
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.

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 μόνογενὴς ἀρχή, "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.

It is evident from this brief statement of the claims of the reading μονογενῆς Seós, 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. 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 Seós. 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 μονογενής 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 μονογενής Θεός, there are but four who quote or refer to the passage with this reading only; four quote it with both readings; nine quote it with the reading filius only, except that in one of the quotations of Titus of Bostra μονογενής Θεός occurs; two repeatedly allude to it, — sometimes using the phrase 'only-begotten God,' and sometimes 'only-begotten Son,' in connection with the words 'who is in the bosom of the Father,' — but do not distinctly quote it; and twenty-five do not quote or allude to it at all. Of the particular passages referred to by Wetstein, a great majority have no bearing whatever on the subject, but merely contain the expression μονογενής 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 \( \text{viōs} \) or \( \text{filius} \). Indeed, in some of these passages we do not find even this expression, but only the term \( \text{γεννητὸς} \) [al. \( \text{γεννητὸς} \)] \( \text{Σεός} \), or \( \text{genitus Deus} \), 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 \( \text{ματωργητὴς} \) \( \text{Σεός} \), but \( \text{four} \), I believe, can be relied on with much confidence, and even their testimony is far from unexceptionable; \( \text{three} \) may be regarded as doubtful; \( \text{eight} \) really support the common reading; \( \text{two} \) merely allude to the passage; and \( \text{eight} \) 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 \( \text{Σεός} \), I produced, as the result of original investigation, quotations of the passage, supporting the reading \( \text{viōs} \), from no less than \( \text{eighteen} \) Greek and \( \text{six} \) 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 \( \text{had} \) been cited, on one side or the other, in editions of the Greek Testament. In this exposition of the evidence I was scrupulously careful to mention not only

---

\(^1\) "As in the following: 'Origenes in Psalm. i. ap. Epiphanius,' see Epiphanius, Haeres. LXIV. c. 7, Opp. I. 531b, or Origen, Opp. II. 526a; 'Eusebius, D. IV. 2,' i. e. Dem. Evang. Lib. IV. c. 2; 'Prudentius in Apotheosi,' viz. line 895; 'Claudianus Mamert. de statu animae i. 2,' where Lib. I. c. 2 must be the place intended."

\(^2\) Norton's Statement of Reasons, etc. Appendix, Note C, pp. 451—453.
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every quotation of the passage which I had found with the reading Σεος, but every allusion to it which might be imagined to favor this reading, even in cases where it seemed clear that no real argument could be founded on these allusions.

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

"In this one instance I have given at length the evidence for and against the reading, so as to show what authorities do really support μονογενής Σεος and what uphold μονογενής νοος. 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 μονογενής Σεος 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 Σεος 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 Σεος. 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 Σεός, 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 μονογενής Σεός or unigenitus Deus applied to Christ by the writer, and has intermixed these references indiscriminately with those to actual quotations, thus leading the unwary reader

1 I had cited the Dialogue of Cyril, “Quod Unus sit Christus,” Opp. Tom. V. P. i. p. 766, for the reading Σεός. The reference should have been to p. 768 instead of p. 786. 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 μονογενής Σεός (an error which originated, I believe, in revising the proof-sheets the name which had been intended for Prudentius).” This statement has not mended the matter. Prudentius has not only never quoted John i. 18 with the reading unigenitus Deus, but has never used this expression even, in any part of his writings. As to Phoebadius, I not only pointed out the fact that the same remark was true of him, but that he had expressly quoted the passage with the reading unigenitus flius (Contra Arianos, c. 12). Of this Dr. Tregelles, in his account of the evidence, takes no notice. Why should he not be as ready to adduce the testimony of 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 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.


Line 5. “Marcel. ap. Eus. 19.” To be omitted for a similar reason. Eusebius simply says of a letter of Marcellus, containing his creed: Ἐγερθεὶς πατέρα Θεοῦ παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ Θεόν, τὸν κυ­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­&n
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 saepè" 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 Anagrace 2a [228] ap. Epiph. . . . . Haer. lxxii. 8 (i. 854c)." It is quite proper to adduce this among the authorities which favor the reading οὐδώ, but as it is not an express quotation of the passage, it would be more accurate to add the Greek: δ ἐστι [sc. Ἰσαὰκ] τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ μονογενὴς ἡμῶν . . . φησὶν. 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. 786a. For 786b read 786a.

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 Pol. 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 μονογενὴς γωνίων ἑνδυσμάτων, 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 saepe saepe habent verba μονογενὴς Θεός, unigenitus Deus, tanquam nomen Jesu in Scriptura tributum; e. g., Greg. Nys. saepe saepe, 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 Nysaeus; and his assertion, as I shall show, is very poor evidence that he ever found it there.

Authorities cited for the reading μονογενῆς υἱὸς.

Line 29. After "1." insert "69," a manuscript of great value, ranking with 1. and 33.
be pardoned for saying, that so far as the testimony of the Fathers is concerned, nothing whatever will be given at second hand. When it is affirmed that a particular Father has not quoted John i. 18, or has never used in his writings even the expression μονογενὴς ο花椒ς, 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 Ἰωάννου;¹ and, on the other side, the fact (already mentioned in Tischendorf's last edition of the Greek Testament), that


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

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

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

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

Ibid. For "Athanas.," which is out of place, read "Athanas. I. 219e (discote), 227a, 530d, 638a (dis.); cf. 628e, 631d, 634f, 655e, ed. Benedict." Athanasius quotes the passage four times, twice commenting on the word ὑπάρκει, and refers to it in three other places in such a way as to show, in each of them, that he unquestionably read ὑπάρκει.

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

¹ Not having been able to procure at that time the treatise of Didymus "De Trinitate," I was compelled to cite it at second hand from the work of Guericke, "De Schola quae Alexandriæ floruit catechetica," carefully stating, however, this fact in a note. Didymus was the only author thus cited.
the Aethiopic version, as edited by Mr. Platt, supports the reading \( \text{viōs} \). 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 \( \text{μονογενὴς Σεός} \) as compared with that for \( \text{μονογενὴς viōs} \). The testimony of the Greek manuscripts is first to be considered. It is here important to observe, that the words \( \text{viōs} \) and Σεός in the abbreviated form in which they are written in the most ancient codices (\( \text{?[} \), \( \text{?[} \)), differ in but a single letter, so that one might easily be substituted for the other through the inadvertence of a transcriber.
On the Readings of John i. 18.

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

The reading ύς, on the other hand, is found in α** A C*** E F G H K M S U V X Ά, also in 1. 69., and all the other cursive manuscripts containing the passage (so far as is known), amounting to four or five hundred in number, but many of them imperfectly collated. α** denotes the Codex Sinaiticus as corrected; A is the Alexandrine manuscript, of the fifth century; C*** denotes the Ephrem manuscript as corrected in the ninth century; X and Ά 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 ἐς is remarkable; but some circumstances may lessen its apparent weight. The testimony of α, which has the reading a prima manu, cannot be properly estimated till we know something respecting the date of the correction, which possesses an authority, of course, equal to that of a manuscript at the time it was made.
alterations which 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 διοπσωτης, or a very early corrector, altered the reading of from Seos to vios, 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 δ ὄν before eis τὸν κύλτων. Another circumstance may be regarded as weakening in some measure the authority of B C· L in this passage. They all agree in reading μονογενης Seos instead of δ μονογενης vios. 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 Seos, while Mr. Scrivener would lay greater stress than either on the testimony of the later uncials and cursive. 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. n 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 ἦν:—1. the Peshito Syriac, which has been assigned to the second century, but the text of which is regarded by Dr. Tregelles and others as having been greatly corrupted and modernized, especially in the Gospels, by a later revision; 1 2. the Harclean or Philoxenian Syriac (A. D. 616) in the margin; 3. the Coptic or Memphitic (third or fourth cent.); and, 4. the Aethiopic (fourth or fifth cent.) in the Roman edition.

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

It will be perceived that the weight of authority, so far as the ancient versions are concerned, greatly predominates in favor of the reading ἦν. 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 ἦν; 2. of those which support viόs; 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 ἦν.

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 μονογενὴς ὦν ὦς Θεός, "the only-begotten Son, who is God." He does not comment on the passage, in either case, in such a way as to show how he read it; and 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:— ἀντικρος Ἀντίων ἐν οἷς λέγον, Ὁ μονογενὴς Θεός, ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἑκεῖνος εξηγήσατο.

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. 612a and 818b ed. Petav.) In the remark, however, which follows the quotation in the first passage, Θεός and ὦς are interchanged:— Καὶ φησι, Ὁ μονογενὴς Θεός ὁ μὲν γὰρ λόγος ἐστὶν ἐκ πατρὸς γεννηθεὶς, ὁ πατὴρ δὲ οὐκ ἐγεννηθη ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μονογενῆς ὦς. He also speaks of John as "calling Christ only-begotten God:" — Μονογενὴς Θεόν αὐτῶν φάσκων . . . . Περὶ πατρὸς γέγραπται, ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ περὶ νῦν δὲ, στὶ μονογενῆς Θεός. (Ancorat. c. 3. Opp. II. 8rd.) A little before, however, in a quotation of John i. 18, ὁ μονογενὴς is given

---

1 Καὶ τὰτε ἐστατεύσαι τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, δὲ ὁ μονογενὴς ὦν ὦς Θεός μόνος ἐξηγήσατο. — Quis dives salvatur, c. 37. p. 955.


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

4. Didymus of Alexandria, A. D. 370, has quoted the passage twice with the reading Σεός. (De Trinit. Lib. I. c. 26, and Lib. II. c. 5; pp. 76, 140 ed. Mingareli, or in Migne’s Patrolog. Graeca, XXXIX. 393*, 495*.) He also says, ὁ υιός κάθεται μονογενής Σεός λόγος, καὶ εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ. (Ibid. Lib. I. c. 15. p. 27, or col. 313* ed. Migne.) But here it may be doubted whether a comma should be placed after μονογενής, or after Σεός, 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 Σεός 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, Irenæus, Origen, Basil the Great, and Cyril of Alexandria. The first of these favors υίός; the last, perhaps, Σεός; 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 Σεός, 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 Σεός 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 xvi. 3, Epiphanius says: Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τίνα; ἐλέησον Σεός. Εἰ δὲ άδικον Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὃς λέγει νεφιάτα ὄδησιν, ὃ μονογενής, ὃ δὲ εἰς τὸν κλάπαν τοῦ πατρός, αὐτὸς ξεγράφηται. Εἰς Σεός τακέτω ὃ πατήρ, ε. τ. λ.—Anconit. c. 2, p. 76. Here εἰ δὲ must be wrong unless the whole conclusion of the sentence has been lost. Perhaps we should substitute ὁδὴ (comp. Basil. de Spir. Sanct. c. 8, p. 147) or ὀδὴν, though άδικε 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 νός, 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, νός θεός μέν, καθ' νός θεοῦ, ως άνθρωπος, καθ' νός άνθρώπου. (Cap. 9. p. 355 b ap. Epiph.) So Eusebius says that Christ is τοῦ θεοῦ μονογενῆς νός, 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: ΕΙρηναι παρὰ τῆς γραφῆς περὶ τοῦ ἐν ἀρχῇ δυτὸς λόγου, ὅτι ὁ μονογενής θεός, προτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. (De Perf. Christ. Forma. Opp. III. 291.) Some may regard this as a clear proof that Gregory read θεός in John i. 18. One, however, who has become accustomed to the style in which scripture is quoted and referred to in the writings of the Fathers, will

---

1 ὡς ἤκουσεν τὴν ἐκλήσιας ὁ θεός τρία μαρτύρων [ὁ μαρτύρων, Ἡ. καὶ ἡ ἡμείρας ἡμεῖς πατέρα τοῦ νός άμώστης]. 'Ο μέν γὰρ τοῦ σοφοῦ τὴν σοφίαν νός ο δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν λόγον μονογενῆ θεοῦ ο δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν νός εἰκόνα φοιτ. — ἄρα ἐκ παντὶ Ἰακείν. LXXIII. c. 8. Opp. I. 834 b; 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 Ἡ 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. In another place he expressly quotes the words "whom God hath set forth as a propitiation for our souls" as the language of the Apostle. But it would be idle to suppose that he had anything corresponding to the italicized words in his manuscripts in Rom. iii. 25, or that his Greek copies contained the expression "new creation" in Col. i. 16; still more that his copy of the Epistle to the Hebrews contained the words "only-begotten Son," a phrase occurring only in the writings of John. The looseness and inaccuracy of such references to scripture in the writings of the Fathers might be much more fully illustrated. Though Gregory of Nyssa has nowhere quoted John i. 18, he has repeatedly alluded to it, using the words ὃ ἐν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρὸς eight times in connection with the expression ὃ μονογενὴς Θεός, twice in connection with the phrase ὃ μονογενὴς θύσις, and once with the phrase ὃ ἐν ὑψίστων θεός. For examples and references see below.
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expression ὁ μονογενὴς Θεός is a favorite designation of Christ in the writings of this Father. I have noted one hundred and twenty-five examples of its occurrence in his treatise against Eunomius alone. But this expression, as we shall see, is also a favorite one with other Fathers who unquestionably read "only-begotten Son" in John i. 18.

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

Fulgentius has alluded to John i. 18 six times.

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


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

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


¹ Fulgentius has alluded to John i. 18 six times.
II. The following Greek Fathers, with one Pagan writer, support the reading *vio<;*. 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 *vio<;*.


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

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

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

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

---

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

1 Eusebius quotes John i. 18 with the reading vios, De Eccles. Theol. Lib. I. c. 20. §§ 4, 5. p. 86ab. In the remarks which follow the last quotation, he repeats the expression δ μονογενῆς vios, and uses the words αὐτῷ καὶ δ vios eis τὸν κόλπον ἧν τοῦ πατρὸς in such a way as to afford strong confirmation of that reading. A little farther on (p. 86c) he enumerates the apppellations given to Christ by the Apostle John, in their order, in such a manner as to demonstrate that he read vios in John i. 18. He calls upon us to observe how the Evangelist, μετὰ τὸ ἐπησά βουλευόμενον λόγον (John i. 1), καὶ θεὸν τὸν αὐτὸν ἀληθείαν (ver. 1), καὶ φῶς ἀπεκάλεσεν (ver. 7), καὶ μονογενὴς φάναι (ver. 14), καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διαλογίσατε (ver. 18), οὐκ ἐπὶ λόγων δομάζετε, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν λοιπῶν ἵστορεῖ τὸν σωτῆρα οὐ λόγῳ λαύτῳ ἀποκαλοῦντα, ἀλλὰ vios, 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 vios in John i. 18; and the arbitrary hypothesis that in all his apparent quotations of the passage with this reading, Seos has been changed to vios by transcribers, falls to the ground.

Eusebius also reads vios, De Eccles. Theol. Lib. I. c. 20. § 7. p. 29d; Lib. II. c. 23. p. 142c; and Comm. in Psalm. lxxiii. 11, in Montfaucon’s Coll. Nova, I. 440a. We may add his Comm. in Is. vi. 1, where we find δ μονογενῆς vios, δ ἐν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, though not introduced as a formal quotation (Montf. Coll. Nova, II. 374a). It may here be observed that no various reading affecting the word vios 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. Graecia, Tom. XXIV.

Let us now examine the passage on which Dr. Tregelles relies, De Eccles. Theol. Lib. I. c. 9. p. 67d. 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.” Τὸν εἰς τὴν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, δέματα τοῦ κόλπου τοῦ πατρὸς γενομένης, διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲν καθαρὶ διακονεῖ ἡμᾶς. Under these circumstances, an impartial critic will probably think that no clause ever more clearly betrayed itself as a marginal gloss, than the words ἡ μονογενὴς θεός in the present instance. It is perhaps hardly worth while to mention that they are so regarded by the original editor, Bp. Montagu, who says of them in his note: “Non sunt hæc evangelista, sed nec credo Eusebii, nisi forsann, θρων μονογενῆς θεός.”

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

7. Eustathius, Bp. of Antioch, A. D. 320. (De Eustathius, Bp. of Antioch, A. D. 320. (De Eustathius, Bp. of Antioch, A. D. 320. (De Eustathius, Bp. of Antioch, A. D. 320. (De

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


10. Cyril of Jerusalem, A. D. 360, probably. He has nowhere expressly quoted the passage, but alludes to it as follows:—Πιστεύωμεν τοῖς εἰς ἑνα Θεὸν πατέρα... διὰ ὑπέρωπων μὲν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν, ὁ μονογενὴς δὲ μόνος ἔξηγήσατο. (Cat. VII. c. 11. Opp. p. 117 ed. Tout.) Here the omission of **uioς** 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 **Σεός** 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 **Σεός Θεὸν ἐγένεται**. 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 (χρησαίκος ὁ) 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 ὑπὲρ 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 **uioς**.

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


12. Titus of Bostra, A. D. 362. (Cont. Manichaeos, Lib. III. c. 6, in Galland. Bibl. Patr. V. 332[1], or Migne’s Patrol. Gr. XVIII. 1224[2].) He has also once quoted the passage with the reading νίός άεός.[1]


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[5], ed. Venet. 1728.)

16. Chrysostom, A. D. 398, not less than eight times. In several of these instances he so comments on the word νίός 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. ΄Εφηκώς ὑπειθεία ο βαπτιστής, ὃτι νίός εἶναι

---

1 [Ibid. c. 11, ap. Galland. Bibl. Patr. V. 338[6], or Migne, XVIII. 1240[7]. Here άεός may have been added by Titus from John i. 1 to indicate, as he says in the following sentence, that the νίός was νίός γρήγορος άουος τῷ γεγυμνικρὶ. Compare the insertion in the next sentence to this, where he quotes Matt. iii. 17 (or xvii. 5) thus: Οὗτος εἶναι ο νίός μου ο μουργενής καὶ ἄγαπητός, ο ν ο καὶ νεόν καθαρός.

2 De Incomp. Dei Natura, Hom. IV. c. 3, bis; ibid. c. 4; ibid. Hom. V. c. 1; Ad eos qui scandalizatur, 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[8], 476[9], 481[10]; III. 470[11]; VI. 64[12], 264[13]; VIII. 84[14], 86[15], cf. 87[16], 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 άεός, and that transcribers have substituted νίός. I may also remark that neither Savile nor Montfaucon have noted in their manuscripts, in any of these instances, any various reading affecting νίός.
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18. Nonnus, of Panopolis in Egypt, A. D. 410, probably. In his poetical Paraphrase of the Gospel of John, he has no trace of the reading ζεός, which he would hardly have failed to express, had he found it in the original. He uses μονογενής alone, which implies ζεός.


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


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


1 Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Test., p. 232, note †.
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25. Theodore Studites, A. D. 813, twice. (Antirrhet. III. 14, and Epist. II. 56. Epist., etc., pp. 108\textsuperscript{a}, 349\textsuperscript{a}, as edited by Sirmond in his Opera Varia, Tom. V.)

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

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

28. Theophylact, A. D. 1070. (Comm. in loc. Opp. I. 519\textsuperscript{c} ed. Venet.)


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


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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{e}, 130\textsuperscript{a}, 165\textsuperscript{c}, 176\textsuperscript{e}.)

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 \textit{unigenitus Deus} has ever been produced from a single Latin Father. The following quote the passage with the reading \textit{Filius}:


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, 799, 831, 852, 873, 874, 905, ed. Bened.)

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


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

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 Fiiui, nisi proprietatis extrinsecus virtus per exceptionis significatim adderetur. Praeter Fiiium enim; et unigenitum omnim, et unigenitum cognominans, suspicionem adoptionis penitus execucit.”

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. δ' &), 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 unigenitum 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.
1861.]  

On the Readings of John i. 18.  

(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. 510a, 527', 1274b, 1286b; II. 501c, 605', 875r, ed. Bened.)


7. Faustinus, A. D. 384, three times. (De Trin. Lib. I. c. 2. § 5, in Migne's Patrol. XIII. 54th.)

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


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


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 Idatius the chronicler (A. D. 445). See his edition of Athanasii, II. 602, 603.
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doubtful; namely, Origen, Basil the Great, and Cyril of Alexandria. The last, on the whole, favors \textit{Seôs}; 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 \textit{Seôs} twice; on the other hand, he has \textit{vîôs} once, once \textit{vîôs tòv \textit{Seôv}}, and once \textit{unigenitus Dei Filius} in a work preserved only in the Latin version of Rufinus.\footnote{Origen has \textit{Seôs}, In Joann. Tom. ii. c. 29, and xxxii. c. 13 (Opp. IV. 89b, 438d, ed. De La Rue). In both these passages, however, the very literal version of Ferrari, made from a manuscript now lost, reads \textit{unigenitus} alone, without either \textit{Deus} or \textit{Filius}. If he had \textit{vîôs} in his Greek copy, the omission would be unimportant; but if he had \textit{Seôs}, the neglect to translate it would be strange and inexcusable. — On the other hand, we have \textit{vîôs}, Cont. Cels. Lib. II. c. 71. Opp. I. 440f. \textit{Oevo oïdóis kárate nápethe o monogêneti vîôs, o dé eis tòv kóloun tòv xararps, ëxeinos ëggýsato}. So De La Rue and Lommatsch, from two manuscripts; the earlier edition of Hoeschel, founded on a single manuscript, instead of \textit{monogêneti vîôs reads kai monogêneti yè de \textit{Seôs}}. 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. \textit{Tòs tòv \textit{Seôs} occurs, In Joann. Tom. vi. c. 2. Opp. IV. 102d, as edited by De La Rue and Lommatsch from the Bodleian manuscript, which appears to be an excellent one; the earlier edition of Huet, which was founded on a single manuscript, reads \textit{vîôs} \textit{Seôs}. A little after, in two allusions to the passage, \textit{monogêneti} is used alone. Opp. IV. 102e, 114f. — \textit{Unigenitus Dei Filius}, In Cant. Lib. IV. Opp. III. 91f.}

2. Basil of Caesarea, A. D. 370, according to the text of his Benedictine editors (Garnier and Maran), has \textit{Seôs} 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 \textit{vîôs}.\footnote{Basil reads \textit{Seôs}, De Spir. Sanct. c. 6. Opp. III. 12b. Comp. ëbíd. c. 8, p. 14f, where he says: \textit{Oide yâr [h grafh] tò òvoma òuîp tòa òvoma tòv \textit{vîôs}, kal òvoun ìlæðîn ìlægym (al. ìlægi), kal monogêneti ëxeîn, kal dòvun ëxeîn, kal ìlægym, kal ìlægym}. — On the other hand, he has \textit{vîôs}, De Spir. Sanct. c. 11. Opp. III. 23a, where the six manuscripts of Garnier appear to agree in this reading, though one of Matthæi's Moscow MSS. has \textit{Seôs} (see Matthæi's Nov. Test. Graec. I. 780). He again has \textit{vîôs}, apparently without any variation in the two MSS. of Garnier, Epist. 234 (al. 400), c. 3. Opp. III. 358f. Here Matthæi's Moscow MS. also reads \textit{vîôs}.}
3. Cyril of Alexandria, A.D. 412, as edited by Aubert, has Εὐς four times, and υἷς three times. His commentary on the passage, as printed, favors Εὐς, 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 Εὐς, Thes. Assert. xiii. and xxxv. Opp. V. i. 137, 237. The correctness of Εὐς 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, and Migne's Patrol. Gr. LXXII. 487; also in the Catena published by Cramer (VI. 303) on Col. i. 16. He has Εὐς, moreover, in the Dialogue "Quod Unus sit Christus," Opp. V. i. 768. In his Comm. on John i. 18 he has υἷς in the text, Opp. IV. 103; but toward the end of his remarks he quotes the passage with the reading Εὐς, p. 107. He also says: ἐπιγραφήν δὲ πάλιν, Μονογενὴς Ἰησὺς ἀποκαλεῖ τὸν υἱόν, p. 105. But here the scholion in one of Matthaei's Moscow manuscripts cites him as saying, ἐπιγραφήν ταύτην, Ἰησοῦς ἀποκαλεῖ τὸν υἱόν, omitting Εὐς. Still, the commentary on the whole confirms the reading Εὐς.

He has the reading υἷς, Thes. Assert. xxxv., and Adv. Nestorium, Lib. III. c. 5. Opp. V. i. 365, and VI. i. 90. This reading is also found twice in an extract which he gives from Julian, in his work against that emperor. Opp. VI. ii. 333².

² In an allusion to John i. 18, we find ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Εὐου λόγος, ὁ ἐν κόσμῳ ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρὸς. Apol. adv. Orient. Opp. VI. 187².

³ 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 Εὐς, contains no quotation of John i. 18. It has the expression "unigenitus Deus" in the remarks on Matt. i. 20, v. 9, xix. 17, and xxiv. 41. The work is appended to Tom. VI. of the Benedictine ed. of Chrysostom.

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

the passage in question, but merely to examples of the phrase μονογενὴς 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 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,” ἄγέννητος and ἀναρχός, 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 μονογενῆς, τουτέστων, 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.

FOR THE READING Ἴς.

Manuscripts.

A* B C* L, 83.

Versions.

Pesh. Syr., Harecl. Syr. (marg.); Copt., Aeth. (Rom. ed.)

Greek Fathers.

Clem. Al.*. Theod.*. Eiph.***, three times, and one ref. Didym.**. twice, and one ref. (?); Cyr. Al.*. four times, and one ref. (?), but Ἴς three times.

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

Latin Fathers.

None.

Wholly doubtful. Origen**, Basil the Great***. 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 μονογενής Ἴς 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 Ἴς. They represent every important division of the Christian world. The reading Ἴς is attested by the Curetonian, Harclean, 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 \( \text{Seo} \), 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 \( \text{vios} \), before the middle of the fourth century, the Old Latin and Curetonian Syriac, Irenaeus (probably), Tertullian, Hippolytus, the third Synod at Antioch (A. D. 269), Archeaus, Alexander of Alexandria, Eusebius, Eustathius of Antioch, and Athanasius; on the other side, we have during this period only the Peshito Syriac (if that version in its present form is so ancient), Clement of Alexandria (somewhat doubtful), the Excerpta Theodoti, and the Coptic version. In the period that follows, though the few manuscripts that support \( \text{Seo} \) 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 \( \text{Seo} \), that \( \mu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \n
with the expression as remarkable, it is not probable that they would intentionally alter it. They would be more likely to reverence it as containing a mystery. In the second place, though μονογενής Σεός may sound strangely to us, it was not a strange or harsh expression to copyists of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries. On the contrary, it was, as we have seen, a favorite phrase with many writers of this period, being used with equal freedom both by the Arians and their opponents. So far from stumbling at it, transcribers may have been led, by their very familiarity with the expression, to introduce it unconsciously into the text. Let us look at the passage in John. In the clause immediately preceding δ μονογενής οίδα, ἦν ένυ had just occurred, bringing Σεός before the mind of the copyist. Is it strange that in transcribing he should inadvertently connect this word with μονογενής, the combination being so familiar to him, the words οίδα and ένυ being so similar in ancient manuscripts, and Σεός being so much the more common of these two abbreviated words? Such a mistake, in some early manuscript or manuscripts, might have been easily propagated, so as to extend to the comparatively few authorities which exhibit the reading Σεός. It is much more difficult to account for such an ancient and wide-spread corruption as must have taken place, if Σεός proceeded originally from the pen of the Evangelist. If he had written μονογενής Σεός in this passage, so remarkable an expression must have early attracted attention, and stamped itself inefaceably, 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 Ἰησοῦς 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.