

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...*"¹ 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 phrase, "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."² 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,"³ discussed the theologian's problem.

¹ SBC.NET - <http://www.sbc.net/bfm/bfm2000.asp> - Southern Baptist Convention

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 huiois (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 οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς Θεὸς [monogenes theos] ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν 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 discovered 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*).⁸ 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 as 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 were simply changing place within the same reality. {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 fulfilment in Christ. In this context *eis* takes on a new significance as follows. (TDNT)

⁸ 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)

Appendix B

Word Study Greek-English New Testament by Paul R. McReynolds

The complete text
of the Greek
New Testament,
UBS 3rd edition.

John 1:18 page 327

1473	1510	3754	1537	010	4138	846	1473	
μου	ἦν.	16	ὅτι	ἐκ	τοῦ πληρώματος	αὐτοῦ	ἡμεῖς	
of me	he was.		Because	out of	the fullness	of him	we	
3956	2983	2532	5485	473	5485	17	3754	
πάντες	ἐλάβομεν	καὶ	χάριν	ἀντὶ	χάριτος.	17	ὅτι	
all	received	and	favor	in place	of favor;		because	
01	3551	1223	3475	1325	05	5485	2532	05
ὁ	νόμος	διὰ	Μωϋσέως	ἐδόθη,	ἡ	χάρις	καὶ	ἡ
the law	through	Moses	was given,	the favor	and	the		
225	1223	2424	5547	1096	18	2316	3762	
ἀλήθεια	διὰ	Ἰησοῦ	Χριστοῦ	ἐγένετο.	18	θεὸν	οὐδεὶς	
truth	through	Jesus	Christ	became.		God	no one	
3708	4455	3439	2316	01	1510	1519		
ἑώρακεν	πώποτε.	μονογενῆς	θεὸς	ὁ	ὢν	εἰς		
has seen	ever yet;	only born	God	the one	being	in		
04	2859	02	3962	1565	1834	19	2532	
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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

² See pp. 234, 235.

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

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

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

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

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

⁴ “ Gregory of Nyssa and Fulgentius.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

every quotation of the passage which I had found with the reading *θεός*, but every allusion to it which might be imagined to favor this reading, even in cases where it seemed clear that no real argument could be founded on these allusions.

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

"In this one instance I have given at length the evidence for and against the reading, so as to show what authorities do really support *μονογενῆς θεός* and what uphold *μονογενῆς υἱός*. 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 *μονογενῆς θεός* 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 *θεός* 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 *θεός*. In doing this, he does not confine himself to the chronological limit generally followed in his Greek Testament, so far as

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Authorities cited for the reading μονογενῆς Θεός.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Authorities cited for the reading μονογενῆς υἱός.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We will proceed, then, to examine the evidence of the *ancient versions*. The following support *θεός*:—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 Harelean 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 *υἱός*:—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 Harelean 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 *υἱός*. 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 *θεός*; 2. of those *which* support *υἱός*; 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 *θεός*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 imprudence of a confident reliance on such references to scripture as the one before us. Turning back a few leaves in this same treatise of Gregory Nyssen we find the assertion that, among the names which the Apostle Paul has given to Christ,—“He has called him a propitiation for souls, and first-born of the *new* creation, and *only-begotten Son*, crowned with glory and honor,” etc.¹ In another place he expressly quotes the words “whom God hath set forth as a propitiation for our souls” as the language of the Apostle.² But it would be idle to suppose that he had anything corresponding to the italicized words in his manuscripts in Rom. iii. 25, or that his Greek copies contained the expression “*new* creation” in Col. i. 16; still more that his copy of the Epistle to the Hebrews contained the words “*only-begotten Son*,” a phrase occurring only in the writings of John. The looseness and inaccuracy of such references to scripture in the writings of the Fathers might be much more fully illustrated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

² Basil reads Θεός, De Spir. Sanct. c. 6. Opp. III. 12^b. Comp. *ibid.* c. 8, p. 14^c, where he says: Οἶδε γὰρ [ἢ γραφή] τὸ ὄνομα ὑπὲρ πάντων ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ υἱὸν ἀληθινὸν λέγειν (al. λέγει), καὶ μονογενῆ Θεόν, καὶ δύναμιν Θεοῦ, καὶ σφύραν, καὶ λόγον. — On the other hand, he has υἱός, De Spir. Sanct. c. 11, Opp. III. 23^a, where the six manuscripts of Garnier appear to agree in this reading, though one of Matthaei's Moscow MSS. has Θεός (see Matthaei's Nov. Test. Graec. I. 780). He again has υἱός, apparently without any variation in the ten MSS. of Garnier, Epist. 234 (al. 400), c. 3. Opp. III. 358^b. Here Matthaei's Moscow MS. also reads υἱός.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

n* B C* L, 83.

Manuscripts.

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

Versions.

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

Versions.

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

Greek Fathers.

Clem. Al.¹⁰⁴, Theod.¹⁰⁴, Epiph.³⁰⁸, three times, and one ref., Didym.³⁷⁰, twice, and one ref. (?); Cyr. Al.⁴⁰⁰, four times, and one ref. (?), but *υἱός* three times.

u' 12'

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

Greek Fathers.

Iren.¹⁷⁸ probably, Hippol.³⁰⁰, 3d Syn. Ant.³⁰⁰, Archel.³⁰⁰, Alex. Al.³¹³, Euseb.³¹³ six times, and one allus., Eustath. Ant.³²⁰, Athanas.³²⁶, four or rather seven times, Pseud-Athan.^{4th cent.?}, Cyr. Hier.³⁸⁰, probably, Julian³⁸² twice, Tit. Bostr.³⁸², Greg. Naz.³⁷⁰, Pseudo-Basil., Rufin. Syr.³⁰⁰, Chrysost.³⁰⁰, eight times, Theod. Mops.⁴⁰⁷, Nonnus⁴¹⁰ probably, Theodoret³⁸² four times, Proclus⁴⁰⁴, Pseudo-Cyr.^{5th cent.}, Andr. Cret.⁶³⁵, Pseudo-Caesarius^{7th cent.?}, Joan. Dam.⁷³⁰ thrice, Theod. Stud.⁸¹³ twice, Andr. presb.^{9th cent.?}, Caten. ed. Cramer^{9th or 10 cent.}, Theoph.¹⁰⁷⁰, Euthym¹¹¹⁰, thrice, Elias Cret.¹¹³⁰, Zach. Chrys.¹¹⁴⁷, Nic. Chon.¹³⁰⁰.

Latin Fathers.

None.

Latin Fathers.

Tert.³⁰⁰, Hilar.³⁵⁴ seven times, Phoebad.³⁵⁰, Victorin. Afer³⁰⁰ six times, Ambrose³⁷⁴ seven times, Jerome³⁷³, Faustin.³⁸⁴ three times, August.³⁰⁵, three times, Adimant.³⁰⁵, Maximin.⁴²³ twice, Idacius^{385 or 446} three times, Vigil. Taps.⁴⁰⁴, Junil.⁴⁶⁰, Alcuin⁷⁸⁰, and others.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 υἱός*, 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. :

θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

The *Documentary Evidence* for *μονογενής θεός* consists of

Manuscripts: \aleph BC*L 33 (\aleph^* omits the following $\delta \acute{\omega}\nu$; \aleph^c and 33 prefix δ).

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.

$\delta \mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma \upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ is found in

Manuscripts: AC^cEFGHKMSUVXΓΔΛΠ and all known cursives 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 *μονογενής θεός*, with or without δ , 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 *υἱός* 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). IRENÆUS 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.

Clement has $\delta \mu. \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, as in a still looser paraphrase at p. 102 he has $\delta \mu. \dots \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$). 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 $\delta \mu. \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\delta \mu. \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$; in an indirect reference shortly afterwards $\tau\omicron\nu \mu.$ 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 $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$). Eusebius twice, once as an alternative not preferred by himself (*De Eccl. Theol.* p. 67, $\delta \mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma \nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$, $\eta \mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$), and in one other exceptional but seemingly unsuspecting place, p. 174. EPIPHANIUS three or four times (*Ancor.* 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 $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$; the quotation with $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ 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.* ii 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 $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ is printed twice, *c. Eun.* ii 466 [521]; *Ep. ad Flav.* 648 [iii 1004]). The (Homœousian) 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. lxxvi 14, p. 597 Cord. [with absolute certainty by the context, though $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ 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 ($\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ for $\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\acute{\alpha} \mu\epsilon$) 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.

p. 103 [without *ὁ*] by Mr Pusey's best MS. and repeated references in the following comment), and in at least three other places (*Theos.* 137, [without *ὁ*] 237; *Dial. quod Unus*, 768: twice (*Theos.* 365; *Adv. Nest.* 90¹) Aubert's text has *υἱός*, 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 *υἱός*, another has *θεός*, which the argument seems on the whole to require.

The patristic evidence for [*ὁ*] *μονογενῆς υἱός* has next to be given. Irenæus 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 Irenæus. 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 μονογενῆ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ θεόν* occurring not long before. The Latin version of the "ACTS" of the disputation between ARCHELAUS and Mani, c. 32, where again the inserted *nisi* shews the impossibility of deciding whether author or translator is responsible. EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA 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 *ὁ γὰρ μὴν ἐν κόλπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατὴρ μονογενῆς θεὸς λόγος*.

² In the 'Dialogues' of an unknown CÆSARIUS (*Inter.* 4, post Greg. Naz. iv 864 Migne), probably of the fifth if not a later century, the context implies *θεός*, though *υἱός* is printed. The ap-

parent 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 *υἱός* seems to me infinitesimal: but I am content to leave Cæsarius 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 θεοῦ 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 Cæsarea, *Ep.* 234, p. 358, besides one of the three places in the *De Spiritu Sancto* already mentioned, where at least one Moscow MS. has θεός: 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 BOSTRA (*adv. Man.* p. 85 Lag.: but p. 93 ὁ μ. υἱὸς 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, υἱός has a right to claim the authority provisionally, in spite of private suspicions: but it would be unreasonable to concede to υἱός any appreciable part in Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus, or Cyril—I ought to add, in Irenæus or Basil—notwithstanding the variations already mentioned. Serious doubt must also rest on an isolated υἱός 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 Fathers¹ have *unigenitus Filius* in their quotation, and *unigenitus Deus* often elsewhere.

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

θεός NBC*L 33

Memph. Syr.vulg. Syr.hcl.mg. [?Aeth.]

*VALENTINIANI. Iren. *CLEM. *ORIG. [Euseb.]

†Syn.Anc. *EPIPH. *DID. *BAS. *GREG.NYSS. *CYR.AL.

Cf. Caes.

υίος AX &c. &c. [?D]

Latt.omn. Syr.vet. Syr.hcl. Syr.hier. Arm. [Aeth.codd.]

[?? Iren.(lat.)] ? †Ep.Ant. ? †Act.Arch.(lat.) *EUSEB.

*ATH. †Eust. ? †Alex.AL. [??Bas.] Greg.Naz. [?? Greg.

Nyss.] †Tit.Bost. *THEOD.MOPS. *CHRYS., &c.

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 uncials υίος has no tolerable uncial authority to set except A and X, of which even A 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 cursives 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 cursives 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 *viós* 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 *viós* has no doubt the advantage.

The Ante-nicene Fathers follow the analogy of the versions. With the exception of the Antioch epistle, *viós* 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. Th.*); 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 *viós* 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 *υἱός* 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 *υἱός*, 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 *ὁ*, omitted by the four uncials, one passage of Origen probably (*c. Cels.* ii 71), and two of Cyril (*ad l.* and *Theo.* 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*. *Μονογενής 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. *Μονογενής υἱός* (the reading of Hippolytus and of Eusebius once, *in Ps.*), and still more *ὁ μονογενής υἱός*, is a familiar and obvious phrase, suggested by the familiar sense of *μονογενής* in all literature, by the contrast to *τοῦ πατρός* in the same verse (and *παρὰ πατρός* in 14), by two other early passages of this Gospel (iii 16, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, and iii 18, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονο-

γενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ), and by a passage of St John's first Epistle (iv 9, ὅτι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ 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, *θεός* 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 *θεός* (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 τινα ὑποτίθεται τὸ πρῶτον γεννηθὲν [sic] ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃ δὴ καὶ Τύϊόν, καὶ Μονογενῆ θεόν κέκληκεν, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα ὁ Πατὴρ προέβαλε σπερματικῶς) and leaving it, justifying i 1 by the general remark τὸ γὰρ ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθὲν θεός ἐστιν, but not otherwise referring again to any *θεός* 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 *μονογενῆς θεός*. 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 *θεός per se*, or to *θεός* as coupled with *μονογενῆς*, or (with a different purpose) to *μονογενῆς* as coupled with *θεός*, whether in this verse or in the derivative detached phrase mentioned hereafter. The whole verse, with either

¹ Also Cæsarius, if the printed *υἱός* 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 *μονογενῆς θεός* 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 υἱός* 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 \overline{YC} to $\overline{\Theta C}$, 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 υἱός*. 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 \overline{YC} might pass into $\overline{\Theta C}$, 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 *υἱός*, 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 *υἱός* 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 υἱός* and *ὁ μονογενής* 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 *υἱός*, and **Ⲛ** 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 υἱός*, 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 υἱός*; 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 υἱός*

should have been altered to *μονογενῆς θεός*. Nor is the case improved by supposing accidental errors arising out of similarity of letters, CO becoming CΘCO, and O being lost after C. 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 *μονογενῆς* without *ὁ* to be the true reading would only change one difficulty for another: *μονογενῆς* without either article or substantive, followed by *ὁ ὦν*, and caught up by *ἐκεῖνος*, 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 *μονογενῆς 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 *οὗτος* 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 σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, and adds the visible sojourning 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 *μονογενής* 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 ἀληθείας*, 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 *μονογενής*, 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 μονογενής υἱός*; but incongruously, and at best only

a part. Here as in v. 14 special force lies in *μονογενής* in contrast to the *share* possessed by one among many brethren; and for this purpose *υἱός* 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 μονογενής υἱός*, as a term already known, which ill suits the careful progress of St John: the leap from *ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός* would be too sudden; the absence of any indication identifying *ὁ υἱός* 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 *οὐδεὶς* in emphatic violation of the simple order which St John habitually uses: and further *θεόν* has no article, and so comes virtually 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 *μονογενής θεός* in the second. The parallelism brings out the emphasis which the necessary nominative case might otherwise disguise, and a predicative force is again won by the absence of the article. St John is not appealing to a recognised 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 beholding of God was for them impossible. It needed but a single step to give the attribute *μονογενής* to Him whose glory had been already called a glory *as* of a *μονογενής* 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

¹ Cf. Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 101 p. 87 A, *θεότης γὰρ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἀόρατος*.

declared to be *θεός*. 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 *μονογενής*) 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 ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς*¹. It begins with the article, for now that One has been called *μονογενής 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 *μονογενής* as well as *θεός*, it has become right to speak definitely of *τοῦ πατρὸς*. The connecting phrase *ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον* is a repetition of *ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς 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 *μονογενής* 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 *μονογενής*; 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 *μονογενής θεός* the end

¹ Cf. Cyr. Al. ad l. p. 107 B, ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἔφη Μονογενῆ καὶ Θεόν, τίθησιν εὐθύς Ὁ ὢν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ

πατρὸς, ἵνα νοῆται καὶ υἱὸς ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ φυσικῶς κ.τ.λ.

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 *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 *μονογενής θεός* seems to belong essentially to a single definite step in the Prologue. No writer except St John applies *μονογενής* 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 *υἱός* should be introduced; and moreover there were obvious objections to the employment by St John of the definite title *ὁ μονογενής 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 ὦν εἰς 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 λόγος 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 *μονογενής* is fixed by its association with *υἱός* 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

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 *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 *μονογενής θεός* seems to belong essentially to a single definite step in the Prologue. No writer except St John applies *μονογενής* 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 *υἱός* should be introduced; and moreover there were obvious objections to the employment by St John of the definite title *ὁ μονογενής 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 ὢν εἰς 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 λόγος 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 *μονογενής* is fixed by its association with *υἱός* 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 *μονογενῆς οὐρανός* of Plato (*Tim.* 31 B) as made by the 'Father' of all (28 c), and the *μονογενῆς κόσμος* of writers who follow him. Instances are not entirely wanting in which *μονογενῆς* 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 *catenæ*): but Basil's simple rendering (*adv. Eun.* ii 20 p. 256 A) *ὁ μόνος γεννηθείς*, 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 τοι μονογενῆς οὐκ ὄντων ἄλλων ἀδελφῶν μονογενῆς ἐστίν*;) 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 γεννηθείς* 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...διὰ τὸ μόνον τοῦτον*

εἶναι καρπὸν πατρικόν: again *ὡς μόνος φυσικῶς γεννηθείς*: again *ὡς μόνος φυσικῶς γεννηθείς*: again *εἰ δὲ μηδεὶς πώποτε μονογενὲς τὸ μόνον ἔργον κέκληκε, πῶς ὁ υἱὸς ὡς γενόμενος ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς γεννηθείς 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 μονογενῆς υἱός when they quote the Gospel¹. 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 *μονογενῆς θεός* 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 (*ὄν οὐκ ἄλλον πεπεῖσμεθα ἢ τὸν μονογενῆ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ θεόν*, p. 292), and ought, I suspect, to be restored to another (*τοῦτον δὲ τὸν υἱόν, γεννητὸν μονογενῆ † υἱόν †, εἰκόνα τοῦ ἀοράτου θεοῦ τυγχάνοντα, ... πρὸ αἰώνων ὄντα οὐ προγνώσει ἀλλ' οὐσία καὶ ὑποστάσει, θεὸν θεοῦ υἱόν*, p. 290), where the second *υἱόν* 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 τούτου λόγος ὢν καὶ οὐ σύνθετος, ἀλλ' εἰς καὶ μονογενῆς θεός, ὁ καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς οἷα πηγῆς ἀγαθῆς ἀγαθὸς προελθὼν*; *c. Apoll.* ii 5 p. 944 A, *οὐχὶ ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὄντος, ὡς ὑμεῖς συκοφαντοῦντες λέγετε, διασύροντες τὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν μυστήριον, ἀλλὰ θεοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς*

¹ The few Greek writers coming under this description, all of whose quotations with *υἱός* are either solitary

or otherwise doubtful, cannot properly be taken into account.

[i.e. One who is God, even ὁ μονογενὴς θεός] εὐδοκήσαντος τῷ πληρώματι τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ τὴν τοῦ ἀρχετύπου πλάσιν ἀνθρώπου καὶ ποιήσιν καινὴν ἐκ μήτρας παρθένου ἀναστήσασθαι ἐαυτῷ φυσικῇ γεννήσει καὶ ἀλύτῳ ἐνώσει); Arius (ap. Ath. *de Syn.* 15 p. 728 E, λοιπὸν ὁ υἱὸς...μονογενὴς θεός ἐστι; Epiph. *Haer.* 732 A, ὁ υἱὸς...θελήματι καὶ βουλήν ὑπέστη πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων πλήρης θεὸς μονογενὴς ἀναλλοίωτος¹); Alexander the bishop of Alexandria with whom Arius came into conflict (l. c. p. 734 Noess. ἡ τοῦ μονογενοῦς θεοῦ ἀνεκδιήγητος ὑπόστασις); Marcellus (ap. Eus. *c. Marc.* i 4 p. 19 C²); 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. cc. 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, θεῷ θεοῦ μονογενεῖ); Eunomius (*Apolog.* 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. υἱὸς καὶ θεός, i 15 p. 228; 26 p. 237 B); the Apostolic Constitutions (iii 17; v 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 αἰώνων the Son attained that full height, subject to no change, which is expressed by μονογενὴς θεός.

² Marcellus seems to be quoting a Creed, but in such a manner as to make its language his own. Γέγραφε γάρ, says Eusebius (*c. Marc.* 19 C) πιστεύειν εἰς πατέρα θεὸν παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ θεόν, καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦ-

μα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ φησιν ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν μεμαθηκέναι τοῦτον τὸν τῆς θεοσεβείας τρόπον. Quite different in form is the Creed presented by him to Julius of Rome (Epiph. *Haer.* 836), the suspiciously Western character of which is well known. In the epistle to Julius (835 D) he uses the phrase εἰς θεὸς καὶ ὁ τούτου μονογενὴς υἱὸς λόγος, where the added λόγος probably implies θεός, itself excluded by τούτου.

Eunomius alone); Didymus (*de Trin.* i 25 p. 68 Ming.; i 26 p. 72; with *καὶ υἱός*, i 18 p. 53; 26 p. 76; with *υἱὸς 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 B¹); Isaac 'ex Judæo' (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*²; *c. Nest.* iv 1047 Schulze); Theodotus of Ancyra, once with *λόγος*, once without³ (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 phrases⁴, perhaps following the *Henoticon* 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 μονογενῆς υἱὸς καὶ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θεός (*De fid. orth.* i 2 p. 792 c Migne; iii 1 p. 984 A); ὁ μ. υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θεός (iii 12 p. 1029 B); ὁ μ. υἱὸς καὶ θεός (i 2 p. 793 B). In the third passage *θεός* might be independent of *μονογενῆς*; 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 *μονογενῆς θεός* 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 *μονογενῆς θεός* 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 ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ θεόν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, ὅλον ἐξ ὅλου 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, (Hieron. *Opp.* xi 202 Vall.), has long attributed to Jerome or Augustine, the Confession of Pelagius *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 Χριστόν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων θεὸν τέλειον ἐκ θεοῦ τελείου, καὶ ὄντα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐν ὑποστάσει 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, φῶς, ζῶν, ἀλήθειαν, σοφίαν, δύναμιν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ.* (ap. Ath. *de Syn.* 29 p. 746 C; Eriph. *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 ἓνα μονογενῆ θεὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, 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 θεός* 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 ἢ διαιρούμενον,*

ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτόν, υἷόν καὶ μονογενῆ θεὸν λόγον, κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν ("sed unum eundemque Filium et unigenitum Deum Verbum Dominum Jesum Christum," in Mansi's primary old version), καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσε, καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον. It is true that Evagrius (*H. E.* ii 4), Agathō (in Mansi *Conc.* xi 256), and the third Council of Constantinople in 680 omit καὶ so as to bring υἷόν 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 υἷόν from μονογενῆ a few lines above, in the sentence πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτόν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτόν Χριστόν, υἷόν, κύριον, μονογενῆ¹.

At this point a possible suspicion requires notice, whether *μονογενῆς θεός* 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 μονογενῆς υἱός to *μονογενῆς θεός*; 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 θεός* 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 Nicæa 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 Ὁμο-

λογοῦμεν δὲ τὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ θεοῦ υἷόν καὶ θεόν, τὸν κ.τ.λ. (*Evagr. II. E.* iii 14).

conjectures of this kind will not avail unless we are prepared to go so far as to say that *μονογενῆς 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 *μονογενῆς θεός*. There is no trace of the words in the rule of faith expounded in Origen's early work *De Principiis* (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 *μονογενῆς θεός* is clearly absent from the Alexandrian Creed as recited by Alexander, notwithstanding his own use of the term; for the evidently ancient words run *καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν 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 *μονογενῆς 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 *μονογενῆς 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 Euzoios to Constantine, in Socr. *H. E.* i 26; Sozom. *H. E.* ii 27, without even *μονογενῆς*; and the Confession in Eunomius's *Apologeticus*, c. 5, *καὶ εἰς ἓνα μονογενῆ υἱὸν 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 *υἱός* in St John. It is uttered but sparingly and guardedly by Athanasius, once in youth and once in old age, probably for a similar reason¹; 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 *ἴδιον τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας γέννημα*. Once more we find *μονογενῆς θεός* 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 *μονογενῆς 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 *μονογενῆς 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] *μονογενῆς 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*, *υἱός*, 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 respectively¹. 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 things², supposes a certain Ἀρχή, the first thing gendered by God (τὸ πρῶτον γεννηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ), which he has also³ called (κέκληκεν) Son and μονογενῆς θεός, in

¹ The recent criticisms of Heinrici (*Die Valentinianische Gnosis 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 Ptolemaeus 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 things¹." 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 Ἀρχή 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 Tetrad, Pater and Charis, Monogenes and Aletheia; and there he stops, the second Tetrad 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 μονογενῆς 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 etiam nunc* (or *etiamnum*) is a natural rendering of δ 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 δ δὴ καὶ υἱὸν καὶ μονογενῆ θεὸν κέκληκεν; the common text inverting καὶ and μονογενῆ. 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* (Dñi) has been substituted for *Deum* (Dm̄), as read by others, including the Clermont and Arundel MSS., the two best, and representatives of different families.

θεός (ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς ἀντικρυσ θεὸν αὐτὸν δηλοῖ), saying ἡ μονογενῆς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος 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 (θεὸς 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' ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός, ὅτι δι' υἱοῦ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγνώσθη), we have at once in the combined designations a sufficient explanation of the appearance of υἱός in a succeeding allusion to i 18 (καὶ ὁ μὲν μείνας μονογενῆς υἱὸς εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν ἐνθύμησιν διὰ τῆς γνώσεως ἐξηγεῖται τοῖς αἰῶσιν, ὡς ἂν ὑπὸ τοῦ κόλπου αὐτοῦ προβληθείς), without supposing υἱός 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 Irenæus would bring the evidence as to St John's reading far back, perhaps to the second quarter of the second century; for Ptolemæus is named by Hippolytus (l. c.) as belonging to the

¹ So the writer in Irenæus (p. 41). Ἐν γὰρ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ ἀρχή, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὁ λόγος. Καλῶς οὖν εἶπεν Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, ἦν γὰρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ καὶ Ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἀρχή καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος ἀκολουθῶς, τὸ γὰρ ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθὲν θεός ἐστιν. οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἔδειξε τὴν τῆς προβολῆς τάξιν.

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 (=Arche=Noûs), 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 Propheticae* in Clement's youth, about 170—180. His argument is not convincing.

other or 'Italian' School, and thus 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 to take Clement's author as probably belonging to the same period as Ptolemæus.

Irenæus himself thrice quotes i 18, "Deus qui fecit terram... hic et benedictionem escae...per Filium suum donat humano generi, incomprehensibilis per comprehensibilem et invisibilis per visibilem, cum extra eum non sit sed in sinu Patris existat. *Deum enim, inquit, nemo vidit unquam nisi unigenitus Filius Dei qui est in sinu Patris, ipse enarravit.* Patrem enim invisibilem 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,... quemadmodum in evangelio scriptum est, *Deum nemo vidit unquam nisi unigenitus Filius qui est in sinu Patris, ipse enarravit.* 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*¹) 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 Massuet'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*¹. 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 *μονογενής*. Irenæus therefore read *μονογενής 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 Heresies², has the following sentence: 'Ὁρῶν δὲ τὸν θεὸν οὐδ' εἰς εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ παῖς καὶ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος καὶ μόνος διηγησάμενος τὴν βουλήν τοῦ πατρὸς· λέγει γὰρ καὶ Ἰωάννης Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἐώρακεν πώποτε, μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν 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 *υἱός*, but without the preliminary article. The *Syntagma* must have been written in the last decade of the second century³: the later Hippolytean remains are barren of evidence.

Clement himself quotes the whole verse once only (*Strom.* v p. 695), and then reads *ὁ μονογενὴς 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.

² See especially Lipsius *Zur Quellenkritik d. Epiphanius*, 37 ff.; *Die Quellen d. ält. Ketzergesch.* 128 ff.

³ So Lipsius, *Q. Ep.* 33—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 Volkmar, 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*.

ἐξηγήσατο¹ in a sentence in his tract *De divite salvando* (p. 956), θεῶ τὰ τῆς ἀγάπης μυστήρια, καὶ τότε ἐποπτεύσεις τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ὃν ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς θεὸς ὁ μόνος ἐξηγήσατο· ἔστι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη καὶ δι' ἀγάπην ἡμῖν ἀνεκράθη· καὶ τὸ μὲν ἄρρητον αὐτοῦ πατὴρ κ.τ.λ. Here υἱὸς and θεὸς stand side by side, and it may be that the two readings are combined: but it is more likely that υἱὸς 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 θεὸς λόγος founded on John i 1: ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἐν ταυτότητι λόγον θεὸν ἐν θεῷ φαμέν, ὃς καὶ εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι λέγεται, ἀδιάστατος, ἀμέριστος, εἷς θεός· πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο κατὰ τὴν προσεχῆ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ ἐν ταυτότητι λόγου...οὗτος τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξηγήσατο, ὁ σωτήρ. And the process is carried a step further in an allusion which drops θεός but retains λόγος (*Paed.* i p. 102): πῶς γὰρ οὐ φιλεῖται δι' ὃν ὁ μονογενὴς ἐκ κόλπων πατρὸς καταπέμπεται λόγος τῆς πίστεως; It will be observed that there is no trace of υἱὸς except in the passage from the tract *De divite*, where the subject, ἀγάπη, 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 Heraclion who had attributed v. 18 (though strangely not 16, 17) to the Evangelist. He thus sets up a former witness of John, as ἀρξαμένης ἀπὸ τοῦ Οὗτος ἦν ὃν εἶπον 'Ο ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, καὶ ληγούσης εἰς τό 'Ο μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ

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

θεοῦ (or υἱὸς θεός) ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο (iv 102). The variation of reading is here significant. The Benedictine text adopts υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ from the Bodleian MS.¹, while Huet reads υἱὸς θεός² 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 υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ is quite like a scribe's correction of υἱὸς θεός; while this phrase is too peculiar to have been substituted for υἱὸς 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 τὸν μονογενῆ 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 Ὁ μονογενὴς θεός ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος 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: Ἐδίδαξε δὲ ἡμᾶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ὅστις ἦν ὁ πέμψας ἐν τῷ Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τῷ Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς γε ὢν θεός ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο· ἐκεῖνος θεολογῶν ἀπήγγειλε τὰ περὶ θεοῦ τοῖς γνησίοις 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 υἱὸς θεός likewise by *Filius Dei*; since in the two other quotations, where there is no υἱός to help him,

he gets rid of θεός 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 *θεός* following on the initial *θεόν*¹. 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 λόγου μετοχῇ θεότητος διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ὀνόματι* (*Cels.* iii 37 p. 471 Ru.). *Πῶς δεῖ ἀκούειν περὶ μονογενοῦς θεοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ πρωτοτόκου πάσης κτίσεως* (*Cels.* vii 43 p. 725). *Τὸ πρωτότυπον πάντων ἀγαλμάτων, τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, τὸν μονογενῆ θεόν* (*Cels.* viii 17 p. 755). *Ἕμνους γὰρ εἰς μόνον τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι λέγομεν θεὸν καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ λόγον καὶ θεόν· καὶ ὑμνοῦμέν² γε θεὸν καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ ὡς καὶ ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἄστρα καὶ πᾶσα ἡ οὐρανία στρατία· ὑμνοῦσι γὰρ πάντες οὗτοι, θεῖος ὄντες χορός, μετὰ τᾶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις δικαίων τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ*

¹ Ὁ...γέ ὤν singles out *μ.* or *μ. θ.*

² Origen can hardly be introducing here the language of an actual hymn, as the context shews. Celsus has been rebuking the Christians for their scruples against consenting to join in a pæan to a heavenly body or a goddess, *ἐὰν δὲ κελεύῃ τις εὐφημηῆσαι τὸν ἥλιον ἢ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν, προθυμότατα μετὰ καλοῦ παιᾶνος εὐφημεῖν· οὕτω τοι σέβειν μᾶλλον δόξεις τὸν μέγαν θεὸν ἐὰν καὶ τοῦσδε ὑμνῆς*. The reply is *Οὐ περιμένομεν εὐφημηῆσαι τὸν ἥλιον τὸν κελεύοντα, οἱ μαθόντες οὐ μόνον τοὺς τῇ διατάξει ὑποταταγμένους εὐφημεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς*

ἐχθροὺς· εὐφημοῦμεν οὖν ἥλιον ὡς καλὸν θεοῦ δημιουργημα, καὶ τοὺς νόμους φύλασσον θεοῦ, καὶ ἀκουον τοῦ Αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον, ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη (Ps. cxlviii 3), *καὶ ὅση δύναμις ὑμνοῦν τὸν τε* (so read for *ὑμνεῖτε τὸν* and *ὑμνοῦντα τὸν* of the MSS.) *πατέρα καὶ τὸν δημιουργον τοῦ παντός· Ἀθηνᾶν μέντοι μετὰ ἡλίου τασσομένην κ.τ.λ....πολλῶ μᾶλλον οὐ χρὴ ὑμνῆσαι καὶ ὡς θεὸν δοξάσαι τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν, εἴγε οὐδὲ τὸν τηλικούτον ἥλιον προσκυνεῖν ἡμῖν θέμις, κἄν εὐφημῶμεν αὐτόν*. Then follows the passage in the text, as an answer to Celsus's second sentence.

αὐτοῦ (*Cels.* viii 67 p. 792): for λόγον καὶ θεόν 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 Deus¹ 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 *υἱός* in any form of Origen’s writings is in Rufinus’s version of the commentary on Canticles: “Possumus...etiam hoc addere quod *promurale* (Cant. ii 14) sinus sit Patris, in quo positus unigenitus Filius enarrat omnia et enuntiat ecclesiae suae quaecunque in secretis et in absconditis Patris sinibus continentur: unde et quidam ab eo edoctus dicebat *Deum nemo vidit unquam: Unigenitus Dei Filius qui est in sinu 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 *θεός*.

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 *v*), 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 μονογενῆς υἱός θεός* is also possible; in any case their own reference to i 18 contains not *Filius* but *Verbum*, which implies *θεός*.

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 *υἰός* 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 *μονογενῆς 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 *ὁ μονογενῆς υἱὸς* 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 Cæsarea we have the last virtually Antenicene writer, that is, whose training belongs to the days before

¹ It is unnecessary here to attempt the proceedings against Paul being greater definiteness, the chronology of 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 μονογενῆς υἱός*; 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 τοῦ τε εὐαγγελιστοῦ διαρρήδην αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ εἶναι διδάσκοντος, δι' ὧν ἔφη Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἐώρακε πώποτε· ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός, ἢ μονογενῆς θεός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο (p. 67 D). No one can doubt that Eusebius here adopts the reading *υἱός*: but it is wholly arbitrary to reject the clause *ἢ μονογενῆς θεός* as a gloss of scribes¹. 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 *θεός* 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 it². 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 *υἱός*, and again at p. 142 C, with a neutral context; and *υἱός* 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 ἐπέκεινα τῶν ὄλων θεός καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ... μόνος 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 Ru.), Hoeschel's text has πιστὸς ὁ λόγος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ θεός ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι. 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 Ο Θ̄C ΗΛΘΕΝ for ΕΙΧΑΘΕΝ.

² Marcellus (see pp. 20, 22) used the phrase τὸν μονογενῆ θεόν (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 φάντι (Eph. iv 6) is continued by καὶ μόνος μὲν αὐτὸς εἰς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ χρημάτιζοι ἄν, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς μονογενῆς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ δὲ παράκλητον πνεῦμα οὔτε θεὸς οὔτε υἱός (p. 174 f.). It is vain to urge that *χρημάτιζοι ἄν* 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 above¹. Corruption of text is also unlikely, as *υἱός* could hardly stand here in both subject and predicate, to say nothing of intrinsic improbability². Doubtless therefore Eusebius did on this occasion for a special purpose avail himself of the reading³ 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 *υἱός* 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 (ΕΙΘΘ for ΟΘΘ); or Eusebius may have written *εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ* [1 Cor. viii 6, quoted p. 93] *καὶ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.*, the intervening words ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ὁ θεός being lost by *homoteleuton*.

² The concluding words *οὔτε θεὸς οὔτε υἱός* are probably all in antithesis to the second clause ὁ δὲ υἱὸς...πατὴρ; and, if so, they imply *θεός*, whether they refer to the alternative readings (as at p. 67 D), or simply take up *υἱός* from the beginning of the clause. But it is not impossible to take *οὔτε θεός* as in antithesis to the first clause *καὶ μόνος...χρημάτιζοι ἄν*.

³ Passages like the following shew

that it could not have been a stumbling-block to his own mind on the score of doctrine, though ὁ *μονογενῆς υἱός* had a sharper edge against Marcellus: indeed the first (on which more hereafter) substantially contains it. *Καὶ τῷ πατρὶ ὡς υἱὸν διὰ παντὸς συνόντα, καὶ οὐκ ἀγεννητον ὄντα γεννώμενον δ' ἐξ ἀγεννήτου πατρὸς, μονογενῆ ὄντα λόγον τε καὶ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ* (*Dem. Ev.* iv 3 p. 149 A). *Διὸ δὴ εἰς θεὸς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ κηρύσσεται, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἕτερος πλὴν αὐτοῦ· εἰς δὲ καὶ μονογενῆς τοῦ θεοῦ υἱός, εἰκὼν τῆς πατρικῆς θεότητος, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θεός* (*Eccl. Th.* p. 62 A). *Τὸ γὰρ πρόσωπον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου καὶ ἡ θεότης τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ θνητῇ φύσει οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο καταληπτῇ* (*Com. in Es.* 375 D).

lxxiv (lxxiii) 11¹ without the article, and on Isaiah vi 1² with the article.

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

² In Montfaucon, *ib.* ii 374. The

comment of Procopius, p. 91, founded here chiefly on Eusebius but perhaps also on Origen, has ὁ μονογενῆς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος ὁ ὢν 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 *uíos* 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 contrectavimus] 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 (? Unicus¹) sinum Patris disseruit, non sinum suum Pater, praecedit 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* 11, 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 *εἷς* (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 apparet 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 ostenditur, 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.²) or *sinum Patris ipse disseruit* (Tert.², 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 enarravit¹.” These primitive forms of the Old Latin rendering were smoothed away by degrees. The inserted *nisi*², probably derived from vi 46, vanishes only in the Vulgate and one or two other late revisions (f q). *Unicus*³ 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 *ὁ ὦν* in *N**, suggesting that *εἰς* was read as *εἰς*: and apparently with good reason, for *N** has readings hereabouts in common with what must have been the original of the Old Latin in an early form, and *solus* stands for *εἰς* in many authorities in Mark ii 7, and several in x 18, both passages having a similar turn. The correction was probably suggested by *ἐξηγήσατο*, for transitive verbs used absolutely are always a distress to scribes and trans-

lators. 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.* viii 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 constantly¹ 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, ipse² 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 *Ipsa* similarly represents *ἐκεῖνος* 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.

NOTE C

Some details of Æthiopic evidence

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. 525) agrees *prima manu* with the Polyglott. The accusative particle is here prefixed to *μονογενής θεός*, doubtless owing to a misinterpretation natural in a language incapable of expressing *μονογενής* otherwise than by a word like *unicus* (*wahed*), since it was not to be supposed that "the only God" denoted the Son. To *μονογενής θεός* (or *-νή -όν*) six other MSS. add *νίός* followed by *wahed*, which in this second place probably stands for *μόνος* or *εἷς*; two of them (including the other 15th century copy, B.M. Or. 507) having *μονογενής θεός*, the other four the accusative form. This interpolation supplied another possible construction for the accusative *unicum Deum*: it could be taken either simply in apposition to the previous *θεόν* (*Deum nemo vidit unquam, unicum Deum*: [*Filius unicus*] *qui* &c.), or as the object of *ἐξηγήσατο* (*unicum Deum* [*Filius unicus*] *qui est in sinu...enarravit*), or as the object of an intermediate clause (*unicum 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 *μονογενής*, retaining *θεὸς υἱὸς wahed*. The remaining thirteen likewise omit *θεός*. 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 *μονογενής θεός*, the Memphitic reading. With this was next combined the alternative reading *υἱός*, 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 version¹. The first *wahed* would then be dropped as a needless superfluity in MSS. which escaped the accusative prefix: and lastly the further omission of *θεός* 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 *μονογενής θεός* (B.M. Or. 521).

¹ It is possible, but much less likely, that the Æthiopic had originally the double reading, and that *υἱὸς 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.^½ (*Prax.* 21) Fr.Arian.(Mai, *S.V.N.C.* iii 2 228) Hil.^½(*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 *unigēniti (a patre)* b c f vulg. Tert.^½(*Prax.*16) Novat. (*Reg. Fid.* 13) Hil.^½(*Trin.* i 10 text) Amb.¹(i 1204 F) Iren. lat.²(42, 315) Aug.(*ad l. &c.*) Hieron.¹(Eph. v 33) &c.

John i 18 ὁ μονογενής υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον 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.* 138 § 35 &c.) Victorin. Iren.lat. Amb. Aug. &c.

John iii 16 τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν.

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

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

John iii 18 τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.

- 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 μονογενῆ 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 υ. μ.) τῇ μητρὶ 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 υἱόν μου, ὅτι μονογενῆς μοί ἐστιν (or ἐ. μοι).
- A *unicus (mihi est)* all (waiving order).
- Heb. xi 17 τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερον 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 יְהוָה , 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 Λαβέ μοι, φησί, τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν, τὸν μονογενῆ, where *μονογενῆ*, if only a gloss on *ἀγαπητόν*, must at least

have been found by Gregory in his MS., for he remarks in his comment πῶς ἀνεγείρει τὸ φίλτρον καὶ υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν καὶ μονογενῆ καλῶν, ὡς ἂν διὰ τῶν τοιούτων ὀνομάτων 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 (xxxiv) 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 unicolorum*, Tobias and Sarah); and even Sap. vii 22.

Thus throughout the Bible *unicus* is the earliest Old Latin representative of μονογενής; and *unigenitus* the Vulgate rendering of יְהוּנָן, 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 υἱός was the reading of the MS. or MSS. from which the Old Latin version was originally made; for *unicus Deus*¹ could never

renders it not unlikely that Irenæus is following a similar double reading when he speaks of Abraham (233) as τὸν ἴδιον μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγαπητὸν παραχωρήσας θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ, ἵνα καὶ ὁ θεὸς εὐδοκήσῃ...τὸν ἴδιον μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγαπητὸν υἱὸν θυσίαν παρασχέῃν κ.τ.λ. In Jud. xi 34 the Alex. and other MSS add to μονογενής without a conjunction αὐτῷ ἀγαπητή, and others αὐτῷ ἀγαπητή, περίψυκτος 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 *μονογενής* 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 *unicus*¹, (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 Poitiers 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

blunder, arising from the separation of *unicum* from *Filium* by the genitive *ejus* and the immediate proximity of *Dominum*, together with the latitude of sense in *unicus*. In some Spanish Creeds the insertion of *Deum et* before *Dominum* (Swainson 164, 323) brings *unicum* and *Deum* into contact: but the resemblance to *μονογενῆ θεόν* can be only fortuitous.

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 Ulfilas (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-

¹ The closely related formulary of Germinius of Sirmium has however *unicus* (Hil. *Op. Hist.* XIII—XV: cf. Caspari 302).

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 *uni-*

genitus 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 Eliberis, 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 *μονογενής* 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 ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΕΟΣ in the Nicene Creed

The second part of the original Nicene Creed begins thus:—

καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ,
γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς
οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν
ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα,
ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί.

Then follows the recital of the Incarnation.

If now we withdraw the parenthetic clause τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, 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 θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, or should the eight words γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ θεὸν 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 formularies, one or more; and (2) that the three¹ clauses τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, and ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί 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 *ὁμοούσιος* 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 misunderstanding¹. "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 expressions². 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 (*εὖ 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 protestation³. 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 adhesion 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 *Διεπεμψάμεθα ὑμῖν πρῶτον μὲν τὴν ὑφ' ἡμῶν προταθείσαν περὶ τῆς πίστεως γραφήν, ἔπειτα τὴν δευτέραν, ἣν ταῖς ἡμετέραις φωναῖς προσθήκας ἐπιβαλόντες ἐκδεδώκασι.*

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 Nicæa; nor is it likely that the animosity of Eustathius (Socr. i 23) began after the Council.

forth by him (*ταύτης ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐκτεθείσης τῆς πίστεως*), there was no room for gainsaying. The emperor, followed apparently by others¹, 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 *ὁμοούσιος*”; which word he proceeded to interpret by rejecting various erroneous senses². Such, Eusebius says, was the wise discourse of the emperor; “but they, under pretext of the addition of *ὁμοούσιος*, have made the following writing³,” 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 *αὐτός τε πρῶτος ὁ... βασιλεύς*, 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 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 lan-

guage, *καὶ ταύτη τοὺς πάντας συγκαταθέσθαι ὑπογράφειν τε τοῖς δόγμασι καὶ συμφωνεῖν τούτοις αὐτοῖς παρεκελεύετο, ἐνδὸς μόνου προσεγγραφέντος ῥήματος τοῦ ὁμοουσίου*. Following *ὑπογράφειν*, and joined with *τούτοις αὐτοῖς*, *συμφωνεῖν* must as usual denote some express act of agreement or compact.

³ *Καὶ ὁ μὲν σοφώτατος ἡμῶν καὶ εὐσεβέστατος βασιλεὺς τοιαυτὴ ἐφιλοσόφει· οἱ δὲ προφάσει τῆς τοῦ ὁμοουσίου προσθήκης τῆνδε τὴν γραφὴν πεποιήκασιν*. Late usage would allow *πρόφασις* 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 *ὁμοούσιος*, 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 it¹. 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 Nicene². Its verbal coincidences with

¹ By a curious oversight Hahn (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: Οὗς ἐκτραπέισα ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας εὐαγγελικῷ κηρύγματι σεμνύεται, ἕνα μὲν τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν ἔχειν ἀρχοῦσα ἕνα δὲ καὶ υἱὸν μονογενῆ, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐπιγραφομένη (*De Eccl. Theol.* p. 62 c). Διὰ τοιούτων ἀπάντων ἀπο-

καθαίρουσα τὴν πλάνην ἡ ἐκκλησία τὸν ἕνα θεὸν κηρύττει, αὐτὸν εἶναι καὶ πατέρα καὶ παντοκράτορα διδάσκουσα, ... οὕτω καὶ υἱὸν θεοῦ μονογενῆ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν παραδίδωσι, τὸν πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατέρος γεγεννημένον, οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν ὄντα τῷ πατρὶ, καθ' ἑαυτὸν δὲ ὄντα καὶ ζῶντα, καὶ ἀληθῶς υἱὸν συνόντα, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτός, καὶ ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς (p. 66 A, B). Διὸ πιστεύειν παρέληφεν [ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ] εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸν (p. 108 B). 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 accidental¹.

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 Jerusalem², 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.

ἀλλ' ὡς μονογενῆς υἱὸς ὁ μόνος πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένος: 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 shew its coincidences with the Cæsarean base by diversity of type. The concordances and differences are exhibited in another way by Dr Swain-

son, 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 Palestinian Creeds¹, 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 materials².

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,

καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον,
θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, υἷον μονογενῆ,
πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ
τοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένον.

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 τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; Antioch (at least Cassianus and Eusebius of Dorylæum have δι' ἡμᾶς) insertion of δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους; Ap. Const. and Antioch (Lucianus and Eus. Doryl.) insertion of κατελθόντα; Jerusalem ἐνανθρωπήσαντα for ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον; Ap. Const., Jerusalem, and Antioch (Lucianus and Cassianus) εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς for πρὸς τὸν πατέρα; Jerusalem ἐρχόμενον for ἤξοντα πάλιν (ἐν δόξῃ being likewise omitted by Cassianus); and Ap. Const. and Antioch (Lucianus) τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα (at least these Creeds have τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) for ἐν ἅγιον πνεῦμα. In the above enumeration 'Eusebius of Dorylæum' means the author of the *Διαμαρτυρία* against Nestorius, printed in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (Mansi *Conc.*

iv 1109): see Caspari, *Quellen* u.s.w. i 78, 80; and Dissertation II.

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 341 (ap. Ath. *De Syn.* 22 p. 735 E), εἰ δὲ δεῖ προσθεῖναι, πιστεύομεν καὶ περὶ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου. The Anathematism (doubtless suggested by a precedent in the closing exposition of Eusebius, as Mr Lumby 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 λόγον and ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, but the surviving language reappeared in a different arrangement, including a new phrase¹ θεὸν ἀληθινὸν 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 Sonship² 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 [θεῶν], is borrowed from the Jerusalem Creed, which has in like manner τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς θεὸν ἀληθινὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων³. 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, ὅτι τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ πατρὸς ἀληθινὸν ἐστὶ γέννημα); but so do similar forms not adopted at Nicæa, as ἀτρεπτος ἐξ ἀτρέπτου, γέννημα ἐκ τελείου τέλειον, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ μόνου μόνον. On the presence of θεὸν ἀληθινόν 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 Touttée, the editor of Cyril of Jerusalem, in an excellent dissertation on the Creed of Jerusalem (p. 80), conjectures θεὸν ἀληθινόν 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 shews; 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 θεὸν 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, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, τὸν γεννηθέντα πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, ὅλον ἐξ ὅλου, μόνον ἐκ μόνου, τέλειον ἐκ τελείου κ. τ. λ.

When once the evidently premature clause δι' 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 δι' 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 θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ into the single phrase μονογενῆ θεὸν 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.* cxx 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 θεὸν 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 omis-

sion 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. Θεὸν 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, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, retained from Cæsarea. The other, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν 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.

μονογενῆ θεόν of Antioch; and μονογενῆ may have been intended, when transposed, to stand alone after γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, with θεὸν 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 πατρὸς is a strong term containing θεόν, in the one case θεὸν ἀληθινόν, in the other, θεὸν 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 πατρὸς μονογενῆ is redundant and artificial¹, 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 generation². Thirdly, it is difficult to believe that a collocation so naturally suggesting the combination μονογενῆ 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 understood³. On the other hand the one tangible ground for supposing the

¹ The circumlocution would be all the more improbable because the obvious form τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ (or τοῦ θεοῦ) τὸν 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 θεόν) of Antioch. But in the case of μονογενῆ θεόν 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 *Filium* to *Dominum* by transcribers of Latin Creeds (see p. 50 n. 1) can afford no real analogy for the skilful Greek theologians of Nicæa.

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 *γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ*.

Apart from the unfamiliarity of *μονογενῆ θεόν*, the prevalent habit of treating *θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ* 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 *θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ* 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 *γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς* or some equivalent was apparently felt to be needed. Setting aside the Creed of Cæsarea, where *θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ* follows *τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον* with probably the same effect as to sense, and perhaps the Creed recited by Charisius of Philadelphia at Ephesus in 431, where *θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ* follows *τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ*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 A, *εἷς κύριος, μόνος ἐκ μόνου, θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ, χαρακτήρ καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς θεότητος, λόγος ἐνεργῆς κ.τ.λ.*), or the still more elaborate Exposition of Athanasius (p. 99 B), in which *θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ* is isolated among texts of Scripture². On the other hand the rule is observed by the Antiochian baptismal Creed in all its extant forms³; the 'Third' Formulary of the

¹ It is at least equally probable that here too *τὸν μονογενῆ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ* should be taken together; and then *μονογενῆ* would have the same effect as a participle.

² A similar Exposition of uncertain authorship (ad calc. Greg. Naz. i 906 &c.: cf. 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 Dorylæum, 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 Dorylæum, although the words in question precede his express quotation from the *μᾶθημα* of Antioch. He certainly began to interweave the diction of

Synod of Antioch, by Theophronius¹; the 'Fourth' of the same (ap. Ath. *De Syn.* 25 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 γεγεννημένον δὲ μονογενῆ, μόνον ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρός, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, ὅμοιον τῷ γεννήσαντι αὐτὸν πατρί, which was copied, with variations of perfect and aorist only, at the Synod of Nicé 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)²; and lastly by what is known as the 'Constantinopolitan' Creed³. Hence abundant analogy leads to the conclusion that θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, whether forming part of the direct predicate to γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός or not in the Nicene Creed, is at least dependent on it, so that on either construction ἐκ θεοῦ presupposes γεννηθέντα: and when thus much is established, there can be no intrinsic difficulty, μονογενῆ and the parenthesis apart, in the closer construction which makes θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ part of the main predicate.

The chief external evidence for joining to γεννηθέντα a

the Creed before he made formal appeal to it. The words are, ἀλλ' ἕνα τὸν πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων γεννηθέντα θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, κ.τ.λ.

¹ Cf. pp. 22 f. The words are, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων θεὸν τέλειον ἐκ θεοῦ τελείου, καὶ ὄντα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐν ὑποστάσει, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα κ.τ.λ. The position of πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων allows θεὸν 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, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, as this Creed does not contain the simple θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ. In all the other Creeds cited, that of Theophronius excepted (note 1), θεὸν 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 right¹. The whole sentence must be quoted here. *Τούτου δὲ τὸν υἱόν, γεννητὸν μονογενῆ υἱόν (read θεόν), εἰκόνα τοῦ ἀοράτου θεοῦ τυγχάνοντα, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, σοφίαν καὶ λόγον καὶ δύναμιν θεοῦ πρὸ αἰώνων ὄντα, οὐ προγενώσκει ἀλλ' οὐσία καὶ ὑποστάσει, θεὸν θεοῦ υἱόν, ἔν τε παλαιᾷ καὶ νέᾳ διαθήκῃ ἐγνωκότες ὁμολογοῦμεν καὶ κηρύσσομεν.* As soon as *θεόν* is substituted for the unmeaning second *υἱόν*, the two preceding words acquire a clear force, the verbal *γεννητὸν* 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 Antioch². The second required combination, that of *μονογενῆ* with *θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ*, had undoubtedly an actual existence. In the *Demonstratio Evangelica* (p. 149 A) Eusebius speaks of our Lord as *τῷ πατρὶ ὡς υἱὸν διὰ παντὸς συνόντα καὶ οὐκ ἀγέννητον ὄντα γεννώμενον δ' ἐξ ἀγεννήτου πατρὸς, μονογενῆ ὄντα λόγον τε καὶ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ.* The position of *τε* proves a reference to two distinct forms, the familiar *μονογενῆ λόγον*, not seldom used by Eusebius (as by Athanasius), and *μονογενῆ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ*: the only other grammatical construction, that which makes *μονογενῆ* and *λόγον* two distinct terms, would give *λόγον* an inappropriate position, imply an arbitrary distribution of the conjunctions; and enfeeble the

¹ See pp. 4, 19, 39. Even if *υἱόν* is right, which seems incredible, we should still have as the predicate of *γεννητὸν* 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 Nicé 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 θεὸν γεννηθέντα, τὸν ἐκ ζωῆς ζωῆν γεννηθέντα, τὸν ἐκ φωτὸς φῶς γεννηθέντα, τὸν ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα τῷ γεννήσαντι* (iv 7): *ὅμοιος γὰρ ἐν πᾶσιν ὁ υἱὸς τῷ γεγεννηκότι, ζωὴ ἐκ ζωῆς γεννηθείς, καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτός, δύναμις ἐκ δυνάμεως, θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ* (xi 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 μόνου γεννητὸν θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ*; and, slightly extended, in the *Panegyric on Constantine* (xii 7: cf. *Theophan.* i 24); *οὗτος μονογενῆς θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ γεγεννημένος λόγος*¹. It reappears in the Formulary of the Synod of Seleucia in Isauria (A.D. 359) *θεὸν λόγον, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ μονογενῆ, φῶς, ζωὴν κ.τ.λ.* (ap. Ath. *De Syn.* 29 p. 746 c; Eriph. *Haer.* 873 c). And in the next century it is employed by Cyril in his commentary on St John, *σημείον... τοῦ εἶναι βασιλέα καὶ δεσπότην τῶν ὄλων τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ πεφηνότα θεὸν μονογενῆ* (viii 35 p. 541 c), and again, *ἐπεὶπερ ὑπάρχων [ὁ υἱὸς] ἐκ θεοῦ θεὸς μονογενῆς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν* (x 15, p. 653 c); as also in his *Third* (Second Œcumenical) *Epistle to Nestorius* (p. 24 Pusey) *ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθεὶς υἱὸς καὶ θεὸς μονογενῆς*. It is immaterial whether these forms of speech were derived from the Nicene Creed or independent of it². 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 θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ* would sustain and illustrate the other.

Thus far the discussion has left out of account the Nicene parenthesis *τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς*. Were it absent, the evidence would all, as far as I can see, be clearly in favour of taking *μονογενῆ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ* as an unbroken predicate of *γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς*. 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 Nicæa, *τῆς ὠδίνος [the Paternity] τὸ γνήσιον... εὐ μάλα σημαίνοντες, θεὸν ἔφασαν ἐκ θεοῦ*

γεγεννησθαι τὸν υἱόν (p. 178): and again, *οὐ γὰρ τοι ἀπόχρη... φρονεῖν ὡς θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ γεγέννηται τοῦ πατρὸς, ...ἀλλ' ἦν ἀναγκαῖον εἶδέναι πρὸς τούτοις ὡς τῆς ἀπάντων ἕνεκα σωτηρίας κ.τ.λ.· διὰ τοῦτό φασι Τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους κ.τ.λ.* (p. 180). Both passages lose their force if *θεὸν 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 *μονογενῆ* as the one weighty 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*¹. Eusebius passes *μονογενῆ* over altogether, and Athanasius alludes to it with a slightness and indirectness which throw it completely into subordination².

¹ Καὶ δὴ ταύτης τῆς γραφῆς ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὑπαγορευθείσης, ὅπως εἴρηται αὐτοῖς τὸ Ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τὸ Τῷ πατρὶ ὁμοούσιον, οὐκ ἀνεξέταστον αὐτοῖς κατελιμπάνομεν· ἐπερωτήσεις τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἀποκρίσεις ἐντεῦθεν ἀνεκινούντο, ἐβασάνιζεν τε ὁ λόγος τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν εἰρημένων· καὶ δὴ τὸ Ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ὡμολογείτο πρὸς αὐτῶν δηλωτικὸν εἶναι τοῦ ἐκ μὲν τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι, οὐ μὴν ὡς μέρος ὑπάρχειν τοῦ πατρὸς· ταύτη δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν ἐδόκει καλῶς ἔχειν συγκατατίθεσθαι τῇ διανοίᾳ τῆς εὐσεβοῦς διδασκαλίας κ.τ.λ. Eus. *Ep. ad Caes.* 5. Οἱ περὶ Εὐσέβιον [of Nicomedia]...ἐβούλοντο τὸ Ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ κοινὸν εἶναι πρὸς ἡμᾶς [i. e. mankind]...ἀλλ' οἱ πατέρες θεωρήσαντες ἐκείνων τὴν πανουργίαν...ἠναγκάσθησαν λοιπὸν λευκότερον εἰπεῖν τὸ Ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ γράψαι ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν υἱόν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ τὸ Ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ κοινὸν καὶ ἴσον τοῦ τε υἱοῦ καὶ τῶν γενη-

τῶν νομίζεσθαι. Ath. *De Decr.* 19 p. 224 DE. And so in the parallel narrative *Ad Afr.* 5 p. 895 B, ἀλλ' οἱ ἐπίσκοποι θεωρήσαντες τὴν κ.τ.λ. λευκότερον εἰρήκασιν τὸ Ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἔγραψαν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν υἱόν.

² The possible allusions in the *Ep. de Decretis* to *μονογενῆ* (represented by *μόνος*) are in the two sentences ὁ δὲ λόγος, ἐπεὶ μὴ κτίσμα ἐστίν, εἴρηται καὶ ἔστι μόνος ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, τῆς δὲ τοιαύτης διανοίας γνώρισμα τὸ εἶναι τὸν υἱόν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, οὐδενὶ γὰρ τῶν γενητῶν ὑπάρχει τοῦτο, and διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἡ ἅγια σύνοδος λευκότερον εἴρηκεν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς, ἵνα καὶ ἄλλος παρὰ τὴν τῶν γενητῶν φύσιν ὁ λόγος εἶναι πιστευθῆ, μόνος ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (225 A—C). The *Ep. ad Afros* has likewise the word itself, but in an ambiguous context, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς μόνος ἴδιος τῆς τοῦ

But the more the stress is shifted back from *μονογενῆ* to *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς*, the less reason is there to regard the clause as so terminating in *μονογενῆ* as to make *θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ* a fresh clause in apposition. It would seem in fact that *μονογενῆ* was put to double duty, combined alike with *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς* and with *θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ*; just as we have already found reason provisionally to recognise *θεόν* as doing double duty, combined alike with *μονογενῆ* and with *ἐκ θεοῦ*. Thus there would be no real pause between the seven words *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ*. Yet the parenthesis had to be inserted somewhere. It could not be placed at the end, for *τοῦ πατρὸς* was too distant; nor before *ἐκ θεοῦ*, partly for the same reason, partly because *θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ* could not be severed. If placed before *μονογενῆ*, it would have been close to *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς*, but at the cost of depriving *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς* of any additional force or clearness which it could derive from association with *μονογενῆ*, including perhaps the reminiscence of John i 14 (*δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρὸς*). Placed as it actually was, the parenthesis, while chiefly limiting the sense of *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς*, limited also the sense of *μονογενῆ*, as against the Homœousians, and at the same time compelled *μονογενῆ* into a subsidiary limitation of *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς*, as against the Anomœans. No doubt in the process *μονογενῆς θεός* was disguised: but it was not possible to introduce the parenthesis without some sacrifice somewhere. Probably it was thought that *μονογενῆς θεός* 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 πατρὸς*

πατρὸς οὐσίας, τοῦτο γὰρ ἴδιον *μονογενοῦς 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 Jephthah's daughter and the son of the widow of Nain that a child is *not less ὁμοούσιος* with its parent because it is likewise *μονογενής*.

the utmost possible force¹. Thus *μονογενὴς θεός*, though retained like other traditional forms too little stringent for the present need², might have to suffer partial obscuration 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 degree³. Where all the clauses

¹ Innumerable passages of his writings shew 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, loyally as he defends *ὁμοούσιος* 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. of Ath.* 500, 210 d, 264 g), as also his use of the term *ὁμοίας οὐσίας* (210 e: cf. 136 g): cf. *Tracts 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 Decr.* 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 τῆ φύσει μονογενὴς ἐστίν*

ὁ λόγος, δύναμις, σοφία μόνη τοῦ πατρὸς κ.τ.λ. (895 A).

³ To this purpose must probably be referred the omission of *τόν* before the first *γεννηθέντα*, and the emphatic repetition of *γεννηθέντα*, first to set forth the contrast *οὐ ποιηθέντα*, and then to carry *ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ* without another participle. Then comes a fresh start on the relation of the Son to created things, *δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο*; and the added clause *τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ 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 ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν*. The resumptive force of the second *γεννηθέντα*, as connecting *οὐ ποιηθέντα* 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: —

Καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ·
γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ -
τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας -
θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ,
φῶς ἐκ φωτός,
θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ,
γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα,
ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί,
δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο,
τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς·
τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους κ.τ.λ.

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 Philadelphian Creed recited by Charisius, in borrowing the Nicene phraseology, omits the Nicene parenthesis, and thus removes the only hindrance in the way of reading τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ 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 *μονογενὴς θεός* 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 *μονογενῆς θεός*: 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 *μονογενῆς θεός* 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 *μονογενῆς θεός* 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.