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PAUL'S PANEGYRIC OF LOVE — A NEW CRITICAL TEXT.
TRANSLATION, AND DIGEST.

BY A. W. TYLEE, A.M., NEW YORK.

[Continued from page 143.]

No. II.—TEXT AND DIGEST OF AUTHORITIES.

In the Introduction to the former part of this Article it was stated that "many and serious difficulties beset the use of citations from the ecclesiastical writers; but these difficulties render it none the less imperative that we should sift the wheat from the chaff, and avail ourselves of whatever the Fathers, so called, have preserved for us.” In examining these difficulties we find that the works of the early writers were not only liable to the same accidents of transcription, which have been mentioned as corrupting the text of the New Testament itself, but that scripture quotations especially encountered many peculiar obstacles to their perfect preservation and correct transmission to us. All these hinderances must be carefully considered before we can make an accurate estimate of the value of the citations which we find strewn in such wonderful profusion up and down the pages of the Fathers. The obstacles are of two classes, those proceeding from the Fathers themselves, and those which have arisen from the frailties and faults of the copyists.

In the first and second centuries scriptural quotations seem to have been given with but little regard to mere verbal accuracy; but rather with a looseness which would be quite startling to some of the modern advocates for the integrity of the text of the authorized version. Now, every word must be given in its exact relation to every other in the sentence: ¹ then, the grand central truth, or the idea of the

¹ The reader, however, will probably be able to supply instances of gross miscitations of scripture, such as: “The seed of the woman shall bruise the
passage, was the only thing desired or thought of. And frequently this was all that was requisite to illustrate or enforce the argument which the writer had in hand. Accordingly we find that the citations of those two centuries, as given by Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and others, are often but the merest references, sometimes so remote that it is difficult or impossible to determine which of several passages is the one referred to. Such citations are of but little value in settling the words of the sacred text, though their weight may be great when thrown into the balance to determine the question of the omission, retention, or insertion of a passage.

In the third and succeeding centuries the discussions, contentions, and disputes which occurred, and the rise of so many heresies, caused the words of scripture to be carefully studied and more accurately quoted. Both sides referred to the same writings as the ultimate arbiter, and neither, with comparatively rare exceptions, dared falsify their text, which was jealously guarded by all. It is, therefore, what we should expect, when we find that the Greek Fathers, from Irenaeus downward, quote with a good degree of verbal accuracy; or would have done so had not the cruel persecutions to which they were subjected, and the other circumstances of their lives, compelled them to cite so often from memory. It is true that in those days the memory was trained to feats which now seem beyond belief, but in the New Testament where the central thought of so many passages is identical or similar, and the endings of many so nearly alike, the task of keeping each in its proper place was too great for human power to accomplish. (Compare the citation of 1 Cor. xiii. 8 in Clem.-Alex. *Stromata* iv. c. 18, p. 614, or of verse 8, as found in Orig.-Int. *Comm. in Matt.* c. 4, Opp. iii. p. 882, or verses 1–3 in Chr. *de Anathemate* c. 8, Opp. i. 694, for fair illustrations of confusion from this cause.)

serpent’s head”; “Ephraim is joined to his idols”; “It is appointed unto all men once to die,” etc.; and these even by prominent writers.
Prominent among the reasons for citing from memory was the great inconvenience of turning the scrolls, upon which the books of the New Testament were then written, to the exact place wanted. On this account, unless the writer intended to make quite a long quotation from scripture, he was not likely to take this trouble, particularly if he had, or what is the same thing, thought he had, a pretty fair recollection of the passage he wished to cite.

The idiosyncrasies in the style of scripture quotation of each Father need to be thoroughly studied and clearly understood before the precise value of his citations can be rightly estimated. Some of the Fathers quote so loosely that their citations, unless particularly explicit, can have little or no determining weight and may as well be passed by in silence. The memoranda from which this Article was prepared include a large number of such worthless citations. Tertullian is, probably, the most remarkable of any of the Fathers upon our list for the looseness of his scripture quotations. Other Fathers again are very careful in their citations; and where we can be assured that we have what they actually wrote, we are pretty certain that the citation is as they read it in their copies. Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome are conspicuous examples of this class. Especially valuable is the testimony of these three Fathers where they discuss the various forms in which a reading was extant in their day, and give the reasons for the opinions they express. Such passages in their writings can hardly be so corrupted as to destroy their evidence; and even when so rewritten, as they have been,1 as to testify to a reading they were meant to oppose, the change is readily detected by the skilful critic.

Curious as it may appear there are some Fathers who seem to combine the two methods of citation, quoting at one

1 The Latin interpretation of Irenaeus, which is probably contemporaneous with that Father himself, twice testifies to the omission of the name Jesus, in Matt. i. 18; but the Greek of the passage, as preserved in a citation of Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, has been assimilated to the common text and thus Irenaeus is made to testify to a reading of whose existence even he probably had never heard.
time quite accurately and at another in the freest possible manner. For example, Cyril of Alexandria cites the third verse of our passage three times with great exactness, and once, where he uses καυβή, quite loosely; but scarcely any two of his more than twenty-five citations of the twelfth verse will be found to agree throughout with any manuscript on our list, or even with each other. This fact, of course, greatly impairs the value of his testimony where it bears upon important readings of a character liable to misquotation.

Not a few of the Fathers wrote commentaries upon the whole, or upon greater or less portions of scripture. In most of these the passage commented upon is given at length after the manner of most modern commentaries. This "text" was peculiarly liable to corruption at the hands of copyists who were likely, either from accident or from design, to bring it into accordance with the New Testament manuscripts which they considered authoritative. The citations in the body of the commentary—a word, or a phrase or two—were much less liable to change from this cause. When, therefore, we find these citations differing from the text, we may feel pretty sure that they give what the writer intended to be read, and that the text does not. One will not have to read our digest very carefully to find instances of this difference of citation in the "text" of a Father and his commentary thereon.

All the causes which were mentioned in the first Article as likely to corrupt the text of the manuscripts of the New Testament, have even a greater force with regard to the works of the Fathers. The changes from design are far more certain to have occurred, for this reason: that the sacredness which was more or less attached to the text of scripture was not felt with regard to the writings of the Fathers. And, therefore, when a copyist found a citation differing from that with which he was familiar, he would be much more likely to consider the writer wrong and his manuscript of the New Testament correct, than that the contrary was the fact, and would, on that account, be tempted
to force the former into an accordance with the latter. It will be evident at once that the peculiar authority which was early attached to Jerome's Vulgate rendered the work of the Latin writers, or the Latin interpretation of the Greek writers, especially obnoxious to this kind of corruption. Accordingly where we find the Latin interpretation of a Greek Father concurring with the Vulgate against the most ancient Greek uncials, it is to be regarded with great suspicion. But should the interpretation differ from the Vulgate and agree with the earlier Greek manuscripts, we may be pretty sure that we have the correct translation of a passage whose original may have perished more than a thousand years ago, or may perchance have been brought to light since the standard edition of the Father was published. An instance illustrating this occurred in the preparation of this Article. The writer had a very long search for an edition of Amphiloctius of Iconium which would give the Greek of the *Oratio ii. in Circumcisione Jesu Christi*. That oratio is omitted in Vol. xxxix. of Migne, and Vol. vi. of Gallandi, and given in the Latin only in Vol. v. of Despont's *Bibliotheca Maxima*, p. 1060a. But in this last is found scientiae cessabunt, which agrees with Tertullian, Nyssen, Cyril of Alexandria, Maximus Confessor, Damascenus, and the Sinaiticus, in using the plural forms where the Old Latin and Vulgate use the singular. In view of this fact it seemed reasonably certain that if the Greek existed it would read γνώσαται, and the original of the passage, as finally found on p. 11 of Combeis's edition, proved the conclusion correct.

The editions of the works of the Fathers are by no means what they should be to enable us to cite them with much confidence. Allowing that the Jesuits and Benedictine monks, who edited so many of them, were fine Latin scholars they neither were able to collate all the manuscripts extant of the works they were editing, nor possessed the critical skill and acumen rightly to discriminate in the use of those they did have. Worse than this, they have not always been
honest in their work. For example, in the Benedictine edition of the works of Ephraem Syrus, which we have cited in our digest, are several things given as Ephraem's which, according to Professor Rödiger and Cardinal Wiseman, are really the writings of James of Edessa, who lived three centuries later, and were properly accredited to him on the manuscripts from which they were edited. Other things of a similar nature could easily be cited.

We need, and must have, thoroughly critical editions of the earlier and more important Fathers, say all to the end of the fourth century at least, before we can be assured of the ground upon which we stand when we state that a given reading has the support of Origen four times and Eusebius once, while it is opposed by Chrysostom six times, once expressly. The best editions now existing may justify such a statement, but a thorough examination of such codices of Chrysostom's works as the Codex Guelferbytanus, of the sixth century, may show quite a different state of affairs. Chrysostom was an especially favorite author, and the great frequency with which his writings have been copied has undoubtedly conduced largely to the modernized form in which we now find the scripture quotations in his works. It is little less than incredible that Chrysostom's manuscripts of the New Testament were so corrupted as the citations in Montfaucon's edition and the catenae would lead us to suppose. And here we would remark, in passing, that the citations given in the catenae are the least trustworthy sources of evidence we have, as they were almost certain to be assimilated to the text they were intended to illustrate.

2 Wiseman's Essays on Various Subjects (Lond. 1853), Vol. iii. pp. 277, 278.
3 On the corruptions in the writings of the Fathers, compare chap. iv. in Daille's Treatise on the Right Use of the Fathers (London, 2d ed. 1843). (Chap. v. cites some very glaring and vicious mistranslations into Latin of Origen and Theodoret which were made for dogmatic reasons). See also Collette's Dr. Wiseman's Popish Literary Blunders Exposed (London, 1860); and Tyler's Worship of the Virgin Mary (London, 1844). The works named in these three notes (except the German of Herzog), may all be found in the Astor Library, New York.
The testimony of the Fathers has been valued more or less highly by all the editors of the text of the Greek Testament. Erasmus and his successors occasionally cited particular readings out of such manuscripts as they were able to consult; but Mill was the first editor who really appreciated their value or attempted their systematic collection. Bentley, in his proposed edition of the Greek Testament, intended to make use "of all the Fathers, Greeks and Latins within the first five centuries"; and Tregelles \(^1\) thinks that: "he would have done much to investigate every citation used, so as to know if it were really the testimony of the Father himself." Bengel made use of what had been gathered by Mill, and seems to have added to them from his own reading. Wetstein largely increased the stock of patristic citations, and sometimes went further and showed how a quotation applied in the case under consideration.

Griesbach, in his *Symbolae Criticae*, published a thorough collation of the citations to be found in the Greek works of Origen, which he gave with a greater exactness of statement than his predecessors. The citations which he gave from Clement of Alexandria were not, however, collected with equal care. The results of these collations were given in the second edition of his Greek Testament, whence Schoo transferred them to his edition. The citations from Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Hilary, and Lucifer of Cagliari are stated very carefully in the larger edition of Lachmann, that of 1842–1850, for which they were re-examined partly by Buttmann, and partly by Lachmann himself.

Tischendorf's first and second editions, those of 1841 and 1849, were merely manuals and, therefore, it did not come within the author's design to give any extended citations from the Fathers. In the first his researches seem to have been mainly confined to the verification of passages already cited by former editors; while in his second, although he

---

\(^1\) In Horne's Introduction (London, 1836), Vol. iv. p. 341, whence the facts regarding the Greek Testaments, down to that of Lachmann inclusive, are mostly drawn.
made a beginning of original investigation, he did not carry it to any great extent. In both the Fathers are cited merely by name, with no reference to volume or page, except when taken from a commentary in loco. His seventh edition, which was completed in 1859, was a marked advance upon anything which had gone before it (except the first part of Tregelles's edition, mentioned below), and gave a very large number of new and valuable citations. The second part of the volume, from Acts to Revelation, shows a great improvement upon the first in its method of citation, and far more often makes reference by volume and page.

In 1857, Tregelles issued the first part of the noble edition which was completed in March, 1872. In this magnificent work, to use Tregelles's own words, "will be found all the citations that he could gather from the Fathers, Greek and Latin, of the first three centuries, including Eusebius and others who belong partly to the fourth; and besides these, there are given the citations of the Latin Fathers, on which Lachmann relied as authorities for the old Latin text."

"No actual quotation is intentionally omitted; though not a few that superficially appear to be such have been passed by in silence, after a thorough investigation, from its seeming to be certain that they do not actually relate to the passage with which they have been connected. The result is that from Tregelles's notes will be seen all the patristic evidence, with full references to the works themselves, which has been observed as at all bearing on the reading of the text during the three first centuries, and more."

It must have been the influence of this edition which caused Tischendorf to make so much improvement in the second part of his seventh edition, which he was issuing from the press at the time the first part of Tregelles's edition appeared. Still more did it influence him in his method of giving citations in his eighth edition, which began to be issued in numbers in 1864; for in this he begins at once to cite the Fathers, by volume and page. This eighth edition

---

of Tischendorf, the text of which is now happily completed. is likely to be our thesaurus of patristic lore for many years to come; giving, as it does, an immense number of citations never before published, which are the results of careful and protracted researches which can scarcely be conceived of, except by one who has labored in the same field.

The digest published herewith gives the testimony of the manuscripts, versions, and Fathers, in the fullest and most complete form practicable. It aims to present all the available evidence (within the assigned limits of our lists) for the criticism of the passage selected. To accomplish this end, it shows every variation, however minute, of all the uncials of which editions have been published. It is, in fact, an exact collation of codices ABCDFGP and the lectionary 2\textsuperscript{a}. It also gives all the evidence of the MSS. K and L. of the cursive MSS., and of the versions, which could be gathered from the digests already published, or by consultation or correspondence with eminent scholars in this country or in England. And here the writer would express his grateful appreciation of the courtesy of Professor William Wright, LL.D., of Cambridge, England, in the kind promptitude with which he answered the letter of inquiry concerning the reading of the Aethiopic in the important passage in the third verse of 1 Cor. xiii.

The patrology of the passage is presented in the form here given, in order to show how much change is needed in the current method of citing the Fathers. One examining a subject or passage critically, and wishing to verify every step, as he should, can find but few of the patristic citations given in the critical editions of the Greek Testament, unless he happen to be within reach of the very editions of the Fathers used by the editors in their researches. These cannot always be found, even when other, and it may be inferior, editions can. Especially is this likely to be the case since the publication of the immense Latin and Greek Patrologies of Migne, which comprise three hundred and eighty-nine volumes, and a very large proportion of the existing works of the early
ecclesiastical writers. To render these, or any other editions of the Fathers, available to the readers of this Article, every citation is given, at least once in each verse, with full reference to treatise, book, chapter, section, volume, and page. This method of giving such citations is gradually coming into use by authors who have much occasion to refer to the patristic writings. It was suggested to the writer by his friend, Professor Ezra Abbot, D.D., LL.D., of Cambridge, to whom he is deeply indebted for many important citations in the third verse, and for much kind advice and assistance, extending over the whole period of the preparation of this Article. Its value is largely due to the numberless suggestions received from him.

In the digest, as is rightly the custom, readings cited from the uncialis are given without breathings or accents, as these not unfrequently determine the meaning of a word which should be left unsettled until discussed. (For example, αὐτοῦ cannot be said to occur in the Greek of the New Testament, although often found in the Textus Receptus.) Extended citations from the cursives or Fathers are fully accented. In company with recent critical works, the final sigma (ς) is discarded; a diligent search through the second volume of Silvestre's Paléographie Universelle having failed to find more than a trace of its existence in any New Testament manuscript; and that trace, even, is probably but a slip of the pen. The letter j has also been thrown out of the Latin citations, as its use retards the speedy introduction of the scientific method of pronunciation which was recommended by the Committee of the American Educational Convention, at its session held in Boston in August last.

The writer has endeavored so to arrange his digest as to give the clearest view of all the evidence. Each new subject discussed is a paragraph by itself. The main subdivisions of the readings are separated by a perpendicular dash (|); and the minor divisions by inverted leaders (⋯⋯)
PAUL'S PANEGYRIC OF LOVE

GREEK TEXT.

27 'Τακείο δέ ἐστε σῶμα χριστοῦ καὶ μίλη ἐκ μέρους.

DIGEST OF AUTHORITIES.


A LITERAL TRANSLATION.

27 Now are ye the body of Christ, and members individually.
And some God placed in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then powers, then gifts of healing,
29 κυβερνήσεως, γένη γλωσσῶν. μη πάντες ἀπόστολοι; μη πάντες προφηταί; μη πάντες διδάσκαλοι; μη πάντες δυνάμεια; μη πάντες χαρίσματα ἐξουσίων ἰαμάτων; μη πάντες γλῶσσας λαλούσιν, μη πάντες διερμηνεύσαν;


... f. Am. deinde — exinde. ... deinde — et Hier. aut. Iovin. ii. 361. ... deinde — deinde Ambrosiat. in loco. Aug. de Geni Pelagi c. 13. § 32 x. 209d. | omit errata or erra DEFG. d. e. e. Hs i. 967b. Ambros. in Ps. cxviii. Opp. i. 1250c. de Spir. Sanct. ii. 662a. 663a.

28. αὐτοληψις - ΝΑΒ*D*(FG αὐτοληψις), Tisch. Tr. Alf. Ln. | αὐτοληψις - Β*CD*ΕKL, all cursive so far as known, Wd. s. || -ω -A BCD*ESFG. | -υ D*.

— κυβερνήσεως ΝD*: (corrected by Dbc).

— γενε [omits N* by error: (N* supplies it).]


29. δυναμιον ΝD*FG, itacism. | -μιό A BCD*-e.

— Between μη and πάντες ἀπόστολοι Gcorr. adds γυναικα or γυμνα. The word is difficult to read.

30. εχουσιν, λαλουσιν, διερμηνευσουσιν FG.

— Between μη and πάντες γλωσσών Gcorr. would insert γυμνα.

— The v ἐφελκυστικῶν is affixed to λαλουσιν and διερμηνευσουσιν by ΝΑΒ*CDFG. 37. Tisch. Ti. Tif. Tr. Alf. Ln. | It is omitted by Wd. s. solely on the authority of B*, (and possibly K), and the cursive.

29 assistants, governings, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles?

Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all possessors of 30 powers. Have all gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?
31. ζηλουτε δε τα χαρισματα τα μειζονα· και ετι καθ'

31. ζηλουτε ζε6CD | ζηλουται Α. Scr's k o. • • • ζηλουται FG.

Icisms.


— τα χαρισματα ζε6ABCD. Orig. iv. 77d. Cat. Cor. 94. Chr. and Photius Cat. Cor. 247. Damascen. ii. 108d. 358d. 532b. 634b. etc. | omit τα FG.

— τα before μειζονα in F is above the line, in a smaller hand, possibly Fcorr. It is given correctly in G.


31 But earnestly desire the greater gifts; and moreover I am
1 ὑπερβολὴν ὅδον ὑμῖν δείκνυμι. εἰς ταῖος γλώσσας τῶν ὄρων κατ' ἐρώτησιν ἀνέγγισαν, ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἀλοκός γὰρ ἐνέσθη τῶν μεῖζων χαριμάτων; εἰ ὀντὸς ἐνέσθη, ἡγώ ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ ταύτα [p. 251] τοδῆγήσω [Cramér προοδηγήσω] προβούμω. τούτῳ γὰρ ἐνήγαγε καὶ ἐν ὑπερβολῇ ὅδον ὑμῖν δείκνυμι. τούτοις τοῖς κατ' ὑπερβολῇ, μεῖζων χαριμάτων δείκνυμι τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ διδάσκει αὐτοῖς ὅσο τούτων ἀπάτης κρείττων ἐπὶ τὸν πέλαγος ἀγάπη. Τοιαύτης εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν, ἀλοκός τῶν τριῶν. From ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀλοκός to the es! this citation is given in Cramer's Catena as by Theodore of Mopsuestia. And because it has not been noticed that they are the same citation, Theod.-Mops. and Theodoret.-comm. have been cited for μείζων, and Theodoret.-txt. for κρείττων. Very likely Theodore, the pupil, borrowed the comment from Theodore of Mopsuestia his master, and if so he must have written μείζων in his text which the copyists, with their customary carelessness, or something worse, corrupted to κρείττων. It is possible, however, that this is one of the cases so often met with in the works of the Fathers, where whole passages are interpolated by the copyist, and no hint of the fact given. It is worthy of notice here, as showing how little dependence can be placed in the Latin versions of the Greek Fathers, that meliora is given for both κρείττων and μείζων in the Latin of this passage). Damascen. Sacra Parall. a. tit. 18. Opp. ii. 353 b. & tit. 5. p. 532 b. Photius Cat. Cor. 247. Oecumen. in loco i. 546 b. comm. 547 b. Theophyl. ii. 201 b. Ambros. in Ps. xxxvi. c. 4. Opp. i. 778 b. de Videuis c. 5. § 32. ii. 194 b. Ambrosiast. in loco ii. 154. (Confer. Tertul. Uxorii. i. 3. Opp. iii. 77. et meliorem donationem sectatores acimus.). | κρείττων D*E* | κρείττων D*E*FG. Itacism. 31. και ABCDKsL 2 b. | omit FG. Pst. — eti ABCDK^sL 2 b. ··· eti D*F. ··· eti G. Itacism. — μείζων before δεικνυμι ABCDKsL 2 b. Orig. Cat. Cor. 249. Eph.-Syr. Paraen. 26. 46. Opp. ii. 112 a. 169 a. Inst. ad Monachi. iii. 383 a. Chr. ii. 490 d. vii. 376 b. 486 a. x. 289 b. (but six lines below δεικνυμι μείζων). Cyr.-Alex. Hom. in Fest. Pasch. 7. Opp. v. pt. 2. p. 85. etc. | δεικνυμι before μείζων FG. Chr. x. 288 a. (R. 337). 269 b. 269 b. (but see above). | δεικνυμι A ··· δεικνυμι D*: (text D*E*). Itacism. ··· The syllable δεικνυμι alone, is now legible in C. ··· δεικνυμι 17. ··· δεικνυμι Scr's k. — ανθρωπος F* ··· text F*ex. G. 1. Of μη εξω only the letters μ and ε are now legible in C. 1 showing you a supereminentlly excellent way. If I speak with
1. γεγονα χαλκοσ to δε μη γχω in verse 2 is omitted by δουμενετουν in Μ*, the eye of the scribe passing from δε μη γχω at the end of a line to the similar phrase some distance below. Μ* supplies the deficiency, in an elegant hand, upon the upper margin. The passage is vouched for in its entirety by all the other MSS. and MS., both Greek and Latin, the versions, and the Fathers generally whenever they cite the passage.


... d. e. g. m. 16th. Ambrosiast. in loco Opp. ii. pt. 2. p. 154a. read in (g. m. 16). Ambrosiast. om.) unum sum ut (Ambrosiast. velut).

—χαλκος Orig. iv. 121a. Chr. vii. 486d. etc. | χαλκος FG.


the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I have 2 become as sounding brass or a clanging cymbal. And even
though I have the gift of prophecy, and comprehend all the mysteries and all knowledge, and even though I have all faith, so
teiav kai eido tа μυστηρια παντα και πασαν την γνωσιν,
καὶ εαυ την πασαν την πιστιν, δοτε δρη μεθισταναι,

2. Omits ωτε 37.

— μεθωσταναι E BDEFG. 17. 37. 2b. 19. 31. 43. 44. 48. 52. 55. 73. Tisch. Tr. Ln. Clem. Strom. iv. 18. p. 614. (v. 1. p. 644. όποιοι ήσαν οι άποστολοι, ΕΦ' έν την πιστιν δρη μεταστηθαν, και δενθρα μετα-


3 as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. And even though I dole out all my goods to feed the poor, and even though I deliver over my body that I may glory, but have not
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υπάρχοντά μοι; *καὶ ἐὰν παραδῶ τὸ σῶμα μου ἵνα ἴκαν χή-


⋯Clem. 166 διαδο. Chr. x. 292d δε. ⋯ψωμισω F. ⋯ψωμισω G* : (the ν is dotted for omission by Gcorr.).

— μοι] μοι Scr's l.


— ταραδω ΝΑΒCDE. 17. 37. 47. 2b, all the critical editions, the
Fathers generally as for καὶ έκατον and καὶ, above. | ταμαθησαι FG.

Meth. 733a (Jahn 44). Clem. 614 τιτικα.

καιχησουμαι ΝAB. 17. Greek MSS. ap. Hier. (Aeth.-Rom., probably, but see under καιβησουμαι), Memph.-Wilkins (sic, see below). Memph.-Boetticher, Memph.-MS. Memph.-Rom. p. 107. Theb.-Rom. p. 107. Eph.-Syr. Paraen. 26. ii. 112 (but καιχησουμαι by tasism. with Jerome, and some cursives not on our list). A careful examination of the text of Wilkins's Novum Testamentum Aegyptiacum (sic, not Aegyptiacum as Tregelles in Horne, Introduction, tenth edition, 1862, p. 731), which was published in London, 1716, shows the word here used to be enta-shoushou, of which enta is the personal infix of the subjunctive mode, and shoushou the verb to glory, which is also used in 2 Cor. xii. 5, 9, and Ps. v. 11, with the same signification. [On p. 107 of the Rudimenta Linguarum Coptarum a Aegyptiacarum this whole verse is given in Memphitic and Thebaic with a Latin translation. In both the word is shoushou; but, in place of the Memphitic infix enta, the Thebaic has the auxilary sic. that I shall. The Latin is ut glorier. The variations in the text show clearly that it was taken from MSS. altogether independent of those used by Wilkins. See, also, Wakefield's Translation of the N. T., London, 1791. In the third volume of this, p. 173, the author, himself a Coptic scholar, in his note defending his adoption of καιχησουμαι, calls particular attention to the inaccuracy of Wilkins's Latin in this place. This error of Wilkins's has misled Tischendorf, Tregelles, Scrivener, and other recent editors; though Mill, Bengel, Wetstein (who says: Versio Copt. quamvis Editer aliter nos legere iubet), Griesbach, and Scholz have given the citation correctly, as did Tischendorf in his first edition, that of 1841.] Jerome is decided in his testimony. In his Commentary upon Galatians v. 26, ed. Vallars. vii. p. 517a, he says: "Lognatur apostolus, locutur electionis vos: 'Si tradidero corpus meum ut glorier: caritatem autem non habeam, nihil mihi prodest.'" A little further on he says: "Scio in Latinis codicibus in eo testimonio quod supra posuimus: 'Si tradidero corpus meum ut glorier': 'ardeam' habere pro 'glorier'; sed ob similitudinem verbi que apud Graecos 'ardeam' et 'glorier', id est καιβησουμαι et καιχησουμαι, una literae parte distinguitur, apud nostros error inolevit. Sed et apud ipseos Graecos exemplaria sunt diversa." καιχησουμαι was
adopted by Lachmann in his edition of 1831, and is preferred by
Dean Stanley in his Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians. | * καυ-
θρόωμαι CK. 37. Scr. a. e. 10. Vulg.-Clem. Vulg.-Martianus,
* | e. f. g. m 16. (Am. ardor, and so Pst. and Hcl.-txt. read 
* | ut comburatur, not 
* | ut comburar, as Hcl.-marg.) Goth. Arm.
Aeth.-Platt (la-wi'ya ta estê, to the burning of fire), (Aeth.-Walton
reads: la-êma if, ablê' ku I give to be eaten, kama that, èimazagam
I may be rewarded. [In Dillmann’s Lexicon ablê' ku is so con-
nected with the conception of burning, fire, etc., as to render it
possible that it is intended to render καυθρόωμαι and not καυχθρόωμαι.
The rendering, however, is so much of a paraphrase as to leave some
room for doubt in the case.] Pseud-Ignatius Epist. ad Heronem, c.
2. p. 109 (καν παραδον' το σώμα εις καυν). Orig. Cat. Cor. 252. (Meth.
Hom. iii. § 15. p. 38 (Syriac text) ed. Wright, agrees with
Pst. (note that these Homilies have been erroneously ascribed to Jacob of Nisi-
bis; see list of Fathers for the facts in the case; comp. Gallandi’s
Paræn. 46. ii. 169e. Instit. ad Monach. iii. 333’ (Tisch. always fails to
note the vol. with this citation; and also with all references to Chr.
in Reg. 3. ii. 329d. Reg. brev. 282. ii. 514a. Epist. 204 (al. 75), c.
647a καυθρόωμαι one MS. and Garnier’s ed., -σομαι other MSS. and
editions; ii. 8. § 8. p. 665a (sic not -σομαι, as Tisch.). Isaia-Abbas.
Orat. xxi. § 9. col. 1165a. Theoph.-Alex. (A.D. 391), contra Orig-
(R. 339-40, but Moscow codex ap. Tisch. has -σομαι once). xii. 482a
(ìva καυβη). Chr. Cat. Cor. 253. Cyril.-Alex. in Amos viii. 4-6. tom.
pt. 2. p. 85. Theodoret. in loco iii. 252. Eus.-Alex. Sermo de
Charitate (ìva καυβη), (M. lxxxvi. col. 325a). Damascen. in loco
Theophyl. in loco ii. 202a. Tertul. adv. Prax. c. 1. p. 190 (etsi corpus
Testim. iii. 3. p. 304. Auctor lib. de Rebapt. c. 13. p. 368b (ap. Cyp-
p. 484b flammis tradam. Zeno Veronensis Tr. i. 2. c. 6. p. 112a.


3. When we consider the full weight of the combined testimony of MAB. 17, and the two Egyptian versions Memph. and Theb. the evidence seems almost to amount to demonstration that καυθήσωμαι is the very word employed by Paul. It is by far the more difficult reading (see note on p. 142), and is not to be outweighed by the fact that the preponderance of numbers now opposes it. (Eusebius in stating what was, in the first quarter of the fourth century, the evidence of the great majority of Greek MSS. regarding the omission of the last twelve verses of Mark, has shown us how completely changed may be the evidence of the majority of codices which exist to-day. Then these verses were wanting "in the accurate copies," and "in almost all the copies," yet they were found "in some copies." [Quaest. ad Marinum, c. i. § 1, Eus. in Mai Nov Patrum Bibl. iv. pp. 255–56]. To-day M (L) represent "the accurate copies" of Eusebius, while the numerical majority has shifted to the other side.

If καυχήσωμαι were the original word it was almost certain to be changed into καυθήσωμαι, while the converse can hardly be maintained. The present condition of the patristic evidence is such, however, that we are compelled to mark καυθήσωμαι or καυχήσωμαι as equalling our text in value. Between these two words there is little possibility of deciding if the liability to itacism, and the grammatical anomalies of both, be fairly considered.

— δὲ μὴ has perished in C. | For μὴ F seems to have two iotae
μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστεύεται: ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ ξηλοὶ· ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ
dotted, followed by η, there being a little space between the last i
and the η.

514a (one MS.; ed. Garnier οὐδέν from other MSS.). Reg. fol. 28,
from a MS. cited by Wetstein. | * οὐδέν BCDEFGKsL 37. 47.
and not for οὐδέν in ver. 2 as Tisch. and Tr.). Eph.-Syr. ii. 112b. 169a.
665a. Chr. i. 445d. 694a. ii. 612a. vii. 748a. viii. 215b. x. 226b. 291b.
—orabelomai] ορφαλοματι. 17. · · · έμι Clem. 166. Chr. i. 694a.
xii. 36a. Max.-Confess. ii. 545. by confusion with ver. 2.

4. μακροθυμεῖ Clemens-Romanus ad Corinthios Epist. 1. cap. xlix.
(Gall. i. 38a). Clem.-Alex. Paed. iii. 1. p. 251. Orig. Cat. Cor. 252.
ii. 482a. Chr. i. 694a. x. 299a. 310a. xii. 183d. etc. | μακροθυμεῖ F*
(not G).

— ἡ ἀγάπη before οὐ ξηλοὶ is omitted, through mere error, by 41.
Orat. 21. c. 9. p. 1165a. Chr. i. 694a. x. 299a. (300b. 304a. 310a.)
Pomerianus de Vita Contemplativa iii. c. 14. p. 44.

— ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ ξηλοὶ· ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ περιπετευται is thus divided by
authority of Orig. Cat. Cor. 252. Eph.-Syr. Inst. ad Monach. iii.
333a. (Basil. ii. 482a.) Chr. i. 694a. ii. 478a. viii. 695b. x. 299b. 300d
85. (Apophthegmata Patrum π. 74. M. lxv. 340b). Theodoret. in
loco iii. 253. Max.-Confess. seems to favor this punctuation Cap. de
ii. 353d; (does not omit οὐ ξηλοὶ ἡ ἀγάπη, as Tisch.). Theophyl. in
loco ii. 202a. So, also, Ti. Tif. Tif.1841. Tr. Alf. Wd. 5. | χρηστεύεται ἡ

4 love, I am in no wise advantaged. Love suffereth long, is kind;
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If envy is the division and punctuation of Tisch. Ln. on authority of the division of lines in D (thus: χρηστ. ἡ αὐτ., on ζηλ. ἡ αὐ. || ). Damascen. in loco ii. 109a. [It is difficult to see why Tischendorff should cite, as authority for his method of punctuation, Antiochus Monachus Sabae (fl. A.D. 614), Homil. 96, de Dilectione Proximi, p. 1180 ed. Du Duc (M. lxxxix. p. 1728): as in that place Antiochus reads: ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστεύει: ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε ἓκτιάτη, which can hardly be read differently from our text.]

5 Love envieth not; Love vaunteth not herself, is not self-inflated, doth not behave herself unbecomingly, seeketh not her own, is
6 
εαυτής, οὗ παροξύνεται, οὗ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν, οὗ χαίρει
(Tisch. reads non) proternum saporit. · · · · Tisch. errs in citing Eph.-
Syr. iii. 333 for πεπροφθή. He there reads πεπροφθή, but in
Paraen. 46. ii. 169b he reads πεπροφθή.
4. φυσιοῦντα] φυσιοῦντα FG, by itacism.
5. οὐκ αὐχάκομαι Fcorr. G. | οὐκ κακάκομαι F* · · · · οὐκ κακάκομαι
Eph.-Syr. Paraen. 26. ii. 112°. (Damascen. in loco ii. 109a, ap. Le
Quien οὐκ αὐχάκομαι, but Migne οὐκ).
— ζητεί] ζητεί η, by itacism.
Quis Dives Salvator c. 38. p. 956 (sic page, not 947 as Tisch.).
672°. Isaias-Abbas Orat. 21. c. 9. p. 1165b. Chr. i. 102b (R. 124).
694°. (x. 302° and 304° in two codices ap. Tisch.). Cyril. de Ador.
i. in Cantic. i. 5. Opp. ii. 41. in loco iii. 253. Procop.-Gazæus in
in loco i. 549c. Theophyl. in loco ii. 208°. Optatus de Schism.
Donat. vii. 3. (Gall. v. 501°). Ambrosiast. in loco ii. pt. 2. 155°.
Aug. ad Sanctimon. Epist. 211. c. 12. Opp. ii. 786a. Epist. ad Deme-
de Dilectione c. 15. p. xvii°. Ps.-Basil. in Esaiam c. xv. § 293. i.
601°. Chr. x. 302° (R. 353) bis. 304° (R. 354). 310°. | τα μη
εαυτήρα B. Tr.-mg. Clem. Paed. iii. 1. p. 252. It is quite possible
that this is the original phrase of the apostle. If so, however, it
must have been misunderstood, and corrected (after the fashion of
that age) at a very early day, as no trace of it has been found among
the Greek Fathers below Clemens-Alexandrinus.
— παροξυνεται] παροξυνεται FG, by itacism.
c. 38. p. 956.
6 not easily provoked, reckoneth not the evil, rejoiceth not at
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7 έπε τῇ ἠδικίᾳ, συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. πάντα στήριγμα πάντα ψυχεί, πάντα ἐλπίζει, πάντα ὑπομένει.

8 Ἡ ἀγάπη νοεῖται πάντες ἐκείς δὲ τροφητεύει, ἐκείς καὶ ἀλμάτις. ὡς αὐτοὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ καὶ τῇ παρθένῳ.

6. τῇ ἀδικίᾳ] omit τῷ FG. · · · · · · αὐθεντικὸν B* (text B*).

— συγχαίρε — MACDEFGKP 17. 37. 47. 2b. Tisch. Tr. Al. La Wd. Eras. 5. | συγχαίρε — B*DGFG. Tisch. Ti. || μέριμνα ABCDEFGP. 2b. · · · · · · μέριμνα διὰ ΔΡ. by itacism.

— τῇ ἀληθείᾳ] prefixes εἰς Scr's c.

— αὐθεντικὸν ABCDGK. · · · · · · αὐθεντικὸν KDGFG, by itacism.

7. πάντα στήριγμα is repeated by B* · · · · B* does not restore the first, but puts it in brackets, or parentheses.

— στήριγμα MACDEGP. 2b (d. e. f. g. Am. read sustent), the Fathers generally, except as below. | στήριγμα FG. | στήριγμα. Marcus Ermita Opusc. vii. Disputatio cum Caesidio c. 8. (Gall. viii. 14). Photius Epist. lib. i. 2 (M. cii. 956c). Cyprian. de Unit. Eccl. c. 14 p. 199. de Bonae Patienæae p. 252. Testim. iii. 3 p. 304. Zeno de Spe, Rite, Caritate c. 6 p. 112c. (Cyprian and Zeno diligit). · · · · · · add ἡ αὐθεντικὸν Hcr.-mg.-Gr.

— ἦμαρτεν] ὑπομενέι FG. itacism.


7 iniquity, but rejoicest together with Truth; beareth all things, trusteth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Love
ταραγηθόνταί· εἰτε γλώσσαι, παύσονται· εἰτε *γνώσεισ εἰς,


8. εἰτε δἐ] In C τε δἐ is re-written over an erasure by C3. Τισχendor, in his edition of the Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, Paris, 1842, says: "sine dubio a prima manu decret AE." C ends the page with γλωσσαί, and has a grievous hiatus thenceforward to ver. 40 of ch. xv.


— προφητεῖα καταργηθονται (Ν) (Α) CD*EFGKΠL(P). 17. 37. 47. 2θh. Μεμφ.-Ρομ. p. 114. Θεβ.-Ρομ. p. 114, and the versions never faileth; but whether there be gifts of prophecy, they will be brought to naught; whether there be tongues, they will be silenced; whether there be knowledges, they will be brought to
9 καταργηθοῦνται. εὶ μέρους γὰρ γνώσεσκομεν καὶ εἰ
generally. The critical editions; the Fathers generally where
they cite the passage. Tertul. de Pat. c. 12. p. 97, Nuncquam excidit:
nam caetera evacuabuntur, consummabuntur; exhauriens linguis
scientiae, propheteia. ··· καταργοῦνται Clem. 956 (sic, not p. 94
as Tisch.). ··· προφητιὰ A (by mere error, as it has καταργηθοῦ
ται to agree with it). ··· προφητιὰ καταργηθοῦται B. Prosper.-Aquitan. in Ps. ciili. 11. p. 208.

8. γλώσσαι παύονται Clem. 956. ··· καταργηθοῦνται Macr.-
Aegypt. de Pat. et Discretione 11. p. 182. ··· παύονται Scr's c.

— γνώσεως καταργηθοῦνται καὶ (but γνώσις by itacism) AD*FG. 17. 47. (but 17. 47. γνωσις by itacism) g. [Aeth.] Tr.-mg. Lu.-mg.
Amphil. Sermo in Circum. Jesu Christi, Orat. 2. p. 11\textsuperscript{b} (but παυο-
ται for καταργηθοῦνται). Nyssen. de Anima et Resurrectionii. 66\textsuperscript{b} (but παύονται).
Cyril. in Malach. iv. 2–3 § 44. Opp. iii. 867 (but παυο-
ται for καταργ).

Max.-Confess. ad Thalas. Quaest. 60. p. 211.

Damascen. text. in loco ii. 110\textsuperscript{a} (Oecumenian. Cat. Cor. 258. γνωσις.
Tertul. de Pat. c. 12. p. 97, as above. | ··· γνωσις καταργηθοῦνται
BD*E (but γνωσις by itacism or misapprehension of the correc-
tions in D) KeL 37. 2\textsuperscript{b}. Scr's mss. d. e. f. Am. Pst. Hcl. Memph.-
255 (πει τοι μελλοντο γαρ ετεν χρόνων καταργεισθαι την γνωσιν).
Orig. iv. 220\textsuperscript{a} (possibly a reference: τάλαμαν την εκ μέρους
gνωσιν). Orig.-Int. ii. 325\textsuperscript{a}. Archel. Act. Disput. c. 37. 593\textsuperscript{a} (in Latin only).

Didym.-Alex. 446. Basil. ii. 228\textsuperscript{a}. Chr. i. 445\textsuperscript{b} bis. 446\textsuperscript{a} (καταργη-
σθαι). 446\textsuperscript{a}. x. 809\textsuperscript{a}. 810\textsuperscript{a} (R. 363). 311\textsuperscript{a} (R. 363), and once καταργεται.
Cyril. i. 446 (παυοται). in Joan. xvi. 25. lib. xi e. 2.
Opp. iv. 988 (παυοται δε γνωσιν). Theodoret. text. in loco iii. 25\textsuperscript{a} (com-
ment. four lines below, παυοται). Cat. Cor. 255 bis, (ορε
Damascen. comm. in loco ii. 110\textsuperscript{b} (και νοια γνωσιν καταργεται).
Photius Cat. Cor. 256. Oecumen. i. 550\textsuperscript{a}. Theophyl. ii. 204\textsuperscript{a}.
Ambrosiast. in loc.
ii. pt. 2. 155\textsuperscript{a}. Hier. adv. Iovin. lib. ii. c. 23. Opp. ii. 361\textsuperscript{a}.

Angius Ps. ciili. Serm. 3. c. 3. Opp. iv. 1151. de Actis Pelice viii. 478. de
Spir. et Litt. x. 107\textsuperscript{a}. Prosper.-Aquitan. Exp. in Ps. ciili. 11. p. 208.

γνωσιν παυοται P. Cyril. i. 446. Theodoret. Cat. Cor. 255.


9 naught. For we know in part, and we prophecy in part; but
10 μέρους προφητεύωμεν· οταν δὲ ἐλθῇ τὸ τελειον τὸ ἐκ μέ-

— γνωσκομεν] γνωσκομεν B*DEFG, by itacism.
11 ΡΟΥΣ ΚΑΤΑΡΓΗΘΗΣΤΑΙ. ΘΕΣ ΗΜΕΝ ΝΗΠΙΟΣ, ΕΛΑΛΟΥΝ ΙΣΟ


— ΤΟ ΕΧ ΜΙΡΟΥΣ ΚΑΤΑΡΓΗΘΗΣΤΑΙ ΑΒΔΨΡ. 17. 37. 47. Scr's ss. Iren.-Int. i. 238a. Orig. i. 645b. ii. 497b. iii. 519b. iv. 209b. 352a (κα- ταργηθη). Cat. Cor. 69. 249. (Note that Orig.-Int. here follows Ιουν for the contrary order. No dependence can be placed on him in such cases). Archel. Dispt. § 36. p. 593c. § 37. p. 593b. Eus. in Ps. xliv. 14. p. 191b. Athanas. i. p. 851a. Didym. 446. Basil. iii. 35c. Epiph. i. 673b. Melet. i. 881a. Chr. i. 446b. iii. 469a. vii. 209b. i. 10 when the perfect is come which is in part will be brought;
vēpion, ἐφρόνουν ὡς νήπιοι, ἐλογιζόμεν ὡς


11 naught. While I was a child I spake as a child, I thought as a
vēpīoso, dēte γέγονα ἄνηρ κατηργηκα τὰ τοῦ γῆσθι.

c. 2. Opp. ii. 225° (sic, not 223, as Tisch.). Epiph. adv. Hær. liv. c. 32. Opp. i. 555°. Chr. i. 446°. 447b (ὡς νήπις ἐφρ.). iii. 469b. v. 29b. 289° (omits ὡς νήπις ἐδάλων). x. 311b (R. 368). Theodoret. in loco ii. 254. Cat. Cor. 255. Isidor.-Pelusiot. comm. in Epist. 448. p. 125 (ὡς νήπις ἐλ., ὡς νήπις ἐφρ.). Euthal.-Cod. Oecumen. text. in loco i. 53° (but, probably by typographical error, νήπιος is omitted before δάλων. The comment at 551° has ὡς νήπιος δάλων.). Theophyl. is loco ii. 205°. Tertul. de Pudic. c. i. p. 366 (omitting cōgitabam u parvulus). Ambrosiast. in loco 155°. Aug. de Civit. Dei. xxii. c. 2. § 2. Opp. ii. 697a (quasi parv. sap., quasi parv. loq., quasi parv. cogit.). | cē. οὐ νηπτ., οὐ νηπτ. εφρ., οὐ νηπτ. ελογιζομεν 37. Orig.-Int. iii. 274. Hier. in Esaiam. livi. 2. lib. xv. Opp. iv. 655°. This reading is that of Wordsworth, perhaps though, through the printer’s not understanding the marks on the margin of the Greek Testament given him for copy. It seems probable that Wd. intended to adopt the reading of our text, and that he so marked his “copy.”

11. οὐ νηπτ. εφρ., οὐ νηπτ. ελαλων. Scr’s c k.
— ελαλων, ελογιζομεν] λαλον and λογιζομεν FG.
— γεγονα MADFGKLP. 17. 37. 47. 2b. Scr's mss. Clem.-Alex. 118 bis (not 117 as Tisch. and Tr., who must have taken the citation without verification from Griesbach’s Symbolae Criticae ii. 254, which fails to note that only οἴην νήπιος, ἐφρούνον ὡς νήπιος, δάλων ὡς νήπιος is found on p. 117 of Potter’s edition of Clement, and that while the remainder of the verse occurs in no form upon p. 117, child, I reasoned as a child; since I have become a man I have
12 βλέπομεν γὰρ ἀρτι δι’ ἑσόπτρου εν αἰνίγματι, τοῦτε δὲ πρό-it does occur twice upon p. 118). Orig. iii. 479a. Cat. Cor. 256. Cat. Ephes. 172. Meth. (Jahn 79). Macar.-Aegypt. 182a. Didym.-Alex. 446. Nyssen. i. 187a. Basil. i. 159a. ii. 225a. Epiph. i. 155c. Chr. i. 447a. iii. 469b. v. 29b. 289b. x. 311b (R 368). Theodoret. iii. 254. iv. 654. Cat. Cor. 255. Isidor.-Pelusiot. Epist. 443. Nilus 214. Damascen. ii. 110a. Oecumen. i. 551a; (once διαν δὲ γέγονα ἄνηρ and once διὲ δὲ ἄνηρ γέγονα). Theophyl. ii. 205a. | εγενομεν B. Orig. Cat. in 1 Johan. 115. 11. κατηγρύγκα τα του νηπίου ἌΒΚσΛΠ. 17. 87. 47. 2a. Scr's mss. f. Am. Clem.-Alex. p. 118, line 2. Orig. iii. 478a (κατηγρύγκαν). 479b. Cat. Cor. 256 (ἀπέρρυμα τα του νηπιου). Cat. in 1 Johan. 115. Cat. Ephes. 172. Orig.-Int. ii. 293b. 486b. 673b. iii. 27a. 956b. iv. 520b. Arch. 602b. Meth. (Jahn 79, κατηγρύγκα). Macar.-Aegypt. 182a (κατηγρύγκα). Didym.-Alex. 446. Nyssen. i. 187b (κατηγρύγκα). Basil. i. 159b. Chr. i. 447b. v. 29b. 289b. Theodoret. iii. 254. iv. 654. Nilus 214. Damascen. ii. 110a. Oecumen. i. 551a. Theophyl. ii. 205a. Hier. iv. 655b. Aug. vi. 502b. vii. 697a. 478b. x. 105d. Eras.1 κατηγρύγκ κατα του νηπιου. Eras2 κατηγρύγ κατα του νηπιου. Eras2 κατηγρύ γα του νηπιου. | τα του νηπιου κατηγρύγκα DEFG. d. e. g. Hcl. Arm.Goth. Orig. iii. 663b (ἄνηρ τα του νηπιου κατηγρύγκασ). Orig.-Int. ii. 79b. 382b. 673b. Basil. ii. 225a (not 223 as Tisch.). Epiph. i. 555a (κατηγρύγκα). Chr. iii. 469b. x. 311b. Theodoret. Cat. Cor. 255. Isidor.-Pelusiot. Epist. 443. Tertul. de Pudic. c. i. p. 366. Hil. in Ps. cxxxii. § 5. p. 462f. Ambrosiat. 155b. 12 βλέπομεν ἸΑΒΔΕFG. 17. 47. 2b. mss. generally; all the critical editions; most Fathers, with some exceptions, however. (This is a favorite verse with the Fathers, who cite it with every conceivable verbal variation, scarcely any of which we can give, but the sense of their citations is pretty generally identical with the text as found in the great uncials. Cyril.-Alex., alone, cites the verse, more or less fully, over thirty times, with nearly as many variations as citations. We give the variations of βλέπω so that it may be seen how little regard the Fathers had for verbal accuracy. Beyond this we cite few variations not sanctioned by some of the manuscripts on our list). βλεπομεν P. 42, by itacism. βλεπωμεν 37. βλεπωμεν Orig. in Cantic. ii. 3 (θεωρήσωμεν) (Mai Class. Auct. ix. 288). Orig.-Int. iv. 536a (videntur). 537b (contuendo). Chr. x. 312b (βλέπει). 12 laid aside the things of a child. For now we are seeing in a
mirror obscurely, but then face to face; now I am knowing in
1873.]
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155 (βλέπω ότι ἐν ζῷοτρῳ, ὡς ἐν αἰνίγματι). 156 (Max.-Confess. Schol. in Ps.-Dion.-Areop. ii. 188. 229). Hesych. in Levit. ii. 3 (M. xiii. 8066, but as it is in Latin it cannot be trusted. See Latin Fathers below). Photius Bibliotheca lib. vii. codd. 222 (M. xiii. 788c). The Latin Fathers generally, or at least the copies of their works now extant, except as above. 1 (or autem) Pst. (Aeth.). Orig.-Int. iv. 573d. Didym.-Alex. de Trin. i. 9. p. 7. Isaias-Abbas Orat. 25. § 20. fol. 1188a. (Max.-Confess. ad Thalas. Quaest. 9. p. 26). Zeno de Resurr. xiv. p. 132e. [Damascen. de Imaginibus Orat. 2. c. 20. Opp. i. 340c (βλέπομεν γάρ, ὡς ἐν ζῷοτρῳ, καὶ ἐν αἰνίγματι, κτλ.).


— αὐτοπρῶτον F, ed. Scriv. 1 αὐτοπρῶτον F, Treg. (by error?)

— αὐνίγματι FG. · · · enigmāti D*P. Itacisms.

13 ἐπιγνῶσμαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην. νυνὶ δὲ μέιει πίστις


part, but then shall I fully know even as I was fully known. 13 And now there is abiding Faith, Hope, Love, these three, but the greater of these is Love: pursue after Love.
διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην.

(but not f.) G. d. e (but omits et). g. Tolet. Cyprian. 319. (Perhaps the exemplar of D, as that codex has καὶ ὁ στεγνώσθην).  

18. μνει B* D.
— τουτων | τουτων Eras1. (text Eras2).
— We join to our passage the first clause of chapter xiv. on authority of the Sinaiticus, which has no pause at ἀγάπη, but its greatest at ἀγάπην.
Six lines read thus:

ΔΕΤΟΥΤΩΝ ΝΑΠΟΦΗΤΕΥΗ
ΠΗΔΙΟΚΕΤΕΤΗΝ
ΑΓΑΠΗΝ
ΖΗΛΟΥΣΕΤΕ ΑΙΝΙΝ
ΚΑΜΑΛΛΟΝΔΕΙ
ΝΑΠΟΦΗΤΕΥΗ

It will be perceived that the Z, in the fourth line, projects half its diameter to the left of the other lines. The beginning of a new paragraph is very frequently thus indicated in the Sinaiticus.

The Vaticanus also contracts the ντ at the end of ἀγαπῆν so as not to run on to the next line, and begins the next ζηλοῦτε. Damascenus, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, in their commentaries on this passage consider διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην by itself, and thus do not show whether they connected it with the preceeding or with the following clause. It is possible, therefore, that they may have known MSS. divided as ΜΒ. This method of division adds greatly to the impressiveness and beauty of chapter xiii., and if the succeeding δὲ be translated now (as it should be in verse 27 of chapter xii.), no violence will be done to chapter xiv. In fact the three chapters are so closely connected as hardly to bear separation at all.
— διώκετε] αὐωκεται FG. Itacism and blunder combined.