i 24), οὗτος μονογενὴς θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ γεγεννημένος λόγος. It reappears in the Formulary of the Synod of Seleucia in Isauria (A.D. 359) θεῶν λόγου, θεῶν ἐκ θεοῦ μονογενῆ, φῶς, ζωὴν κτ.λ. (ap. Ath. De Syn. 29 p. 746 c; Epiph. Haer. 873 c). And in the next century it is employed by Cyril in his commentary on St John, σημεῖον... τοῦ εἶναι βασιλεὰ καὶ δεσπότην τῶν ὀλον τῶν ἐκ θεοῦ περιήγητα θεὸν μονογενῆ (viii 35 p. 541 c), and again, ἐπείπερ ὑπάρχουν [ὁ νῦς] ἐκ θεοῦ θεὸς μονογενῆς ἀνθρωπος γέγονεν (x 15, p. 653 c); as also in his Third (Second Ecumenical) Epistle to Nestorius (p. 24 Pusey) ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρός γεννηθεὶς νῦς καὶ θεὸς μονογενῆς. It is immaterial whether these forms of speech were derived from the Nicene Creed or independent of it. In either case they shew the naturalness of the combination in the eyes of theologians of the fourth and fifth centuries. Doubtless it was felt that each of the two elements associated with θεόν in μονογενῆ θεῶν ἐκ θεοῦ would sustain and illustrate the other.

Thus far the discussion has left out of account the Nicene parenthesis τοῦτον ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός. Were it absent, the evidence would all, as far as I can see, be clearly in favour of taking μονογενῆ θεῶν ἐκ θεοῦ as an unbroken predicate of γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός. It remains to consider whether we are driven to a different conclusion by the position of the

---

1 The added γεγεννημένος increases the resemblance to the Nicene language, though inverted in order.

2 Yet it can hardly be doubted that at least Cyril had the Nicene Creed definitely in view; for in his Ep. 55, which is a commentary on the Creed, he says that the Fathers of Nicaea, τῆς ὀφθαλμοῦ [the Paternity] τὸ γένος ..., εἰ μάλα σημαίνοντες, θεὸν ἐφασαν ἐκ θεοῦ γεγεννημένος τοῦ νῦν (p. 178): and again, οὐ γὰρ τὸν ἀπόχρηθον ... φρονεῖν ὡς θεόν ἐκ θεοῦ γεγεννημένον τοῦ πατρός,...ἀλλ' ἤν ἀναγκαῖον εἰδέναι πρὸς τούτοις ὡς τῆς ἀπάντησιν ἐνεκα σωρησίας κτ.λ. διὰ τοῦτο φασὶ Τὸν δὲ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους κτ.λ. (p. 189). Both passages lose their force if θεῶν ἐκ θεοῦ was not part of the main predicate.
parenthesis. It matters little for our purpose whether the Nicene Fathers were here simply copying an earlier (lost) Creed, or, as the extant language of Jerusalem and Antioch has rather suggested, to a certain extent modifying in combination and arrangement the traditional materials. In either case the sense and the place of their own entirely new parenthesis must be taken into account in order to ascertain the meaning which they attached to their completed work.

A reader examining the passage merely as a piece of Greek, unaided by extraneous knowledge, could hardly fail to take μονογενὴς as the one weighted word interpreted by the parenthesis. Yet this supposition cannot be more than partially true at most, if we are to trust the concurrent testimony of the two men who had the best means of knowing the facts, who moreover regarded them from different points of view. Eusebius and Athanasius represent ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς as the interpretation of ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς. Eusebius passes μονογενὴς over altogether, and Athanasius alludes to it with a slightness and indirectness which throw it completely into subordination.

1 Kai δὴ ταῦτα τῆς ὑπερμείρητος, διὸς εἰρήται αὐτός τῷ Ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῷ Τῷ πατρὶ δμοοῦσιν, ὦ τι ἀνεξέπταστον αὐτῶς κατελεύπανομιν ἐπερωτήσιες τοιαοφόν καὶ ἀποκρίσεις ἐνεπέθεθαν ἄνεκνωτο, ἐβασινεῖτε το δ λόγος τῆς διάνοιας τῶν εἰρήμενων δὴ τῷ Ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ὑμολογεῖτο πρὸς αὐτῶν δηλωτικὸν εἶναι τοῦ ἐκ μέν τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι, οὐ μὴν ὡς μέρος ὑπάρχειν τοῦ πατρὸς ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν ἐδόκει καλῶς ἠχεῖν συγκατατίθεσθαι τῇ διανοίᾳ τῆς εὐεξίας διδασκαλίας κ.τ.λ. Eus. Ep. ad Caes. 5. Ὁ περὶ Εὐδοβίον [of Nicomedia]...ἔβαλονντο τῷ Ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ κοινών εἶναι πρὸς ἡμᾶς [i.e. mankind]... ἄλλοι πατέρες θεωρηθήσαντες ἐκελευητήρωιν πανορμητοῖν... ἡγιασθήσαντες λωτῶν λευκότερον εἰπέων τῷ Ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ γράφει ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι τοῦ ιδόν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ τῷ Ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ κοινών καὶ ίσον τοῦ τοι υἱόν καὶ τῶν γεννητων νομίζεσθαι. Ath. De Deor. 19 p. 224 de. And so in the parallel narrative Ad Afr. 5 p. 895 b, ἀλλ' οἱ ἐπισκοποὶ θεωρήσαντες τὴν κ.τ.λ. λευκότερον εἰρήκασι τῷ Ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἔγραψαν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι τοῦ ιδόν.

2 The possible allusions in the Ep. de Decretis to μονογενὴς (represented by μόνος) are in the two sentences ὁ δὲ λόγος, ἐπεὶ μὴ κτισμα ἐστίν εἰρήται καὶ ἐστὶ μόνος ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, τῆς δὲ τοιαύτης διανοίας γνώριμα τὸ εἶναι τοῦ ιδὸν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, οὗ δὲν γὰρ τῶν γεννητῶν υπάρχει τούτο, and ὁ δὲ τῷ γὰρ καὶ ἡ ἁγια σῶνος λευκότερον εἰρημένη ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτῶν εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς, ὡς καὶ ἄλλος παρὰ τὴν τῶν γεννητῶν φύσιν ὁ λόγος εἶναι πατευθυνμένος, μόνος ὁ δὲ τῷ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (225 λ—ο). The Ep. ad Afrinos has likewise the word itself, but in an ambiguous context, δὲ υἱὸς μόνος ἠινὸς τῆς τοῦ
But the more the stress is shifted back from μονογενή to ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, the less reason is there to regard the clause as so terminating in μονογενή as to make θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ a fresh clause in apposition. It would seem in fact that μονογενή was put to double duty, combined alike with ἐκ τοῦ πατρός and with θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ; just as we have already found reason provisionally to recognise θεὸν as doing double duty, combined alike with μονογενή and with ἐκ θεοῦ. Thus there would be no real pause between the seven words ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μονογενή θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ. Yet the parenthesis had to be inserted somewhere. It could not be placed at the end, for τοῦ πατρός was too distant; nor before ἐκ θεοῦ, partly for the same reason, partly because θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ could not be severed. If placed before μονογενή, it would have been close to ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, but at the cost of depriving ἐκ τοῦ πατρός of any additional force or clearness which it could derive from association with μονογενή, including perhaps the reminiscence of John i 14 (δόξαν ὡς μονογενός παρά πατρός). Placed as it actually was, the parenthesis, while chiefly limiting the sense of ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, limited also the sense of μονογενή, as against the Homoeans, and at the same time compelled μονογενή into a subsidiary limitation of ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, as against the Anomoeans. No doubt in the process μονογενής θεὸς was disguised: but it was not possible to introduce the parenthesis without some sacrifice somewhere. Probably it was thought that μονογενής θεὸς was too well known and accepted to lose instant recognition despite the parenthesis. But at all events its acceptance by Arius himself deprived it of controversial value for the special purpose of the Council; whereas in the eyes of at least Athanasius it must have been of primary importance to secure to the interpretation ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός

πατρὸς οὐσίας, τοῦτο γὰρ ήδη μονο-
γενοῦς καὶ ἀληθινοῦ λόγου πρὸς πατέρα
(895 c). These incidental references
are of no force as compared with the
express statements of fact cited in the
last note. Indeed elsewhere (De Syn.
51), assuming ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας as the uni-
versal criterion of true parentage and
filiation, Athanasius argues from Jep-
thabah’s daughter and the son of the
widow of Nain that a child is not less
όμοοιός with its parent because it is
likewise μονογενής.
the utmost possible force. Thus μονογενῆς θεὸς, though retained like other traditional forms too little stringent for the present need, might have to suffer partial obscurity through the necessity of the case.

No other explanation than this appears to account for all the facts, and to do justice alike to the language of the Creeds of Antioch and Jerusalem, to the statements of Eusebius and Athanasius, and to the actual order of words in the Nicene Creed. There is the less difficulty in accepting a single long clause made up of closely combined terms, if we remember the evident purpose to give continuity of form to the entire declaration respecting the nature of the Divine Sonship, the other Creeds having been more or less disjointed hereabouts, the Creed of Cæsarea to an extreme degree. Where all the clauses

1 Innumerable passages of his writings show that the form of language adopted in this clause was the test on which he relied above all others for the exclusion of Arianism. On the other hand, loyal as he defends ὕμνος when needful, he shews no great inclination to use it when left to himself: Dr. Newman has noticed its almost total absence from the great treatise made up by what are called his first three Orations against the Arians (Sel. Treat., 500, 210 d, 264 g), as also his use of the term ὑμνάσας ὑμίν (210 e: cf. 136 g); cf. Tract. Theol. and Eccl. 291. The final result in the Creed may have been a combination of the expedients proposed by different sections of the majority in the Council.

2 Athanasius dwells on the desire of the Council to use only scriptural terms, till it was found that the party of Eusebius of Nicomedia was ready to accept them all (De Deocr. 19 ff. p. 224 ff.; ad Afr. 5 f. p. 894 ff.). Among such terms he includes the following, evidently described somewhat vaguely, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς φύσει μονογενῆς ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος, ὅν τιν οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ πατρὸς κ.τ.λ. (895 a).

3 To this purpose must probably be referred the omission of τὸν before the first γεννηθέντα, and the emphatic repulsion of γεννηθέντα, first to set forth the contrast οὗ πουνθέντα, and then to carry ὑμνάσας τῆς πατρί without another participle. Then comes a fresh start on the relation of the Son to created things, δι' ὅν τὰ πάντα ηὗτο; and the added clause τὰ τῆς γῆς, wanting at Cæsarea, Antioch, and Jerusalem (it is found in the Apostolic Constitutions), at once gives weight to this division of the second article of the Creed and constitutes a parallel to the first article, on the Father, πάντων ὄρατω τε καὶ δοράτων ποιήσας. The resumptive force of the second γεννηθέντα, as connecting οὗ πουνθέντα with the earlier clause, is distinctly recognised in the later Antiochian Creed (Cassianus), which has been modified by Nicene influence, ex eo natum ante omnia saecula, et non factum, Deum verum ex Deo vero; as also, by exactly the same collocation,
bearing on a single subject are so carefully shaped into a whole, it is only natural that the series of terms relating to one portion of the subject should be knit together with unusual closeness. The arrangement may be exhibited as follows:—

Kal ei's eina kuriou 'Ihsou'n Xristou',
tou uivon tou theou:

γεννηθέντα ek tou patro's monogenη -
tou't' estin ek tis autηs ouσia -
theou ek theou,

φως ek phwto's,

theou alηthion ek theou alηthion,

γεννηθέντα, ou poiythena,

δυμουσιον το' patri,

di ou tα panta' byneito,

tα te en tο' ouranou kal tα ep'i tis γηs' -
tou di' hμas tou's anbropous k.t.l.

We have, it is to be feared, no means of knowing with any certainty how the sentence was understood in the following years. The remarkable form of the Creed noticed above (p. 23) as employed by Eustathius and others in 366 might be due either to an attempt to express more clearly the assumed sense of the Nicene language, or to a conscious reintroduction of a combination assumed to have been set aside. The concise Philadelphia Creed recited by Charisius, in borrowing the Nicene phraseology, omits the Nicene parenthesis, and thus removes the only hindrance in the way of reading tou uivon autou tou monogenη theou ek theou continuously: but the other construction remains possible; and again the authors of this Creed may have intended to improve rather than to interpret. Yet the growing favour of the phrase monogenηs theos with the friends and successors of Athanasius, in spite of its controversial uselessness, during the time that the distinctive terms of the Nicene Creed were the watchwords of every struggle, suggests the operation of some

in the (Syriac) Mesopotamian Creed examined in the following Disserta-
tion, which rests on an Antiochian foundation.
more potent and universal cause than the influence of scattered local Creeds, or of Synods of doubtful orthodoxy which borrowed their language. The Nicene Creed itself would evidently be such an adequate cause, if it was understood as containing μονογενὴς θεὸς: and if such was the retrospective view taken in the fourth century, such also, we may not unreasonably believe, was the intention of the Council.

Against this evidence there is, as far as I am aware, nothing to set. A Cappadocian Creed formed on the base of the Nicene Creed at a date not far from 370, of which some account will be given in the next Dissertation, merely repeats this part of the Nicene language unchanged. No other known Creed can be said with any propriety to be a revised form of the Nicene Creed. That the 'Constantinopolitan' Creed had no such origin, it is easy to shew: but a position so much at variance with commonly received views requires to be illustrated in some detail, and must therefore be treated separately. It is enough here to say that the history of μονογενὴς θεὸς in ancient times virtually closes with the gradual supersession of the Nicene Creed. As its primary apostolic sanction had been lost long before through the increasing degeneracy of biblical texts, so its ecclesiastical sanction, such as it was, died out by an equally fortuitous process. Neither in 381 nor at any other date was the phrase μονογενὴς θεὸς removed from the Nicene Creed. If it had a place there from 325, as we have found good grounds on the whole for concluding, it was never displaced while the authority of the Nicene Creed was in force. It passed away only when the Nicene Creed itself completely yielded place to another Creed which never possessed it.