

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE V.

ON THE READING "CHURCH OF GOD," ACTS XX. 28.

BY PROFESSOR EZRA ABBOT, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Common version : — "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

Received text : — Προσέχετε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῇ ποιμνίῃ, ἐν ᾗ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος.

Various readings : — οὖν, "therefore," is bracketed by Lachmann, and omitted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Green (*Twofold New Test.*), and Westcott and Hort, but is retained by Alford and Wordsworth. For τοῦ θεοῦ, "God," Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Green read τοῦ κυρίου, "the Lord"; Alford, Wordsworth, and Westcott and Hort retain θεοῦ. But Tregelles places θεοῦ in the margin with a mark of interrogation, implying some doubt whether it should not be regarded as an *alternative* reading; and Alford on the other hand puts κυρίου in the margin, in large type, as of nearly equal authority with θεοῦ. All the editions named above read in the last clause διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου for διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος.

Of those who have written treatises on the textual criticism of the New Testament, Porter, Davidson, and Hammond give the preference to κυρίου; Scrivener and Milligan defend θεοῦ. Among recent commentators and translators, θεοῦ is preferred by Dr. Gloag; on the other hand, Meyer, Ewald, Lechler (in Lange's *Bibelwerk*) very confidently, Overbeck, Dr. David Brown (with hesitation), Holtzmann (in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*), the new Dutch translation (1868), and Weizsäcker adopt the reading κυρίου.

To recount the opinions of the earlier critics, or to give a sketch of the literature of the subject, would carry us too far. But as a mistake made by one scholar often leads many astray, it may be well to say that Matthæi does not read θεοῦ, as stated by De Wette,

Davidson, and Alford, but *κυρίων καὶ θεοῦ*, in both of his editions; that Gratz does not reject *κυρίων*, as is affirmed by Bloomfield (9th ed.), but adopts it; and that although Michaelis defends *θεοῦ* in his Introduction to the New Testament (4th ed., 1788), in a later work (*Anmerkungen zu seiner Uebers. d. N. T.*, 1790, ii. 407 ff.) he gives the preference to *κυρίων* as the best supported reading.

The passage presents one of the most interesting and important problems in the textual criticism of the New Testament; but no thorough investigation of the evidence for the different readings has been published, so far as I am aware, since the time of Wetstein. The recent accession of the Sinaitic manuscript to the authorities for *θεοῦ* may be thought by some to turn the scale in its favor; and the fact that this reading is received into the text by scholars so eminent as Professor Westcott and Dr. Hort might alone justify a new discussion of the question, if any excuse were needed.

In stating the evidence for the different readings, we may begin with

I. THE AUTHORITIES FOR *κυρίων*.

Manuscripts.—AC*DE, $\frac{13}{\text{XI}}$, $\frac{15}{\text{X or XI}}$, $\frac{18}{\text{XIII}}$, $\frac{36}{\text{XIII}}$, $\frac{40}{\text{XI}}$, $\frac{69}{\text{XIII}}$, $\frac{73}{\text{XI}}$, $\frac{81}{\text{XI}}$, $\frac{95^*}{\text{XI or XII}}$, $\frac{180}{\text{XII}}$, $\frac{156}{\text{XI}}$, $\frac{168}{\text{XIV}}$, $\frac{180}{\text{XII}}$, $\frac{a^{scr}}{\text{XII}}$, B-C H. 7, $\frac{58}{\text{XIII}}$; and Lect. $\frac{58}{\text{XII}}$; in all, 4 uncial and 16 cursives.¹ As to date, 2 are supposed to be of the fifth century, 2 of the sixth, 1 of the tenth or eleventh, 5 of the eleventh, 1 of the eleventh or twelfth, 4 of the twelfth, 4 of the thirteenth, and 1 of the fourteenth. Here the high character of the cursives which read *κυρίων* is particularly to be remarked. Eight of them, Nos. 13, 36, 40, 69, 73, 81, 95, and 180, are marked by Tischendorf with an asterisk in the Prolegomena to his seventh critical edition as noticeable for their agreement with the text of the most ancient copies; and there are three others at least, namely, Nos. 15, 18, and a^{scr}, which deserve to be so marked. The first in the list, No. 13

¹ I omit Tischendorf's "cat", by which he means not "some catenae," but the text of the manuscript (New Coll. Oxford, 58), published by Cramer with its catena in 1838. Tischendorf sometimes cites this as "cat", sometimes as "cat^{ox}", but does not seem to be aware that it is identical with No. 36 — Bloomfield (*Crit. Annot.*, Lond. 1860, p. 194) says, "I am now, indeed, enabled to add to the evidence for *κυρίων*, 9 Lam. and Scr. mss." But *κυρίων* here must be a mistake for *κυρίων καὶ θεοῦ*. B-C. ii. 7 is one of the Burdett-Coutts mss. recently collated by Scrivener; see his *Introduction*, 2d ed., pp. 221, 540.

(33 Gosp., 17 Pauline Epist.), is said by Eichhorn to be "full of the most excellent and oldest readings." He styles it "the Queen of the cursive manuscripts." No. 40 Tischendorf designates as "codex admodum insignis." No. 73 is called by Griesbach "præstantissimus." "Optimis adnumerare non dubito," says Birch (*Variæ Lect.* 1798, p. ix). No. 180 is justly spoken of by Scrivener as "important." Finally, Scrivener's "a" represents, according to him, "a very interesting and valuable text . . . being found in harmony . . . with the most ancient mss., and very conspicuously with that most precious document designated . . . as p" [now 61, formerly Tischendorf's "10^a"]. (*Introd. to Cod. Augiensis*, p. lvi.) The excellence of most of the cursives that support *κυρίου*, in contrast with the inferior character of those which read *θεοῦ*, is an important point, and will be illustrated hereafter.

Ancient Versions. — The OLD LATIN (2d cent.), as shown by the quotations in all the earlier Latin fathers (see below), confirmed more or less by the Latin interpreter of Irenæus, and the Graeco-Latin manuscripts D and E; the MEMPHITIC or COPTIC (3d cent., or perhaps the 2d), the THEBAIC or SAHIDIC (same date), the ARMENIAN (5th cent.), and the HARCLEAN or PHILOXENIAN SYRIAC (A.D. 616) in the *margin*, representing an Alexandrian manuscript "very accurate and approved," according to Thomas of Harkel, and which certainly exhibits an early form of the text, though, like D, disfigured by interpolations.

Fathers. — IRENAEUS (cir. A.D. 180), *Cont. Haer.* iii. 14. § 2, in a very early Latin version (already used, it is thought, by Tertullian): *Attendite igitur et vobis et omni gregi in quo vos Spiritus sanctus praeponit episcopos, regere ecclesiam Domini, quam sibi constituit per sanguinem suum.* This is the more important, as it is part of a quotation embracing six verses (ver. 25–30), and therefore probably not made from memory. I know of no particular reason for doubting that this version represents the Greek of Irenæus; certainly there is nothing in the context (*pace* Mr. Nolan) to suggest such a doubt; and we may at any rate say with Lachmann, "licet aliquando non Irenaeum sed Latinos novi testamenti codices secutus sit [Latinus interpres], eos cum Irenaei libris in plerisque omnibus consensisse multis documentis cognoscitur" (*N.T.*

tom. i. p. x). But if it be assumed, without proof, that the translator here followed the Old Latin version instead of Irenaeus, we have at all events a testimony for *κυρίου* which reaches back to the second century.

APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS (3d or 4th cent.?), ii. 61. § 4, an allusion rather than a quotation, and from which, though it favors *κυρίου*, we cannot draw any confident inference: *συντρέχετε εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου, ἣν περιποιήσατο τῷ αἵματι τοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου, τοῦ πρωτοτόκου πάσης κτίσεως*. Here, according to Lagarde, Codd. x y z of the 14th and 16th cent., but of different families, with the edition of Turrianus, which he follows, read *κυρίου*, while Cod. w (A.D. 1111) has *θεοῦ*. Comp. the allusion vii. 26. § 1; viii. 12. § 18. I do not include ii. 57. § 13; viii. 11. § 2; 41. § 4; see 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. The compiler of the Apostolical Constitutions, if he refers to Acts xx. 28, may possibly, though not very probably, have interpreted the *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου* as equivalent to *διὰ τ. αἵμ. τ. ἰδίου υἱοῦ*, as is done by Erasmus (Paraphr.), Limborch (though he prefers the reading *κυρίου*), John Milton, Lœnfant and Beausobre, Doederlein, Van der Palm (note in his Dutch trans.), Granville Penn, and Mr. Darby. But if he read *θεοῦ* in the Acts, he would hardly have substituted the unusual expression, "the church of the Lord," which occurs elsewhere, I believe, but twice in the Constitutions (ii. 20. § 9; 43. § 4), for his familiar phrase, "church of God," which he uses at least 16 or 18 times.

ATHANASIUS (fl. A.D. 328, d. 373), in *Ep. i. ad Serap. c. 6*, as edited, reads *θεοῦ*; but Cod. Reg. 1, of the 10th or 11th century, and "egregiae notae" according to Montfaucon, has *κυρίου*, and three other good manuscripts *χριστοῦ*. (Athan. *Opp. i. 653°* ed. Bened., or ii. 544^b in Migne's *Patrol. xxxvi.*) That the true text of Athanasius here is either *κυρίου* or *χριστοῦ*, is made almost certain, I think, not only by the passage cited by Tischendorf from his treatise against Apollinaris, but by many other passages in the same work. See below, Supplementary Note A, p. 343 ff.

DIDYMUS of Alexandria (A.D. 309–395), *De Trin. ii. 8. § 2* (*Opp. col. 621^b* in Migne's *Patrol. xxxix.*), quotes the passage *Προσέχετε . . . διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος*, with the reading *κυρίου*. So also in his treatise *De Spiritu sancto*, c. 24 (*Opp. col. 1054°*), as preserved in

the Latin translation by Jerome. In a *reference* to the passage in Cramer's *Catena* (p. 337), he uses the expression τῷ ποιμνίῳ ὁ περιεποίησατο ὁ σωτήρ τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι.

CHRYSOSTOM (A.D. 347-407) quotes the passage with the reading κυρίου in *Hom. xi. in Ep. ad Eph.* (on Eph. iv. 12; *Opp.* xi. 83^a (95), ed. Montf.). Here the mss. of Savile, Montfaucou, and Field present no variation, and Matthæi's ms. of Chrysostom confirms the reading (see his *N.T. Gr. et Lat.* viii. 92, note on Eph. iv. 9). That Chrysostom's text in his *Comm.* on the Acts,¹ as edited by Montfaucou, which reads θεοῦ twice (*Opp.* ix. 333 (372)), has been corrupted, as often elsewhere (see Tregelles, *Textual Criticism*, p. 335), is proved, I think, by five distinct considerations:—(a) By the context, as Mill perceived: εἰ γὰρ ὁ δεσπότης ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας οὐδὲ τοῦ αἵματος ἐφείσατο τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, κ. τ. λ., though this alone might not be decisive. (b) By the extract in Cramer's *Catena* on the passage (pp. 336, 337), shown to belong to Chrysostom instead of Ammonius not only by its contents, but, what has not been noticed, expressly ascribed to Chrysostom (Τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου instead of Τοῦ αὐτοῦ) in the *Paris* ms. of this *catena* (Cod. Coislin. xxv. i.e. No. 15 of the Acts), which is much older and better than the *Oxford* ms. (see Cramer, p. 446, and his preface, p. iv). This *catena* reads twice, in both manuscripts, ποιμαίνειν τ. ἐκ. τοῦ κυρίου where Montfaucou has θεοῦ. (c) By the anonymous commentary on the Acts published by Finetti with the works of Theophylact from a ms. in the Medicean Library at Florence, and which here, as often elsewhere, abridges Chrysostom. This reads Ὁρᾶς; παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχετε τὴν χειροτονίαν, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου. Ἴδου καὶ ἄλλη ἀνάγκη· τοῦ κυρίου ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία. (Theophylacti *Opp.* ed. De' Rossi and Finetti, iii. 620^a, or iii. 1115^a in Migne's *Patrol.* cxxv.) (d) It has not been observed that this reading of Chrysostom in the *catena* is further confirmed in part by one or more of Savile's manuscripts. In his edition of Chrysostom (vol. iv. p. 855), for the text of Montfaucou, εἶτα, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκ. τοῦ θεοῦ, ἰδὸν καὶ δευτέρα [sc.

¹ That θεοῦ stands in the text prefixed to the comment is hardly worthy of notice, as editors and transcribers very often in such cases conformed the text to that of the copies with which they were familiar. See Wetstein's *N.T.* ii. 867; also, Tischendorf's notes on Acts xi. 20, p. 97, and 1 Cor. vii. 5, p. 489, bottom.

ἀνάγκη] he gives the various reading, Ἰδοὺ καὶ ἄλλη, τοῦ κυρίου ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία.¹ (e) Adding to these considerations the fact that Chrysostom on Eph. iv. 12 unquestionably reads κυρίου, we cannot reasonably hesitate, I think, to regard the catena as preserving the true reading here. If Dr. Tregelles is right (*Printed Text*, p. 232) in regarding the Homilies on the Acts as not really Chrysostom's, this last argument falls away; but the others appear to be decisive, and we have then two authorities for κυρίου instead of one.

PSEUDO-CYRIL (5th cent. ?), *De sancta et vivif. Trin.* c. 26, published by Cardinal Mai as Cyril's, but regarded by Dr. Tregelles (*Account of Printed Text*, p. 232, note †), to whose judgment I defer, as belonging to a later author: Προσέχετε ... κυρίου ... διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου. (Cyrilli *Opp.* viii. 1185^b, in Migne LXXV.)

CONSTANTINE VI. and IRENE, Letter to Pope Hadrian I. (*Divalis sacra ad Hadrian. papam*) at the time of the second Nicene Council (A.D. 787):—"Et iterum divinus ... apostolus ... sic mandavit: *Pascite gregem Domini cum disciplina, quam acquisivit proprio sanguine.*" (*Concilia*, ed. Coleti, viii. 677^d, 678^a.)

THEODORUS STUDITA (A.D. 759-826), *Epist.* lib. ii. ep. 56: ὁρῶν οὕτω κινδυνεύουσαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἣν περιποιήσατο κύριος διὰ τοῦ οἰκείου αἵματος. (In Sirmondi *Opp. Var.* v. 379^d, or Migne XCIX. 1269^b.)

ANTONIUS MELISSA (8th cent. ? 12th cent. ?), in "Loci communes Sententiarum ... collecti per Antonium et Maximum monachos," etc. Genev. 1609 (appended to Stobaeus), *Serm.* clxxiii. p. 286: Προσέχετε ... κυρίου ... διὰ τ. ἰδ. αἵματος.

But this is not all. The quotations given by Wetstein (*N. T.* ii.

¹ In the case of another important passage, 1 Tim. iii. 16, Savile's mss. preserve, as I believe, the true reading of Chrysostom. In his *Hom.* xv. (al. xiv.) in *Joan.* (on John i. 18, *Opp.* viii. 86 (99) ed. Montf.), the printed editions read: Εἰ δὲ ἀλλαχού φησι, θεὸς ἐφανέρωθη ἐν σαρκί, μὴ θαυμάσῃς· ὅτι ἡ φανέρωσις διὰ τῆς σαρκός, κ.τ.λ. But here Savile (*Chrys. Opp.* ii. 613, l. 27) gives the various reading, Διὰ τοῦτο φησιν, ὅς ἐφανέρωθη ἐν σαρκί, ἡ γὰρ φανέρωσις, κ.τ.λ. This is confirmed by the Latin translation of Chrysostom's Homilies on John made in the fifteenth century by Francesco Accolti of Arezzo (Franciscus Aretinus), which reads:—"Propterea inquit, *Qui manifestatus est in carne,*" etc.

Cramer's catena on 1 Tim. iii. 16 likewise preserves the genuine text of Chrysostom in opposition to the text of Montfaucon, and is here confirmed by an old Latin version of this father, as is remarked by Dr. W. H. Ward in his valuable Article on this passage in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for Jan. 1865, p. 26 f.

597, 598), to which I must content myself with referring for want of space, from ORIGEN (A.D. 230),¹ GREGORY OF NYSSA (A.D. 370), ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM (A.D. 412), EUTHERIUS (not "Eucherius") OF TYANA (A.D. 419), THEODORET (A.D. 423) — see especially his Third Dialogue, NESTORIUS (A.D. 428), and JOANNES MAXENTIUS (A.D. 520), seem altogether inconsistent with the supposition that they could have regarded "the blood of God" as a scriptural expression. We may with great probability consider these writers as supporting the reading *κρῖον*, or possibly in some cases (as in that of Theodoret), *χριστοῦ*. To these I would add EUSTATHIUS OF ANTIOCH (fl. A.D. 325), who maintains that he has shown ἀπαθὲς τὸ θεῖον τοῦ χριστοῦ πνεῦμα (see the passages preserved by Theodoret in Migne's *Patrol.* xviii. 681); who affirms, as quoted by Gelasius, "vesaniunt et bacchantur et furiunt et insaniunt et suis mentibus excesserunt, qui Deo Verbo passionem applicare praesumunt" (Migne xviii. 694); who says, as quoted in Syriac by Sabarjesus (*Assemani Bibl. Orient.* iii. i. 542), "Si quis dixerit Deum Verbum quascumque creaturarum passiones passum fuisse, maledictus esto in caelo et in terra," and who, like Theodoret, in discussing this question, meets the argument of his adversaries founded on 1 Cor. ii. 8 (see Migne, xviii. 681*), but seems never to have heard of an argument from Acts xx. 28. Sabarjesus (*ibid.*) also quotes "Gregory" ("perhaps Thaumaturgus," says Assemani), as saying "Stultus est et insipiens qui affirmat Deum Verbum cum suo templo passiones tulisse." GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS (fl. A.D. 370) is shocked at the idea that our Saviour τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτοῦ θεόρρητι πάθος δέξασθαι (*Epist.* cciii. ad Nectarium; *Opp.* iii. 333*, in Migne

¹ The passages of Origen cited by Wetstein are *Cont. Cels.* ii. 36 (hardly relevant) and vii. 16 (see cc. 13–17); *Opp.* i. 416, 705 ed. De la Rue. To these may be added *Comm. in Joan.* t. xxviii. c. 14, οὐκ ἀπίθανον ὁ θεὸς λόγος κ.τ.λ.; t. xxxii. c. 17, *Opp.* iv. 392^a, 446^b; and especially *Comm. in Matt.* t. xvi. c. 8 ad fin., *Opp.* iii. 726, 727. "The godhead of Christ," as Redepenning remarks, "Origen everywhere taught had no share in his suffering" (*Origenes*, ii. 410, n. 7). — The expression "Deum crucifixerunt," which Dr. Burton ascribes to Origen (*Testim. of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Div. of Christ*, pp. 223, 312) rests only on the notoriously untrustworthy authority of the Latin translation of Rufinus. (Origen, *Opp.* ii. 676^b.) The reader of Dr. Burton's book needs also to be warned that the comments ascribed to Origen in *Catenae* are often of very doubtful genuineness. See the Preface to Vol. ii. of De la Rue's edition.

XXXVII.). AMPHILOCHIUS OF ICONIUM (fl. A.D. 370) also says: *Εἰ μὲν οὖν θεότης ἔπαθεν, εἶπας τὸ βλάσφημον* (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* xxxix. 100^b), with much more of the same sort (Migne xxxix. 104^c; 108^c; 113^{abc}; and Sabarjesus in Assemani, as above).

We may notice here some misleading references. EUSEBIUS, *Comm. in Isa.* xxxv. 9, 10 (*Opp.* vi. 341^c, in Migne xxiv.), cited by Wetstein and many others, seems to me to prove nothing. The *διὰ κυρίου* belongs to Isaiah; and the *οὗς αὐτὸς δηλονότι ἐλυτρώσατο τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι* may as well refer to 1 Pet. i. 18, 19 and Eph. i. 7, as to Acts xx. 28. Equally inconclusive is the passage referred to in the Epistle of MAXIMUS to Nicander: *καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τὸν ταύτην δι' αἵματος οἰκείου καὶ ζωοποιῶν κατὰ θέλησιν ἄρμυσάμενον κύριον* (*Opp.* ed. Combefis ii. 47, or Migne xci. 92^d). The Epistle of IBAS to Maris or Mares (not "Marinus") has been cited on both sides without reason. In the passage referred to, the Greek text or version reads "God," while three *independent* Latin versions have "Lord"; but the passage is not a quotation, and it may be doubted whether it contains even an allusion to Acts xx. 28. See *Concilia*, ed. Coleti, iv. 1577^c, 1578^c; vi. 132^a; and the translation of Facundus Hermianensis, *Pro Def. trium Capitulorum*, lib. vi. c. 3 (Migne lxxvii. 665^a).

We come now to the Latin fathers. Their quotations are of interest only as serving to determine the reading of the Old Latin version.

LUCIFER OF CAGLIARI (fl. A.D. 354, d. 371), *De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus* (Migne xiii. 997^a): *Attendite ... regere ecclesiam Domini ... sanguine suo.*

The AUTHOR of *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.* (A.D. 370), Q. 97: *Attendite ... regere ecclesiam Domini Jesu* (Migne xxxv. 2296). This is ascribed to HILARY THE DEACON by Cave and many others, and was written, as Cave remarks, about A.D. 370 (see *Quaest.* 44). It was formerly attributed to Augustine, and appears in many editions of his works.

JEROME (cir. A.D. 345-420), *Epist.* 146 (al. 85) *ad Evangelium* (al. *Evagrium*): *Attendite ... ut regetis eccles. Domini ... sanguine suo.* (*Opp.* i. 1193; Migne xxii.) So in his *Comm. in Ep. ad Tit.* i. 5 (*Opp.* vii. 563; Migne xxvi.): *Attendite ... pascere eccles. Domini ... per sanguinem suum.* That Jerome's text is here

faithfully preserved is evinced by the fact that the passage is cited in precisely the same words by SEDULIUS SCOTUS (8th or 9th cent.) in his *Collect. in Ep. ad Titum* (Migne CIII. 243^d), who is here borrowing from Jerome; and by AMALARIUS of Metz (9th cent.), *De Eccles. Offic.* ii. 13 (Migne CV. 1089), who expressly quotes from Jerome.

AMBROSE of Milan (A.D. 340–397), *De Spir. Sancto* ii. 13. § 152 (*Opp.* ii. 663 ed. Bened., or Migne XVI. 775^d): *Attendite ... regere eccles. Dei*, as edited. But it has not been observed that the Benedictine editors in their appendix of "Variae lectiones inter omissas non contemnendae" inform us, "Quidam mss., *regere ecclesiam Domini.*" Now when we consider that this reading is supported by the other authorities for the Old Latin version, and that the tendency of transcribers would be to conform their text to that of the Vulgate rather than the reverse, it seems very probable that these manuscripts represent the true reading of Ambrose. That he did not read *Dei* here is confirmed by various passages of his writings: e.g. *De Incarn.* c. vi. § 52: "cum utique Scripturae dicant quia Christus secundum carnem passus est, non secundum divinitatem"; comp. c. v. §§ 37, 40; *De Fide*, ii. c. 7, §§ 56–58; c. 8, § 65; and v. c. 8, § 106, "quod creatura omnis sine passione aliqua divinitatis *Dominici* sanguinis redimenda sit pretio."

ARATOR (A.D. 544) in his poetical paraphrase of the Acts lib. ii. lines 850–853 (Migne LXVIII. 221^b), favors the reading *Domini* or *Christi*: "— Servate, ministri, | Ecclesiam Christi [*al.* Christus] pretium quam sanguine nobis | Fecit in orbe suo; famuli retinere laborent | Quae Dominus de morte dedit." I do not know for what reason Wetstein, Griesbach, Scholz, and others cite this work under the name of Alcimus.

The collection of Scripture passages called the SPECULUM, ascribed on very slight evidence, and against strong presumptions, to Augustine, but at any rate a sort of authority for the Old Latin version, quotes the passage thus: "Attendite ... universo gregi, in quo sanctus Spiritus conlocavit vos esse episcopos, ad pascendam ecclesiam Jesu Christi." (*Spec.* c. 3; Mai, *Nov. Patr. Bibl.* i. ii. p. 10.) The SPECULUM often quotes very loosely; but it will be

admitted, I think, that in a loose quotation *Jesu Christi* would be more naturally substituted for *Domini* than for *Dei*.¹

The argument from silence must be used with caution; but considering the nature of the writings of TERTULLIAN, CYPRIAN (see especially his *Testim.* ii. 6), and NOVATIAN (*De Regula Fidei sive de Trinitate*), it seems almost incredible that they should not have cited this passage if they had the reading *Dei*; and I think we may reasonably regard them as decidedly confirming *Domini* as the reading of the Old Latin version.

We see thus, if I mistake not, that *all* the authorities for the reading of the Old Latin version whose testimony is of any weight favor the reading "Lord." The only apparent exception is PRIMASIUS, who is too late to be of any importance, flourishing in the middle of the sixth century, and who, though preserving some readings of the Old Latin, is so poor an authority that Dr. Tregelles remarks in his *Book of Revelation in Greek*, etc. (Lond. 1844), p. xxvii, note †, "I have purposely omitted the readings of the ancient Latin version cited by Sabatier out of Primasius; — many of the readings so cited are undoubtedly really ancient, but many of them have been *indubitably* modernized, — perhaps by transcribers and editors."²

We now proceed to

II. THE AUTHORITIES FOR THE READING θεού.

Manuscripts. — \aleph B, $\frac{4}{\text{XV}}$, $\frac{22}{\text{XII}}$, $\frac{23}{\text{XI or XII}}$, $\frac{25}{\text{A.D. 1087}}$, $\frac{37}{\text{XIII}}$, $\frac{46}{\text{XI}}$, $\frac{65}{\text{XIII}}$, $\frac{66^*}{\text{XII}}$ (?), $\frac{68}{\text{XII}}$, $\frac{84}{\text{X cir. fin.}}$, $\frac{89}{1093}$, $\frac{154}{\text{XV}}$, $\frac{162}{\text{XV}}$, $\frac{\text{Lect. 12}}{1022}$; and *ex silentio*, "on

¹ Cardinal Mai assigns the manuscript of the *Speculum* (designated by Tischendorf as "m") to the 6th or 7th century. Being of interest as perhaps the oldest copy that contains the famous passage 1 John v. 7 (it has also the spurious Epistle to the Laodiceans), it may be well to note that Reifferscheid, a much better authority as I suppose, dates it as "Saec. viii.-ix." (*Die römischen Bibliotheken*, in the *Sitzungsberichte d. phil.-hist. Cl. d. kais. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien*, Bd. i. 1865, p. 753.) Hartel agrees with him (Pref. to his edition of Cyprian, p. xxv; see also p. 34.

² We may here again note some irrelevant references. The Acts of the THIRD COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE (A.D. 258 or 256), *Sent.* 79 (al. 80), merely use the expression "ecclesiam Domini gubernantes," or in the Greek, *την εκκλ. θεου κυβερνησαστες*. (*Concilia*, ed. Coleti, i. 815*, 836^{do}.) AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Parmen.* i. 12 (al. 7, al. 6), cited by Wetstein and many others, simply has, "ille Dominus noster qui emit totum mundum pretio sanguinis sui." (*Aug. Opp.* ix. i. 71^b, ed. Par. alt. 1837.)

which," as Scrivener remarks, "one can lay but little stress,"
 $\overline{\text{X}}$ ' $\overline{\text{XI}}$ ' $\overline{\text{X}}$ ' $\overline{\text{I}}$ ' $\overline{\text{XII}}$ ' $\overline{\text{XII}}$ ' $\overline{\text{XV}}$ ' $\overline{\text{XIV}}$; in all, 2 uncials and 14
 cursives, with 8 in which the reading is merely inferred from the
 silence of collators. As to date, passing over the silent witnesses,
 we have 2 of the fourth century (middle), 1 of the tenth, 4 of the
 eleventh, 1 of the eleventh or twelfth, 3 of the twelfth, 2 of the
 thirteenth, and 3 of the fifteenth. Of this whole number, Tischendorf
 marks three only with an asterisk as noticeable for their frequent
 agreement with the oldest manuscripts: No. 25, of which Griesbach says, "melioribus, nec tamen optimis, accensendus est";
 No. 68, of which he says, "interdum quidem cum optimis libris consentit;" and Lect. 12, of which Scrivener remarks, "it contains
 many valuable readings (akin to those of Codd. ADE) but numerous errors." We ought also, I think, to add $\overline{\text{c}}^{\text{scr}}$, though its reading
 is only inferred *ex silentio*, as it appears to be well collated. Of this
 Scrivener says, "it is one of our best authorities, being full of
 weighty and probable variations from the common herd." With
 these exceptions, the cursives that support $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ are of a very inferior
 character (see the special examination in Griesbach's note); and as
 a whole, they are not to be compared in value with those that read
 $\kappa\upsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$. This will be illustrated in the proper place.

Ancient Versions. — The PESHITO SYRIAC (4th cent., in its present form?) in Lee's edition, and in 8 mss., including 4 very ancient, in another as a late correction, and another in the margin (see Supplementary Note B); the VULGATE (cir. A.D. 385); and the HARCLEAN OR PHILOXENIAN SYRIAC in the *text* (A.D. 508, rev. 616). The AETHIOPIC of the Polyglot has a word which may represent $\kappa\upsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ or $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, but I think favors $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$; ¹ on the other hand, Platt's edition, with most of the mss., supports the reading $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$. (See Supplementary Note B.)

Fathers. — ATHANASIUS, *Ep. i. ad Serap.* c. 6, as edited, reads $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$; but the manuscripts vary. See above, under I. p. 316.

¹ The word *ezriabher* is apparently used for $\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ only when the translator regarded $\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ as equivalent to Jehovah. To take the examples in the present chapter: in *vr.* 19 it represents $\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, in *vv.* 21, 24, 25, 27, 32, *θεός*; but it does not stand for $\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in the phrase $\delta\ \kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \text{'I}\eta\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$, *vv.* 21, 24, 35. See Dillmann's *Lex. Ling. Aeth.*, col. 1192.

EPIPHANIUS (fl. A.D. 368), *Haer.* lxxiv. c. 7, transferred from the *Ancoratus* c. 69: Προσέχετε (+ δὲ Anc.) ... ἐν ᾧ ἔθ. ὑμᾶς (ὕμ. ἔθ. Anc.) ... ποιμ. ὑμᾶς (Anc. om. ὑμ.) ... τ. ἐκκλ. τ. θεοῦ. Not quoted in proof of the deity of Christ, but of the Holy Spirit.¹

BASIL THE GREAT (fl. A.D. 370), *Moral.* lxxx. c. 16 (*Opp.* ii. 316 (442) ed. Bened.): Προσέχετε οὖν ... ποιμ. τ. ἐκκλ. τοῦ θεοῦ. Not quoted for any dogmatic purpose.

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA (fl. A.D. 412, d. 444), *Quod B. Maria sit deipara*, c. 22 (*Opp.* ix. 281^d ed. Migne; in his *Patrol.* lxxvi.): Προσέχετε γὰρ ... θεοῦ ... διὰ τ. αἵμ. τ. ἰδίου. Here the word θεοῦ is repeated and commented on. This is the earliest and the *only* example which I find in the Greek fathers of the quotation of this passage in reference to the deity of Christ.

PSEUD-ATHANASIUS (uncert.), *Testim. ex S. Script.* c. 3 (*Opp.* ii. 4^a ed. Montf.; Migne xxvii.): Προσέχετε ... ποιμενίῳ [sic] ... ἐν ᾧ ὑμ. ἔθετο ... ποιμ. τ. ἐκκλ. τ. θεοῦ. Quoted in proof of the deity of the Spirit.

ANTIOCHUS THE MONK (fl. A.D. 614), *Hom.* lxi.: Προσέχετε ... (ἐπισκόπους om.) ... ποιμ. τ. ἐκκλ. τ. θεοῦ. (Migne lxxxix. 1617^a) Again, *Hom.* cxii.: Προσέχετε ... θεοῦ ... διὰ τ. ἰδ. αἵματος. (Migne, *ibid.* 1812^b.) In both places, quoted for no dogmatic purpose.

PSEUDO-CHRYSOSTOM (uncert.), *De S. Joan. Apost. Serm.* (Chrys. *Opp.* viii. pars ii. 135 (785), ed. Montf.): ὡς ἔφη ὁ ἅγιος Παῦλος: Ποιμάνετε τ. ἐκκλ. τοῦ θεοῦ. Montfaucon remarks, "Jure hanc orationem praetermisit Savilius, utpote indignum quae legatur; nam est otiosi cujusdam Graeculi, ut nemo non videt."

AN ANONYMOUS SCHOLIAST in Cramer's *Catena* (p. 338): τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ... ἦν γὰρ φησι περιποιήσατο ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου· θάρρει οὖν ... καὶ μηδὲν ἐνδοιάσεις [-σης?] ἀκούει ὥστερ Ἰουδαῖοι αἶμα καὶ σῶμα θεοῦ τὸ σωτήριον κ.τ.λ. The writer has just quoted John vi. 47-58. The same scholion is found in mss. No. 15,

¹ I venture to suggest here a small, but not unimportant, emendation of the text of Epiphanius. Even in the recent editions of Dindorf and Oehler we read, ἢ, "ἀτὴ ἢ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τοῦ λόγου. προσέχετε" κ.τ.λ., as above, as if the quotation began with ἀτὴ. Read, ἢ ἀτὴ ἢ διακ. κ.τ.λ., — "The ministry of the Spirit and of the Word [i.e. the ministry to which they appoint] is the same"; which is illustrated by the two quotations that follow, viz. Acts xx. 28 and 1 Tim. i. 12.

18, and 87, though the first two, as well as No. 36, from which Cramer published his *Catena*, read *κυρίου* in the text.

OECUMENIUS (10th cent.?): Προσέχετε οὖν . . . θεοῦ . . . διὰ τ. ἰδ. αἵματος. (*Opp.* i. 260*, in Migne CXXVIII.) This is merely the text; there is no allusion to *θεοῦ* in the commentary.

THEOPHYLACT (11th cent.), or rather the commentary No. 2 published under his name by Finetti from a Vatican manuscript.¹ Just as in Oecumenius, whose text and comment are copied *verbatim*. (*Opp.* iii. 1016^b, in Migne CXXV.)

I do not follow Bengel in citing the ORTHODOXA CONFESSIO ECCL. ORIENT., P. i. Q. 85 (Kimmel, *Libri symb. Eccl. Or.* p. 158), as that document belongs to about the middle of the seventeenth century, and also quotes 1 John v. 7 (P. i. Q. 9).

Tischendorf should not have cited Pope CAELESTINE I. (A.D. 428), *Ep.* xviii. *ad Syn. Eph.* (Migne L. 508^c, or *Concil.* ed. Coleti iii. 1145^b), as an authority for the *Greek* here, as the *Greek* text of this Epistle is plainly a mere translation from the Latin which it accompanies: Προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ πάσῃ τῇ ἀγγέλῃ, ἧς ὑμ. τ. πν. τ. ἄγ. ἔταξεν ἐπισκόπους, διοικεῖν τ. ἐκ. τ. θεοῦ, ἣν περιεπ. τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι. This is shown also by the translation of other passages of Scripture in the same Epistle.

The earliest writer not Greek who seems to have quoted this verse with the reading "God" is the Egyptian monk ORESIUS or Oresiesis (fl. A.D. 345), *De Inst. Monach.* c. 40 (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* XL. 886^c): "scientes vos reddituros rationem pro omni grege, super quem vos Spiritus sanctus constituit inspicere et pascere ecclesiam Dei, quam acquisivit proprio sanguine." But we have him only at third hand. The treatise was written in Coptic, then translated into Greek, from which version Jerome, as he tells us, *dictated* to a *notarius* his Latin translation, in which alone it has come down to us.

The Latin fathers who have quoted this verse with the reading *Dei* are all later than Jerome, most of them much later, and only

¹ The designation of this commentary by Griesbach and Scholz as "Theoph. 2," and of that mentioned above under I. as "Theophyl. 3," has led to the erroneous statements by Davidson, Tregelles, and others, that Theophylact reads *θεοῦ* twice, and *κυρίου* three times.

attest what is already settled, the reading of the Vulgate. I will then simply name those in whom I have found the reading *Dei* down to the time of Beda in the eighth century, referring to the places.

CAELESTINE I. (A.D. 423) has been already cited; next come CASSIAN (cir. 430), *De Incarn.* vii. 4 (Migne L. 204^b),¹ JULIANUS POMERIUS (A.D. 498, *al.* Prosper Aquitanus), *De Vita contemp.* ii. 3. § 1 (M. LIX. 446^a), *bis*; PASCHASIUS the Deacon (A.D. 501, *al.* Faustus Rejensis), *De Spir. sanct.* ii. 10 (M. LXII. 21^{ab}); FULGENTIUS (A.D. 507), *De Fide* c. 19, *al.* 60, and *Cont. Fabian.* fr. 33 (M. LXV. 699^b, 807^a); ANON. (6th cent.?) *Brev. Fidei cont. Arian.* (M. XIII. 662^{ab}), Pope JOHN II. (A.D. 532-5), *Ep. ad Senat.* (M. LXVI. 22^b), FERRANDUS (A.D. 533), *Ep.* iii. *ad Anat.* c. 14 (M. LXVII. 902^d, 903^a), PRIMASIUS (A.D. 550), *In Apoc.* vii. 10 (M. LXVIII. 852^a), Pope MARTIN I. (A.D. 649), *Ep.* i. (M. LXXXVII. 129^c, or *Concil.* ed. Coleti vii. 386^{ab}, see also col. 95^a), BEDA (A.D. 701), *Super Act. Ap. Expos.*, in loc. (*Opp.* iii. 986^a ed. Migne, in *Patrol.* XCII.), and ANON. (8th or 9th cent.), *De xlii. Mans. Fil. Isr.* c. 13 (M. XVII. 24^a). I refer to this last treatise, often printed with the works of Ambrose, merely because it is cited by Sabatier, and might be mistaken for a witness to the Old Latin. But Sabatier assigns its date to the time of Beda or Rabanus (*Bib. Sac. Lat. Verss. Ant.* i. p. lxiii.).

The allusion of ARCADIUS, delegate of the Church of Rome at the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431 (Act. ii. — *Concil.* ed. Coleti, iii. 1147-48), does not determine the reading: — "pro ecclesia Dei, quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus sanguine suo acquisivit, *Gr.* ἐπὲρ τῆς ἐκ. τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. τῷ ἰαντροῦ αἵματι περιεποιήσατο.

Of the Latin writers named above, Cassian, Paschasius, Fulgentius (*bis*), Ferrandus, Pope John II., Primasius, and Beda, cite the passage with reference to the deity of Christ; the anonymous authors of the *Breviarium Fidei* and the treatise *De xlii. Mansionibus*, adduce it in proof of the deity of the Holy Spirit; the others do not quote it for a doctrinal purpose.

On the use of the expression "the blood of God," and many

¹ Following a mistake of Griesbach in copying from Wetstein, Scholz, Tischendorf (eds. 1849, 1859), Alford, Porter, Davidson, and Scrivener substitute *Cassiodorus* for Cassian.

kindred expressions, in the writings of the fathers, see Supplementary Note A.

III. AUTHORITIES FOR THE READING *κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ*.

Manuscripts. — C³HLP, all of the 9th century and of inferior character, with more than 110 cursives (cent. x-xv) most of them of little value. Nos. $\frac{5}{XII}$, $\frac{27}{XV}$, $\frac{29}{X \text{ or } XI}$, $\frac{31}{XIV}$, $\frac{96}{XI}$, $\frac{114}{XIII}$, $\frac{137}{XI}$, and $\frac{142}{XII}$, are marked with a star by Tischendorf as distinguished from the rest by a more frequent accordance with the oldest copies, but none of them seems in the Acts remarkably distinguished in this respect. Most noteworthy, perhaps, are No. 31 (Gosp. 69), and No. 137, which has a singular agreement with the eccentricities of D and with the margin of the Harclean Syriac.

Ancient Versions. — The SLAVONIC, of the ninth century.

Fathers. — THEOPHYLACT, as edited by Sifanus — No. 1 of the Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles published under the name of Theophylact — has this reading in the text, with no remark on the words in the commentary. (*Opp.* iii. 777^{de} ed. Migne; *Patrol.* CXXV.)

Manuscripts No. 3, 95^{**}, and the Arabic of the Polyglot read *κυρίου θεοῦ*, and No. 47 *θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου*. The GEORGIAN version (6th cent.) is cited by Scholz as reading *κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ*. But we have no trustworthy edition of it.

IV. AUTHORITIES FOR THE READING *χριστοῦ*.

Manuscripts. — None.

Ancient Versions. — The PESHITO SYRIAC in all editions but Lee's, and in many manuscripts (one of the 6th cent., others of the 7th, 8th, and 9th), both Jacobite and Nestorian (see Supplementary Note B); the AETHIOPIC in Platt's edition, and in most of the manuscripts; and the ERPENIAN ARABIC, made from the Syriac.

Fathers. — ATHANASIAS, *Ep. i. ad Serap.* c. 6, in three mss.; see above, under I. p. 316; THEODORET (A.D. 423), *Int. Ep. ad Philip.* i. 1, 2 (*Opp.* iii. 560th ed. Migne; *Patrol.* LXXXII): Προσέχετε . . . ἕμ. ἕθερο . . . ποιμ. τ. ἐκ. τ. χριστοῦ; and PSEUD-ATHANASIAS, *Dial. i. cont. Maced.* c. 13 (*Opp.* ii. 550^c ed. Bened.; Migne xxviii. 1312^b),

quoting precisely like Theodoret, above.¹ PSEUDO-FULGENTIUS (6th cent.), *Pro Fide Cath.* c. 9 (Migne LXV. 716^d): *Attendite gregem Christi, in quo vos Spiritus sanctus constituit episcopos.* For the SPECULUM, which has *Jesu Christi*, see above, under I. p. 321.²

LET us now attempt to weigh the evidence. The question lies, of course, only between the readings *κυρίου* and *θεοῦ*.

The MANUSCRIPT authority for the rival readings may seem, at first view, nearly balanced; but I must regard it as decidedly preponderating in favor of *κυρίου*. *Æ* and *B* are excellent manuscripts, but we must not over-estimate their value. One of the two is often wrong, for they often differ; and the cases in which they are both wrong, though much rarer, are sufficiently numerous to teach us that their combined testimony is far from decisive. One clear example, unless we suppose these two MSS. right in opposition to *all* the other MSS. and *all* the ancient versions, and to internal evidence, is to be found in Acts xvi. 32, where, for the less familiar expression, *τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου*, *Æ* and *B* have substituted the more familiar, *τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*, as I believe they have done here.³ In the Acts and Catholic Epistles, so far as I can judge without a thorough examina-

¹ Garnier attributes this Dialogue to Theodoret, and publishes it as *Dial. iv. de Spir. sancto* among seven *Dialogi de Trinitate* which he ascribes to that author; others, as Petavius, Combefis, and Du Pin, more correctly, as Schulse thinks, assign it to Maximus the Confessor (A.D. 645). Tischendorf cites it both under "Dial^{mssd}" and "Thdr^t & 1033," as if these were two independent authorities.

² Other authorities cited for *χριστοῦ* are not quotations, and afford no proof that Acts xx. 28 was in the mind of the writer; as Origen, *De Orat.* c. 28, *χριστοῦ ἠνεσημένου ἡμᾶς τῷ βίῳ αἵματι*; *Ezhort. ad Mart.* c. 12, *ὁ ἠνεσημένος ἡμᾶς τῷ ἑαυτοῦ τιμῷ αἵματι*, and c. 50, *ὡς περ τιμῷ αἵματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἠγοράσθημεν* (*Opp.* i. 252^f, 282^d, and 309^e, ed. De la Rue). The *brevarium* of Basil referred to by Wetstein and others, which Davidson says "can only mean Basil's *Regulae brevis tractatae*," where he has "searched for it in vain," is simply the summary or heading of his *Moral.* lxxx. c. 16, quoted under II. above, p. 324, and amounts to nothing. It has merely the expression *ὡς ποιήσας προβάτων χριστοῦ*.

³ See particularly Tischendorf's note on that passage, and to his five examples in which "*λογ. τ. θεοῦ* non solet fluctuare," add Acts xiii. 46; xvii. 13; xviii. 11. — For other instances of the agreement of *Æ* and *B* in readings manifestly or probably false, see Matt. vi. 8; viii. 9; ix. 32; xxvii. 49; Mark iv. 21; Luke xv. 21; John x. 18; xix. 41; Acts xii. 25; xxviii. 12; Gal. ii. 12; Eph. i. 15; 1 Thes. ii. 7; Jas. i. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 13.

tion, A is right nearly, if not quite, as often as \aleph . The manuscript authority for $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ is made exceedingly strong by the fact that its uncials represent both the Alexandrian and the Western forms of the text, and that it embraces *nearly all of the best cursives*. In cases where our chief uncials differ, the testimony of those mss. which are remarkable for their frequent or general agreement with them is obviously of special importance. To show how great is the superiority of the cursives which support $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ over those which have $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ we need not go far, though numerous examples of a striking character will be found in the Acts. (a) The omission of $\omicron\nu$ in ver. 28 is supported by \aleph ABD, 13, 15, 36, 81, 180, σ^{scr} ; of these six cursives all but one read $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$, and none reads $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. (b) In the last clause of the verse the reading $\delta\acute{\alpha}$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\nu$ is found in \aleph ABCDE, 13, 15, 31, 33, 34, 36, 40, 69, 73, 81, 105, 130, 142, 156, 163, 180, a c m of Scrivener, and Lect. 12. Of the 15 cursives¹ which support $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$, 12 have this reading; while of the 14 which support $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ only one has it, Lect. 12; or, if we include those counted *ex silentio*, of the 22 which read $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ only 2 have it. (c) In ver. 29 $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\omega}$ without a conjunction is the reading of \aleph^* AC*D, 13, 15, 36, 81, 130, 180, *all* of which cursives read $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$. (d) In the same verse, $\omicron\delta\acute{\alpha}$ without $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ is the reading of \aleph ABC*D, 13, 15, 36, 68, 69, 105, 163, 180, σ^{scr} . Of these 9 cursives, 7 support $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$, and only one, No. 68, $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. We see clearly, then, that in the present case \aleph and B are caught in bad company; which affords a strong presumption that they are in the wrong, and that the uncials and cursives which usually agree with them are right.

The numerous manuscripts which read $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ seem to me to confirm the reading $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$. "The church" (or "churches") "of God" being a familiar expression, occurring 11 times in the Epistles of Paul, and "the church of the Lord" being unique, if $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ were original, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ or $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ would be a natural marginal addition or interlineation, which would readily pass into the text. Further, when $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ had been introduced into some mss. by unconscious substitution of the familiar expression for the unusual one, or by the substitution of the marginal $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ by those who were pleased

¹ Sixteen, including B-C. ii. 7; but I do not know how this ms. reads in the last clause.

with that reading, copyists of manuscripts with *κυρίου*, finding that others had the reading *θεοῦ*, would think themselves safe if they took both into the text. But, as Tischendorf says, "Quis τοῦ κυρίου additurus fuisset, si τοῦ θεοῦ invenisset?"

The authorities for *χριστοῦ* also, such as they are, seem to favor the reading *κυρίου* rather than *θεοῦ*. The abbreviation \overline{XY} resembles \overline{KY} more than $\overline{\Theta Y}$; and in a version or quotation the substitution of "Christ" for "Lord" (but not so for "God") might have seemed a matter of indifference, or have been unconsciously made.¹ A deliberate falsification of the text is the last supposition to be resorted to. That *χριστοῦ* has not played a great part as a marginal gloss for either reading appears from the fact that it is found in no Greek manuscript.

The authority, next, of the ANCIENT VERSIONS decidedly confirms the reading *κυρίου*. It is supported by the *three oldest*, the Old Latin, the Memphitic, and the Thebaic, which carry us back to a far earlier date than any of the authorities for *θεοῦ*; and these are confirmed by the Armenian, with the margin of the Harclean Syriac, and indirectly, I think, by those that read "Christ," though their testimony is more or less uncertain. That Jerome should adopt the reading *Dei* in the Vulgate need excite no surprise, or that the Monophysite translator of the Philoxenian or Harclean Syriac should prefer the reading favorable to his doctrine.

The evidence of the FATHERS is pretty well balanced, but the *earlier* testimony (as that of Irenaeus), though not absolutely free from doubt, favors *κυρίου* rather than *θεοῦ*. The authorities for *κυρίου* also represent the principal divisions of the Christian world. (See the detailed statements above.) I have already observed that the earliest and the only Greek father who quotes the passage as

¹ How easily "Christ" might be inadvertently substituted for "Lord" in a version or quotation may be illustrated by modern examples. Ewald, who reads "Lord," in his paraphrase substitutes *Christus*, printing it in italics as a translation (*Die drei ersten Evang. u. d. Apostelgeschichte*, 1872, ii. 209; comp. p. 500). Renss, who in his *Théol. Chrétienne*, ii. 341, n. 2, 2d ed., p. 308 Eng. trans., adopts the reading *κυρίου*, actually cites Acts xx. 28 (*ibid.* p. 186, note, or p. 169, Eng.), as containing the expression *ἐκκλησία τοῦ χριστοῦ*; and Adler, *Nov. Test. Verss. Syr.*, 1789, p. 36, speaks of the reading "pascatis ecclesiam Christi" as found in "nonnullis graecis codicibus."

bearing on the deity of Christ is Cyril of Alexandria, in the fifth century, who adduces it once. In connection with this point, I may quote the important remark of the Rev. Thomas Sheldon Green: "According to the common reading, the passage bears strongly upon more than one great dogmatic controversy, and, accordingly, had this form possessed established currency in the age of those disputes, its employment as a dogmatic weapon ought to be of no unfrequent occurrence in the writings of that age; whereas the contrary is evidently the case." (*Developed Criticism*, etc. p. 112.)

WE will now consider the *internal evidence*. What supposition will best explain the various phenomena?

Alford says, "If θεῶν was the original, *but one reason* can be given why it should have been altered to κυρίων, and *that one was sure to have operated*. It would stand as a bulwark against Arianism, an assertion which no skill could evade, which *must therefore be modified*. If θεῶν stood in the text originally, *it was sure to be altered to κυρίων*."

I perceive no ground for this confident assumption, and must reject it for the following reasons. (1) The Arians were as devout believers in the sacredness of Scripture as their adversaries, and would equally have regarded a deliberate falsification of the record as a horrible impiety. There is no evidence that they tampered with the text in any other passage of the New Testament.¹ The absence of 1 John v. 7 from our manuscripts of the Greek Testament and from the ancient versions is not now ascribed to them. (2) Such an attempt would have been absurd and useless. The Arians did not have possession of the orthodox copies; and how would a wilful corruption of their own have helped them in controversy? It was sure to be detected, and to expose them to shame. (3) We have no evidence that the Arians were troubled by the passage; it does not appear to have been quoted by any Greek father in the Arian controversy. (4) The reading θεῶν would have been really favorable to the Arians. They did not hesitate to apply the term θεός to Christ; but lowered its meaning. They were fond, as we learn from Athanasius, of "calling τὴν θεότητα τοῦ λόγου παθητήν"; of saying that

¹ On John iii. 6 see the note of Wetstein or Tischendorf.

"God suffered through the flesh, and rose again"; and of using the bald expression "the blood of God." Referring to such expressions, Athanasius exclaims: *φεῦ τῆς ἀτοπίας καὶ τῆς βλασφημίας! Ἄρειανῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα τολμήματα.* — *Cont. Apollinar.* ii. 11, 12, 13. (See Supplementary Note A.) And very naturally. "A God whose blood was shed," says Professor Stuart, "must surely be a *θεὸς δεύτερος* as the Arians would have it, and not the impassible and eternal God, which I believe the Logos to be." (*Amer. Bibl. Repository* for April 1838, p. 315.) We do not find, however, that the Arians and Apollinarians ever appealed to the reading *θεοῦ* in this passage. They justified such language on other grounds. (5) This hypothesis does not explain the existence of the reading *Lord* in authorities which reach back to a century or more before the Arians were heard of.

In truth, Dean Alford's theory of wilful alteration would have been much more plausible, if he had ascribed the substitution of *κυρίου* for *θεοῦ* to the orthodox. But such an imputation would, I believe, be doing them great injustice. If they had found the word *θεοῦ* in the text, they would have been much more likely to reverence it as containing a mystery; and there was less occasion to stumble, as the opinions of the earlier Christian fathers respecting the possibility of the Logos differed from those which afterwards prevailed. They also used the words *θεός* and *deus* rather loosely. From an early period there were many rhetorical writers, like Tertullian and Lactantius, who were fond of startling and paradoxical expressions, which would also suit the popular taste. (See Supplementary Note A.) At a later date, the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* bridged the difficulty. In the Latin Vulgate the reading *Dei* has been undisturbed, being found, apparently, in all the manuscripts.

But though we reject the supposition of a wilful alteration of the text on the part either of the Arians or the orthodox, it may still be said that *κυρίου* may have been a marginal explanation of *θεοῦ*, which would readily and innocently be substituted by those who might stumble at the harshness of the latter. This is possible, but not very probable; for the natural marginal addition would rather have been the unambiguous *χριστοῦ*, which has been found in no Greek manuscript. "The churches of Christ" occurs once in Paul's writings; and "the blood of Christ," "Christ died," and "Christ suffered," are familiar expressions.

On the other hand, supposing *κυρίου* to be the original reading, we can easily explain all the variations without resorting to the hypothesis, *a priori* extremely improbable, of a deliberate corruption of the text. We have only an example of what has occurred in a multitude of instances, the *substitution by the copyist of a familiar expression for an unusual one*; a substitution often made unconsciously, but sometimes, perhaps, because the more common form had been noted in the margin. The expression "the church" (or "churches") "of God" occurs, as has already been remarked, *eleven* times in the Epistles of Paul, while "the church of the Lord" is found nowhere else in the New Testament; the former expression is also frequent, while the latter is rare, in other early Christian writings; see, e.g. the statement respecting the Apostolical Constitutions under I., above, p. 316. The resemblance of 1 Pet. v. 2 to the present passage, — *Ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποιμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐπισκοποῦντες* (om. by *MB*, and perhaps derived from *ἐπισκόπου* in Acts xx. 28) *κ.τ.λ.* — "might aid," as Dr. Tregelles remarks, "in suggesting *τοῦ θεοῦ*."

This tendency of transcribers to substitute the familiar expression for the unusual, which would be particularly strong in the present case, may be illustrated by a few examples.

Acts xv. 40, *παρδοθεῖς τῇ χάριτι τοῦ κυρίου*. "The grace of God" being a very common expression, and occurring in a similar passage (xiv. 26), *θεοῦ* is here substituted for *κυρίου* by CEHLP, and all but about six of the cursives.

James iii. 9, for *τὸν κύριον καὶ πατέρα*, the familiar *τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα* has been substituted in KL, and, apparently, all the cursives but two.

1 Pet. iii. 15, for *κύριον δὲ τὸν χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε κ.τ.λ.*, *κύριον δὲ τὸν θεόν* appears in KLP, and, apparently, all the cursives but seven.

Col. iii. 16, for *ὁ λόγος τοῦ χριστοῦ*, *κ^cD^cE**K*, and all but about seven of the cursives read *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*. For Acts xvi. 32, where *MB* seem to be clearly wrong, see above, p. 328.

Col. iii. 22, for *φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον*, *κ^cD^cE**K*, and all but about twelve of the cursives read *φοβ. τὸν θεόν*, the more common expression.

Eph. v. 21, for ἐν φόβῳ χριστοῦ, K reads ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου, comp. Acts ix. 31; 2 Cor. v. 11; and most of the cursives ἐν φθεοῦ, comp. Rom. iii. 18; 2 Cor. vii. 1, and the use of the verb φοβέομαι.

2 Thess. iii. 16, for ὁ κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης, FGL, 7 cursives, and many Latin mss. read ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης; comp. Rom. xv. 33; xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 20. — For other examples, see Col. iii. 15; 2 Thess. iii. 3; Acts viii. 22, 24. I will only notice further, that in the single instance in which we have the phrase, αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι τοῦ χριστοῦ, Rom. xvi. 16, the mss. 3, 23, 42, 69, 106, 120, 177, a^{***}, k^{scr}, and two of Matthæi's Chrysostom manuscripts, read θεοῦ. See Wetstein, Scholz, and Scrivener; Tischendorf does not note the variation.

Thus I think it clearly appears, that on the supposition that κυρίου was the original reading, the variations may be easily and satisfactorily explained; and we may adopt the language of Dr. Tregelles, who remarks that "even if the evidence for ἐκκ. τοῦ κυρίου had not been so strong, it would have been confirmed by its peculiarity, and by the immense probability of the familiar phrase being substituted for it." (*Account of the Printed Text*, etc. p. 233.)

Bengel's explanation of the origin of the reading κυρίου is as follows: "Ex LXX. apud quos sæpe dicitur ἐκκλησία κυρίου." The "sæpe" is 7 times in all, viz. Deut. xxiii. 1, 2, 3 (*bis*), 8; 1 Chron. xxviii. 8; Mic. ii. 5, the phrase being applied to the congregation of Israel. Of this far-fetched explanation it is enough to say, that there appears to be no reason why the cause of error assigned should not have affected the other passages where ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ (in the singular or plural) occurs in the New Testament as well as Acts xx. 28. But in these eleven passages the various reading κυρίου is not once found, according to the critical editors, in a single manuscript. Bengel's hypothesis, therefore, has no foundation.

Another argument of Dean Alford and many others for the reading θεοῦ is this. Paul is the speaker. He has used the expression "church" (or "churches") "of God" eleven times in his Epistles, but never "church of the Lord." Does not *Pauline usage*, then, strongly confirm the genuineness of θεοῦ here?

I agree with those who regard Pauline usage as very important in its bearing on this question. In the divided state of the external evidence, it is entitled to be regarded as a decisive consideration. But it has been strangely misapprehended.

Paul has used the phrase (ἡ) ἐκ. or αἱ ἐκ. (τοῦ) θεοῦ eleven times, eight times in the singular, three in the plural. But has any respectable commentator in any one of these passages understood him to mean *Christ* by θεοῦ? In four of them, 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Thess. i. 4, Christ is in the immediate context clearly distinguished from θεός; and in none of the others (1 Cor. x. 32; xi. 16, 22; xv. 9; Gal. i. 13; 1 Tim. iii. 5, 15) has Dean Alford suggested, or would it occur to any reader, that θεοῦ is used as a designation of Christ. So far, then, as the phrase in question is concerned, the appeal to the usage of Paul shows that it is extremely improbable that he would have employed it here to describe the church as belonging to *Christ*.

Let us look a little further. What is the usage of Paul in the rest of this discourse? Examine the use of the words κύριος and θεός in vv. 19, 21, 24, 25, 27, 32, 35; note especially vv. 21 and 24. Is it not clear, without argument, that the usage of the Apostle *here* favors the supposition that he would employ κυρίου rather than θεοῦ to denote Christ in ver. 28?

If he had occasion to describe the church as belonging to Christ, he *might* have used the name "Christ," as he has done in Rom. xvi. 16; but in such a connection as this, in speaking of the Chief Shepherd of the flock, after reference to the ἐπίσκοποι, — overseers of the church, but servants of Christ, — it was particularly appropriate that κύριος should be used, the term by which the Apostle especially delights to designate Christ in his exaltation; see Phil. ii. 9–11. Arator in his paraphrase, quoted above under I. p. 321, seems to have felt the point of the expression: "*Famuli* retinere laborent Quae Dominus de morte dedit." See also on this matter Wordsworth's note.

But much more is to be said; and as two or three of the passages to which I shall have occasion to refer have been sometimes appealed to in theological controversy, I beg that it may be understood that I am not attempting to argue a doctrinal question, which

would here be out of place, but wish simply to call attention to certain important facts in relation to the New Testament *use of language*.

If τοῦ θεοῦ here denotes Christ, we have ὁ θεός used *absolutely*, not as θεός is *predicated* of the λόγος ἀσαρκος in John i. 1, but *assumed* as a designation of Christ in his mediatorial relation, and this when the term has just before been used in the same discourse in marked distinction from Christ. What is PAULINE USAGE in regard to this point?

The term θεός occurs in Paul's writings, not including the Epistle to the Hebrews, more than 500 times. How does he employ it? We all know that his *habitual* use of language in his Epistles is in perfect accordance with 1 Cor. viii. 6, ἡμῖν εἰς θεός ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ. I need not refer to other passages, as Eph. iv. 5, 6; Phil. ii. 9-11. Paul certainly had a most exalted conception of Christ; see, e.g. Col. ii. 9; i. 15-20; but I am now speaking simply of his *use of language*; and it cannot be denied that he generally sharply distinguishes θεός and χριστός; e.g. 1 Cor. iii. 23; xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 5. Has he *ever* given the name θεός to Christ? Alford himself finds only *one* instance in all his writings in which he supposes him to have done so; viz. in Rom. ix. 5. But I need not say that the application of θεός in Rom. ix. 5 depends on the *punctuation* and *construction*, on which the most eminent scholars have differed; and when we observe that Lachmann, Buttmann, Kuenen and Cobet, and Tischendorf have so punctuated the passage as to exclude the reference to Christ, and that their construction has been adopted or favored by commentators so able and unprejudiced as Rückert (2d ed.), Fritzsche, Lücke,¹ De Wette, Meyer, Ewald, Clausen (author of the *Hermeneutik*), Van Hengel, and Jowett; by such a grammarian as Winer, and by many eminent recent translators, as Holtzmann (in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*), Noyes, Oltramare, Lipsius (in the *Protestanten-Bibel*), Professor Godwin, Davidson, Volkmar, Weizsäcker, and in the new Authorized Dutch Version (1868), we can hardly, I think, rely with any con-

¹ De Invocatione Jesu Christi, Part. I. (1843), p. 8; and *ms. Notes* of his Lectures on Romans, taken by Professor E. J. Young.

fidence on this supposed exception to the otherwise *uniform* usage of the Apostle.¹ And consider the extent of this usage, the exceeding frequency with which the words in question occur! If the *usus loquendi* of a writer is ever to be regarded in textual criticism, I hardly see how there could be a stronger case than the present.

In treating a critical question like this, we must not confound the style of the fourth century, or even of the second, with that of the first, or allow ourselves to be unconsciously influenced by the phraseology with which custom has made us familiar. We find in some writers in the latter half of the second century and afterwards, — or as some suppose, even earlier, — when the application of the names *θεός* and *deus* to Christ had become frequent, such expressions as the blood, the sufferings, the birth and death, the burial and resurrection of God; but I need not say how foreign this language is from the style of the New Testament.

It appears to me, then, in fine, that the evidence of manuscripts, ancient versions, and the early Christian writers, when fairly weighed, decidedly preponderates in favor of the reading *κυρίου*; and that, even if the external testimony for *θεοῦ* were far stronger than it is, we should not be justified in adopting it, in the face of the extreme improbability that Paul (or Luke) should have here used an expression so foreign from his own style and that of the New Testament writings; especially when the origin of *θεοῦ* and of all the other variations can be so easily and naturally explained, on the supposition that *κυρίου* is the genuine reading.

Two matters of interest remain which require some further notice, and which, for convenience, have been reserved for

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES.

A. ON THE USE OF SUCH EXPRESSIONS AS "THE BLOOD OF GOD" IN THE WRITINGS OF THE CHRISTIAN FATHERS.

In a few passages of early Christian writings the expression "the blood of God" occurs, and it is urged, not without plausibility, that

¹ On Eph. v. 5 and Tit. ii. 13, on which few would now lay any stress, it may be enough to refer to Alford, Meyer, Huther, and Winer; and on Col. ii. 2, if we adopt the reading *τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ*, to the notes of Bishop Ellicott and Dr. Lightfoot.

"nothing short of scriptural authority could have given early vogue to a term so startling." The fathers who use it are thus regarded as indirect witnesses to the genuineness of the reading $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in Acts xx. 28.

If the writers who employ this expression used it in such a connection as to show that this particular passage was in their minds; and if they were generally careful not to use startling expressions analogous to this without some Scripture precedent, the argument would have much weight. But so far as my examination of their writings has extended, — which indeed has not been exhaustive, — the reverse is true. Though language of this sort was freely used by some, and strongly condemned by others, and though the passage would seem to have a direct bearing on the Patripassian controversy and on the Gnostic controversies of the second and third centuries; yet I cannot find that it was ever adduced, on the one hand, by way of justification of such expressions, or that, on the other, attempts were made to explain it away. Other passages, far less relevant, were appealed to; but concerning this, *altum silentium*. The reading $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ had doubtless found its way into some manuscripts as early as the first part of the fourth century; but it had not become current; it had not attracted attention; and it is not till the fifth century that we find it actually quoted in reference to the deity of Christ and the propriety of such language as "the blood of God."

The expression $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ occurs in IGNATIUS, *Eph.* c. 1, $\delta\nu\alpha\lambda\omega\pi\upsilon\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma \epsilon\nu \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\omicron\nu \dot{\iota}\rho\gamma\omicron\nu \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\rho\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, according to the Shorter Greek form of the Epistles, and in the Syriac version of the Three Epistles as published by Cureton; the Old Latin version of the Shorter form reads "in sanguine *Christi Dei*"; and the Longer Epistles $\epsilon\nu \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$. The Armenian version, made from the Syriac, omits the phrase altogether; and Petermann in his edition of Ignatius (p. 6) says, "Equidem dixerim, primitus scriptum esse *Χριστού*, deinde ex nota Monophysitae cujusdam marginali in textum irrepsisse $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, ac deinde vocem $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ excidisse." Bunsen puts a comma after $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, and connects $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ either with $\tau\omicron \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron$ (*Die drei ächten . . . Briefe des Ignatius*, 1847, pp. 42 and 86, n. 7), or with $\dot{\iota}\rho\gamma\omicron\nu$ (*Hippolytus*, i. 95, 2d ed.). But for brevity I waive all question of the reading, or the construction, or the genuineness of the Epistles, which so far as I can venture at present to judge (and this is the view of eminent scholars) cannot be regarded as earlier in any of their forms than the latter half of the second cen-

tury. The phrase suits the style of these Epistles very well, and the only point important to notice is that there is nothing in the context to suggest in the slightest degree a reference to the passage in the Acts. The appeal sometimes made to Ignat. *Rom.* c. 7 rests on a false reference of *αἵτου*, to say nothing of the fact that *θεοῦ* after *πόμα* is probably spurious.

The next example is in TERTULLIAN (*Ad Uxor.* ii. 3): "Non sumus nostri, sed pretio empti; et quali pretio? sanguine Dei." Here again there is no allusion in the context to Acts xx. 28; and even Burton admits (*Testim. of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Div. of Christ*, 2d ed., p. 25) that "his words bear such a direct reference to another text, 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20, that we cannot say, whether he had the words of St. Paul to the Ephesians also in mind." I will add that Roensch, who in his *Das Neue Testament Tertullian's* (1871) has collected with extreme care all the allusions of Tertullian to passages of the New Testament as well as his quotations, finds no allusion in his writings to Acts xx. 28.

The remaining example of this expression is in CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (*Quis dives salvetur*, c. 34): "Not knowing how great a treasure we bear in an earthen vessel, *δυνάμει θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ αἵματι θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ δρόσῳ πνεύματος ἁγίου περιτετευχισμένον*. Here again there is in the connection no allusion to Acts xx. 28.

These are all the examples that have been adduced, so far as I am aware, from the Ante-Nicene fathers, of the expression "blood of God."¹ They are found in highly rhetorical writers, remarkable generally for the harshness and extravagance of their language. They are connected with a large number of kindred expressions, in which the fathers speak of the birth, conception, flesh, body, sufferings, death, crucifixion, burial and resurrection of God, for which no Scripture precedent can be pleaded, but which are founded merely on inference. Under these circumstances, it seems to me extremely rash to single out this, one of the rarest, and claim that it implies the existence of the reading *θεοῦ* in Acts xx. 28, against the very strong presumption that if it had existed there, it would often have been directly appealed to.

¹ In the *Paul. Samos. Quaest.* (Q. iv.), ascribed to Dionysius of Alexandria, we have the expression *τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (*Concil. ed. Coleti*, i. 888^b); but Dr. Burton should not have cited this work as he has done, together with the so-called Epistle of Dionysius against Paul of Samosata (Burton, *Testim.* p. 25 f., 92 f., 161, 397-419), without warning the reader of their probable spuriousness. See Lardner's *Works*, ii. 685 ff., ed. 1829.

I regret that the wholly unexpected length to which the preceding discussion has extended forbids any detailed illustration of what has been stated in regard to the language of the Christian fathers, and of the extent to which, when the use of θεός and *deus* as appellations of Christ had become familiar, they use the most harsh and startling expressions without Scripture authority, and simply as the result of inference. I can only refer to the collection of such expressions given by Wetstein in his note on Acts xx. 28 (*N. T.* ii. 596 f.), and add some references to passages not noticed by him.

See IGNATIUS, *Rom.* c. 6: "Suffer me to be an imitator τοῦ πάθους τοῦ θεοῦ μου. Here again there are various readings (see Lipsius, *Text der drei syr. Briefe*, pp. 77, 78). *Eph.* c. 18: ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκνοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας. — TATIAN, *Or. ad Graec.* c. 13: "rejecting τὸν διάκονον [the Holy Spirit] τοῦ πεπονθότος θεοῦ." — MELITO, *Ex Serm. de Passione*, ap. Anastasium Sin.: ὁ θεὸς πέπονθεν ὑπὸ δεξιᾶς Ἰσραηλιτιδος, but in the Syriac: "God was put to death; the King of Israel was slain by an Israelitish right hand" (see Cureton, *Spicil. Syr.* p. 55, cf. p. 56; or Otto, *Corp. Apol. Christ.* ix. pp. 416, 422, 444 ff., and 459, n. 119). Cureton has some doubt whether this and some other pieces in which similar language occurs belong to Melito; there may be a confusion between Melito and Meletius, "the honey of Attica," who flourished in the fourth century. See his *Spicil. Syr.* pp. 96, 97. — TERTULLIAN, as might be expected from his fiery intensity of feeling, and the audacities of his glowing style, has much language of the kind referred to. See, e.g. *De Carne Christi*, c. 5. After speaking of the "passiones Dei," he exclaims: "Quid enim indignius Deo . . . nasci an mori? carnem gestare an crucem? circumcidi an suffigi? educari an sepeliri? in praesepe deponi an in monumento recondi? . . . Nonne vere crucifixus est Deus? nonne vere mortuus est, ut vere crucifixus? nonne vere resuscitatus, ut vere scilicet mortuus?" He goes on to speak of the "interemptores Dei." On the passage just cited, which contains the famous sentence, *Certum est, quia impossibile*, so often misquoted, I would refer to the valuable notes of Mr. Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels*, 2d ed., iii. 175 ff., or ii. 272 ff., Eng. ed. For other examples of similar language in Tertullian, see *ibid.* c. 4; *Adv. Marcion.* ii. 16 (mortuum Deum), 27 (Deum crucifixum); iv. 13 (quia Deus homo natus erat); v. 5 (nativitas et caro Dei); *De Patient.* c. 3. — IRENAEUS, *Cont. Haer.* v. 19. § 1: "[Maria] per angelicum sermonem

evangelizata est, ut portaret Deum." — CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Paed.* ii. c. 3, p. 190 ed. Potter: τοὺς πόδας ἐνιπτεν αὐτῶν σαβάνῳ περιζωσάμενος ὁ αἰνῆτος θεὸς καὶ κύριος τῶν ὄλων. *Ibid.* c. 8, p. 214: ἐδίωξεν τὸν θεόν. — HIPPOLYTUS, *De Antichristo* c. 45 (Migne, *Patrol.* x. 764^b): τὸν ἐν κοιλίᾳ παρθένου συνειλημμένον θεὸν λόγον. *Ex Serm. in Elcan. et Annam*: ὡς ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει, Τὸ δὲ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐθύθη Χριστὸς ὁ θεός. (Migne, col. 864^e.) Ὁ θεός is in the same way added to 1 Cor. v. 7 in ms. No. 116, and in one ms. of Chrysostom; and that passage is so quoted, according to Wetstein, by the Lateran Council. Such cases are instructive. — NOVATIAN, *De Reg. Fid. sive de Trin.* c. 25, opposes those who argued, "Si Christus Deus, Christus autem mortuus, ergo mortuus est Deus." — SYNOD OF ANTIOCH (A.D. 269), *Epist. ad Dionys. et Max.* (in Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iii. 312, 2d ed.): θεὸς ἦν ἐν γαστρὶ συνουσιωμένος τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ; and see what precedes. — SIBYLLINE ORACLES, vi. 26, ὦ ξύλον ὦ μακαριστόν, ἐφ' ᾧ θεὸς ἐξετανύσθη. vii. 66, τλήμων, οὐκ ἔγνωσ τὸν σὸν θεόν, ὃς ποτ' ἔλουσεν Ἰορδάνου ἐν προχῆσσι [Friedlieb ὑδάτεσσι]. viii. 288, καὶ δώσουσι θεῷ βαπίσματα χερσὶν ἀνάγνοις, quoted by Lactantius, iv. 18. viii. 462, δέξαι ἀχράντοισι θεὸν σοῖς, παρθένη, κόλποις. See also vii. 24. — There is a great abundance of such language in LACTANTIUS; see *Inst.* iv. cc. 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 29, 30. — ALEXANDER OF ALEXANDRIA, *De Anima et Corpore*, c. 5 (Migne xviii. 595, cf. 603), preserved in Syriac and Arabic: "Quaenam, oro, necessitas Deum coegit in terram descendere, carnem assumere, panniculis in praesepi involvi, lactante sinu ali, baptismum in famulo suscipere, in crucem tolli, terreno sepulcro infodi, a mortuis tertia die resurgere?" — APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS, lib. viii. (late) c. 1. § 4: ὅτι συγχωρήσει θεοῦ σταυρὸν ὑπέμεινεν αἰσχύνῃς καταφρονήσας ὁ θεὸς λόγος, καὶ ὅτι ἀπέθανε καὶ ἐτάφη καὶ ἀνέστη κ.τ.λ.

The subject has been very imperfectly presented, but the foregoing references and citations may be sufficient to establish the position taken. They may also serve to show, in reference to the argument that θεοῦ is the *lectio durior*, that expressions which seem very harsh to us were well suited to the taste of many in the second and third centuries. And how ready the Christian fathers were to confound their own *inferences* with the language of Scripture may appear, to take a single example, from Cyril of Alexandria, who says: Τίς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον μέμνηνεν, ὡς μὴ βούλεισθαι μετὰ τῶν Εὐαγγελίων θεοτόκον ἀποκαλεῖν τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον; (*Quod B. Maria*

sit deipara, c. 23; *Opp.* ix. 284^b, in Migne LXXVI.) One who thinks the fathers would have been very scrupulous about using such expressions as *μονογενὴς θεός*, *αἷμα θεοῦ*, etc. unless they had found them in Scripture, may look into Sophocles's Greek Lexicon under such words as *θεογεννήτωρ*, *θεοκτόνος*, *θεομήτωρ*, *θεοπάτωρ*, and *θεοπρομήτωρ*, to say nothing of *θεοτόκος*. The title *Dei avia* applied to Anna, the mother of the Virgin, became so popular that, as Wetstein remarks, Clement XI. had to issue an edict against it, as offensive to pious ears.

One very early passage, wrongly supposed, as I think, to speak of "the sufferings of God," requires a little discussion, which has been reserved for the present place.

In the First Epistle of CLEMENT OF ROME to the Corinthians (c. 2) we read τὰ παθήματα αὐτοῦ ἦν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἡμῶν, τοῦ θεοῦ being the near antecedent. But as the term *θεός*, with or without the article, is throughout the Epistle applied exclusively to the Father, and is used in marked distinction from Christ (see, e.g. cc. 1, 7, 12, 16, 20, 42, 46, 49, 50, 58, 59), this reference of the αὐτοῦ would seem to make Clement a Patripassian; and such is the view of Lipsius (*De Clem. Rom. Ep. ad Cor. priore*, pp. 101, 102), comp. Hellwag in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1848, p. 255 f. But this supposition, as well as the supposition that the second person of the Trinity is intended by the τοῦ θεοῦ preceding, is so entirely out of harmony with the rest of the Epistle (see above, and in reference to the blood of Christ, cc. 7, 12, 49), that I should regard as much more probable the conjecture of *μαθήματα* for *παθήματα*, proposed by the first editor of the Epistle, Patrick Young (Junius), and adopted by Fleury (*Hist. Eccl.* liv. ii. c. 33), Whitby (*Disq. Mod.* p. 18), Hilgenfeld (*N.T. extra Can.* i. p. 5, note), and Donaldson (*Apost. Fathers*, 1874, pp. 157, 158). The older forms of the Mu and Pi were sometimes hardly distinguishable;¹ and as Dr. Lightfoot (*in loc.*) remarks, "the confusion of *μαθητής*, *παθητής*, in Ign. *Polyc.* 7, and *μαθήματα*, *παθήματα*, in Ign. *Smyrn.* 5, shows that the interchange would be easy." And I do not perceive much force in the remark that "the reading *μαθήματα* would destroy the propriety of the expressions in the parallel clauses . . . 'the words in your hearts, the sufferings before your eyes.'" The eyes of the

¹ See Silvestre, *Paléogr. univ.* pl. lvi.; and the Copto-Greek form of M in Uhlemann's Coptic Grammar or Schwartze's Memphitic Gospels. See also Donaldson, as referred to above.

mind — what Clement calls τὰ ὄμματα τῆς ψυχῆς (c. 19) and οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας (c. 36) are certainly referred to; and the use of such language with μαθήματα is perfectly paralleled by τὴν παράδοσιν (τῶν ἀποστόλων) πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχων, in *Iren. Haer.* iii. 3, § 3; comp. *Const. Apost.* ii. 36, § 1, and *Mart. Polyc.* c. 2. But the conjecture, however plausible, does not seem necessary; we have only to suppose a somewhat negligent use of αὐτοῦ (of which we have an example near the end of the same chapter, and others in cc. 32, 34, 36, 50), referring to Christ *in the mind of the writer*, though not named. This is the view of Dr. Samuel Clarke (*Works*, iv. 569), Rössler (*Bibliothek d. Kirchen-Väter*, i. 47, n. 2), Martini (*Gesch. des Dogma von der Gottheit Christi*, p. 24, note), Dorner (*Lehre von der Person Christi*, i. 139, or p. 99, Eng. trans.), Bunsen (*Hippolytus*, i. 46, note, 2d ed.), Ekker (*De Clem. Rom. Epist.* p. 92, note), and Reuss (*Théol. Chrétienne*, ii. 326, 2^e éd.). For such a use of αὐτός, see Luke ii. 38; 1 John ii. 12, 27, 28, and other places; and comp. Wahl, *Clavis N. T.* s. v. αὐτός, 2. c. bb-dd, and Winer, *Gram.* § 22. 3, and § 67. 1. d. In the passage in question I adopt the punctuation of Lightfoot and Gebhardt (who put a colon after ἀκούμενοι), and their interpretation of ἐφοδίους. Observing then that Clement has just borrowed a saying introduced in Acts xx. 35 by the phrase "*remembering the words of the Lord Jesus*" — how natural that, with Christ in mind, he should go on to say, "and diligently giving heed to his words, ye had laid them up in your hearts, and his sufferings were before your eyes." I refer, it will be seen, both of the αὐτοῦ's to Christ. This is also, perhaps, favored by the use of the plural, τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ; comp. in this Epistle cc. 13, 46; also Acts xx. 35, 1 Tim. vi. 3, *Const. Apost.* viii. 45; whereas except in Rev. xvii. 17; xix. 9, where the reference is to the words of a particular prophecy, we always have in the New Testament, and I think in the Apostolical Fathers, ὁ λόγος, not οἱ λόγοι, τοῦ θεοῦ. The general resemblance in sentiment (noticed by Professor Lightfoot) between c. 2 of Clement and c. 13, in which "the words" of Christ are twice appealed to, lends confirmation to this view, on which I have dwelt the longer, as no notice is taken of it in the editions of Cotelier, Jacobson, Hefele, Dressel, Lightfoot, Gebhardt and Harnack, or in any other within my knowledge.

An important passage of ATHANASIUS remains to be considered, which I quote in full, as different views have been taken of its

bearing. *Cont. Apollinar.* ii. 14 (*Opp.* i. 951 ed. Bened., or Migne xxvi. 1156^a): Οὐδαμῶς δὲ αἷμα θεοῦ δίχα σαρκὸς παραδεδώκασιν αἱ γραφαί, ἢ θεὸν διὰ σαρκὸς παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα. Ἀρειανῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα ὀλημήματα, ἐπειδὴ μήτε θεὸν ἀληθινὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ὁμολογοῦσιν. Αἱ δὲ ἅγιοι γραφαί ἐν σαρκὶ θεοῦ καὶ σαρκὸς θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου, αἷμα, καὶ πάθος, καὶ ἀνάστασιν κηρύττουσι σώματος θεοῦ, ἀνάστασιν ἐκ νεκρῶν γενομένην. I would propose a different punctuation of the last sentence, — placing a comma after κηρύττουσι, and removing it after γενομένου and after the last θεοῦ. We may then translate as follows: "But the Scriptures have nowhere spoken of 'blood of God' apart from the flesh, or of *God* as having suffered and risen again through the flesh. Such audacities belong to the Arians, since they do not confess that the Son of God is true God. But the holy Scriptures speak of blood and suffering and resurrection *in the flesh* of God and *of the flesh* of God become man, — a resurrection from the dead of the *body* of God."

I have italicized certain words made emphatic by position. Here, for αἷμα θεοῦ δίχα σαρκὸς, the edition of Athanasius *ex Officin. Comeliniana*, 1601 (i. 503^a), reads αἷμα θεοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς, which is also the reading of the Paris edition of 1627 (i. 645^{bc}). Wetstein, who used the former edition, quotes the passage with ἡμᾶς for ἡμᾶς (probably a misprint, as the two words are often confounded), whereupon Dr. Burton charges him with inserting καθ' ἡμᾶς "from his own head" and leaving out the words δίχα σαρκὸς, "upon which the whole meaning of the passage turns." (*Testimonies of the Antiochene Fathers*, p. 20 f.) This is unjust to Wetstein; and the charge is the more unfortunate, as Dr. Burton himself immediately *misquotes* the edition (the Benedictine) which he professedly follows, substituting δίχα σαρκὸς for διὰ σαρκὸς in the second clause, and in citing the last sentence (p. 22) omits the last clause, which is important as determining its construction. He has also, if I mistake not (I would speak with deference), misconstrued and mistranslated the sentence.¹

¹ He renders: "But the Holy Scriptures speaking of God in the flesh, and of the flesh of God when he became man, do mention *the blood* and sufferings and resurrection of the body of God." But if αἷμα κ.τ.λ. is connected with σώματος, what does σαρκὸς depend on? — I venture to think that the construction I have adopted is confirmed, and the whole passage illustrated, by c. 16 (Migne, col. 1160^a). In answer to those who ask, "How did they crucify the Lord of glory, and not crucify the Word?" Athanasius says, "they nailed the *body* of the Word to the cross. He was God who was rejected; σαρκὸς δὲ θεοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς τὸ πάθος, καὶ ὁ θάνατος, καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις γέγονε."

In saying that the Scriptures nowhere αἷμα θεοῦ δίχα σαρκὸς παραδεδώκασιν Athanasius means, as I understand him, that they have nowhere used this naked expression. As Dr. Humphry remarks, "if θεοῦ were the reading in our text [Acts xx. 28] there would be mention of the blood of God δίχα σαρκός." (*Comm. on the Acts of the Apostles*, 2d ed., p. 164.) Mr. Darby takes the same view of the language of Athanasius in the note on Acts xx. 28 in his new translation of the New Testament (2d ed., 1872). This view seems to me to be confirmed by the whole tenor of the treatise against Apollinaris, as well as by many particular passages. See, for example, lib. ii. c. 13 (Migne, col. 1153^b): Πῶς οὖν γεγράφατε, ὅτι θεὸς ὁ διὰ σαρκὸς παθὼν καὶ ἀναστὰς; εἰ γὰρ θεὸς ὁ διὰ σαρκὸς παθὼν καὶ ἀναστὰς, παθητὸν εἶρετε καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν παράκλητον. *Ibid.* c. 19 (Migne, col. 1165^a): Μάταιοι οὖν οἱ τῇ θεότητι αὐτοῦ πάθος προσάγοντες. See also lib. i. cc. 3, 5, 11, 15, 20; lib. ii. cc. 3, 7, 11, 12. "The Scriptures," says Athanasius, ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ πάθος ἰστώσι, καὶ οὐχ ὑπερβαίνουσιν. . . . περὶ δὲ τῆς θεότητος τοῦ λόγου τὴν ἀτρεπτότητα καὶ τὴν ἀφραστότητα ὁμολογοῦσι (*ibid.* lib. ii. c. 18); and neither he, nor those with whom he argues, seem ever to have thought of the passage, Acts xx. 28, as opposing this view on the one hand, or favoring it on the other.

The use of the phrase δίχα σαρκός may require further notice. Dr. Burton, in discussing this passage of Athanasius (*ubi supra*, p. 22), makes an assertion which even his own translation does not justify. "Since that Father tells us," he says, "that the Scriptures do speak of the blood of God, we ask, where else do they speak of it, except in Acts xx. 28?" — He does not observe that Athanasius represents the Scriptures as speaking, *not* of the blood and suffering and resurrection "of God," but "of the *flesh* of God," or, according to *his* rendering, "of the *body* of God;" expressions which Athanasius here and elsewhere employs to denote the flesh or body which, together with a human soul, ὁ θεὸς λόγος assumed. He does not mean that the Scriptures use even these expressions; but that in speaking of the blood and passion and resurrection of Christ they do not use the word θεός, which is a term δίχα σαρκός, one that does not suggest or imply the flesh or human nature, but such names as χριστός, which, as he says, is *not* given δίχα σαρκός; that is, it implies the incarnation. Οὔτε οὖν τὸ χριστός ὄνομα δίχα τῆς σαρκός προσάγεται· ἐπειδὴ ἀκολουθεῖ τῷ ὀνόματι τὸ πάθος καὶ ὁ θάνατος, τοῦ μὲν Παύλου γράφοντος κ.τ.λ., citing Acts xxvi. 23; 1 Cor. v. 7;

1 Tim. ii. 5, 6; 2 Tim. ii. 8. (*Cont. Apollinar.* ii. 2.) Thus he refers repeatedly to 1 Pet. iv. 1, where we read that "Christ suffered for us in the flesh." (See *Or. iii. cont. Arian.* cc. 31, 34; *Cont. Apollinar.* ii. 18, 19.) It is just because the word *θεός*, without modification, does not, like *χριστός*, suggest "the flesh," in other words, because it is *δίχα σαρκός*, that Athanasius regards such expressions as *αίμα θεοῦ* and *ὁ θεὸς ἔραθεν καὶ ἀνίστη* as senseless and blasphemous (see above, p. 332).

B. ON THE READING OF THE PESHITO SYRIAC AND THE ÆTHIOPIC VERSIONS.

Before entering upon this subject, I wish to express my hearty thanks to Dr. William Wright, Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, for very important and interesting information, most kindly communicated, concerning the Syriac and Æthiopic manuscripts in the British Museum. The statements here made respecting their readings in Acts xx. 28 all rest on his authority. For a detailed account of the manuscripts, his Catalogues are of course to be consulted.

Of the SYRIAC manuscripts in the British Museum the following read in Acts xx. 28 "the church of God":

Addit. 14473 (6th cent.); 17121, f. 59^a (6th cent.); 14472, f. 39^b (6th or 7th cent.); 18812, f. 35^a (6th or 7th cent.); and 14470, f. 160^b in its later supplement (9th cent.). It is also found in Addit. 17120 (see below) as a late correction; and in 14681 (12th or 13th cent.) as a marginal variant, the text reading "of Christ."

The reading "God" is also found, as is well known, in a Syriac Lectionary in the Vatican Library, No. 21, dated A.D. 1042 (see Adler's *Novi Test. Verss. Syr.* p. 16 ff.), in a manuscript brought by Dr. Buchanan from Travancore, "Codex Malabarensis," now in the Library of the University of Cambridge, Oo. i. 1. 2, which Dr. Lee considers 500 years old; and a ms. in the Bodleian Library, "Dawk. 23," which he regards as "much older."¹ Dr. Lee admitted the reading "God" into the text of his edition of the Syriac New Testament in 1816 on the authority of these three manuscripts.

Of the Syriac manuscripts in the British Museum the following read "the church of Christ" (or the Messiah):

Addit. 17120, "written in a good regular *Estrangelā* of the sixth

¹ See the letter of Dr. Lee in Hug's *Introduction*, trans. by Wait, i. 368-370, and his *Prolegomena in Bibl. Pol. Lond. min.*, iii. § 4, c. 14.

century"; altered "at a much later period into 'of God'" (Dr. Wright); 14448 (A.D. 699-700), f. 143^a; 7157, f. 121^a, "a very fine ms. of the year A.D. 768" (Wright; see also Scrivener, *Introd.*, 2d ed., p. 279, n. 2); 14474 (9th cent.); 14680 (12th or 13th cent.); 17124 (A.D. 1234); and 14681 (12th or 13th cent.) in the *text*, but with "of God" as a marginal variant.—The two mss. numbered 7157 and 14448 are Nestorian.

Respecting the Syriac manuscripts in other libraries I have little information. We may set down, I suppose, as supporting the reading "of Christ" the manuscripts on which the printed editions that have that reading were founded, or in which no variation was noted by the collator; but our knowledge of them is imperfect. Among these editions are those of Widmanstadt (1555), resting on one or two Jacobite manuscripts; the edition of Tremellius (1569) who used a Heidelberg manuscript; that of Le Fevre de la Boderie (Fabricius Boderianus) in the Antwerp Polyglot (Vol. v. 1572), in which he used a manuscript, dated 1188, brought by Postel from the East; that of Rapheleng (1575), who used a "Cologne manuscript," but Marsh thinks this was probably identical with the one just mentioned; that of Gutbier (1664), who had a manuscript borrowed from L'Empereur; and that published by the Propaganda at Rome in 1703 from a copy made by Antonius Sionita in 1611 from three mss. belonging to the College of Maronites. (See Hug's *Introd.*, Part I. § 69, p. 215, Fosdick's trans.) Two Nestorian manuscripts in the Vatican Library, No. 16 (al. 10), assigned by Assemani to the thirteenth century, and No. 17 (al. 9), dated A.D. 1510, described by Adler (*ubi sup.* p. 20 ff.) also have that reading. To these I can only add the ms. Ff. 2. 15 in the Library of the University of Cambridge, Ridley's No. 14, who says that it is dated A.D. 1524; and what is more important, "a Syriac ms. of about 1000 years old, belonging to Mr. Palmer of Magdalen College," mentioned by the Rev. J. B. Morris (*Select Works of S. Ephrem the Syrian*, Oxford, 1847, p. 395, note).¹

We have thus an interesting question respecting the primitive reading of the Peshito in this passage. A majority of the *oldest*

¹ The passage of Ephrem which gave occasion to Mr. Morris's note reads: "Flee from it [Judaism], thou that art feeble; a light thing is thy death and thy blood to it; it took [upon it] the Blood of God, will it be scared away from thine? . . . It hung God upon the Cross, and all created shook to see Him."—*Rhythm i. concerning the Faith*, c. 46 (*Opp.* Syr. et Lat., iii. 1899).

manuscripts, so far as our information at present extends, support the reading "the church of *God*"; and as *χριστοῦ* is found in no Greek manuscript, and in but few patristic quotations, is it not probable that *θεοῦ* was originally read by the Syriac translator?

This is a question on which I am not qualified to express a confident opinion; but I will state the considerations which incline me to a different view.

(1) The manuscript evidence for both readings extends back to the sixth century; but it is important to notice that *all* the Nestorian manuscripts have the reading "Christ," while the Jacobite or Monophysite manuscripts are divided, the majority in point of number, including one of the sixth century, also supporting that reading. In the controversies of the fifth century, when it became known that some Greek mss. supported the reading *θεοῦ*, and after the Philoxenian Syriac, prepared at the instance of a leading Monophysite bishop, had adopted this reading in the text, it is not strange that some of the Jacobites or Monophysites should have *corrected* (as they thought) their copies of the Peshito by the Greek or by the Philoxenian, and that thus the reading "God" should have found its way into a considerable number of mss., since it is a reading which would especially favor the Monophysite doctrine.¹ Latin influence, so far as it went, would also tend in the same direction. I lay no stress upon the fact that the Nestorians (as Sabarjesus at the end of the tenth century) *charged* their adversaries with corrupting this passage and Heb. ii. 9 (see Assemani *Bibl. Orient.* III. i. 543). Such charges amount to little on one side or the other. But we must consider the probabilities. Had "God" been the original reading, the Nestorians were not likely deliberately to change it to "Christ," which must have been found in few if any Greek manuscripts; they would rather have substituted "Lord," which has so much very ancient authority; but passing this by, if they *had* thus corrupted the text, how could their reading, in opposition to the text which had been handed down for centuries, have found its way into a majority of the manuscripts of the hostile sect, after controversy had become bitter?²

¹ "Iacobitarum codices post editam versionem Philoxenianam ad textum Graecum corrigi coeptum est." — Wichelhaus, *De N. T. Vers. Syr.*, p. 231; comp. p. 190: "Haec versio [Philoxeniana] . . . nacta est haud exiguum apud illos famam et auctoritatem, ita ut plurimum transscripta sit et variis temporibus a Iacobitarum doctoribus laudata."

² "Fuit ni fallor haec rerum conditio, ut Nestoriani omnes legerent 'Christi,'

That the Nestorians were not the authors of the corruption appears probable from the similar case of Heb. ii. 9, where their manuscripts and some Jacobite manuscripts also read, "For he *apart from God* (*χωρίς θεοῦ* for *ἁπενὶ θεοῦ*) tasted death for all men"; while most of the Jacobite manuscripts read, "For *God himself, in his grace*, tasted death for all men." That the reading *χωρίς θεοῦ* was not invented by the Nestorians is shown by the fact that it was current two hundred years before they existed, being found in the manuscripts of Origen and many other ancient fathers (see Tischendorf, and Bleek *in loc.*), whereas the Jacobite reading has in Greek no manuscript support.

It must be confessed, however, that the authority of the Synod of Diamper is against them. In the Acts of that Council (A.D. 1599) the Nestorians are charged with maliciously corrupting both Heb. ii. 9 and Acts xx. 28. "Nam ipsi Nestoriani, a Diabolo acti, veritatem Catholicam scilicet Deum pro nobis passum sanguinemque fudisse fateri nolunt." (Mansi, *Concil. Coll. Nova, seu Supplementum*, etc. tom. vi. col. 24.) That very learned and judicious body also restored to the Syriac text the passage about the Woman taken in Adultery, the reading "the love of *God*, because he laid down his life for us," 1 John iii. 16, the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7, 8, and some other gems from the Clementine Vulgate.¹

Should it be urged that the majority of the *oldest* manuscripts in the British Museum collection support the reading "God," though very ancient manuscripts are found on both sides, I would call attention to the fact that most or all of these manuscripts come from the monastery of St. Mary *Deipara* in the Nitrian desert, a Jacobite establishment, and that what is really remarkable is the fact that they do not all have that reading.² The *tendency* to alter the reading "Christ" to "God" is illustrated by the manuscripts Addit. 17120 and 14681; see above, and note the changes in Rich's *ms.* 7157, described by Tregelles (*Textual Criticism*, p. 262, n. 2).

Iacobitarum alii codices 'Christi' exhiberent alii 'Dei,' quam Graeci textus lectionem genuinam et veram habemus." — Wichelhaus, *ibid.* p. 150.

¹ See La Croze, *Hist. du Christianisme des Indes*, 1758, i. 341 ff.

² "Neque id mirum est, quod Iacobitarum potissimum libri in Europam translati sunt. Etenim qui in Nitriae deserta confugerunt ibique in monasterio Mariae Deiparae sedes fixerunt, Monophysitae erant et codices attulerunt ex Iacobitarum monasteriis; deinde plus omnino commercii fuit ecclesiae occidentali cum Iacobitis quam cum Nestorianis, qui interioris Asiae tractus incolebant." — Wichelhaus, *ubi sup.*, p. 147.

(2) The genuineness of the reading "Christ" is favored by its existence in the Erpenian Arabic, made from the Peshito.

(3) It is also favored by the fact that all or most of the earlier fathers of Syria and its neighborhood, as Eustathius of Antioch, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Nestorius, Amphilochius of Iconium, the Gregories, and Eutherius of Tyana, appear to have been averse to such expressions as "the blood" or "the sufferings of God;" see p. 319 f. Perhaps Ephrem is an exception; see the note quoted above; but he was a poet, and fond of extravagant and paradoxical language. Moreover, Sabarjesus quotes him as saying, "Deus Verbum neque passus, neque mortuus est." (*Assemani Bibl. Orient.* III. i. 542.)

Such being the state of the case, I incline pretty strongly to the belief that "Christ" was the original reading of the Peshito in Acts xx. 28.

The AETHIOPIC VERSION as printed in Walton's Polyglot, as has already been mentioned (see p. 323), uses a word regarded by Griesbach, Tischendorf, and others as ambiguous, but which seems to me to support the reading "God."¹ But the Polyglot text (from the Roman edition of 1548-49) represents but a single manuscript, parts of which in the Acts were defective, and supplied by the native editors from the Greek or the Vulgate. Thomas Pell Platt's edition, printed for the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1830, was also made, in the Acts and Epistles, from a single manuscript. (Tregelles, *Textual Criticism*, p. 318.) This edition reads "Christ." In this uncertainty about the text, the following account, for which I am indebted to Dr. Wright, of the readings of the Aethiopic manuscripts in the British Museum, is of special interest:

Orient. 526, f. 67^a; 527, f. 111^a; 529, f. 93^a; 530, f. 89^b; and 531, f. 78^a, agree in reading "church of *Christ*." Or. 532, f. 116^b, omits the word *Christ* altogether. Or. 528, f. 18^a, has "church of *God*," using the word *egziabher*.

"These manuscripts," Dr. Wright remarks, "are all of the

¹ I would add, in further illustration of the statement that the word *egziabher* appears to stand for *κύριος* only when *κύριος* was regarded by the translator as equivalent to Jehovah, and that it is the common representative of *θεός*, the examples of its use in 1 Cor. ii. In vv. 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, it stands for *θεός*; in ver. 16 for *κύριος*; but *not* for *κύριος* in ver. 8 — "they would not have crucified the Lord of glory."

seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; but we have none older in the British Museum."

I would add that Dr. Lightfoot has kindly examined for me the only one of the MEMPHITIC manuscripts in the British Museum containing the Acts, or at least the only one accessible at the time, viz. Orient. 424, and states that "the reading is clearly *roû κυρίον*."

POSTSCRIPT.

On p. 322, note ¹, the manuscript of the *Speculum* published by Cardinal Mai is spoken of as "perhaps the oldest copy that contains the famous passage 1 John v. 7." I have not yet had the opportunity of examining Ziegler's *Italafragmente der Paulinischen Briefe nebst Bruchstücken einer vorhieronymianischen Uebersetzung d. ersten Johannesbriefes aus Pergamentblättern der ehemaligen Freisinger Stiftsbibliothek* (Marburg, 1876), but in the *Theol. Literaturblatt* for Jan. 15, 1876 there is an interesting notice of the volume by Dr. Reusch, who states that the Freising manuscript mentioned in the title just given contains the disputed passage in the following form (supplying the gaps):

"et spiritus est testimonium, quia spiritus est veritas. Quoniam tres sunt qui testificantur in terra: spiritus et aqua et sanguis, et tres sunt qui testificantur in caelo: Pater et Verbum et Spiritus sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt."

As this Freising fragment of the Old Latin version (containing 1 John iii. 8-v. 21) is said to be "of the seventh century at the latest," it is probably entitled to the distinction of being the oldest Latin copy in which the Three Heavenly Witnesses have yet appeared. The La Cava manuscript of the Vulgate, which, like the *Speculum*, contains the spurious Epistle to the Laodiceans, is, indeed, referred by Cardinal Mai to the seventh century; but Tischendorf assigns it to the eighth, and Ziegler, as the result of a special investigation, would place it even later.

In regard to the authorship of the *Speculum*, the opinion expressed above (p. 322), and in the American edition of Orme's *Memoir of the Controversy respecting the Three Heavenly Witnesses* (pp. 187, 188), is confirmed by Ziegler, who remarks, as quoted and endorsed by Dr. Reusch, that "the *Speculum* is not by Augustine, but by an unknown, probably African author; and that it is not even certain

whether he took this verse with the Heavenly Witnesses from a manuscript of the Bible, or added it himself; at any rate, the citation in the *Speculum* is of no more importance than that in *Vigilius*." As the passage was quoted by *Vigilius Thapsensis* (cir. 484) and by *Fulgentius* (507-533), we need not be surprised to find it in a Latin ms. of the sixth century.

ARTICLE VI.

RELATIONS OF THE ARYAN AND SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

BY REV. JAMES F. MCCURDY, PRINCETON, N.J.

II. — CRITERIA OF RELATIONSHIP.

IN passing now from the more critical to the more constructive portion of our Essay, it will be well to throw some light on the nature of the task before us, by exhibiting the more obvious points of contrast between the two families of speech.¹ Bringing thus into view the distinguishing features of each idiom, we shall be the more able to propound the conditions of a just investigation, and to establish the true criteria of evidence as to their relations.

In every language, or group of languages, there are three elements, whose peculiarities determine its special character, and help in different degrees towards its classification. These are, its sounds, its structural principles, and the contents of its vocabulary. In the case before us the numerous points of dissimilarity seem at first sight radical and indicative of a diverse origin, while the points of agreement appear accidental and superficial.

As regards the first element, the sounds of the respective languages, great divergence is apparent among the dentals, in which the Semitic family has developed a strong tendency to multiply sibilant and lisping sounds, and a wider differ-

¹ Comp. Ewald, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (8th ed.), 1870, p. 26 ff.; Renan, *Histoire générale des langues Sémitiques* (4th ed.), 1863, p. 18 ff., 454 ff.; Whitney, *Language and the Study of Language*, p. 300 ff.