ARTICLE I.

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

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

Καὶ ὁμολογοῦμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εἰσεβείας μυστήριον: ἢδε ἤφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, ἐκκαίωθη ἐν πνεύματι, ὅφθη ἀγγέλου, ἐκπύχθη ἐν δόξῃ, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ.

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

While Σεος in this passage supports the divinity of Christ, this is not a doctrine which rests on any single text. If the result of criticism could be proved adverse to this reading, it would not affect our general faith. God does not leave such an important doctrine as the Trinity to depend on so few and feeble arguments that a single proof-text more or less makes any appreciable difference in our belief.
We have perfect confidence in the principles of our faith, and look with no feelings of concern upon investigations of the purity of the scripture text. Even with the reading ὃς, some of the early Fathers, as will be seen, deduced from this passage the divinity of Christ, and Dr. S. Clarke truly says of this passage, that "the same is evident; that that person was manifest in the flesh, whom John in the beginning of his gospel styles Ἰησός, God."  

I. MANUSCRIPTS.

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

The Codex Sinaiticus, distinguished as α, and belonging to the fourth century, clearly reads ὃς a prima manu. Tischendorf says: "A prima ὃς ἐφανερώθη. Another corrector, the latest of all who have altered this MS., of nearly the twelfth century, has substituted Ἰησός, but so carefully has he done it, that he has left the more ancient writing untouched."  

This seems to leave the reading of this most ancient MS. in no kind of doubt. Would that we could say as much for some of the others.

The Alexandrian MS., which is marked as Codex A, and belongs probably to the fifth century, has been referred to as authority by the advocates of either reading. The form Ἰη, as it now appears, is the ordinary contraction for Ἰησός, but it has evidently been altered or retouched at quite a

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

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


2 Griesb. Symbol. Crit., Vol. I. p. x. Others say that the passage itself has not been defaced, only that part of the page being affected where the hand has rested while holding the microscope. The facsimile given by Porter seems to confirm the statement.
various readings, but afterwards, having more carefully examined the passage (*perlustrato attentius loco*), I found some marks and remains sufficiently distinct (*satis certa*) of the line which at first had escaped my examination, especially towards the left side, where it touches the circumference of the letter."  

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

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

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

---

1 Mill's Nov. Test., in 1 Tim. iii. 16.  
3 Epistles of Clement, p. 27 (Oxford, 1710).  
light. It was left for Wetstein, in the year 1746, to explain the faint appearance of this line. His discovery may best be given in his own words. He says: "I asked an old friend to take me into the Royal Library, and when he had done it, and carefully examined this passage in the Alexandrian MS., not only with the naked eye, but with various kinds of glasses, he pronounced that it had originally been written in no other way than OG; but when I sought towards the left for the line of Mill and Berriman, I found it indeed, but when I wished to show it to my friend, I could not, because it had vanished; and when the line alternately appeared and again disappeared, and I was not a little perplexed by the phantasm, my friend, with his peculiar penetration, immediately suggested the cause, and showed that the line was not written on the page where it is read ὑψηφρευσθη, but on the other side of the leaf, where is written κατ' εὑρεθέλων (1 Tim. vi. 3), and that it formed a part of the first letter ε of the word εὑρεθέλων. For when the book was laid on the table, as often as the leaf which we were considering was so placed on the following leaves that it should touch and cover the whole of the next leaf, the line could not be seen, because the parchment was opaque; but as soon as the leaf was so raised and separated from the following leaves that both sides should be shown upon, not only was this line seen through the translucent parchment, but even whole letters and words."¹ This explanation of Wetstein, that the supposed faint transverse line was only the sagitta of the ε seen through the thin vellum, is probably the true one. Woide, the learned editor of this Codex, endeavored in his Prolegomena to throw discredit upon it; but it has been defended by Tischendorf,² Porter,³ Tregelles,⁴ and more lately by Ellicott,⁵ so satisfactorily that there seems but little room to doubt its correctness.

³ Principles of Text. Critic., p. 487.
⁵ Commentary on 1 Tim. iii. 16; also note on p. 100. This note seems
It is astonishing how many errors Dr. Henderson has compressed into the single page which he devotes to the Alexandrian MS. He says: "This proof (of its reading ἈἸδ.) is furnished by the unimpeachable testimony of Junius, Huish, Mill, Wotton, Croyk, Berriman, Ridley, Hewitt, and Pilkington, who carefully and minutely inspected the passage before it became illegible, and found the genuine transverse line in the Θ. To these names may be added those of Walton, Tell, Bentley, and Grabe, all of whom had access to this MS. at an earlier period, and who concur in its exhibiting ΘĆ and not OC. The evidence thus elicited was attempted to be set aside by Wetstein, who on first examining the MS. was able to discover no stroke, and conjectured that what Mill had taken for it was merely the line of an E in the word ἔτιςβεθείας on the opposite side of the leaf, which made its appearance through the vellum; but on inspecting the Θ more minutely afterwards, he found that the fine stroke which was originally in the body of the letter was discoverable at each end of the fuller stroke, with which some corrector had retouched it."¹

¹ Biblical Repository, Vol. II. p. 82.
Here are almost as many errors as assertions. We will examine his statements in order.

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

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

3. Mill found the “genuine transverse line” so faint that at first in his Various Readings he referred to this MS. as authority for ο̇ς.

4. Wotton certainly defends the reading ο̇ς, but even he says it can only be seen by examining the letter accuratioribus oculis.

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

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

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

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

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

1 Berriman’s Diss., p. 154, also Woide’s Proleg. to Alex. MS., p. 31.
2 Nolan’s Greek Vulgate, p. 285, note; also Woide’s Proleg., p. xxx.
sage, but confided the collation of this MS. to Huish. Is it possible that Henderson refers to Wotton, whose name has been Latinized into Waltonus by Wetstein,¹ and perhaps others?

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

11. Bentley, as far as we can learn, nowhere speaks of the reading of this MS. as Σος; certainly not in his Essay on Freethinking, nor in the Notes for his projected edition, which have been published.

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

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

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

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

¹ Prolegom., p. xxii.
² Quoted by Woide, pp. xxx and 76, or Spohr's Leipsic ed., p. 431.
ially restored, and has been published by Tischendorf, who has also given us a beautiful facsimile of this passage. This MS. had been regarded as authority for $\zeta$ till Wetstein questioned its reading. He says: "C, I think, has $\zeta$; for the slender line which converts $O$ into $\Theta$ is not apparent, and the other line, drawn over the letters $\Theta C$ as a sign of contraction for $\zeta$, and which elsewhere is drawn evenly over them, is so made, with a more heavy and unskilful stroke, that it seems to betray a different hand."

This supposed inelegance, other critics, as Woide and Less, failed to discover; but Griesbach, in his notice of this MS., ably and satisfactorily defends the opinion of Wetstein. Since the ancient text has been restored, and the transverse stroke of the $\Theta$ brought to light, Tischendorf has found fresh reason to believe that the relative was the original reading. His facsimile seems to confirm this opinion. He even goes so far as to assign the change to his second corrector, relying on the character of the strokes and the color of the ink. Tregelles confirms the reading of Tischendorf.

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

---

1 The transverse line was not visible till the writing had been chemically restored.
2 Wetstein's Nov. Test. in 1 Tim. iii. 16.
4 Codex Rescr. (ed. Tischendorf), p. xii.
7 The same explanation of this alteration is given by Le Clerc in his Epist. de Ed. Nov. Test. Millii, prefixed to Kiiister's edition of Mill (1768).
protrude beyond the regular commencement of the line, while in shape it is more circular than the same letter as drawn by the original scribe, and the $C$ has the general outlines of the $O$ out of which it was made. This MS., is the only one known which has $\delta$, and a reading so unique is no doubt referable to the Latin scribe, who accommodated the relative to his Latin text, which has *quod*. Tischendorf has also edited this MS. and says: "It is most certain that the first hand wrote $O$, and the third $\Theta C"."

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

J and K, Moscow MSS. of the ninth or tenth century, have $\Sigma\varepsilon\delta\varsigma$.

All the cursive MSS. agree in reading $\Sigma\varepsilon\delta\varsigma$, with the exception of 17 (33 of the Gospels, called sometimes "the Queen of the Cursives"), 73, and 181.

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

II. Ancient Versions.

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

1 p. 584.

2 p. 282.

be referred personally to Christ, as the passage was understood by many of the early Fathers. It may be translated indifferently, as in the versions: "Great is the Mystery of Godliness," i.e. "Christ, who or which was manifested in the flesh."

The Old Latin Version gives us: *Et manifeste magnum est pietatis sacramentum, quod manifestatum est in carne, justificatum est in spiritu.* Many have held here that *quod* implies necessarily the neuter relative *qui*. But we see no valid reason why *qui* may not have been translated by the neuter *quod*, in more strict grammatical conformity with its supposed antecedent, since *μυστήριον* and *sacramentum* were understood by the translator to be a title of Christ. At any rate, on such a minute point we must refer back to the MSS. which strongly oppose *qui*. Versions are hardly competent witnesses for the distinction of gender.

Jerome, in his revised version, retains the exact words of the Old Latin just quoted. Henderson refuses to receive the reading of the Vulgate as any authority for that of Jerome, notwithstanding he also reads *Qui manifestatus est* in his Commentary on Isaiah, till it can be proved that his revision extended to this part of the Old Version. In answer we would say that there are in this very verse two variations between the Vulgate and the Old Latin as published by Labatier. Jerome’s version, in more strict accordance with the Greek, omits *hoc* before *mundo*, and reads *assumptus* for *absumptus*.

Nearly or quite equal in value to the Latin Versions are the Syriac. The old Peschito translates this passage, "And truly great is the mystery of godliness, which [or who] was manifested in the flesh, and was manifested in the Spirit." Here the relative *qui* refers to *ην*. Henderson endeavors to show that *qui* may be a conjunction, and the

---

1 Henderson’s Defence of the Mystery of Godliness, p. 29, or Biblical Repository, Vol. II. p. 17.
passage be translated, "Great is the mystery of godliness, that he," i.e. God, referring to the clause "house of God" in the fifteenth verse, was manifested in the flesh," a most improbable supposition.

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

In the margin of this version is added ἰλλε, which White thinks was meant to be inserted before ἱνα, as a fuller form of the relative, but without rendering its gender any clearer. But this seems too trivial an alteration even for the Philoxenian Version, and we conjecture that it

1 White's Philox. Version, 1 Tim. iii. 16; also note, p. 338.
was intended to take the place of [ο], God, in which case the margin would favor ἐμ. If we are not mistaken, no reliance can be placed on this version in support of either reading.

The Aethiopic Version belongs probably to the fourth or fifth century. As printed in the London Polyglot, the passage reads: Ἀναργυρός: Ὄννε: Ὑπάλληλος: ἀνδρός: Ἄρσας: Ἡλίαντήρας: ἡμών: Ἔμ: ἡμᾶς: Ἡ: ἡμῶν: ἡμᾶς: "Since great is the mystery of truth, which [or who] appeared in the flesh of man." The word here used to translate μυστήριον is of the masculine gender, so that nothing can be gathered from this version to decide between ἐμ and ἐν. Lawrence asserts that both the Peshito and the Aethiopic indisputably favor ἐμ, and not ἐν. He says: "If ἐμ be the reading, it is evident that the following clauses of the verse cannot be grammatically connected by a copulative, but that the passage must be translated as the Unitarians translate it. 'He who was manifested in the flesh was justified,' etc., but in all the versions alluded to the subsequent clauses are grammatically connected by a copulative."¹ It does not seem to have occurred to Lawrence that it might be translated, the mystery of godliness who, or he who, was manifested in the flesh, [and who] was justified, etc. Augustine² and many others, quoting this passage, refer the mystery personally to Christ.

In Platt’s edition of the Aethiopic Version we have the remarkable variation, Ὄννε: Ἡμᾶς: Ἡλίαντήρας: ἡμών: ἐμᾶς: ἡμᾶς: "Great is he who was seen in the flesh of man." We can hardly help believing that this is a variation peculiar to the single MS. which Mr. Platt used in editing the epistles. It certainly is not founded on the Greek. But the variation serves, at least, to discredit Henderson’s statement, that the relative ἡ may be regarded as a conjunction, like ἡ in

¹ Remarks on Griesb. Classif., p. 79.
² Sermon 204.
the Syriac, and *quod* in the Latin, for in this shorter form of the verse, Η is preceded only by the demonstrative *θά∙Η*.

The *Coptic or Memphitic Version*, which has been referred to the third century, as edited by both Wilkins and Boetcher, translates το ἑυστήριον by ΗΙ ΜΣΤΗΡΙΩΝ, and for the relative gives us *ΦΗ ΕΤ*, i.e. *ille qui*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Again, the passage may be alluded to in such a way as to indicate what was the author's reading, although not formally quoted. If we read that "the mystery of godli­ness was manifested in the flesh," we may be sure that the writer's copy of the scriptures contained only a relative
between μυστήριον and ἐφανερώθη. On the other hand, if an author frequently allude to this passage, persistently connecting Θεός with some form of φανερῶ, we may be sure that he read this passage as in the Textus Receptus, while if he generally connects ἐφανερώθη with such subjects as κύριος, υἱός, Χριστός, and σωτήρ, instead of Θεός, it is a probable proof that Θεός was not in his copy, although the presumption is much weakened if such subjects are connected with the subsequent predicates. Thus, little can be gathered from Origen's remark: "My Saviour is said to have been received up into glory."

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

The following Fathers clearly support ὅς: —

1. Epiphanius. A.D. 368. "Ος ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι." This passage is found in a long quotation from the Ancoratus of Epiphanius, taken by him into his Panarium. The two passages have been generally quoted as independent authorities, and correctly so, as Epiphanius himself transferred these sections from one work to the other. In the Ancoratus, as we now have it, ὅς is omitted, a remarkable omission if the reading had been Θεός.


a. "Ος ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι. ἐδικαιωθάται ἐν πνεύματι λέγων ἀυτὸν εἶτε ὅς, κ. τ. λ." "Who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit; saying that he was justified in the spirit either because, etc."

b. Consonantia et apostolus dicit, et manifeste magnum est

---

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

Less decisive in its present form is the following:

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

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

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

a. Πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς, μὴτε μὴν τῆς εὐσεβείας τὸ μέγα μυστήριον, τοῦ ἐστὶν Χριστόν, δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἐν σαρκί, εὐκατάθυτα, κ. τ. λ. Εἶν γὰρ ἐν ὦν ἑτέρον οἶμαι τῇ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, η αὐτὸς ημῖν ὑπὲρ πατρὸς λόγος, δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἐν σαρκί. Bis. 1 "Ye err, not knowing the scriptures, nor indeed the great mystery of godliness, that is, Christ, who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, etc.; for the mystery of godliness could be nothing else, I think, than the Word of God the Father sent to us, who was mani-

2 Ad Baptizandos, Mansi, Tom. IX. col. 218.
3 Ibid., col. 206.

Vol. XXII. No. 85.
fested in the flesh.” This explanation necessarily requires the reading δε, for if δεος takes its place, the mystery is evidently the great doctrine of redemption through the God-man, and not the person of the Word of God.

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

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

1 Schol. de Incarn. Unig., Cap. 12. sp. Occum. Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 16 (Par., 1631), Tom. II. p. 227.
3 Oecumenius introduces the quotation with the words Ὅς ὁ γίγνεσιν Κύριος ἐν τῷ διδακτής κεφαλαί τῶν Ἰςκηλίων φησίν· δε ἐφανερώθη, κ. τ. λ. This is frequently quoted in the margin of MSS.
5 This expression, δεός ὄν ὁ λόγος, is quite common with Cyril; cf. Id. pp. 72 A, 94 D.
divinity, but continuing the same that he ever had been, then great, and confessedly great, is the mystery of godliness." The argument for Christ's divinity is drawn from the fact that the mystery is called great, and not from the word Ἵεός. "But," he adds, "if Christ be regarded as a common man, how has he been manifested in the flesh? or rather, is it not evident that all men are in the flesh, and cannot be seen in any other way?" This Father thus goes on to draw his argument from the predicates ἐφανερώθη, ἡφίσθη, etc., and bases not the slightest proof on the word Ἵεός. "And how was he seen of the holy angels? Do not the angels see us? and what is there strange or mysterious if, being no different from us, some of the angels saw him? And how was he preached to the Gentiles?" And so Cyril proceeds to comment on the remaining clauses of the verse, from each of which he concludes that Christ must have been God. He then closes with these words: "Great, then, is the mystery of godliness, ἐφανερώθη γὰρ ἐν σαρκὶ Ὁeos ἐν καὶ ὁ λόγος; for the Word has been manifested in the flesh, being also God; he was also justified in the spirit; was also seen of angels; was preached also to the Gentiles; and is believed on by the inhabitants of the world, as in truth the Son of God and the Father, and he who appeared in the flesh." Is not the context clear that Cyril did not recognize Ὁeos?

d. Καὶ ὁμολογούμενος, κ. τ. λ., Ὁeos ἐφαν., κ. τ. λ.1 In this place also the text of Cyril has been tampered with, as the context shows; for he asks: Τίς ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερώθης; ἡ δὲ πάντες καὶ πάντως ὁ ἐκ Ὁeos πατρὸς λόγος οὐ τῶ γὰρ ἔσται μέγα τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον [Inicio ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ], 2 ὡ κοί ἐκ ὄν γένεσις ἀναβαίνου εἰς ὦρανοὺς. "Who is it that was manifested in the flesh? Is it not evident that

1 De Recta Fide, p. 124 C.
2 The words enclosed in brackets are omitted by Euthymius Zigadenus in his citation of this passage from Cyril (vid. Matthaei's Greek Test., Vol. II., Pref. to Caib. Epp., also Max. Biblio., Tom. XIX. p. 165 D); they are not translated in Aubert's Latin Version, nor are they necessary for the sense. They are, no doubt, spurious. Cf. Griesb. Symbol. Crit., Tom. I. p. lii.
it was most certainly the Word which is from God, the Father? for so will the mystery of godliness be great. He was seen also of angels as he ascended into heaven; was preached unto the Gentiles by the holy apostles; was believed on in the world. By no means can we then say that he was a mere man, like us; but as God he was made in the flesh, even as we are." This passage taken as a whole, like the one previously quoted, shows that Cyril read ἕως, for it were most strange that with the word ἕως before him, he should have omitted to speak of it when so much to his purpose, and should have endeavored to prove that ὁ φανερός Ἔλς was divine by the use of the word μυστήριον, the mystery not being "confessedly great" unless the man Christ Jesus is also God. Can we believe that he would have felt obliged to fortify his proof of the divinity of him who was manifested in the flesh, by showing that the further statements in regard to him, "was seen of angels, was preached to the Gentiles," etc., are inconsistent with his mere humanity, if this very text had called Christ God? Is it possible that so keen a champion of orthodoxy as Cyril would, in professedly quoting a passage to prove the divinity of Christ, have withheld all reference to the most important word in it, and expended his strength in drawing comparatively feeble deductions? Would he have been content with throwing sand when he might have hurled a cannon ball at the heretics? He did not certainly set the same value upon ἕως, if he had it, as do some later critics. If any one is inclined to doubt that Cyril here read ἕως, let him compare with these passages the same Father's comment on Col. i. 26, "the mystery which has been hidden from ages," etc., and see how similarly the argument is there drawn from the word mystery. "For the mystery would not be great, nor worth speaking of, unless we regard Christ as God," etc.¹

1 De Recta Fide, p. 72 A.
ἔστι, γέγονε σῶμα ὅ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος;1 κ.τ.λ. "St. Paul writes: Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God [as now edited] was manifested in the flesh, etc.' What then is the meaning of this, 'He was manifested in the flesh'? It means that the Word, who is from God the Father, became flesh, not that his nature was transmitted into flesh by any conversion or change, etc." Does not the context here render it probable that ἧς is a corruption of ὅ;? In separately quoting this clause, Cyril omits the ἤς, a fact which casts much suspicion upon it. Griesbach and others loosely assert that MSS. read ὅ in this passage, but we can find no particular MS. specified which preserves this reading. No doubt these assertions rest on Wetstein's statement that "MSS., and those who made catenae from them, read ὅ." Those who made the catenae referred to must have found the reading ὅ in Cyril's Scholia de Incarn., cap. 12, or rather in Oecumenius's quotation from it; but there is no proof that Wetstein ever found ὅ in any MS. of the Twelve Anathematisms.

Other allusions are less decisive; as,—

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

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

In two passages Cyril might seem to favor ἦς:

h. "Ὁ γε μὴν ἐνακορμήσας ἦς, καίτοι νομισμάτων οὐδὲν ἐπερεύθη πλῆθν ὧτι μόναν ἀνθρώπον, αὐτὸ δὲ τούτῳ τὸ δράμενον, ἐκπρήξθη ἐν ἔνασιν, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ.4 "God, indeed, having become man, although in no other respect human except in what was visible, was preached unto the Gentiles, was believed on in the world." Here ἦς is made the subject of the later predicates, but not of ἐφανερώθη.

2 De Recta Fide, p. 20 E.
4 De Recta Fide, p. 170 D.
EXAMINATION OF THE VARIOUS

καὶ ταῦτα . . . ὁ ἀπόστωλος ἡμᾶς ἔδιδαξε λέγον, ὤμολογουμένως, κ. τ. λ., ἴδος ἐφαν., κ. τ. λ. Καὶ τὴν μὲν φανέρωσιν συνεεξευξῆς τῇ σαρκί, τὴν δὲ δικαιώσων κατὰ τὴν τῶν αἰρετικῶν ἀβελητηρίαν ἐδικαίωση δὲ τῇ συνεργείᾳ τοῦ πνεύματος. Ἀρα τὸ δικαιόσωσαν πνεῦμα κρείττων τοῦ δικαιώσεντος νῦν; ἀλλ' οὐκέτι ταῦτα οὐκ ἔστι· τὸ γὰρ ἡμέτερον ἐδικαίωση διὰ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ φανέρωσεν ἢδον, ὥς ἀχωρίστως αὐτῷ συνεκμένος, κ. τ. λ. Ἔρει. Καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἔστι· τὸ γὰρ ἡμέτερον ἐδικαίωση διὰ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ φανερώσεν ἢδον, ὥς ἀχωρίστως αὐτῷ συνεκμένος, κ. τ. λ. Ἐρεί. Καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἔστι· τὸ γὰρ ἡμέτερον ἐδικαίωση διὰ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ φανερώσεν ἢδον, ὥς ἀχωρίστως αὐτῷ συνεκμένος, κ. τ. λ.

And this . . . the apostle teaches us, saying: 'And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh,' etc. He connects not only the manifestation with the flesh, but, according to the absurdity of the heretics, the justification also; but he was justified by the co-operation of the Spirit. Was then the justifying Spirit superior to the justified Son? By no means; for our Saviour was justified through the God manifested in him, who was joined inseparably with him, etc.' This comment seems rather to favor ἴδος, but is by no means conclusive. We have found no other reference in Cyril so favorable to the received text. It has not before been collated.

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

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

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

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

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

a. The philosopher Phaedo asks: "How was he seen on earth, and associated as a man with men, if he was the unchangeable God? Answer of the holy fathers, by Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem: Κατὰ τὴν φανήν τοῦ Θεοπασιου Πάιλου, Μέγα ἐστὶ τ. τ. ε. μ., ἢ ἐφ. ε. σ., τοῦτ ἐστίν, ὁ τοῦ Θεού νιός. Τίτοι αὐτός ὁφθη καὶ ἄγγελοι, ὁδὲ γὰρ ἄγγελοι ἢ ἄρχαγγέλοι ἢ τις τῶν ἐπουρανίων δυνάμεων Θεοῦ, ὁ Μονογενής, εἰπε-τερ Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε τίποτε.\" According to the words of St. Paul, 'Great is the mystery of godliness, who was manifested in the flesh, that is, the Son of God. Then was he seen also of angels, since neither to angels nor archangels, nor any of the heavenly hosts, is the Only-begotten visible, for 'no one hath seen God at any time.'" In the editions is printed δ, but, at least four MSS., including those from which Gelasius was first printed, read ως.
EXAMINATION OF THE VARIOUS

b. Ἰησοῦς δὲ μετὰ τὴν τῆς ἐνοχῆς κυρίου παρουσίας οἰκονομίας, τὸ μέγα ἀληθὲς τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, καὶ ἠγέραται φανερωθείς ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ ἀγγέλοις, ὡς ἔδει, κ. τ. λ. 1 "Of Jesus, who after the dispensation of his presence in the flesh, the great mystery of godliness, as it is written, having been manifested in the flesh and seen of angels," etc.


a. Τὴν ἀγίαν τὸλυ 'Ἰερουσαλήμ, εὖ ἢ τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας φανερώθη ὁ μυστήριον.1 "The holy city Jerusalem, in which the great mystery of godliness was manifested.

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

The following writers probably read ὅς.

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

2 Vita Sabae, Sect. 52. Wetstein erroneously has Sect. 50.
3 Vita Sabae, Sect. 5, 7, Ep. ad Anast. Imp.
4 Comm. in Rom. i. 2 (ed. De la Rue), Tom. IV. p. 465.
'Εὰν δὲ ὁ ἐμὸς Ἰησοῦς ἀναλαμβάνως ταῖς ἐν δόξῃ λέγηται. 1

"If my Jesus be said to be received up into glory."

Οἱ ἄγγελοι οὐς ὀφθησάτων. 2

"The angels by whom he was seen," referring to Ἰησοῦς, not Θεός.

2. Apollinaris. A.D. 370. Εἶτα ἑπάγει τοῖς εἰρημένοις διὰ τὸ μυστήριον ἐν σαρκί ἐφανερώθη. 3

"Then he [i.e. Apollinaris] adds to what he has said that 'the mystery was manifested in the flesh.'" This would seem of itself quite conclusive that Apollinaris did not read Θεός; but the quotation of his words here made by Gregory is very brief, and perhaps not exact.

Καὶ ἐστι Θεός ἄληθινός ὁ ἁπάρκος ἐν σαρκί φανερωθείς, τέλειος τῇ ἄληθινῇ καὶ Θελα τελειότητι. 4

"And he who without flesh was manifested in the flesh is truly God, complete in true and divine perfection." The reading of this passage found by Franc. Turrianus is perhaps preferable: "He who without flesh was manifested in the flesh is truly one," etc, 5 especially as the writer immediately adds, "not two persons, nor two natures." Wetstein, however, quotes this passage with Θεός, "apud Photium, cod. 280."

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

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

---

1 Cont. Cels., Lib. III., Tom. I. p. 467 C.
2 Comm. in Matth. xix. 14, Tom. III. p. 660 C.
4 Script. Vet. Vat. Coll. (ed. Mai), pp. 147, 174. The work here quoted was generally ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus, but Leontius Byzantinus, in his Fraud. Apollinist., says it is falsely ascribed by heretics to this Father, being really a production of Apollinaris.
6 Comment. in Isa. liii. 11 (ed. Martiani, Par., 1704), Tom. III. col. 387.
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than the writings of any other Father, and the reading Σεός is now found in three passages in his works, yet in two of these cases there are important various readings which contradict his printed text.

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

1 Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 16, Tom. XI. pp. 605, 606.
2 Cramer's Catena on 1 Tim. iii. 16, p. 31.
was manifested in the flesh, being the Creator." This reading finds strong confirmation in a Latin translation which reads: "Ad altiora profecto nos subvehit, quod scilicet in carne manifestatus est Conditor."¹ This translation made directly from an old MS. agrees with the Greek given by Cramer, which in all probability the more correct reading, as the alteration would be more naturally made for the purpose of conforming to the supposed words of scripture than the contrary.

b. Having spoken of Christ as invisible, because the image of the invisible God, Chrysostom adds, according to our printed editions: Ὑδὲ ἄλλαχον φησί, Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, μὴ Ἀναμάθη. ὃτι ἡ φανέρωσις διὰ τῆς σαρκός, οὐ μὴν κατὰ τὴν σοφίαν γέγονεν. Ἐντεύχεται δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀδραστός οὐ μόνον ἀδραστοὺς, ἄλλα καὶ τοὺς ἄνω δυνάμεις ὦ Παῦλος, εἰπὼν γὰρ ὅτι ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐπήγαγε ὅτι ὁ ἄγγελος.² "But if it is elsewhere said, God was manifested in the flesh, wonder not at it; for the manifestation had regard to the flesh, and not the invisible essence. For Paul shows that he is invisible, not only to men but to the higher intelligences; for having said that he was manifested in the flesh, he adds that he was seen of angels." The context here does not especially confirm or oppose the reading ἔδει; as here quoted in the text; but some MSS. here have ἦν for ἔδει. Instead of ἔδει ἄλλαχον φησί, κ. τ. λ. Savil gives in his edition the various reading. ἔδει τούτο φησιν, δὲ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἡ γὰρ φανέρωσις διὰ τῆς σαρκός, κ. τ. λ.³ "Therefore," i.e. because Christ is in his nature invisible, "it is said, 'Who was manifested in the flesh,' for the manifestation had refer-

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

² In Joan. Hom. XV., Tom. VIII. pp. 85, 86.
³ Euseb (1612), Tom. II. p. 613, l. 27. For the facts in reference to this passage in Chrysostom, as also for the quotations from Theodorus Stultites, and for much other valuable assistance, we are indebted to the combined kindness and learning of Mr. Ezra Abbott, of Cambridge, Mass.
ence to the flesh, etc.” This reading gives an equally good sense, and bears internal marks of genuineness. In confirmation of it, compare the Latin translation made from a MS. in the fifteenth century by Francesco Accolti of Arezzo [Franciscus Aretinus.] It reads in the most exact conformity with the variation given by Savil: “Propterea inquit ‘Qui manifestatus in carne,’ manifestatio autem per carnem non est secundum substantiam.” 1

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

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

5. Nestorius. A.D. 428. Ἐγὼ δικαίουσώμην τὸ πλασθὲν ἀνέπλασεν, Ἐφανερώθη, γὰρ φησιν, ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαίωθη ἐν πνεύματι. 4 “According to justice he [i.e. the Spirit] filled 5 that which had been made, [i.e. the humanity of Christ], for it is said, ‘he was manifested in the flesh, justified in the

1 Found in the same Frankfort edition just referred to.
2 Homil. de Philog., Tom. I. p. 497 D; published also as a scholium by Matthaei, Pref. to Cath. Epp.
3 Apud Cyr. Adv. Nest., Tom. VI. p. 103 E.
4 Reading ἀνεπλάσεν for ἀνέπλασεν, in accordance with repleverit in Cassian and replevit in Arnobius, though Mar. Merc. has reformavit.
spirit.' Not only is so striking a word as Ἄνδρις here omitted, but the insertion of ὄς would make the citation peculiarly apposite, being translated "He who appeared in the flesh, i.e. ὁ πλασμένος, was made just by the spirit," i.e. κατὰ διακαιοσύνην ἀνέπλασεν. No relative, however, is preserved by Marius Mercator in his translation of this sermon of Nestorius, nor by Arnobius or Cassian, although the latter uses the masculine form justificatus to translate ἀκακιωθη.

6. Eutherius Syanensis. A.D. 431. "To be united to flesh is not to be converted into flesh, wherefore it is said, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί ὃν ἐφανερώθη ἡ σάρξ, he was manifested in the flesh, not that the flesh was manifested." 4

7. Pseudo-Chrysostom. Ὕμολογουμένως μέγα καὶ ὑπερθέρμαν ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ. 5 The present form exhibits ὄς, which favors ὄς rather than Ἄνδρις.

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

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

9. Pope Martin. A.D. 649. Ὀμολογουμένως μέγα καὶ ὑπερθέρμαν ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ. 9 This peculiar reading of ὃς

2 Conflict. cum Serap., Lib. xxi.
3 De Incarn. Dom., Lib. vii. cap. xvi.
4 Confut. quar. Prop. ap. Athan., Tom. II. p. 564 B. This is attributed to Theodoret by Photius.
6 Tom. X. p. 763; cf. p. 764.
7 This word is printed ἐκλεπρονθη; an evident error in transcription.
9 Concil. Lateran. I., Ep. 5; Mansi, Tom. X. col. 813. The Acts of this Council were composed in Greek as well as Latin.
for ἄ is probably due to the first editor; cf. the alteration suffered by Liberatus.


After commenting on the first clause, he adds: Ἐσώ ναφανερώθην ἐν σαρκί. εἶτα λέγει τὸ μυστηρίον. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ναφανερώθη, οὕτως οὖ παρὰ ἀνθρώπινων ὀφθαλμοῖς δίκαιος ἐκρήθη, ἀλλὰ τῶν τοῦ πνεύματος ὀφθαλμοῖς τῶν δρικώσατο καὶ τὰ βαθύ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Τὸ δὲ, Ἐδικαιώθη, διὰ τὴν σάρκα, καὶ δο γάρ ἐστι Θεός οὗ δικαιώτατο, ἀλλὰ δικαιοῖ.1 "'God was manifested in the flesh;' here he tells the mystery, for he who was manifested in the flesh to men was not judged just by human eyes, but by the eyes of the Spirit, which search even the deep things of God. The phrase 'was justified,' refers to his humanity, for as God he is not justified, but justifies." This comment renders it almost certain that Oecumenius read ἄ. With this reading it is natural to say that the mystery consists in the way in which "he who was manifested in the flesh was justified," while with the reading Θεός, the mystery must consist in the fact of the manifestation of God in the flesh. The manner in which this writer speaks immediately after of Cyril's comment on this passage,2 confirms us in the belief that he read ἄ, for he does not quote Cyril, as has generally been understood by scholiasts, for the purpose of giving a various reading, but simply for the sake of his comment attached to the text.

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

---

1 Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 16, Tom. II. p. 227 (Paris, 1631).
2 Vide supra, p. 21.
fested in the flesh?” It is to be accounted for only on the supposition that he read δε.

This text is found in our editions of Athanasius: "Εξοντι γὰρ καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον συγγράφην αὐτοῖς νέμοντα, καὶ οἴονει χείρα αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ λέγειν ἐκείνοντα, ὥστε. Καὶ ὁμολογομένος μέγα, εἰς τὴν κυρίον. Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.¹ For they have the apostle also extending pardon to them, and, as it were, stretching out his hand to them, with the words: “Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh.” This passage is probably spurious. The Benedictine editors found it in but a single MS., and accordingly enclosed it in brackets. Yet Henderson, who must have known these facts, quotes it without a hint at its more than dubious authenticity.²

The following Fathers clearly read Θεὸς.


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

b. ἀλλὰ περιθέντες ὅτι ἄλλως Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.

² Another quotation sometimes referred to the same Father will be found under the name Pseud.-Athanasius.
EXAMINATION OF THE VARIOUS

But being persuaded that truly God was manifested in the flesh, let us believe this to be the true mystery of godliness."

c. "But being persuaded that truly God was manifested in the flesh, let us believe this to be the true mystery of godliness."

d. "God who was manifested."

e. "How then was God manifested in the flesh?"

f. "But God indeed is manifested in the flesh, and the flesh which exhibited God in itself, having been transformed and changed into that which he was, who manifested himself in the flesh, etc."

g. "By which we learn that God would not have been manifested in the flesh unless the Word was made flesh."

h. "The bodily man, in whom God was manifested;... man in whom God was manifested;... through this servile creature [i.e. the body] he was manifested in the flesh."

i. "Euph. to the wise and the foolish and the God and the Word in the flesh"
ėφανερώσθην.1 "Since the Light and the Life and God and the Word was manifested in the flesh."

j. ὁ θεὸς ἐφανερώσθη εἰς σαρκὶ.2 "God was manifested in the flesh."

This passage is again quoted without the article;

k. θεὸς ἐφανερώσθη εἰς σαρκὶ.3 "God was manifested in the flesh."

l. Οὔτοι δέ φησιν οὐ θεὸν εἰς σαρκὶ πεφανερωθέντα.4 "But this [Apollinaris] says that God was not manifested in the flesh."

m. Καὶ ἦν εἰς σαρκὶ θεὸς ἐφανερώσθη.5 "According to which, God was manifested in the flesh."

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

o. ὁ φανερωθέντα ήμῖν εἰς σαρκὶ θεὸς.7 "God, who was manifested to us in the flesh."

p. ἐν οὐ καὶ θεὸς ἐφανερώσθη.8 "In which God was manifested."

q. ἐν σαρκὶ πεφηνέναι τὸν θεόν.9 "That God appeared in the flesh."

r. θεὸν διὰ σαρκὸς ἐμψυχον πεφανερωθέντα.10 "That God was manifested through the flesh, with a human soul.

s. Εἰ...θεὸς ἐφανερώσθη εἰς σαρκὶ.11 "If...God was manifested in the flesh."

t. Τὸν εἰς σαρκὶ πεφανερωθέντα θεόν.12 "God, who was manifested in the flesh."

u. ἐπεζήθη οὐ καὶ θεὸς ἐφανερώσθη εἰς σαρκὶ.13 "Since God was manifested in the flesh."

v. Τὸν δὲ θεὸν εἰς σαρκὶ πεφανερωθέντα ἦμῖν ὁ τὸς ἀποδείκνων

---

1 Contra Eunom., Orat. vi., Tom. II. p. 715.
3 Ibid., p. 149.
4 Ibid., p. 126.
5 Ibid., p. 149.
6 Ibid., p. 131.
7 Ibid., p. 131.
8 Ibid., p. 183.
9 Ibid., p. 258.
10 Ibid., p. 129.
11 Ibid., p. 163.
12 Ibid., p. 239.
13 Ibid., p. 163.
14 Ibid., p. 270.
"He who seeks proofs that God was manifested to us in the flesh."

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

a. Τῷ τὸ μέγα φανεροῖν τῆς εὐακείας μυστήριον. "To him who manifests the great mystery of godliness."

b. Τὸν ἐν αρχῇ λόγον ἐν σαρκὶ πεφανερωθὲν λέγει. "He says, that in the beginning the Word was manifested in the flesh."

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


a. Καὶ Τιμίῳ δὲ γράψας, εἷς ἄκρον ἔσολογησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπ' ἀμφότερον τῶν λέεων τὸ μὴ εἶναι κατὰ Ἱερώτατα παρὰ φύσιν τῆς πατρικής ἐδιδαξέν. Εἴπεν γὰρ τοῦτο οὖν ὁ Ἐμολογομένως μέγα ε. τ. τ. ε. μ. Ἑσός ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, κ. τ. λ. "And, writing to Timothy, he most distinctly speaks of him as God, and from both passages [i.e. Col. ii. 9 and 1 Tim. iii. 16] he teaches that he does not differ in the nature of his divinity from the Father, for he says: 'Without controversy, great

---

1 Orat. Catechet., Cap. xii., Opp., Tom. III. p. 67 A.
3 Contra Eunom., Orat. vi., Tom. II. p. 588.
4 De Trinitate, Lib. i. (ed. Mingard.), p. 83.
is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, etc.’” This seems so clear as to leave no room to doubt the reading of Didymus. With what show of justice can Davidson say, “No importance can be attached to the reading of Didymus, a blind man.” 1 But Didymus was one of the lights of the Alexandrian school, and certainly accustomed to hear the scriptures read; and we see no reason why his blindness should, as Davidson insinuates, invalidate his testimony. Less reliable is the following citation from a Latin translation; “Secundum quod dictum est, manifestatus in carne.” 2

3. **Epiphanius Diaconus. A.D. 787.**

“Δεισοσον τουγαροιν του Παύλου μεγαλοφόνως ἐμβούντος, καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τούτοις ἐπισφαγίζωντος: Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, κ. τ. λ. Θεὸς, φησί, ἐφανερώθη.” 3 “Hear, then, Paul crying with a loud voice, and confirming to them the truth: ‘God was manifested in the flesh, etc.’ ‘God, he says, was manifested.’”

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

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

β. Τούτῳ γὰρ ἔστιν . . . ὁ φησιν ὁ μέγας ἀπόστολος: Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ ἐστιν εἰς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν δυσὶ φύσεις, τελείως Θεὸς καὶ τελείως ἀνθρώπος. 5 “For this is . . . what the great apostle says: ‘God was manifested in the flesh’; and he is one and the same in two natures, perfect God and perfect man.”

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

Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ . . . Ἐνταῦθα γὰρ Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη . . .

---

2 Comm. in 1 John iv. 2, 3.
3 Concil. Nic. II. Paneg., Mansi, Tom. XIII. col. 446.
5 Ibid., Epist. clvi. p. 498.
"God was manifested in the flesh. ... For here God was manifested; how? in the flesh; for in his godhead he is invisible."

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

"O μακάρος ἀπόστολος Παύλος φησι, Μέγα ἦστι τ. τ. ε. μ., Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. λ. ... πεφανερώθη Θεὸς ἐν σαρκί, ... εἰ μὴ, Θεὸς ἐν σαρκί πιστεύωντο εἶναι."

"The blessed apostle Paul says, 'Great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifested in the flesh, etc.' ... God has been manifested in the flesh, ... unless God was believed to be in the flesh." This epistle, the author of which evidently read Θεὸς, was not Athanasius, as it opposes the errors of the Nestorians. The Benedictine editors give as another reason for questioning its authenticity: "And if Athanasius had read the passage, Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, as here quoted, he would certainly have made use of it against the Arians, to prove the divinity of Christ. But he seems to have used copies which had δ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί [or rather δ], as does the present Vulgate. ... If he had read in the other way, Athanasius, a man so skilled in the scriptures, could never have passed by so remarkable a passage."

The following Fathers probably read Θεὸς:


1 Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 16 (Venet.), Tom. II. p. 569. This is also given by Matthaei as a scholium found by him, Praef. to Cath. Epp.
2 Ep. de Incarn. Dei Verbi, Tom. II. pp. 33, 34.
4 Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 16 (Paris, 1642). Quoted also by Matthaei, Praef. to Cath. Epp., from a scholium.
controversy, great is the mystery of godliness.' He calls it a mystery, as having been pre-ordained of old, but latterly manifested: ‘God was manifested in the flesh.’ For being God and the Son of God, and having an invisible nature, he became evident to all by his incarnation. Clearly, then, he teaches us the two natures; for ‘in the flesh’ he says, that the divine nature was manifested.”

b. Ὁμολογουμένος μέγα ε. τ. τ. ε. μ., ὃς ἐφανερώθη κ. τ. λ. Ἀδριανος τοῦ Ἰουνίου, ὃς ἀδρατος μὲν ἡ θελα φύσις, ἐρατὴ δὲ ἡ σάρξ. Ἀρμοδίας, τοῦ Ἀδριανος ἀπόστολος εἶπε, ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. “Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, etc.’ It is evident, then, that the divine nature is invisible, but the flesh visible. Properly, then, did the divine Spirit say, ‘God was manifested in the flesh.’” The context in these quotations shows ὃς was probably the reading of this Father. He draws from this text the doctrine of the two natures in Christ. The clauses, ὃς ἐστι, καὶ ὃς ὦν τις, and ἡ θελα φύσις, seem to have reference to the reading ὃς. But it may be said, on the other hand, that these phrases are of such frequent occurrence in Theodoret’s dialogues, that they do not here necessarily require this reading, and that the quality of Christ’s nature might also be deduced with the reading ὃς. Besides this, Theodoret adds, to show that before our Saviour’s advent the angels had never seen God, ὃς ἀπόστολος εἶπεν ὃς ἐφανερώθης ἐν σαρκί ὃς θελα ἐφανερώθης. “The apostle says that after he was manifested in the flesh he was seen of angels,” a statement peculiarly consistent with the reading and construction: “He who was manifested in the flesh was seen of angels.” A little further on he adds, in pursuance of the same thought: Ἔτσε μεντοι τὴν ἐκκυρώσειν ὃς θελα καὶ τοῖς ἐγερωμενα κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον,” ὃς

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

Indeed, then, after the incarnation he was seen also of the angels, according to the holy apostle, 'He who was manifested in the flesh was justified in the spirit, was seen of angels.' The fact that in his commentary Theodoret does not refer the mystery personally to Christ would accord with this construction, as well as with the reading Σεός.

2. Severus, Patriarch of Antioch. A.D. 513. Τὸν νομοδέτην, τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθέντα Σεόν. The lawgiver, the God, manifested in the flesh. This is preserved only in a catena, but yet quite reliably indicates Σεός.

3. Pseudo-Dionysius Alexandrinus. Εἰς ἑστων ὁ Χρυσός, ὁ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, συναλλος λόγος· ἐν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτην, ἀδρατὸς Σεός καὶ ὀρατὸς γενόμενος· Σεός γὰρ εφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικὸς, κ.τ.λ. Christ is one, the co-eternal Word existing in the Father; one in his person, God invisible and made visible; for God was manifested in the flesh, made of a woman, etc. This would seem to imply Σεός, although there is no direct quotation. Not only does this belong to a later age than that of Dionysius, but an old Latin translation of the first part of this work, which is still extant, contains, as Tregelles has mentioned, no such reference to 1 Tim. iii. 16.

4. John of Damascus. A.D. 730. The text of this author’s commentary on 1 Tim, iii. 16, reads Σεός. There is nothing in the comments, composed of excerpts from Chrysostom, to shed light on his reading. In another work he refers to this passage: Ἀλ γὰρ τῶν Σαματῶν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος εφανερώθη καὶ ἑπιστήθη τῷ κόσμῳ ὅτι υἱὸς ἐστίν τοῦ Σεοῦ. For by miracles, and

---

1 Wolfe's Catena on Acta iii. 23, Tom. III. of his Anecdota Graeca, p. 138.
4 Dionys. Opp., p. 300.
6 De Fide Orthodox., 91, or Lib. IV. Cap. xviii., Tom. I. p. 287 E.
the resurrection, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, was he manifested, and believed on in the world that he is the Son of God.”

5. Photius. A.D. 858. Καὶ ὁμολογομένως μέγα e. τ. τ. e. μ., θεός ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ. τ. τ. Λ. This is quoted by Nolan 1 from a MS., but without the connection or comment; so that we cannot judge of its value. Τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ φανέντα θεόν. 2 “God, who appeared in the flesh.”

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

1. Epistle of Barnabas. Ἁδέ πάλιν Ἰησοῦς οὐχ, ὁ νῦς ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλ’ ὁ νῦς τοῦ θεοῦ τύπω καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερώθησιν. 3 “Behold again Jesus, not the Son of Man, but the Son of God, and in a figure manifested in the flesh.” Ἐν σαρκὶ οὖν αὐτοῦ μελλοντός φανεροῦσαι [i.e. κυρίων]. “When the Lord was about to be manifested in the flesh.” Εἰπώσατε ἐπὶ τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ μελλοντα φανεροῦσαι ύμῖν Ἰησοῦν. “Trust in Jesus, who is about to be manifested to you.” Οτι ἐμελλέν ἐν σαρκὶ φανεροῦσαι [i.e. κυρίος]. 4 “Because the Lord was about to be manifested in the flesh.”

2. Ignatius. A.D. 101. Εἰς Ἰατρὸς ἐστιν, σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός, γεννητός καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός. 5 “There is one Physician, both corporeal and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten, God made in the flesh.” Here there is no certain allusion to this passage. Πῶς οὖν ἐφανερώθη τοὺς αἰῶνας; “How then was he made manifest to the ages?” Α στέρ ι χον ε ν ἑ θε ν, etc.” θεόν ἀνθρωπίνως

---

2 Basnage’s Thesaurus, Tom. II. p. 436.
3 Sect. 12.
4 Sect. 6.
5 Epist. ad Eph., Cap. vii.
6 The reference is to Col. 1. 26.
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"when God in a bodily form was manifested in the newness of an eternal life."

But the Syriac here reads vioū for ὅεοῦ, ἐδεικνύον... Λέοντις. The interpreted form of Ignatius reads in this place, ὅεοῦ ὡς ἀνθρώπου φανερωμένου, καὶ ἀνθρώπου ὡς ὅεοῦ ἐνεργοῦντος. "God appearing as man, and man working as God." Whatever may have been the original of Ignatius, there is no probable allusion to this text.


4. Justin Martyr. A.D. 140. "Ὄχρων ἀπέστειλε Δόγον, ἦν κόσμο φανή· δὲ ὑπὸ λαοῦ ἀντιμαχεῖς, διὰ ἀποστόλων κηρυχθέντες, ὑπὸ ἔκτων ἐπιστεύθη. "For which reason he sent the Word, that he might appear to the world; who, having been dishonored by the people, and preached by the apostles, was believed on by the Gentiles." The authenticity of this epistle has been questioned.

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

6. Clement of Alexandria. A.D. 192. "TCHAΠιμων· μετ' ἡμῶν εἶδον οἱ ἄγγελοι τὸν Χριστόν, πρὸτερον οὐχ ὀρθῶντες. "O the mystery! with us the angels saw Christ, whom before they had not seen."


---

1 Epist. ad Eph., Cap. xix.
2 Cureton's Corpus Ignatianum, p. 287.
5 Epist. ad Diogn.
7 Quoted by Oecumenius, in 1 Tim. iii. 16 (Paris, 1631), Tom. II. p. 228. Chrysostom, John of Damascus, and Theophylact read τὸν ὑιὸν τοῦ ὅεοῦ instead of τὸν Χριστόν, though some manuscripts of the latter author have τοῦ μοντήρων. Scholia of Codd. 19 and 20 have, according to Wetstein, Οἱ ἄγγελοι μὲν ἡμῶν εἶδον τὸ μέγα τῆς εἰσελθείς μονοθρίου, a form which forbids ὅεος.
8 Cont. Noet., Cap. xvii. A similar passage is quoted by Theodoret, Dial. 2, Tom. IV. p. 89, although professing to be taken from a commentary on the
"This God coming into the world was manifested in the body, coming as a perfect Man."

8. Eudoxius of Constantinople. A.D. 360. "There were not in Christ two natures, for he was not a complete man, but instead of a soul, God in the flesh," ἂλλ' ἄντι ψυχῆς ἦν σαρκὶ.

9. Basil. A.D. 370. Αὐτὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ. "He [i.e. κύριος] was manifested in the flesh." ᾿Απελευθέρωσεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς τοῦτο τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσέβειας μυστήριον. "And he left us this great mystery of godliness."

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

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

12. Hesychius. Πρὸς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔγγυσε, τὸν ἐν second Psalm: ὁτες δὲ προσέλθησαν εἰς κόσμον θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐφανερώθη. "He who came into the world was manifested as God and man."


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

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

Zacagni Collect., p. 689.


In Zophon. 3. 2. Quoted from Wetstein. We have failed to discover and verify this quotation. It certainly is not found in Hesychius's Sticheron, Crit. Sec., Tom. VII. Part iii. p. 26, the only work of Hesychius which Wetstein refers to in his Prolegomena. It may be a scholiast found attached to some MS. of the Old Testament.
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σαρκὶ φανέντα ἄντιγγ. "She did not approach to her God, who appeared to her in the flesh."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

² Mecalla V. C. Cos. Constantinopolis jubente Anastasio Imperatore, sancta evangelia, tanquam ab idiotis evangelisitis composita, reprehenduntur et emendatur.

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

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

¹ Serm. iii. in Mar. Merc. (ed. Migne), col. 769.
² Serm. i. col. 761.
³ Serm. iii. col. 771.
of Anastasius, and of all who believed that Council to have
distinguished too clearly between the human and divine
natures as joined in Christ.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR THE READING ( \text{Seos} ).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J, K, and all cursive MSS. except</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm. (of Polyglot), Slav., Georg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR THE READING ( \delta ).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha ), ( \alpha ) probably, ( \alpha ), ( \delta ) has ( \delta ), F, G,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 73, 181.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Lat., Vulg., Peac. Syr., Aeth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(both Rom. and Plath's), Copt., Theob.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goth., Arm., Arab. (of Erp. and of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatican). All of these, except Plath's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeth. and the Gothic, may read ( \delta ) as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well as ( \delta ).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHOLLY DOUBTFUL,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Philox. Syr., both text and margin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg. Nyss. 570, Didymus 570, Epiph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. 172, Theod. Stud. 619, Theoph. 1077,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Ath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably, Theodoret 429, Severus 613,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Dion., John Dam. 732, Phot. 565.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epiph. 302, Theod. Mops. 407, Cyr. 413,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelasius 475, Cyr. Scyth. 445.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably, Origen 220, Apollinarius 470,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome 670, Chrys. 250, Nest. 250, Euther.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Syden. 431, Pseudo-Chrysost., Pseudo-
| Epiph., Pope Martin 402, Oec. 500-520. |
| With little doubt Athan. 228 may also |
| be included here, though he nowhere |
| quotes the text. |
We next come to consider the internal evidence. In favor of Σεός may be adduced the improbability of its being a careless alteration from δς. If the original reading were δς, it would seem to require an intentional corruption of the text to produce Σεός. It is a good rule never to have recourse to the charge of intentional corruption to explain a various reading when it can be accounted for equally well without imputing bad motives to the copyists. Now the change from OC to ΣΣ, requires the positive, intentional addition of two strokes, which were evidently not in the transcriber's exemplar. On the other hand, the change from ΣΣ to OC might be unintentionally made, simply by omitting two small strokes, which may have become effaced in the MS. copied, or been carelessly omitted by a sleepy scribe. It would be much like the failure to cross a t or to dot an i. It is not rare to find cases in old MSS. where Θ has failed to receive its transverse stroke at first, or lost it through age, and thus at present exhibits only the circular outline. It is true that the rule is often given, that of two forms the longer is the more suspicious; but this rule relates only to cases where one or more entire words may have inadvertently been admitted from the margin. In the case of kindred letters a stroke is more liable to be omitted than added. The addition implies intentional corruption, a charge which should, if possible, be avoided. In this view Σεός has the preference.

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

¹ Biblical Repository, Vol. II. pp. 70-72. Matthaei, whom Henderson thinks the most learned man who ever edited the New Testament, says of the notion that τὸ ἐφανερώθη would be the only form grammatically allowable if we reject δς: "If we were speaking of a Greek author, I should have nothing to say
construction. Very few, however, of the defenders of the reading Ὑς admit this translation. They regard the clause ἔφανε ὑμῖν not as the subject of the subsequent predicates, ἐδεικνύσθη, ὄφθαλμος, etc., but as co-ordinate with them. Their translation would be: “Great is the mystery of godliness; he who was manifested in the flesh, [he who] was justified in the spirit, [he who] was seen of angels, etc.”

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

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

‘He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit,
‘Seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles,
‘Believed on in the world, received up into glory.’”

The omission of the article before ἴδες, although it is the subject of the sentence, is another suspicious circumstance mentioned by Professor Stuart. He found, out of two hun­
dred and fifty-seven cases in the New Testament in which Σεός is used as the subject of the sentence, only four cases in which it fails to take the article, and so strong is the tendency to insert it, that in three of these cases, an examination of the authorities collected by Tischendorf will show that important MSS. exhibit the article. It is however noticeable that these four cases all occur, like our passage now under discussion, in the writings of Paul.

It is a further argument in favor of ὅς that Paul has in other cases similarly connected μυστηριον with some form of the verb φανερω. In Coll. i. 26, 27, he has τὸ μυστηριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰῶνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, νῦν ἔστιν Σεός ἡμῶν ἡ ὑπόθεσις τῆς κακίας τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦτον ἐν τοῖς ἑκάστοις, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐπίθεσις τῆς δόξης. Here μυστηριον is not only followed by ἐφανερωθεί, but a little later τὸ μυστηριον is followed by ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός, which shows that μυστηριον may be applied personally to Christ, and followed by the masculine relative, unless the gender is here due to attraction. In Rom. xvi. 25, 26, Paul again connects μυστηριον with φανερω: κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηριον χρόνου αἰῶνου σεσυγημένου, φανέρωσεν ποτέ γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.

In favor of ὅς, has sometimes been adduced the argument that Σεός seems to be an alteration made for the purpose of its use in polemic theology, as giving the orthodox an additional text to use against the Arians and other heretics. But there seems to have been no intentional corruption of this sort, for we cannot see that there was any distinction between the orthodox and the heretics in their use of the passage. Some defenders of the deity of Christ favor one, and some the other reading. Both Gregory of Nyssa in the East, and Didymus at Alexandria, simultaneously exhibit Σεός, the former using it as freely as if it were the universally received reading; while, on the other hand, the multifarious polemical writings of Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, and Epiphanius nowhere contain this passage, except
that the latter quotes it to prove the divinity of the Holy Ghost. If we descend to a later period, we shall find that in the fifth and sixth century the reading Σεός would be likely to be looked on with suspicion as favoring the heresies of Nestorians. It would not be regarded as the orthodox reading, for it distinguishes most clearly between the divine and the human natures: God is not confounded with the flesh, but said to have been manifested in it. It was only after a long controversy that the Eastern and North African churches settled to a general opposition to the doctrine of the single nature of Christ. The conflict waged so bitterly by Cyril and his supporters against Nestorius and Theodoret had the effect of leading his successors into the opposite Monophysite heresy. For a season there was scarcely any middle ground allowed between the Nestorians and the Eutychians. All who opposed the blind and intolerant zeal of the Monophysites were branded by them as Nestorians. The whole Eastern church seemed falling into this extreme. At this time it will be seen that those who regarded themselves as the orthodox party, and the devoted followers of Cyril, would have looked with great suspicion on the reading "God was manifested in the flesh," a reading so apparently opposed to their Monophysite rendering of John's text: "The Word was made flesh." Accordingly we find that Liberatus distinctly speaks of the reading with Σεός as Nestorian and heretical. If there had been at an earlier time a temptation to the orthodox to alter δς to Σεός, the temptation was now equally strong to change Σεός to δς.

Editors of the New Testament, have according to their different principles of criticism or means of information, varied in their reading of this passage. In favor of Σεός may be mentioned Stephens, Mill, Matthaei, Scholz, and others of less note; Griesbach, Lachman, Tischendorf, and Tregelles prefer δς, while Wetstein's choice seems to favor δς. We do not propose to balance against each other the various arguments for either reading, with the purpose of defending
one or the other. It has been our aim simply to give a more complete, accurate, and impartial statement of the facts in the case than has heretofore been accessible, that each one who studies them may have all the materials necessary for the satisfaction of his own judgment, and that something may thus be done for perfecting the purity of the original text of the scriptures.

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