

AN  
HISTORICAL ACCOUNT  
OF  
TWO NOTABLE  
CORRUPTIONS OF SCRIPTURE:  
IN A LETTER TO A FRIEND.  
BY  
SIR ISAAC NEWTON.

PUBLISHED ENTIRE FROM A MS. IN THE AUTHOR'S HAND-WRITING  
IN THE POSSESSION OF THE REV. DR. EKENS,  
DEAN OF CARLISLE.

---

*Exactly reprinted from Bishop Horsley's Edition of Sir Isaac Newton's  
Works, vol. v. 1785.*

---

LONDON:  
JOHN GREEN, 121 NEWGATE STREET.

1841.

BISHOP HORSLEY'S  
ADVERTISEMENT.

---

A VERY imperfect copy of this Tract, wanting both the beginning and the end, and erroneous in many places, was published at London in the year 1754, under the title of Two Letters from Sir Isaac Newton to Mr. Le Clerc. But in the Author's MS. the whole is one continued discourse ; which, although it is conceived in the epistolary form, is not addressed to any particular person.

AN  
HISTORICAL ACCOUNT  
OF  
TWO NOTABLE CORRUPTIONS  
OF SCRIPTURE.

---

IN A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

---

BY SIR ISAAC NEWTON.

---

SIR,

SINCE the discourses of some late writers have raised in you a curiosity of knowing the truth of that text of Scripture concerning the testimony of the Three in Heaven, 1 John v. 7, I have here sent you an account of what the reading has been in all ages, and by what steps it has been changed, so far as I can hitherto determine by records. And I have done it the more freely, because to you, who understand the many abuses which they of the Roman church have put upon the world, it will scarce be ungrateful to be convinced of one more than is commonly believed. For although the more learned and quick-sighted men, as Luther, Erasmus, Bullinger, Grotius, and some

others, would not dissemble their knowledge, yet the generality are fond of the place for its making against heresy. But whilst we exclaim against the pious frauds of the Roman church, and make it a part of our religion to detect and renounce all things of that kind, we must acknowledge it a greater crime in us to favour such practices, than in the Papists we so much blame on that account: for they act according to their religion, but we contrary to ours. In the Eastern nations, and for a long time in the Western, the faith subsisted without this text; and it is rather a danger to religion, than an advantage, to make it now lean upon a bruised reed. There cannot be better service done to the truth, than to purge it of things spurious: and therefore knowing your prudence, and calmness of temper, I am confident I shall not offend you by telling you my mind plainly; especially since it is no article of faith, no point of discipline, nothing but a criticism concerning a text of Scripture which I am going to write about.

II. The history of the corruption, in short, is this. First, some of the Latines interpreted the Spirit, Water, and Blood, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to prove them one. Then Jerome, for the same end, inserted the Trinity in express words into his version. Out of him the Africans began to allege it against the Vandals, about sixty-four years after his death. Afterwards the Latines noted his variations in the margins of

their books; and thence it began at length to creep into the text in transcribing, and that chiefly in the twelfth and following centuries, when disputing was revived by the schoolmen. And when printing came up, it crept out of the Latine into the printed Greek, against the authority of all the Greek manuscripts and ancient versions; and from the Venetian presses it went soon after into Greece. Now the truth of this history will appear by considering the arguments on both sides.

III. The arguments alleged for the testimony of the Three in Heaven, are the authorities of Cyprian, Athanasius, and Jerome, and of many Greek manuscripts, and almost all the Latine ones.

IV. Cyprian's words run thus—"the Lord saith, 'I and the Father am one.' And again of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost it is written, 'And these Three are One.'" The Socinians here deal too injuriously with Cyprian, while they would have this place corrupted: for Cyprian in another place repeats almost the same thing<sup>1</sup>. "If," saith he, ["one baptized among heretics] be made the temple of God, tell me, I pray, of

<sup>1</sup> "Dicit Dominus, Ego et pater unum sumus; et iterum de patre et filio et spiritu sancto scriptum est, Et tres unum sunt."—*Cypr. de Unit. Eccles.*

<sup>2</sup> "Si templum Dei factus est, quæso cujus Dei? Si spiritus sancti, cum tres unum sint, quomodo spiritus sanctus placatus ei esse potest, qui aut patris aut filii inimicus est?"—*Cypr. Epist. 73, ad Jubaiamum.*



what God? If of the Holy Ghost, since these Three are One, how can the Holy Ghost be reconciled to him who is the enemy of either the Father or the Son?" These places of Cyprian being, in my opinion, genuine, seem so apposite to prove the testimony of the Three in Heaven, that I should never have suspected a mistake in it, could I but have reconciled it with the ignorance I meet with of this reading in the next age, amongst the Latines of both Africa and Europe, as well as among the Greeks. For had it been in Cyprian's Bible, the Latines of the next age, when all the world was engaged in disputing about the Trinity, and all arguments that could be thought of were diligently sought out, and daily brought upon the stage, could never have been ignorant of a text, which in our age, now the dispute is over, is chiefly insisted upon. In reconciling this difficulty, I consider, therefore, that the only words of the text quoted by Cyprian in both places are, "And these Three are One:" which words may belong to the eighth verse as well as to the seventh. For Eucherius<sup>1</sup> bishop

<sup>1</sup> Eucherius reads the text thus: "Tria sunt quæ testimonium perhibent; aqua, sanguis, et spiritus." And then adds this interpretation, "Plures hęc ipsam, interpretatione mystica, intelligunt Trinitatem; eò quod perfecta ipsa perhibeat testimonium Christo: aqua, patrem indicans; quia ipse de se dicit, me dereliquerunt fontem aquæ vivæ: sanguine, Christum demonstrans, utique per passionis cruorem: spiritu verò sanctum spiritum manifestans."—*Eucher. de Quest. N. Test.*

of Lion in France, and contemporary to St. Austin, reading the text without the seventh verse, tells us, that many then understood the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, to signify the Trinity. And St. Austin<sup>1</sup> is one of those many; as you may see in his third book against Maximus, where he tells us, that "the Spirit is the Father, for God is a Spirit: the Water the Holy Ghost, for he is the Water which Christ gives to them that thirst: and the Blood the Son, for the Word was made flesh." Now if it was the opinion of many in the Western churches of those times, that the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, signified the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; it is plain that the testimony of Three in Heaven, in express

<sup>1</sup> "Sanè falli te nolo in epistolâ Joannis Apostoli, ubi ait, 'tres sunt testes, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et tres unum sunt; ne fortè dicas, spiritum et aquam et sanguinem diversas esse substantias, et tamen dictam [dictum] esse, tres unum sunt. Propter hoc admonui te, ne fallaris: hæc enim sunt, in quibus non quid sint, sed quid ostendant, semper attenditur. Si verò ea, quæ his significata sunt, velimus inquirere; non absurdè occurrit ipsa Trinitas, quæ unus, solus, summus est Deus, pater et filius et spiritus sanctus; de quibus verissimè dici potuit, tres sunt testes, et tres unum sunt: ut nomine spiritûs significatum accipiamus Deum patrem, (de Deo ipso quippe adorando loquebatur Dominus, ubi ait, 'spiritus est Deus;') nomine autem sanguinis, filium; quia verbum caro factum est: nomine autem aquæ, spiritum sanctum. Cùm enim de aquâ loqueretur Jesus, quam daturus erat sitientibus, ait evangelista; 'Hoc autem dicit de spiritu, quem accepturi erant credentes in eum.'"—*D. Augustin. cont. Maximum. lib. iii. cap. xxij.*

words, was not yet crept into their books : and even without this testimony, it was obvious for Cyprian, or any man else of that opinion, to say of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost, "it is written, 'And these Three are One.'" And that this was Cyprian's meaning, Facundus<sup>1</sup>, an African bishop in the sixth century, is my author ; for he tells us expressly that Cyprian, in the above-mentioned place, understood it so, interpreting the Water, Spirit, and Blood, to be the

<sup>1</sup> Facundus, in the beginning of his book to the Emperor Justinian, *Pro Defensione trium Capitulum Consilii Chalcedonensis*, first recites the text after the manner of Cyprian, but more distinctly in these words : "Nam Joannes apostolus, in epistolâ suâ, de patre et filio et spiritu sancto sic dicit, 'Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis ; et hi tres unum sunt ;' in spiritu significans patrem, &c. Joan. iv. 21. In aquâ spiritum sanctum, Joan. vii. 37 ; in sanguine verò filium." And a little after he thus confirms this interpretation by Cyprian's authority, saying, "Aut si forsân ipsi, qui de verbo contendunt, in eo quod dixit, 'Tres sunt qui testificantur in terrâ, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et hi tres unum sunt,' Trinitatem nolunt intelligi ; secundum ipsa verba quæ posuit, pro apostolo Joanne respondeant. Numquid hi tres, qui in terrâ testificari, et qui unum esse dicuntur, possunt spiritus et aquæ et sanguines dici ? Quod tamen Joannis apostoli testimonium B. Cyprianus Carthaginensis, antistes et martyr, in epistolâ sive libro quem de Trinitate, immò de Unitate Ecclesiæ scripsit, de patre, filio, et spiritu sancto dictum intelligit : ait enim, 'dicit dominus, ego et pater unum sumus ; et iterum de patre, filio, et spiritu sancto scriptum est, et hi tres unum sunt.'"—*Facund. lib. i. p. 16 ; ex edit. Sirmondi, Parisiis, 1629.*

Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; and thence affirming that John said of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; "these Three are One." This at least may be gathered from this passage of Facundus, that some in those early ages interpreted Cyprian after this manner. Nor do I understand how any of those many who took the Spirit, Water, and Blood, for a type of the Trinity ; or any man else, who was ignorant of the testimony of the Three in Heaven, as the churches in the times of the Arian controversy generally were, could understand him otherwise. And even Cyprian's own words do plainly make for the interpretation. For he does not say, "the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost," as it is now in the seventh verse ; but "the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost," as it is in baptism ; the place from which they tried \* at first to derive the Trinity. If it be pretended, that the words cited by Cyprian are taken out of the seventh verse, rather than out of the eighth, because he reads not, "*Hi Tres in Unum sunt,*" but "*Hi Tres Unum sunt ;*" I answer, that the Latines generally read, "*Hi Tres Unum sunt,*" as well in the eighth verse, as in the seventh ; as you may see in the newly cited places of St. Austin and Facundus, and those of Ambrose, Pope Leo, Beda, and Cassiodorus, which follow,

\* *The insinuation contained in this expression, that the Trinity is not to be derived from the words prescribed for the baptismal form, is very extraordinary to come from a writer who was no Socinian.*—Bp. Horsley.

and in the present vulgar Latine. So then the testimony of Cyprian respects the eighth, or at least is as applicable to that verse as to the seventh, and therefore is, of no force for proving the truth of the seventh: but on the contrary, for disproving it we have here the testimony of Facundus, St. Austin, Eucherius, and those many others whom Eucherius mentions. For if those of that age had met with it in their books, they would never have understood the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, to be the Three Persons of the Trinity, in order to prove them One God.

V. These passages in Cyprian may receive further light by a like passage in Tertullian, from whence Cyprian seems to have borrowed them; for it is well known that Cyprian was a great admirer of Tertullian's writings, and read them frequently, calling Tertullian his master. The passage is this<sup>1</sup>: "The connection of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, makes three coherent ones from one another, which Three are One (one thing, not one person,) as it is said, 'I and the Father are One;' denoting the Unity of substance, not the singularity of number." Here, you see, Tertullian says not, "the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost," as the text now has it,

<sup>1</sup> "Connexus patris in filio, et filii in paraceto, tres efficit coherentes, alterum ex altero, 'qui Tres Unum sunt,' (non Unus) quomodo dictum est, 'Ego et Pater Unum sumus;' ad substantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem."—*Tertullian. advers. Prax.* cap. 25.

but "the Father, Son, and Paraclete;" nor cites anything more of the text than these words, "which Three are One." Though this treatise against St. Praxeas be wholly spent in discoursing about the Trinity, and all texts of Scripture are cited to prove it, and this text of St. John, as we now read it, would have been one of the most obvious and apposite to have been cited at large, yet Tertullian could find no more obvious words in it for his purpose than "these Three are One." These, therefore, he interprets of the Trinity, and inforces the interpretation by that other text, "I and the Father are One;" as if the phrase was of the same importance in both places.

VI. So then this interpretation seems to have been invented by the Montanists for giving countenance to their Trinity. For Tertullian was a Montanist when he wrote this; and it is most likely that so corrupt and forced an interpretation had its rise among a sect of men accustomed to make bold with the Scriptures. Cyprian being used to it in his master's writings, it seems from thence to have dropt into his: for this may be gathered from the likeness between their citations. And by the disciples of these two great men, it seems to have been propagated among those many Latins, who (as Eucherius tells us) received it in the next age, understanding the Trinity by the "Spirit, Water, and Blood." For how, without the countenance of some such authority, an interpretation so corrupt and strained should come

to be received in that age so generally, I do not understand.

VII. And what is said of the testimony of Tertullian and Cyprian, may be much more said of that in the feigned disputation of Athanasius with Arius at Nice. For there the words cited are only "*και οι τρεις το εν εις*," "and these Three are One;" and they are taken out of the seventh verse, without naming the persons of the Trinity before them. For the Greeks interpreted "the Spirit, Water, and Blood," of the Trinity, as well as the Latins; as is manifest from the annotations they made on this text in the margin of some of their manuscripts. For Father Simon<sup>1</sup> informs us that in one of the manuscripts in the library of the king of France, marked numb. 2247, over against these words, "*οτι τρεις εις οι μαρτυρουντες εν τη γη<sup>2</sup>, το πνευμα και το υδωρ και το αιμα*," "for there are Three that bear record [in earth,] the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood;" there is this remark, "*τουτεστι, το πνευμα το αγιον, και ο πατηρ, και αυτος εαντου*," "that is, the Holy Ghost, and the Father, and He of Himself." And in the same copy over against these words, "*και οι τρεις εις το εν εις*," "and these Three are One;" this note is added, "*τουτεστι, μια θεοτης, εις θεος*," that is, "One Deity, One God." This manuscript is about 500 years old.

<sup>1</sup> Critical History of the New Testament: cap. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Suspicio verba εν τη γη non extare in MS.

VIII. Also in the margin of one of the manuscripts in Monsieur Colbert's library, numb. 871, Father Simon tells us there is a like remark. For besides these words, "*εις θεος, μια θεοτης*," "One God, One Godhead;" there are added, "*μαρτυρια του θεου του πατρος και του αγιου πνευματος*." "The testimony of God, the Father, and of the Holy Ghost." These marginal notes sufficiently show how the Greeks used to apply this text to the Trinity; and by consequence how the author of that disputation is to be understood. But I should tell you also, that that disputation was not writ by Athanasius, but by a later author, and therefore, as a spurious piece, uses not to be much insisted upon.

IX. Now this mystical application of "the Spirit, Water, and Blood," to signify the Trinity, seems to me to have given occasion to somebody, either fraudulently to insert the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" in express words into the text, for proving the Trinity; or else to note it in the margin of his book, by way of interpretation; whence it might afterwards creep into the text in transcribing. And the first upon record that inserted it, is Jerome; if the preface<sup>1</sup> to the canoni-

<sup>1</sup> The whole preface runs thus: "Incipit prologus in epistolas canonicas. Non ita est ordo apud Græcos, qui integrè sapiunt, fidemque rectam sectantur, epistolarum septem, quæ canonicæ nuncupantur, sicut in Latinis codicibus invenitur: ut quia Petrus est primus in ordine apostolorum, primæ sint etiam ejus epistolæ in ordine ceterarum. Sed sicut evange-

cal epistles, which goes under his name, be his. For whilst he composed not a new translation of the New Testament, but only corrected the ancient vulgar Latin (as learned men think), and among his emendations (written perhaps at first in the margin of his book) he inserted this testimony; he complains in the said preface, how he was thereupon accused\* by some of the Latins for falsifying Scripture; and makes answer, that

listas dudum ad veritatis lineam correximus, ita has proprio ordini, Deo juvante, reddidimus. Est enim una earum prima Jacobi, duæ Petri, tres Johannis, et Judæ una. Quæ si sicut ab eis digestæ sunt, ita quoque ab interpretibus fideliter in Latinum verterentur eloquium, nec ambiguitatem legentibus facerent, nec sermonum sese varietates impugnarent, illo præcipuè loco ubi de Unitate Trinitatis in primâ Johannis epistolâ, positum legimus, &c. In quâ etiam ab infidelibus translatoribus, multum erratum esse à fidei veritate comperimus, trium tantummodo vocabula, hoc est, Aquæ, Sanguinis, et Spiritûs, in ipsâ suâ editione ponentibus: et Patris, Verbique, ac Spiritûs testimonium omittentibus; in quo maximè et fides catholica roboratur, et patris, ac filii, et spiritûs una divinitatis substantia comprobatur. In cæteris verò epistolis, quantum à nostrâ aliorum distet editio, lectoris judicio derelinquo. Sed tu, virgo Christi Eustochium, dum à me impensius scripturæ veritatem inquiris, meam quodammodo senectutem invidorum dentibus corrodendam exponis, qui me falsarium, corruptoremque sanctarum pronunciant scripturarum. Sed ego, in tali opere, nec æmulorum meorum invidiam pertimesco, nec Sanctæ Scripturæ veritatem poscentibus denegabo."

\* Jerome complains not of any accusation raised upon what he had done in this or any other particular text of Scripture. He affirms, that this text was unfaithfully rendered in the Latin Bibles, which were current in his time before his own

former Latin translators had much erred from the faith, in putting only "the Spirit, Water, and Blood," in their edition, and omitting the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," whereby the Catholic faith is established. In his defence he seems to say, that he corrected the vulgar Latin translation by the original Greek; and this is the great testimony the text relies upon.

X. But whilst he confesses it was not in the Latin before, and accuses former translators of falsifying the Scriptures in omitting it, he satisfies us that it has crept into the Latin since his time, and so cuts off all the authority of the present vulgar Latin for justifying it. And whilst he was accused by his contemporaries of falsifying the Scriptures in inserting it, this accusation also confirms, that he altered the public reading. For had the reading been dubious before he made it so, no man would have charged him with falsification for following either part. Also whilst, upon this accusation, he recommends the alteration by its usefulness for establishing the Catholic faith, this renders it the more suspected; by discovering both the design of his making it, and the ground of his hoping for success. However, seeing he was thus accused by his contempora-

*edition. That his edition, in this as well as in other passages, faithfully represented the original Greek; and he expresses an apprehension, that the number of his emendations, which the infidelity of former translators had rendered necessary, might furnish his enemies with a pretence for abuse.—Bp. Horsley.*

ries, it gives us just reason to examine the business between him and his accusers. And so, he being called to the bar, we are not to lay stress upon his own testimony for himself, (for no man is a witness in his own cause,) but laying aside all prejudice, we ought, according to the ordinary rules of justice, to examine the business between him and his accusers by other witnesses.

XI. They that have been conversant in his writings, observe a strange liberty which he takes in asserting things. Many notable instances of this he has left us in composing those very fabulous lives of Paul and Hilarion, not to mention what he has written upon other occasions. Whence Erasmus said of him, that he was in affirming things, "frequently violent and impudent, and often contrary to himself<sup>1</sup>." But I accuse him not. It is possible that he might be sometimes imposed upon, or, through inadvertency, commit a mistake. Yet since his contemporaries accused him, it is but just that we should lay aside the prejudice of his great name, and hear the cause impartially between them.

XII. Now the witnesses between them are partly the ancient translators of the Scriptures into the various languages; partly the writers of his own age, and of the ages next before and

<sup>1</sup> "Sæpe numero violentus, parumque pudens, sæpe varius, parumque sibi constans."—*Erasmi Annotation. in Johan. v. 7.*

Vide etiam quæ Erasmus contra Leum in hunc locum de Hieronymo fusiùs dixit.

after him; and partly the Scribes who have copied out the Greek manuscripts of the Scriptures in all ages. And all these are against him. For by the unanimous evidence of all these, it will appear that the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was wanting in the Greek manuscripts, from whence Jerome, or whoever was the author of that preface to the canonical epistles, pretends to have borrowed it.

XIII. The ancient interpreters, which I cite as witnesses against him, are chiefly the authors of the ancient vulgar Latin, of the Syriac, and the Æthiopic versions. For as he tells us, that the Latins omitted the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" in their version before his time, so in the Syriac and Æthiopic versions, (both which, from bishop Walton's account of them, are much ancients than Jerome's time, being the versions which the Oriental and Æthiopic nations received from the beginning, and generally used, as the Latins did the vulgar Latin,) that same testimony is wanting to this day; and the authors of these three most ancient, most famous, and most received versions, by omitting it, are concurrent witnesses, that they found it wanting in the original Greek manuscripts of their own times. It is wanting also in other ancient versions; as in the Egyptian Arabic, published in Walton's Polyglot; in the Armenian version<sup>1</sup>, used, ever

<sup>1</sup> "Codex Armeniacus ante 400 annos exaratus, quem vidi apud Episcopum Ecclesiæ Armeniæ, quæ Amstelodami col-

since Chrysostom's age, by the Armenian nations; and in the Illyrican<sup>1</sup> of Cyrillus, used in Rascia, Bulgaria, Moldavia, Russia, Muscovy, and other countries, which use the Slavonic tongue. In a copy of this version<sup>1</sup>, printed at Ostrobe (Ostrow) in Volhinia, in the year 1581, I have seen it wanting; and one Camillus<sup>2</sup> relates the same thing out of ancient manuscripts of this version seen by him. Father Simon notes it wanting also in a certain version of the French church, which, saith he, is at least 1000 years old, and which was published by Father Mabillon, a Benedictine monk. Nor do I know of any version wherein it is extant, except the modern vulgar Latin, and such modern versions, of the Western nations, as have been influenced by it. So then, by the unanimous consent of all the ancient and faithful interpreters which we have hitherto met with, (who doubtless made use of the best manuscripts they could get,) the testimony

*igitur, locum illum non legit.*—*Sandius Append. Interpret. Paradox. in h. l.*

<sup>1</sup> The printed Slavonic version runs thus: "Quia Tres sunt qui testificantur, Spiritus, et Aqua, et Sanguis; et Tres in Unum sunt. Si testimonium," &c.

<sup>2</sup> "Testimonium trium in Cœlo non est in antiquissimis Illyricorum et Ruthenorum codicibus; quorum unum exemplar, à sexcentis ferè annis manuscriptum, jampridem apud illustrissimum Gabrielem Chineum, terræ Bactricæ Dominum vidi, et legi: alterum manibus nostris teritur, fide et antiquitate suâ nobile."—*Camillus de Antichristo*, lib. ii. cap. 2. pag. 156.

of "the Three in Heaven" was not anciently in the Greek.

XIV. And that it was neither in the ancient versions nor in the Greek, but was wholly unknown to the first churches, is most certain by an argument hinted above; namely, that in all that vehement, universal, and lasting controversy about the Trinity in Jerome's time, and both before and long enough after it, this text of "the Three in Heaven" was never once thought of. It is now in everybody's mouth, and accounted the main text for the business, and would assuredly have been so too with them, had it been in their books. And yet it is not once to be met with in all the disputes, epistles, orations, and other writings of the Greeks and Latins (Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, the council of Sardica, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Hilary, Ambrose, Austin, Victorinus Afer, Philastrius Brixienensis, Phæbedius Agennensis, Gregorius Bæticus, Faustinus Diaconus, Paschasius, Arnobius Junior, Cerealis and others,) in the times of those controversies; no, not in Jerome himself; if his version and preface to the canonical epistles be excepted. The writings of those times were very many, and copious; and there is no argument, or text of Scripture, which they do not urge again and again. That of St. John's gospel, "I and the Father am One," is everywhere inculcated, but this of "the Three in Heaven, and their being One," is no-



where to be met with, till at length, when the ignorant ages came on, it began by degrees to creep into the Latin copies out of Jerome's version. So far are they from citing the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," that, on the contrary, as often as they have occasion to mention the place, they omit it, and that too, as well after Jerome's age, as in and before it. For Hesychius<sup>1</sup> cites the place thus: "*Audi Johannem dicentem, Tria sunt qui testimonium præbent, et Tres Unum sunt, spiritus, et sanguis, et aqua.*" The words '*in terrâ*' he omits, which is never done, but in copies where "the Three in Heaven" is wanting. Cassiodorus, or whoever was the author of the Latin version of the discourse of Clemens Alexandrinus on these epistles of St. John, reads it thus: "*Quia tres sunt, qui testificantur, spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis; et hi Tres Unum sunt.*" Beda, in his commentary on the place, reads it thus: "*Et spiritus est qui testificatur, quoniam Christus est veritas. Quoniam Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et Tres Unum sunt. Si testimonium,*" &c. But here the words, *in 'terrâ,* so far as I can gather from his commentary on this text, have been inserted by some latter hand. The author of the first epistle, ascribed to Pope Eusebius, reads it, as Beda doth, omitting only the words, *in terrâ.* And if the authority of popes

<sup>1</sup> Hesych. in Levit. lib. ii. c. 8. post med.

<sup>2</sup> Cassiodor. in Bibl. S. Patr. edit. Paris. 1589.

be valuable, Pope Leo the Great, in his tenth epistle, thus cites the place: "*Et spiritus est qui testificatur, quoniam spiritus est veritas; quia Tres sunt qui testimonium dant, spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis; et hi Tres Unum sunt.*" St. Ambrose, in the sixth chapter of his first book, *De Spiritu Sancto*, disputing for the unity of the Three Persons, says, "*Hi Tres Unum sunt, Johannes dixit, aqua, sanguis, et spiritus: Unum in mysterio, non in naturâ.*" This is all he could find of the text, while he was disputing about the Trinity, and therefore he proves the unity of the persons by the mystical unity of the Spirit, Water, and Blood: interpreting these of the Trinity with Cyprian and others. Yea, in the eleventh chapter of his third book, he fully recites the text thus: "*Per aquam et sanguinem venit Christus Jesus, non solum in aquâ, sed in aquâ et sanguine; et spiritus testimonium dat, quoniam spiritus est veritas. Quia Tres sunt testes, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis; et hi Tres Unum sunt in Christo Jesu.*" The like reading of Facundus, Eucherius, and St. Austin, you have in the places cited above. These are Latins as late, or later, than Jerome; for Jerome did not prevail with the churches of his own time to receive the testimony of "the Three in Heaven." And for them to know his version, and not receive his testimony, was in effect to condemn it.

<sup>1</sup> See also Ambrose in Luc. xxii. 10, and in his book, *De iis qui mysteriis initiantur*, cap. 4.



XV. And as for the Greeks, Cyril of Alexandria reads the text without this testimony in the xivth book of his Thesaurus, cap. 5; and again in his first book *De Fide ad Reginas*, a little after the middle; and so does Oecumenius, a later Greek, in his commentary on this place of St. John's epistle. Also, Didymus Alexandrinus, in his commentary on the same passage, reads, "the Spirit, Water, and Blood," without mentioning "the Three in Heaven:" and so he doth in his book of the Holy Ghost, where he seems to omit nothing that he could find for his purpose: and so doth Gregory Nazianzen in his xxxviii oration concerning the Holy Ghost; and also Nicetas in his commentary on Gregory Nazianzen's xlvth oration: And here it is further observable, that, as the Eusebians had contended, that "the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" were not to be connumerated, because they were things of a different kind; Nazianzen and Nicetas answer, that they might be connumerated, because St. John connumerates three things not substantial, namely, "the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood." By the objection of the Eusebians, it then appears that the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was not in their books; and by the answer of the Catholics it is as evident, that it was not in theirs; for while they answer by instancing "the Spirit, Water, and Blood," they could not have missed of "the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost," had they been connume-

rated, and called one in the words immediately before; and to answer by instancing in these, would have been far more to their purpose, because it was the very thing in question. In like manner the Eunomians, in disputing against the Catholics, had objected, that the Holy Ghost is nowhere in Scripture conjoined with the Father and the Son, except in the form of baptism; which is as much as to say, that the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was not in their books: and yet St. Basil<sup>1</sup>, whilst he is very diligent in returning an answer to them, and perplexes himself in citing places, which are nothing to the purpose, does not produce this text of "the Three in Heaven," though it be the most obvious, and the only proper passage, had it been then in the Scriptures; and therefore he knew nothing of it. The objection of the Eunomians, and the answer of the Catholics, sufficiently show that it was in the books of neither party. Besides all this, the tenth epistle of Pope Leo, mentioned above, was that very famous epistle to Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople, against Eutyches which went about through all the churches, both Eastern and Western, being translated into Greek, and sent about in the East by Flavian. It was generally applauded in the West, and read in the council of Chalcedon, and there solemnly approved and subscribed by all the bishops; and in this epistle the text was thus cited: "*Et spiritus est qui*

<sup>1</sup> Lib. 5, adversus Eunomium sub finem.

*testificatur, quoniam Christus est veritas; quia Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis; et hi Tres Unum sunt.*" And by putting πνευμα (according to the Greek reading) for *Christus*, which is still the vulgar Latin, it was thus translated by the Greeks: "και το πνευμα εστιν το μαρτυρον' επειδη το πνευμα εστιν η αληθεια' τρεις γαρ εισιν οι μαρτυροντες, το πνευμα, και το υδωρ, και το αιμα, και οι τρεις το εν εισι." So then we have the reading, quoted by the Pope, owned in the West, and solemnly subscribed in the East by the fourth general council, and therefore it continued the public received reading in both the East and West, till after the age of that council.

XVI. So then the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," which, in the times of these controversies, would have been in everybody's mouth, had it been in their books, was wholly unknown to the churches of those ages. All that they could find in their books was the testimony of "the Water, the Spirit, and the Blood." Will you now say, that the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was razed out of their books by the prevailing Arians? Yes, truly, those Arians were crafty knaves, that could conspire so cunningly and slyly all the world over at once (as at the word of a Mithridates) in the latter end of the reign of the emperor Constantius, to get all men's books in their hands, and correct them without being perceived: ay, and conjurors too, to do it

without leaving any blot or chasm in their books, whereby the knavery might be suspected and discovered; and to wipe away the memory of it out of all men's brains, so that neither Athanasius, or anybody else, could afterwards remember that they had ever seen it in their books before; and out of their own books too; so that when they turned to the consubstantial faith, as they generally did in the West, soon after the death of Constantius, they could then remember no more of it than anybody else. Well, then, it was out of their books in Jerome's age, when he pretended it was in; which is the point we are to prove; and when anybody can show, that it was in their books before, it may be pertinent to consider that point also; but till then we are only to inquire how, since it was out, it came into the copies that are now extant. For they that, without proof, accuse the heretics of corrupting books, and upon that pretence correct them at their pleasure without the authority of ancient manuscripts, as some learned men of the fourth and fifth centuries used to do, are falsaries by their own confession, and certainly need no other confutation. And therefore if this reading was once out, we are bound in justice to believe, that it was out from the beginning; unless the razing of it out can be proved by some better argument than that of pretence and clamour.

XVII. Will you now say, that Jerome followed some copy different from any which the Greeks

were acquainted with? This is to overthrow the authority of his version by making him depart from the received Greeks; and besides, it is contrary to what he himself seems to represent; for in his blaming not the vulgar Greek copies, but the Latin interpreters only, which were before his time, as if they had varied from the received Greek, he represents that he himself followed it. He does not excuse and justify himself for reading differently from the received Greek, to follow a private copy, but accuses former interpreters, as if, in leaving out the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," they had not followed the received Greek, as he did. And; therefore, since the Greeks knew nothing of this testimony, the authority of his version sinks; and that the rather, because he was then accused of corrupting the text, and could not persuade either the Greeks or the Latins of those times to receive his reading; for the Latins received it not till many years after his death; and the Greeks not till this present age, when the Venetians sent it amongst them in printed books; and their not receiving it was plainly to approve the accusation.

XVIII. The authority of this version being thus far discussed, it remains, that we consider the authority of the manuscripts wherein we now read the testimony of "the Three in Heaven." And by the best inquiry that I have been able to make, it is wanting in the manuscripts of all languages but the Latin. For, as we have shown,

that the Æthiopic, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, and Sclavonian versions, still in use in the several Eastern nations, Ethiopia, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Muscovy, and some others, are strangers to this reading, and that it was anciently wanting also in the French; so I am told by those who have been in Turkey, that it is wanting to this day in the Greek manuscripts, which have been brought from those parts into the West; and that the Greeks, now that they have got it in print from the Venetians, when their manuscripts are objected against it, pretend that the Arians razed it out. A reading to be found in no manuscripts but the Latin, and not in the Latin before Jerome's age, as Jerome himself confesses, can be but of little authority: and this authority sinks, because we have already proved the reading spurious, by showing that it was heretofore unknown, both to the Western and the Eastern churches, in the times of the great controversy about the Trinity. But, however, for further satisfaction, we shall now give you an account of the Latin and Greek manuscripts; and show, first, how, in the dark ages, it crept into the Latin manuscripts out of Jerome's version; and then how it lately crept out of the Latin into the printed Greek without the authority of manuscripts; those who first published it in Greek having never yet so much as seen it in any Greek manuscript.

XIX. That the vulgar Latin, now in use, is a

mixture of the old vulgar Latin, and of Jerome's version together, is the received opinion. Few of these manuscripts are above four or five hundred years old. The latest generally have the testimony of "the Three in Heaven:" the oldest of all usually want it, which shows that it has crept in by degrees. Erasmus notes it to be wanting in three very ancient ones, one of which was in the Pope's library at Rome, the other two were at Bruges; and he adds, that in another manuscript belonging to the library of the Minorites in Antwerp, the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was noted in the margin in a newer hand. Peter Cholinus notes in the margin of his Latin edition of the Scriptures, printed anno Christi 1543 and 1544, that it was wanting in the most ancient manuscript of the Tugurine library. Dr. Gilbert Burnet has lately, in the first letter of his travels, noted it wanting in five other ones kept at Strasburg, Zurich, and Basil; one of which manuscripts he reckons about 1000 years old, and the other four about 800. F. Simon has noted it wanting in five others in the libraries of the king of France, Mons. Colbert, and the Benedictines of the Abbey of St. Germain's. An ancient and diligent collator of manuscripts, cited by Lucas Brugensis by the name of Epanorthotes, notes in general, that it was wanting in the ancient Latin manuscripts. Lucas himself, collating many Latin ones, notes it to be wanting in only *five*, that is, in the few old ones he had, his manuscripts being

almost all of them new ones. For he praises<sup>1</sup> the Codex Lobiensis written anno Christi 1084, and the Codex Tornacensis written anno Christi 1105, as most ancient and venerable for their antiquity; and used others much more new, of which a great number was easily had; such as was the Codex Buslidianus, written anno Christi 1432, that is, but eight years before the invention of printing. The Lateran council, collected under Innocent the Third, anno Christi 1215, canon 2, mentions Joachim, the abbot, quoting the text in these words: "*Quoniam in canonicâ Johannis epistolâ [legitur,] Quia Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cælo, Pater, et Verbum, et Spiritus; et hi Tres Unum sunt: statimque subjungitur: Et Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terrâ, Spiritus, Aqua, et Sanguis, et Tres Unum sunt: sicut in codicibus quibusdam invenitur.*" This was written by Joachim<sup>2</sup> in the papacy of Alexander the Third, that is, in or before the year 1180, and therefore this reading was then got but into some books; for the words "*sicut in codicibus quibusdam invenitur*" refer as well to the first words of Joachim, "*quoniam in canonicâ Johannis epistolâ legitur,*" as to the text [*next*], "*statimque subjungitur;*" and more to the first than the text [*next*], because the first part of the citation was then but in some books, as appears by ancient manuscripts; but the second part was in almost

<sup>1</sup> Lucas Brug. in calce annot.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Math. Paris Histor. Angl. A.D. 1179.

all: the words "*Tres Unum sunt*" being in all the books which wanted the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," and in most of those which had it; though afterwards left out in many, when branded by the schoolmen for Arian.

XX. But to go to the original of the corruption. Gregory the great<sup>1</sup> writes, that Jerome's version was in use in his time, and therefore no wonder if the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" began to be cited out of it before. Eugenius bishop of Carthage, in the seventh year of Huneric king of the Vandals, anno Christi 484, in the summary of his faith exhibited to the king, cited it the first of any man, so far as I can find. A while after, Fulgentius, another African bishop, disputing against the same Vandals, cited it again, and backed it with the forementioned place of Cyprian, applied to the testimony of "the Three in Heaven." And so it is probable, that by that abused authority of Cyprian it began first in Afric, in the disputes with the ignorant Vandals, to get some credit; and thence at length crept into use. It occurs also frequently in Vigilius Tapsensis, another African bishop, contemporary to Fulgentius. In its defence, some allege earlier writers; namely, the first epistle of Pope Hyginus, the first epistle of Pope John II. the book of Idacius Clarus against Varimadus; and the book, *De unitâ Deitate Trinitatis*, ascribed to Athanasius. But Chiffletius, who published the works of

<sup>1</sup> Vide Walton's Prolegomena, x. 5.

Victor Vitensis and Vigilius Tapsensis, sufficiently proves the book against Varimadus to be this Vigilius's, and erroneously ascribed to Idacius. To the same Vigilius he asserts also the book *De unitâ Deitate Trinitatis*. Certainly Athanasius was not its author. All the epistles of Hyginus, except the beginning and the end, and the first part of the epistle of Pope John, wherein the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" is cited, are nothing else than fragments of the book against Varimadus, described word by word by some forger of decretal epistles, as may appear by comparing them. So then Eugenius is the first upon record that quotes it.

XXI. But though he set it on foot among the Africans, yet I cannot find that it became of authority in Europe before the revival of learning in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In those ages St. Barnard, the Schoolmen, Joachim, and the Lateran council, spread it abroad, and scribes began generally to insert it into the text; but in such in Latin manuscripts and European writers, as are ancients than those times, it is scarce to be met with.

XXII. Now that it was inserted into the vulgar Latin out of Jerome's version, is manifest by the manner how the vulgar Latin and that version came to be mixed. For it is agreed that the Latines, after Jerome's version began to be of use, noted out of it his corrections of the vulgar Latin in the margin of their books; and these the

transcribers afterwards inserted into the text. By this means, the old Latin has been so generally corrected, that it is nowhere to be found sincere. It is Jerome that we now read, and not the old vulgar Latin; and what wonder, if in Jerome we read the testimony of "the Three in Heaven?" For who that inserted the rest of Jerome into the text, would leave out such a passage for the Trinity, as this hath been taken to be?

XXIII. But to put the question out of dispute, there are footsteps of the insertion still remaining. For in some old manuscripts it has been found noted in the margin; in others, the various readings are such as ought to arise, by transcribing it out of the margin into the text. I shall only mention the three following varieties. Of the manuscripts which have not the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," some have the words *in terrâ*, in the eighth verse, but the most want it; which seems to proceed from hence, that some, before they allowed so great an addition to the text, as the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," noted only *in terrâ* in the margin of their books, to be inserted into the testimony of the Spirit, Water, and Blood. Of the manuscripts which have the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," some in the eighth verse have "*Hi Tres Unum sunt*;" others not. The reason of this seems to be, that of those who noted this testimony in the margin, some blotted out "*Et hi Tres Unum sunt*" in the

eighth verse according to Jerome; and others did not. And, lastly, the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" is in most books set before the testimony of "the Three in earth;" in some, it is set after; so Erasmus notes two old books, in which it is set after; Lucas Brugensis a third; and Hesselius (if I misremember not) a fourth; and so Vigilius Tapsensis<sup>1</sup> sets it after; which seems to proceed from hence, that it was sometimes so noted in the margin, that the reader or transcriber knew not whether it were to come before or after. Now these discords in the Latin manuscripts, as they detract from the authority of the manuscripts, so they confirm to us, that the old vulgar Latin has in these things been tampered with, and corrected by Jerome's version.

XXIV. In the next place, I am to show how, and when, the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" crept out of the Latin into the Greek. Those who first printed the Greek Testament, did generally, in following their manuscripts, omit the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," except in Spain; for it was omitted in the first and second edition of Erasmus, anno Christi 1516 and 1519; in the edition of Francis Asulan, printed at Venice by Aldus, anno Christi 1518; in that of Nicholas Gerbelius, printed at Haganau, anno Christi 1521; and a little after, in that of Wolfius Cephalius, printed at Strasburg, anno Christi 1524; and again in 1526, in the Badian edition,

<sup>1</sup> Vigilius, libr. advers. Varimadam, cap. 5.

as Erasmus notes ; and in that of Simon Colinæus at Paris, anno Christi 1534<sup>1</sup>. At the same time it was omitted in some editions of other Western languages, as in the Saxon and German editions of Luther ; and in the Latin Tugurine editions of Peter Cholinus, anno Christi 1543 and 1544. The first edition in Greek, which has the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," was that of Cardinal Ximenes, printed at Complutum in Spain, in 1515 ; but not published before the year 1521. The Cardinal, in his edition, used the assistance of several divines, which he called together to Complutum, there founding an university, anno Christi 1517, or a little before. Two of those divines were Antonius Nebrissensis and Stunica. For Stunica then resided at Complutum, and in the preface<sup>2</sup> to a treatise he wrote against Erasmus, gives this testimony of himself :

<sup>1</sup> " In editis exemplaribus nonnullis non legi ; ut in Aldinâ et Badianâ editione. Addo, nec in Græco Testamento Gerbelli Haganoæ, 1521 ; nec in Colinæi Parisiis edito."—*Gomarus in h. l.*

<sup>2</sup> " Cum præsertim, si quisquam alius, et nos quoque his de rebus, nostro quodam jure, judicium ferre possumus. [Quippe] qui non paucos annos in sanctis scripturis Veteris et Novi Testamenti, Hebraicè, Græcè, et Latinè perlegendis consumperimus ; ac Hebraica, Græcæque ipsa divinarum literarum exemplaria cum Latinis codicibus diligentissimè contulerimus. Longâ igitur lectione ac experientiâ jampridem edocti, quantum tralationi huic ecclesiasticæ Novi Testamenti deferendum sit, ni fallor, optimè novi."—*Hæc Stunica in præm. libri sui.*

" That he had spent some years in reading the holy Scriptures in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin ; and had diligently collated the Hebrew and Greek exemplars with the Latin copies." This book, displeasing the cardinal, was not printed till after his death ; and then it came forth at Complutum, anno Christi 1520. The year before, one Lee, an Englishman, writ also against Erasmus ; and both Stunica and Lee, amongst other things, reprehended him for omitting the testimony of "the Three in Heaven." Afterwards Erasmus, finding the Spaniards, and some others of the Roman church, in a heat against him, printed this testimony in his third edition, anno Christi 1522, representing, "That in his former editions he had printed the text as he found it in his manuscripts ; but now there being found in England one manuscript which had the testimony of 'the Three in Heaven,' he had inserted it, according to that manuscript ; for avoiding the calumnies raised against him." And so it continued in his two following editions. And at length Robert Stephens, anno Christi 1550, reprinted Erasmus's edition, with some few alterations and various lections, taken out of the Complutensian edition, and fifteen Greek manuscripts, which he named after the numeral letters  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ , &c., putting  $\alpha$  for the Complutensian edition, and  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ , &c. for the manuscripts in order ; and noting in the margin, that the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was wanting in the seven manuscripts,

δ, ε, ζ, θ, ι, ια, ιγ. Whence Beza<sup>1</sup> tells us, that he had read it in the rest. His words are, "*Legit Hieronymus, legit Erasmus in Britannico codice, et in Complutensi editione. Legimus et nos in nonnullis Roberti nostri veteribus libris.*" And this is the original and authority of the printed editions. For these are the editions ever since followed by all the West; and of late years propagated by the Venetian presses into Greece; and nothing further, that I know of, has been discovered in any manuscripts in favour of these editions.

XXV. Now to pull off the vizard, I cannot but, in the first place, extremely complain of Beza's want of modesty and caution in expressing himself<sup>2</sup>. In the preface to his annotations, describing what helps he had in composing his first edition, he tells us, "That he had the annotations of Valla, Stapulensis, and Erasmus, and the writings of the ancients and moderns collated by himself; and out of Stephens's library, the exemplar which Stephens had collated with about twenty-five manuscripts, almost all of which were printed." He should have said seventeen; for that number he puts in other places, and in his

<sup>1</sup> Beza in hunc locum.

<sup>2</sup> "Non desunt, qui Bezam nimis audacem fuisse judicant, dum à receptâ lectione sapiùs sine necessitate recedit; et unius, interdum nullius, codicis autoritate fretus, prætoriam exercet potestatem, ex conjecturis mutando et interpolando textum sacrum pro libitu."—*Walton. Prolegom. iv. sect. 15, in Bibl. Polyglot.*

annotations cites no more. So then he had the collations of two more manuscripts than Stephens has given us in print. And this was all his furniture. The original manuscripts he does not here pretend to have; nor could he have them; for they were not Stephens's manuscripts, but belonged to several libraries in France and Italy. The manuscript β Stephens himself never saw; but had only various lections collected out of it by his friends in Italy. The manuscripts γ, δ, ε, ζ, η, ι, ιε, were not Stephens's, but belonged to the library of the king of France, to whom Stephens was printer. The other six books, θ, ια, ιβ, ιγ, ιδ, ις, Stephens had not out of his own library, but borrowed them for a time from several places to collate, his friends studying to promote the design of his edition. And yet Beza in his annotations, when he would favour any text, cites the collations of Stephens in such a manner, as if he had the very original manuscripts at Geneva before his eyes. And where Stephens does not cite various lections, there he reckons, that in the text of Stephens's collated books he read all the manuscripts. So in Mark vi. 11, where Stephens notes a certain period to be wanting in the manuscript copies β and η, Beza saith, "*Hæc periodus in omnibus exemplaribus Græcis legitur, exceptis secundo et octavo.*" In the Acts xiii. 33, because Stephens had noted no various lections, Beza affirms of the Greek text, "*Ita scriptum invenimus in omnibus vetustis codicibus.*" In 1 John iv. 3, where



Stephens is silent, Beza speaks; "*Sic legitur in omnibus Græcis exemplaribus, quæ quidem mihi inspicere licuit.*" In James i. 22, where Stephens is again silent, Beza tells us of the word  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$ , "*Ego in omnibus nostris vetustis libris inveni.*" And so, where Stephens in the margin had noted the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" to be wanting in seven manuscripts, he thinks that, in reading the text of Stephens's collated book, he reads it in the rest; and so tells us, "*Legimus et nos in nonnullis Roberti Stephani codicibus.*" This he did in the first edition of his annotations. Afterwards, when he had got two real manuscripts, the Claromontan, and that which at length he presented to the University of Cambridge (in both which the canonical epistles are wanting); in the epistle to his fourth edition, in reckoning up the books he then used, he puts only these two, and the seventeen of Stephens; and in his fifth edition he writes summarily, that he used nineteen manuscripts, joining with those two real ones the collations of Stephens, as if in those he had seventeen others; which sufficiently explains his way of speaking in his annotations. But whilst he had not the manuscripts themselves to read with his own eyes, it was too hard and unwarrantable a way of speaking to tell us, "*Legimus et nos in nonnullis Roberti Stephani codicibus;*" and therefore, in his later editions, he corrects himself, and tells us, only, that the reading doth "*extare in nonnullis Stephani veteribus libris.*" Thus Beza

argues from Stephens's book of collations; and the same inference has been made by Lucas Brugensis and others, ever since, from Stephens's fore-mentioned edition of that book. "For," say they, "Stephens had fifteen manuscripts in all, and found the testimony of 'the Three in Heaven' wanting but in seven; and therefore it was in the other eight; and so being found in the greater part of his manuscripts, has the authority and manuscripts on its side." Thus they argue; and this is the great argument by which the printed Greek has hitherto been justified.

XXVI. But if they please to consider the business a little better, they will find themselves very much mistaken. For though Stephens had fifteen manuscripts in all, yet all of them did not contain all the Greek Testament. Four of them, noted  $\gamma$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\iota\beta$ ,  $\iota\delta$ , had each of them the four Gospels only. Two, noted  $\beta$ ,  $\eta$ , contained only the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. One, noted  $\iota\epsilon$ , contained the Apocalypse only. One, noted  $\iota\epsilon$ , had only the Apocalypse, with St Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. The other seven, noted  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\iota\alpha$ ,  $\iota\gamma$ , contained both St. Paul's Epistles and the canonical ones, besides some other books; namely, the manuscript  $\zeta$  contained the Epistles and Gospels; the manuscripts  $\iota$ ,  $\iota\alpha$ ,  $\iota\gamma$ , the Epistles and Acts of the Apostles; and the manuscripts  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\theta$ , the Epistles, Gospels, and Acts. And this any one may gather, by

noting what manuscripts the various lections are cited out of, in every book of the New Testament. For in the various lections of the canonical epistles, and those to the Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and the Hebrews, are found these seven manuscripts,  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ , everywhere cited, and no more than these. The same also, and no more, are cited in the epistles to the Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and the Hebrews; one numeral error (whether of the scribe or typographer) excepted. Stephens therefore did collect various lections of the Epistles out of only these seven manuscripts,  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ ; and in all these seven he found the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" to be wanting; as you may see noted in the margin of his edition.

XXVII. And that this testimony was wanting in all Stephens's manuscripts, is apparent also by its being generally wanting in the manuscripts which are now extant in France. For Father Simon<sup>1</sup> tells us, "That after a diligent search in the library of the king of France, and in that also of Monsieur Colbert, he could not find it in any one manuscript; though he consulted seven manuscripts in the king's library, and one in Colbert's." And because Stephens had some of his various lections from Italy, I will add, that a gentleman, who, in his travels, had consulted twelve manuscripts in several libraries in Italy, assured me that he found it wanting in them all.

<sup>1</sup> Simon's Critical History of the New Test. chap. xviii.

One of the twelve was that most ancient and most famous manuscript in the Pope's library, written in capital letters.

XXVIII. So then the authority of the printed books rests only upon the authority of the editions of Erasmus and Cardinal Ximenes. But seeing that Erasmus omitted it in his two first editions, and inserted it unwillingly, against the authority of his manuscripts, in his three last; the authority of these three can be none at all. When Lee, upon Erasmus's putting forth his second edition, fell foul upon him for leaving out the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," Erasmus<sup>1</sup> answered, "That he had consulted more than seven Greek manuscripts, and found it wanting in them all; and that if he could have found it in any one manuscript, he would have followed that in favour of the Latin." Hence notice was sent to Erasmus out of England, that it was in a manuscript there; and thereupon to avoid<sup>2</sup> their calumnies (as he saith) he printed it in his following editions; notwithstanding that, he suspected that manuscript

<sup>1</sup> "Dicam mihi diversis temporibus plura fuisse exemplaria quàm septem [scilicet Græca]; nec in ullo horum reperitum, quod in nostris [scilicet Latinis] legitur. Quod si contigisset unum exemplar, in quo fuisset, quod nos legimus, nimirum illinc adjecissem, quod in cæteris aberat. Id quia non contigit, quod solum licuit, feci; indicavi quid in Græcis codicibus minus esset."—*Hæc Erasmus contra Leum, in hunc locum.*

<sup>2</sup> "Ex hoc igitur codice Britannico reposuimus, quod in nostris dicebatur deesse; ne cui sit ansa calumniandi. Quan-

to be a new one, corrected by the Latin. But since, upon inquiry, I cannot learn that they in England ever heard of any such manuscript, but from Erasmus; and since he was only told of such a manuscript, in the time of the controversy between him and Lee, and never saw it himself, I cannot forbear to suspect, that it was nothing but a trick put upon him by some of the Popish clergy, to try if he would make good what he had offered, the printing of the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" by the authority of one Greek copy, and thereby to get it into his edition<sup>1</sup>. Greek manuscripts of the Scripture are things of value, and do not use to be thrown away; and such a manuscript, for the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," would have made a greater noise than the rest have done against it. Let those who have such a manuscript, at length tell us where it is.

XXIX. So also let them, who insist upon the edition of cardinal Ximenes, tell us by what manuscript he printed this testimony; or, at least, where any such manuscript of good note is to be seen; for till then I must take the liberty quam et hunc suspicor, et Latinorum codices, fuisse castigatum. Posteaquam enim concordiam inierunt cum ecclesiâ Romanâ, studuerunt et hac in parte cum Romanis consentire."—*Erasmi Annotation. in hunc locum; editio tertia, et sequen.*

<sup>1</sup> "Versiculus 1 Joan. v. 7, in Syriacâ, ut et vetustissimis Græcis exemplaribus, nostro Alexandrino, aliis manuscriptis Græcis, quos contulimus, non reperitur."—*Walton. Prolegomena, xiv. 23, in Bibl. Polyglot.*

to believe, that he printed nothing else than a translation out of the Latin, and that for these reasons.

First: Because in the preface to his edition of the New Testament we are told, that this Testament was printed after the manuscripts taken out of the Pope's library; and these the cardinal only borrowed<sup>1</sup> thence, and therefore returned them back so soon as his edition was finished: And Caryophilus some time after, by the Pope's command, collating the Vatican manuscripts, found the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" wanting in them all. I do not say but that the cardinal had other manuscripts; but these were the chief, and the only ones he thought worth while to tell his reader of.

Secondly: I startle at the marginal note in this place of the cardinal's edition. For it is beside the use of this edition, to put notes in the margin of the Greek text. I have not found it done above thrice in all this edition of the New Testament; and therefore there must be something extraordinary; and that, in respect of the Greek, because it is in the margin of this text. In 1 Corinth. xv. there is noted in this margin a notable variation in the Greek reading. In Matthew vi. 13, where they, in their edition, recede from the Greek copies, and correct it by the Latin, they make a

<sup>1</sup> "Accivit è Vaticanâ Romæ Bibliothecâ, bonâ cum Leonis X. pontificis maximi veniâ;"—as Gasper Bellerus, in his epistle prefixed to the Quinquagena of Antonius Nabrisensis, expresses it.

marginal note to justify their doing so; and so here, where the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" is generally wanting in the Greek copies, they make a third marginal note, to secure themselves from being blamed for printing it. Now in such a case as this, there is no question but they would make the best defence they could; and yet they do not tell of any various lections in the Greek manuscripts, nor produce any one Greek manuscript on their side, but run to the authority of Thomas Aquinas<sup>1</sup>. The Greek manuscripts have the text thus: "For there are Three that bear record, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood; and these Three are One." In many of the Latin manuscripts, the words "these Three are One" are here omitted, and put only at the end of the

<sup>1</sup> The marginal note is this: "Sanctus Thomas, in expositione secundæ decretalis de summâ Trinitate et Fide Catholice, tractans istum passum contra Abbatem Joachim, viz. 'Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in cœlo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus,' dicit ad literam verba sequentia:—'Et ad insinuendam unitatem trium personarum subditur, et Hi Tres Unum sunt;' quandoquidem dicitur propter essentialitatem. Sed hoc Joachim perversè trahere volens ad unitatem charitatis et consensûs, inducebat consequentem auctoritatem. Nam subditur ibidem, 'Et Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ, Spiritus Sanctus, Aqua, et Sanguis:' et in quibusdam libris additur, 'et hi Tres Unum sunt.' Sed hoc in veris exemplaribus non habetur; sed dicitur esse appositum ab Hæreticis Arianis ad pervertendum intellectum sanam auctoritatis præmissæ de unitate essentialitatis Trium Personarum." Hæc Beatus Thomas, ubi supra.

testimony of "the Three in Heaven," before that of "the Spirit, Water, and Blood:" in others they are put after both testimonies. In the Complutensian edition they follow the former copies, and justify their doing so, by the authority of Thomas Aquinas. "Thomas," say they, "in treating of the Three which bear witness in Heaven, teaches, that the words 'these Three are One' are subjoined for insinuating the unity of the essence of the Three persons. And whereas one Joachim interpreted this unity to be only in *love* and *consent*, it being thus said of the Spirit, Water, and Blood, in some copies, 'these Three are One';" Thomas replied, "That this last clause is not extant in the true copies; but was added by the Arians for perverting the sense." Thus far this annotation. Now this plainly respects the Latin copies (for Thomas understood not Greek), and therefore part of the design of this annotation is to set right the Latin reading. But this is not the main design. For so the annotation should have been set in the margin of the Latin version. Its being set in the margin of the Greek text, shows that its main design is to justify the Greek by the Latin thus rectified and confirmed. Now to make Thomas thus, in a few words, do all the work, was very artificial; and in Spain, where Thomas is of apostolic authority, might pass for a very judicious and substantial defence of the printed Greek. But to us Thomas Aquinas is no Apostle. We are seeking for the authority of Greek manuscripts.

A third reason why I conceive the Complutensian Greek to have been in this place a translation from the Latin, is, because Stunica (who as I told you, was one of the divines employed by the Cardinal in this edition, and at that very time wrote against Erasmus) when, in his objections, he comes to this text of the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," he cites not one Greek manuscript for it against Erasmus; but argues wholly from the authority of the Latin. On the contrary, he sets down, by way of concession, the common reading of the Greek manuscripts (as well as his own, and that of others) in these words, "ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα· καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι:" and then condemns them altogether without exception; and justifies the Latin against them by the authority of Jerome. "Know," saith he, "that in this place the Greek manuscripts are most evidently corrupted; but ours (that is, the Latin ones) contain the truth itself, as they are translated from the first original: which is manifest by the prologue of St. Jerome upon the Epistles, &c."<sup>1</sup> And this prologue (which he goes on to cite at length, and of which we gave

<sup>1</sup> "Sciendum est, hoc loco codices apertissimè esse corruptos; nostros verò veritatem ipsam, ut à primâ origine traducti sunt, continere; quod ex prologo B. Hieronymi super Epistolas manifestè apparet. Ait enim, 'Quæ si sicut ab eis digestæ sunt; ita quoque ab interpretibus fideliter in Latinum verterentur eloquium,'" &c.—*Hæc Stunica in hunc locum. Ejus Liber existat in Criticor. vol. ix.*

you an account above) is all he argues in favour of the testimony of "the Three in Heaven." In other places of Scripture, where he had Greek manuscripts on his side, he produces them readily. So 1 Thessalonians ii. 7, "*Ita quidem legitur,*" says he, "*in Græcis codicibus quos ego viderim.*"

In James i. 11, he saith, "*Sciendum in omnibus Græcis codicibus πορεία hic legi per ei diphthongum.*" In 1 Thessalonians v. 23, he saith, "*Cum in Græcis exemplaribus quotquot sunt, ὁλοκληρον, et in Latinis integer hic legatur, perne mine discrepante, nescio cur Erasmus dixerit,*" &c. In Philipp. iv. 9, "*Si quidem in omnibus,*" saith he; "*Græciscodicibus, ταυτα λογιζεσθε hic legitur; neque Græci sunt libri, qui πρᾶσσετε hoc loco, neque Latini, qui agite; nisi mendosos utriusque, linguæ codices, cum hæc commentaretur Erasmus, perlegit.*" After this manner does Stunica produce the manuscripts used in the Complutensian edition, when they make for him; and here he produces them too, but it is for Erasmus against himself. "Know," saith he, "that in this place the Greek manuscripts are most evidently corrupted." In other places, if he hath but one manuscript on his side, he produces it magnificently enough; as the Codex Rhodiensis in his discourses upon 2 Corinthians ii. 3, James i. 22, 2 Peter ii. 2, and other texts. Here he produces all the manuscripts against himself, without excepting so much as one. And hence Erasmus, in his answer to Stunica, gloried in the consent of the Spanish manuscripts with

his own; and Sanctius Caranza, another of the Complutensian divines, in his defence of *Stunica*, written presently after, had nothing to reply in this point. Neither could Sepulveda, or the Spanish monks who next undertook the controversy, find one Greek manuscript, which here made against Erasmus. Neither had Marchio Valesius better success, though on that occasion he collated sixteen Greek manuscripts, eight whereof belonged to the king of Spain's library, and the other eight to other libraries of Spain: and he did it on purpose to collect out of them whatever he could meet with in favour of the present vulgar Latin. Neither did the reprinting of the Complutensian Bible by Arias Montanus produce the notice of any such manuscript; though, on that occasion, many manuscripts, as well Greek as Latin, fetched from Complutum and other places, were collated by Arias, Lucas Brugensis, Canter, and others.

XXX. So then, to sum up the argument, the Complutensian divines did sometimes correct the Greek by the Latin, without the authority of any Greek manuscript, as appears by their practice in Matthew vi. 13; and therefore their printing the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" is no evidence that they did it by a manuscript, but, on the contrary, for want of one, they contented themselves with the authority of Thomas Aquinas; and *Stunica* confessed that they had none. Nor has all the zeal for this text been able since

to discover one either in Spain, or anywhere else.

XXXI. And now you may understand whence it is, that the Complutensian edition, and the reading of the pretended English manuscript, set down by Erasmus in his annotations, differ so much from one another; for the Complutensian edition has the text thus; "Ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὁ πατήρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα· καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι. καὶ τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα." The pretended English manuscript thus; "Ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, πατήρ, λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα· καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσιν. καὶ τρεῖς μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ, πνεῦμα, καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ αἷμα." The differences are too great to spring from the bare errors of scribes, and arise rather from the various translations of the place, out of Latin into Greek, by two several persons.

XXXII. But whilst these two readings, by their discord, confute one another, the readings of the real Greek manuscripts by their agreement confirm one another as much. For Caryophilus, who by the command of Pope Urban the Eighth, collated the Vatican and other manuscripts, borrowed out of the principal libraries in Rome, found one common reading in them all, without the testimony of "the Three in Heaven;" as you may see in those his collations, printed in 1673 by Peter Possinus, in the end of his *Catena* of

the Greek Fathers upon Mark. He met with eight manuscripts in all upon the epistles, and notes their reading thus: "1 Joan. v. 7, Manuscripti octo (omnes nempe) legunt, Ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα· καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι." "Porro totus septimus versus hujus capituli desideratur in octo manuscriptis codicibus Græcis," &c. Thus Caryophilus.

XXXIII. The very same reading Erasmus, in his annotations on this place, gives us of all his manuscripts, which were more than seven; and so doth Stephens of all his seven, without noting any various lections in them. Only the comma, which in Stephens's edition is, surely by mistake, set after *οὐρανῶ*, is to be put in its right place. The very same reading does Stunica also, in his book against Erasmus, note out of the manuscript he had seen in Spain, as was seen above. Nor does Valesius, in his collection of the sixteen Spanish manuscripts, note any various lections in this text. The same reading exactly have also the manuscripts in England; namely, that most ancient and famous one in the king's library, which was conveyed thither from Egypt through Greece, and published in Walton's Polyglott Bible; and the four at Oxford, viz. that in New College, and that in Magdalen College, both very old, and two in Lincoln College; and four or five other ancient ones lately collated at Oxford, in order to a new impression of the Greek Testament, as I am in-

formed. The very same reading have also the three manuscripts of Monsieur Petavius Gachon, a senator of Paris, whose various lections, collected by his son John Gachon, were printed in the Oxford edition of the New Testament, anno Christi 1675. The same reading, without any variation, is published by Francis Asulan in his edition, printed anno Christi 1518, by Aldus at Venice, out of the manuscripts of those parts. The same reading Œcumenius, six hundred years ago, found in the manuscripts of Greece; as you may see in the text of his commentary on this epistle of St. John. The same reading also Cyril of Alexandria met with in the manuscripts of Egypt, above eleven hundred years ago; as you may see in his citations of the text; both in his Thesaurus, lib. xiv. cap. 5; and in his first book *De Fide ad Reginas*; excepting that in the latter of these two citations the particle *εἰς* is omitted; and *μαρτυροῦσι* written for *οἱ μαρτυροῦντες*. And that the very same reading was also in the manuscripts of the first ages, may be gathered from the conformity of this reading to all the ancient versions.

XXXIV. It may seem by what has been hitherto said, that this testimony is not to be found in the Greek manuscripts. Epanorthotes<sup>1</sup>, whom

<sup>1</sup> "Habuimus ab Hunnæo,—id quod maximi facimus, MS. Bibl. correctorium ab incerto auctore, quem Epanorthotem, aut correctorem fere vocamus, magnâ diligentia, ac fide contextum, secuto uti oportet antiquos nostræ editionis codices,

Lucas Brugensis describes to be an ancient, accurate, full, and industrious collator of manuscripts, found it wanting in all those he met with. "*Epanorthotes*," saith Lucas, "*deesse hæc eadem Græcis libris, et antiquis Latinis annotat.*" Nor have other collators made a further discovery to this day. Lee, Stunica, and the rest in England, Spain, Flanders, France, and Italy, who conspired against Erasmus, could find nothing in the manuscripts of those parts against him; if that Phœnix be excepted, which once appeared to somebody somewhere in England, but could never since be seen. Hesselius<sup>1</sup>, about the year 1565, pro-  
 eosque cum Hebræis, Græcis, et veterum patrum commentariis sedulo collatos; qui liber ad Genesin viii. 7. latius à nobis descriptus est." Hæc Lucas; qui ad Genesin viii. 7. dixit hunc librum multis annis scriptum, et pluribus fortè compositum. Dein, loco ex eo citato, pergit. Ad quæ dici quid possit? An quod libro fidendum non sit? Non hoc dicet, qui evolverit; quæ namque à nostri seculi scriptoribus ex MSS. codicibus collectæ sunt variæ lectiones, omnes propemodum in eo comperimus; et ad fontes fideliter examinatasprehendimus. *Scriptis hæc Lucas, anno 1579; "utde sequitur correctorium ante disputationes Erasmi de testibus in cælo elaboratum esse."*

<sup>1</sup> Hesselius in hunc locum ait; "Manuscripti Græci fere omnes sic se habent: 'Quoniam Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ, Spiritus, Aqua, et Sanguis, et hi Tres Unum sunt; nullâ factâ mentione triplicis testimonii de cælo 'Patris, Verbi, et Spiritûs Sancti.'" Dein codices aliter legentes describendo sic pergit; "Nostro tempore duo Græci codices manuscripti reperti sunt; unus in Angliâ, et alter in Hispaniâ; quorum uterque hoc loco testimonium habet 'Patris, Verbi, et Spiritûs Sancti.'"

fessor of divinity at Lovain, in his commentary on this place, ingenuously confesses it wanting in all the Greek manuscripts then known, except two, the one in Spain, the other in England; meaning those by which the Complutensian divines and Erasmus printed it. Which two we have shown to be none at all; unless one Annius dug up one in England. Since that time nothing further has been produced, besides the imaginary books of dreaming Beza. And yet I will not say, but that it may hereafter be found in some Greek copies. For in the times of the holy war, the Latines had much to do in the East. They were long united to the Greek church; they made Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch; they reigned at Constantinople over the Greeks from the year 1204, for above fifty years together; and during this their kingdom, in the year 1215, was assembled the Lateran council, consisting of four hundred and fifteen bishops, Greeks and Latins together; and therein the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was quoted out of some of the Latin manuscripts, as we told you above. All which might occasion some Greeks, as well as Latins, to note it in the margins of their books; and hence insert it into the text in transcribing. For this is most certain, that some Greek manuscripts have been corrected by the Latin ones. Such a book Erasmus<sup>1</sup> tells us, that he "once met with, and

<sup>1</sup> "Hic obiter illud incidit admonendum esse Græcorum quosdam Novi Testamenti codices ad Latina exemplaria emen-



that there was such another in the Pope's library." He suspected also that book in England, out of which he printed the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," to be of the same kind; though I rather think it was none at all; unless some falsary of that age were at the pains to transcribe one or two of St. Paul's epistles. Such another book was one of those, out of which Valesius collected his various lections. Whence Mariana, into whose hands the manuscript book of those lections fell, tells us, that for that reason, in his annotations on the New Testament, he used those lections but sparingly and cautiously. And that Valesius did meet with such a corrected manuscript, appears by the lections themselves. For in the Apocalypse xviii. 17, where the Greek reads *ἐπι τοπον*; and the Latin translates *in locum*, and by the error of one letter *in lacum*, as the books now have it; some Grecian has here corrected this book by the Latin, and written *ἐπι λιμνην*; as it is in the lections of Valesius, taken out of this. Again, in the Apocalypse ix. 11, where the Latin translation, in expounding the names *Abaddon et Apollyon*, adds, *Et Latine*

*datos. Id factum est in fœdere Græcorum cum Romanâ ecclesiâ; quod fœdus testatur Bulla, quæ dicitur Aurea; visum est enim et hoc ad firmandam concordiam pertinere. Et nos olim in hujusmodi codicem incidimus; et talis adhuc dicitur adservari in Bibliothecâ Pontif. Verum ex his corrigere nostros est Lesbiam, ut aiunt, admovere regulam.*—*Erasmus ad Lectorem. Editio 5ta Novi Testamenti.*

*habens nomen exterminans*; Valesius notes the reading in his Greek copy to be *ρωμαισι εχων ονομα εξτερμωναν*; which certainly is a translation of the Latin. Again, in the Apocalypse xxi. 12, where the Greek has *αγγελου*, and some ancient Latin copies, *angelos*, but the far greater part of the Latin copies at present have *angulos*; Valesius, in his manuscript, reads *γωνιας*. So in the Apocalypse xix. 6, where the Greek is *οχλου πολλου*, the Latin, *turbæ magnæ*; and in the later copies, *turbæ magnæ*; Valesius, in his manuscript, reads *σαλπιγγος μεγαλης*. In Hebrews xiii. 2, for *ελαθον*, *latuerunt*; and in later copies, *placuerunt*, Valesius reads *ηρεσαν*; and in 1 Peter iii. 8, for *το δε τελος*, *in fine*, and by an error *in fide*, Valesius reads *εν τη πιστει δε*. These, and such like instances, put the thing out of dispute. Now, though Valesius found not the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" in this manuscript; and Erasmus tells us, that he never saw it in any Greek manuscript; and, by consequence, not in that corrected one which fell into his hands; yet it may have crept out of the Latin into some other books, not yet taken notice of; and even in some manuscripts, which, in other places, have not been corrected by the Latin, it may possibly have been inserted by some of the Greek bishops of the Lateran council, where the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was read. And therefore he that shall hereafter meet with it in any book, ought first, before he insist upon the authority of that book, to

examine whether it has not been corrected by the Latin; and whether it be ancients than the Lateran council, and empire of the Latins in Greece; for if it be liable to either of these two exceptions, it can signify nothing to produce it.

XXXV. Having given you the history of the controversy, I shall now confirm all that I have said from the sense of the text itself. For, without the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," the sense is good and easy, as you may see by the following paraphrase inserted in the text in a different character.

"WHO IS HE THAT OVERCOMETH THE WORLD, BUT HE THAT BELIEVETH THAT JESUS IS THE SON OF GOD? that Son spoken of in the Psalms, where he saith, 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.' THIS IS HE THAT, after the Jews had long expected him, CAME, first in a mortal body BY BAPTISM OF WATER, AND then in an immortal one by shedding his BLOOD upon the cross, and rising again from the dead; NOT BY WATER ONLY, BUT BY WATER AND BLOOD; being the Son of God, as well by his resurrection from the dead (Acts xiii. 33.), as by his supernatural birth of the Virgin (Luke i. 35.). AND IT IS THE SPIRIT also, THAT, together with the water and blood, BEARETH WITNESS of the truth of his coming; BECAUSE THE SPIRIT IS TRUTH; and so a fit and unexceptionable witness. FOR THERE ARE THREE THAT BEAR RECORD of his coming; THE SPIRIT, which he promised to send, and

which was since shed forth upon us in the form of cloven tongues, and in various gifts; THE BAPTISM OF WATER, wherein God testified, 'This is my beloved Son;' AND THE shedding of his BLOOD, accompanied with his resurrection, whereby he became the most faithful martyr or witness of this truth. AND THESE THREE, the spirit, the baptism, and passion of Christ, AGREE IN witnessing ONE and the same thing, namely, that the Son of God is come; and, therefore, their evidence is strong: for the law requires but two consenting witnesses, and here we have three. AND IF WE RECEIVE THE WITNESS OF MEN, THE threefold WITNESS OF GOD, which he bare of his Son, by declaring at his baptism, 'This is my beloved Son;' by raising him from the dead, and by pouring out his spirit on us, IS GREATER; and therefore ought to be more readily received."

XXXVI. Thus is the sense plain and natural, and the argument full and strong; but if you insert the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," you interrupt and spoil it. For the whole design of the apostle being here to prove to men by witness the truth of Christ's coming, I would ask how the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" makes to this purpose. If their testimony be not given to men, how does it prove to them the truth of Christ's coming? If it be, how is the testimony in heaven distinguished from that on earth? It is the same spirit which witnesses in heaven and in earth. If in both cases it witnesses

to us men, wherein lies the difference between its witnessing in heaven, and its witnessing in earth? If, in the first case, it does not witness to men, to whom does it witness? And to what purpose? And how does its witnessing make to the design of St. John's discourse? Let them make good sense of it who are able. For my part, I can make none. If it be said that we are not to determine what is Scripture, and what not, by our private judgements; I confess it in places, not controverted; but in disputable places, I love to take up with what I can best understand. It is the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind, in matters of religion, ever to be fond of mysteries; and for that reason, to like best what they understand least. Such men may use the apostle John as they please; but I have that honour for him, as to believe that he wrote good sense; and therefore take that sense to be *his*, which is the best; especially since I am defended in it by so great authority. For I have on my side the authority of the Fourth General Council, and, so far as I know, of all the churches in all ages, except the modern Latin, and such others as have lately been influenced by them; and that also of all the old versions, and Greek manuscripts, and ancient Latin ones; and nothing against me, but the authority of Jerome, and the credulity and heat of his followers.

For to tell us of other manuscripts, without ever letting us know in what libraries they were

to be seen; to pretend manuscripts, which, since their first discovery, could never be heard of; nor were then seen by persons whose names and credit we know; is plainly to impose upon the learned world, and ought not to pass any longer for plain dealing. The Spaniards tell us plainly that they followed the Latin, and by the authority of Thomas left out the clause, "And these Three are One," in the eighth verse, as inserted by the Arians. And yet St. Ambrose, St. Austin, Eucherius, and other Latins, in the Arian age, gathered the unity of the Deity from this clause; and the omission of it is now, by printing it, acknowledged to be an erroneous correction. The manuscript in England wanted the same clause, and therefore, if there was any such manuscript, it was a corrected one, like the Spanish edition, and the manuscript of Valesius. Erasmus, who printed the triple testimony in heaven by that English manuscript, never saw it; tells us it was a new one; suspected its sincerity; and accused it publicly in his writings on several occasions, for several years together; and yet his adversaries in England never answered his accusation; never endeavoured to satisfy him and the world about it; did not so much as let us know where the record might be consulted for confuting him; but, on the contrary, when they had got the Trinity into his edition, threw by their manuscript, if they had one, as an almanac out of date. And can such shuffling dealings satisfy consider-

ing men? Let manuscripts at length be produced, and freely exposed to the sight of the learned world; but let such manuscripts be produced as are of authority; or else let it be confessed, that whilst Jerome pretended to correct the Latin by the Greek, the Latins have corrected both the Latin and the Greek by the sole authority of Jerome.

---

I. WHAT the Latins have done to this text the Greeks have done to that of St. Paul, 1 Timothy iii. 16. For by changing  $\acute{o}$  into  $\Theta\text{C}$ , the abbreviation of  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ , they now read, "Great is the mystery of godliness; GOD manifested in the flesh." Whereas all the churches for the first four or five hundred years, and the authors of all the ancient versions, Jerome, as well as the rest, read, "Great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh." For this is the common reading of the Ethiopic, Syriac, and Latin versions to this day; Jerome's manuscripts having given him no occasion to correct the old vulgar Latin in this place. Grotius adds the Arabic, but the Egyptian Arabic version has  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ , and so has the above-mentioned Sclavonian version of Cyrillus; for these two versions were made long after the sixth century, wherein the

corruption began. With the ancients versions agree the writers of the first five centuries, both Greeks and Latins. For they, in all their discourses to prove the Deity of the Son, never allege this text, that I can find, as they would all have done, and some of them frequently, had they read "God manifested in the flesh;" and therefore they read  $\acute{o}$ . Tertullian *adversus Praxeam*, and Cyprian *adversus Judæos*, industriously cite all the places where Christ is called God, but have nothing of this. Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, the bishops of the council of Sardica, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Cassian, also Hilary, Lucifer, Jerome, Ambrose, Austin, Phæbadius, Victorinus Afer, Faustinus Diaconus, Pope Leo the Great, Arnobius junior, Cerealis, Vigilus Tapsensis, Fulgentius, wrote all of them in the fourth and fifth centuries, for the Deity of the Son, and incarnation of God; and some of them largely, and in several tracts; and yet I cannot find that they ever allege this text to prove it, excepting that Gregory Nyssen<sup>1</sup> once urges it, if the passage crept not into him out of some marginal annotation. In all the times of the hot and lasting Arian controversy, it never came into play; though, now those disputes are over, they that read "God manifested in the flesh," think it one of the most obvious and pertinent texts for the business.

<sup>1</sup> Orat. xi. contra Eunom.

II. The churches, therefore, of those ages were absolute strangers to this reading. For, on the contrary, their writers, as often as they have any occasion to cite the reading then in use, discover that it was  $\acute{o}$ . For though they cite it not to prove the Deity of the Son, yet in their commentaries, and sometimes in other discourses, they produce it. And particularly Hilary (lib. 2. *de Trinitate*) and Ambrose, or whoever of his contemporaries was the author of the commentary on the epistles, reads  $\acute{o}$ ; and so doth St. Austin in *Genesin ad litteram*, lib. 5: and Beda in his commentary on this text, where he cites the reading of St. Austin, and the author of the commentary on the epistles, ascribed to Jerome. So also do Primasius and Sedulius in their commentaries on this text; and Victorinus Afer, lib. 1. *adversus Arium*; and Idacius Clarus, or rather Vigilius Tapsensis, lib. 3. *adversus Varimadum*, cap. 12; and Fulgentius, c. 2. *de Incarnatione*; and so did Pope Leo the Great, epist. 20. *ad Flavianum*; and Pope Gregory the Great, lib. 34, *Moral.* cap. 7. These ancient Latins all cite the text after this manner, "Great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh;" as the Latin manuscripts of St. Paul's epistles generally have it to this day; and therefore it cannot be doubted, but that this hath been the constant public reading of the Latin churches from the beginning. So also one of the Arians in a homily, printed in Fulgentius's works, reads  $\acute{o}$ , and interprets it of the Son of God, who was

born of the Father *ante secula*; and of the Virgin, *in novissimo tempore*. And Fulgentius, in his answer to this homily, found no fault with the citation; but, on the contrary, in his first book *ad Trasimundum*, cap. 6, seems to have read and understood the text after the same manner with other Latins.

III. Now for the Greeks: I find indeed that they have changed the ancient reading of the text, not only in the manuscripts of St Paul's epistles, but also in other authors; and yet there are still remaining sufficient instances among them of what the reading was at first. So in Chrysostom's commentary on this epistle, they have now gotten  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  into the text; and yet by considering the commentary itself, I am satisfied that he read  $\acute{o}$ . For he neither in this commentary, nor anywhere else, infers the Deity of Christ from this text; nor expounds it as they do who read  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ \*; but,

\* Nor expounds it as they do who read  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ .] *They who read  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  cannot expound the passage otherwise than Chrysostom expounds it. His words, "For God was made Man, and Man God," are not particularly expositive of  $\acute{o}$ , as our author imagines, but declarative of the mystery which the apostle calls the great mystery of godliness, and they will not decide for either reading. "Observe," says Chrysostom, "how the apostle calls the dispensation for our sakes [the scheme of redemption] a mystery in all its branches. With good reason. For it is not known to all men. Nay, rather it was [formerly] not known to angels. How should it? since it has been discovered through the church. Therefore, he says, without controversy it is great. And great indeed it is. For God has been made Man, and Man God. A*

with the Latins, who read  $\acute{\omicron}$ , understands by it Christ incarnate; or, as he expresses it, "Man made God, and God made man;" and so leaves it at liberty to be taken for either God or man. And accordingly in one place of his commentary he saith, "Εφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκὶ ὁ δημιουργός\*." In another place; "Ἀνθρώπος ὠφθῆ ἀναμαρτητός, ἀνθρώπος ἀναληφθῆ, ἐκηρυχθῆ ἐν κόσμῳ, μεθ' ἡμῶν εἶδον αὐτὸν οἱ ἀγγελοί." "Man appeared without sin; Man was received up; Man was preached in the world; was seen amongst us by angels." Instead of "ὁ ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκὶ, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι," &c. he saith, "Man appeared without sin;" making Man the nominative case to these, and all the verbs which follow; which certainly he would not have done, had Θεός been their nominative case expressly in the text. He

*Man was seen without sin. A Man has been received up—preached in the world—angels saw him with us—truly this is mystery." The design of this paraphrase of St. Chrysostom's is to show that the scheme of redemption involves mystery in every distinct branch mentioned by the apostle; and our author's conclusion, that the subject of the verb εφανερῶθη, in Chrysostom's Bible was something that might be taken either for God or man, is at best precarious. The more natural conclusion would be, that the common subject of the verbs εφανερῶθη, ἐδικαιώθη, ὠφθῆ, ἐκηρυχθῆ, &c. was some word that might denote a living person; and is not likely to have been the neuter relative ὁ.—Bp. Horsley.*

\* Chrysostom's words are—λέγων, "Θεός εφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί," τοῦτ' ἐστίν, ὁ δημιουργός. Substitute  $\acute{\omicron}$  for Θεός in the text of Chrysostom, and the exposition τοῦτ' ἐστίν ὁ δημιουργός, will be rank nonsense.—Bp. Horsley.

might properly put man for  $\acute{\omicron}$ , but not for Θεός. Neither could he have put ἀναμαρτητός for ἐδικαιώθη, if he had read in his text Θεός ἐδικαιώθη. For what man of common sense would say, that God was made sinless in and through the spirit? But what I have said of Chrysostom will be more evident, when I shall have shown you how afterwards, in the time of the Nestorian controversy, all parties read  $\acute{\omicron}$  or ὁς, without any dispute raised about the reading; and how the Greeks have since corrupted the text in Cyril's writings, and changed  $\acute{\omicron}$  and ὁς into Θεός, as they have done in Chrysostom's.

IV. And, first, that the Nestorians read  $\acute{\omicron}$  is evident by some fragments of the orations or homilies of Nestorius, sent by him to the Pope, and cited by Arnobius junior, in the second book of his conflict with Serapion. For there, in order to show what was the opinion of Nestorius, and how he defended it, he cites two of his orations in these words; "Non peperit sanctissima Maria Deitatem; nam quod natum est de carne, caro est. Non peperit creatura Creatorem; sed peperit hominem Deitatis ministrum. Non ædificavit Deum verbum Spiritus Sanctus; quod ex ipsâ natum est, de Spiritu Sancto est. Deo itaque virgo templum ex virgine ædificavit." Et paulo post; "Qui per se natus est Deus in utero (scilicet ante Luciphorum) Deus est." Et paulo post; "Θεοτοκὸν formam in Deo honoramus." Et in aliâ prædicatione; " Spiritum divina separat natura, qui

*humanitatem ejus creavit. Quicquid ex Maridatum est, de Spiritu Sancto est, qui et secundum justitiam replevit, quod creatum est; hoc quod manifestum est in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu.*"

Which last words in the language wherein Nestorius wrote those homilies, are, "ὁ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι."

V. Here you see that Nestorius reads ὁ expressly: not only so, but absolutely excludes God from being understood by it; arguing, that the Virgin was not θεοτοκος, because that thing which was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the spirit; or, as he expounds it, replenished by the spirit in righteousness, and calling that thing which was manifested in the flesh, a creature; "*Spiritus,*" saith he, "*secundum justitiam replevit [hoc] quod creatum est; [nempe] hoc quod manifestum est in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu.*"

VI. And now, whilst he read the text after this manner, and urged it thus against the Deity of Christ, one would suspect, that if this had not been the received public reading in the Greek churches, his adversaries would have fallen foul upon him, and exclaimed against him for falsifying the text, and blasphemously saying it was a created thing, which the Scripture calls "God manifested in the flesh." And such an accusation as this would surely have made as great a noise as anything else in the controversy; and yet I meet with nothing of this kind in history.

His adversaries do not so much as tell him that Θεος was in the text. They were so far from raising any controversy about the reading, that they do not in the least correct him for it; but on the contrary, they themselves, in their answers to his writings, read ὁ as he did; and only laboured by various disputations to put another sense upon the text, as I find by Cassian and Cyril, the two principal who at that time wrote against him.

VII. John Cassian was Chrysostom's scholar, and his deacon and legate to the Pope; and after the banishment of Chrysostom, retired from Constantinople into Syria and Egypt, where he lived a monkish life for some time, and then ended his days in France. At that time, therefore, when Nestorius, who was patriarch of Constantinople, broached his opinion, and Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, opposed him; Nestorius sent a legacy to Rome with copies of his orations, to let the Pope understand the controversy: and thereupon Leo the Great, who was then archdeacon of the Church of Rome, and afterwards Pope, put Cassian (then in France) upon writing this book, *De Incarnatione Domini*, against Nestorius. He wrote it therefore in the year 430, as Baronius also reckons. For he wrote it before the condemnation of Nestorius in the council of Ephesus, as appears by the book itself. This book is now extant only in Latin; but, considering that his design in writing was to stir up the



Greek church against Nestorius, and that for the making great impression upon them, he quotes Greek fathers at the end of his book, and concludes with an exhortation to the citizens of Constantinople, telling them, that what he wrote for, he had received from his master Chrysostom; I am satisfied that he wrote it originally in Greek: his other books were in both languages. For Photius saw them in eloquent Greek; and it is more likely that they had their author's eloquent language from their author, and the Latin from one of the Latins where he lived, than that the contrary should be true. Now in this treatise<sup>1</sup>, when he comes to consider the passage of Nestorius about this text, of which we gave you an account above out of Arnobius, he returns this answer to it; "*Jam primum enim hoc ais, Nestori, quia justitiã repleverit, quod creatum est; et hoc apostolico vis testimonio comprobare, quod dicat, apparuit in carne; justificatus est in Spiritu; utrumque falso sensu et furioso spiritu loqueris. Quia et hoc, quod à Spiritu vis eum repletum esse justitiã, ideo ponis, ut ostendas ejus vacuitatem, cui præstitam esse asseras justitiæ adimpletionem. Et hoc, quod super hãc re apostolico testimonio uteris, divini testimonii ordinem rationemque furaris. Non enim ita ab apostolo positum est, ut tu id truncatum vitiatumque possuisti. Quid enim apostolus ait? 'Et manifestè magnum est pietatis sacramentum, quod manifes-*

<sup>1</sup> Libro septimo, cap. 18.

tum est in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu.' *Vides ergo, quod mysterium pietatis, vel sacramentum justificatum apostolus prædicavit.*" Thus far Cassian not only reading ó, but confuting Nestorius by that reading. For whereas Nestorius said it was a creature which was justified, Cassian tells him, that if he had read the whole text, he would have found that it was "the mystery of godliness." "*Vides ergo,*" saith he, "*quod mysterium pietatis justificatum apostolus prædicavit.*" He does not say, "*Deum justificatum apostolus prædicavit*" (as he would certainly have done, had that been in his Bible), but *mysterium*; and so makes *mysterium*, or, which is all one, its relative *quod*, the nominative case to the verbs which follow. In another part of this treatise, lib. 5, cap. 12, Cassian cites and interprets the text as follows; "*Et manifestè magnum est pietatis sacramentum, quod manifestatum est in carne, &c. Quod ergo magnum est illud sacramentum, quod manifestatum est in carne? Deus scilicet natus in carne, Deus visus in corpore, qui utique sicut palam est assumptus in gloriã.*" So you see Nestorius and Cassian agree in reading ó, but differ in interpreting it; the one restraining it to a creature, by reason of its being justified; the other restraining it to God, by reason of its being a great mystery, and assumed in glory.

VIII. In like manner, Cyril, the grand adversary of Nestorius, in his three books *De Fide ad*



*Imperatorem et Reginas*, written against him in the beginning of that controversy, did not reprehend him, as if he had cited the text falsely, but only complained of his misinterpreting it; telling him, that he did not understand the great mystery of godliness, and that it was not a created thing, as he thought, but the Word or Son of God; and arguing for this interpretation from the circumstances of the text. And, first, in his book *De Fide ad Imperatorem*, sect. 7, he has this passage; “Πλανασθε, μη ειδοτες τας γραφας μητε μεν το μεγα της ευσεβειας μυστηριον, τουτεσι Χριστον, ος εφανερωθη εν σαρκι, εδικαιωθη εν πνευματι,” &c. “Ye err,” saith he, “not knowing the Scriptures, nor the great mystery of godliness, that is Christ; who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit.” By this citation it is plain that he read *ος*, using one of these manuscripts which, by understanding *Χριστον* for *μυστηριον*, turned *ο* into *ος*; and, by way of interpretation, inserting *τουτεσι Χριστον*, which in those manuscripts was to be understood; unless you will say that he turns *Θεος* into *ος*, which is very hard. For had *Θεος* been in this text, he would not have said *μυστηριον, τουτεσι Χριστον, ος εφανερωθη*; but *μυστηριον, Θεος, τουτεσι Χριστος, εφανερωθη*, putting *Χριστος*, not for *μυστηριον*, but for *Θεος*. For *Χριστος* and *Θεος* are more plainly equipollent than *Χριστος* and *μυστηριον*. And making *Χριστος* and *μυστηριον* equipollent, he makes *μυστηριον* the nominative case to *εφανερωθη*; and therefore read them

joined in this text by the article *ος*. Had he read *Θεος*, he would never have left out that authentic and demonstrative word, and by way of interpretation for *μυστηριον Θεος* written *Χριστον ος*. For this was not to argue against Nestorius, but to spoil the argument which lay before him. Neither would he have gone on, as he does, within a few lines, to recite the same text, putting *λογος* by way of interpretation for *μυστηριον*; and after to propound it as his bare opinion, that the Word or Son of God was here to be understood by this mystery, and to dispute for this his opinion, as needing proof out of other texts of Scripture, as he does after this manner<sup>1</sup>: “Moreover,” saith he, “in my opinion, that mystery of godliness is nothing else than he who came to us from God the Father; the Word, who was manifested in the flesh. For in taking the form of a servant, he was born of the holy God-bearing Virgin,” &c. And then, after many other things, he at length in sect. 23 and 24, concludes, that “this divine mystery is above our understanding; and that the only-begotten, who is God, and, according to the Scriptures, the Lord of all things, appeared to us, was seen on earth, and became man.” This he makes not the text itself, but the interpretation thereof; and from the preceding disputation, concludes it to be genuine.

<sup>1</sup> “Ειν γαρ αν ουχ ετερον οικαι τι το της ευσεβειας μυστηριον, η αυτος ημιν ο εκ Θεου πατρος λογος, ος εφανερωθη εν σαρκι. λεγεται γαρ δια της αγιας παρθενου και θεοτοκου, μαρτυρον δουλου λαβων.” *Cyril. de Fide ad Imperatorem*, Sect. 8.

IX. Again, in the first of his two treatises, *De Fide ad Reginas*, near the end, he cites the text, and argues thus against the interpretation of Nestorius. "Who is he," saith he, "that is manifested in the flesh? Is it not fully evident, that it is no other than the Word of God the Father? For so will that be a great mystery of godliness (which was<sup>1</sup> manifested in the flesh); he was seen of angels, ascending into heaven; he was preached to the Gentiles by the holy apostles; he was believed on in the world, but this not as a mere man; but as God born in the flesh, and after our manner."

X. So also in his second book, *De fide ad Reginas*<sup>2</sup>, he cites the place again; and then argues upon it against the opinion of Nestorius after this manner: "If the Word, being God, is said to become a man, and yet continue what he was before, without losing his Deity, the mystery of godliness is without doubt a very great one; but if Christ be a mere man, joined with God only in the parity of dignity and power (for this is maintained by some unlearned men), how is he manifested in the flesh? Is it not plain, that every man is in the flesh, and cannot otherwise be seen by any body? how then was he said to be seen of the holy angels? For do they not also see us? What was there therefore new or extraordinary in Christ, if the angels saw him such a man as we are, and

<sup>1</sup> Codex Græcus hoc loco jam legit ΘC pro ὁC sensu perturbato.

<sup>2</sup> Sect. 33.

nothing more," &c. Thus Cyril goes on to give his reasons why that which was manifested in the flesh, was not a mere created Man, as Nestorius interpreted, but the eternal Word, or Son of God; all which would have been very superfluous and impertinent, if *God* had then been expressly in the text.

XI. Seeing therefore Nestorius alleged the text to prove, that it was a created thing which was manifested in the flesh; and Cyril, in confuting him, did not answer that it was *God* expressly in the text, nor raise any debate about the reading, but only put another interpretation upon the text than Nestorius had done; arguing with Cassian, that in the text it was not a mere man, as Nestorius contended, but a great mystery of godliness; and by consequence Christ, or God the Son, which was manifested in the flesh; and labouring by divers other arguments to prove this interpretation; it is evident beyond all cavil, that Cyril was a stranger to Θεος, now got into the text; and read ὁC or ὁ, as Nestorius and Cassian did.

XII. And all this is further confirmed by Photius, who, in his commentary on the epistles not yet published, relates that Cyril, in the 12th chapter of his Scholiums, read "ὁC εφανερωθη," &c.; and consonant to this reading is Cyril's commentary upon the text in his explanation of the second of the twelve Anathematisms, where he puts the question, "Quid est igitur quod dicit, apparuit in carne?" And explains it by saying, "Hoc est,

*Dei patris verbum caro factum est;*" and concludes, that it is hence that we call him God and Man. Whereas had Θεος been in the text, it would have needed no interpretation; nor would he have put λογος for Θεος, in order to prove that God was manifested in the flesh. And yet in his books *ad Reginas*, and his other writings, wherever he quotes this text, the Greeks have since corrected it by their corrected manuscripts of St. Paul's epistles, and written Θεος instead of ὁ; whence, if you would truly understand the Nestorian history, you must read ὁ or ὁς for Θεος in all Cyril's citations of this text.

XIII. Now, whilst Cyril read ὁ or ὁς, and in the explanation of the twelve chapters, or articles, quoted this text in the second article; and this explanation was recited by him in the council of Ephesus, and approved by the council<sup>1</sup>, with an anathema at the end of every article; it is manifest that this council allowed the reading ὁς or ὁ; and by consequence that ὁς or ὁ was the authentic, public, uncontroverted reading till after the times of this council. For if Nestorius and Cyril, the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, and the heads of the two parties in this controversy, read ὁς or ὁ; and their writings went about amongst the Eastern churches, and were canvassed by the bishops and clergy without any dispute raised about the reading; and if Cyril read ὁς by the approbation of the council itself;

<sup>1</sup> Concil. Ephes. par. iii. sub initio.

I think that the conclusion we make of its being then the general uncontroverted reading must needs be granted us. And if the authority of one of the four first general councils make anything for the truth of the reading, we have that into the bargain.

XIV. Yet whilst the Nestorian controversy brought the text into play, and the two parties ran the interpretation into extremes, the one disputing that ὁ or ὁς was a creature, the other that it was the Word of God; the prevalence of the latter party made it pass for the orthodox opinion, that ὁ or ὁς was God; and so gave occasion to the Greeks henceforward to change the language of *Christ* into that of *God*; and say, in their expositions of the text, that God was manifested in the flesh (as I find Theodoret doth), and at length to write *God* in the text itself; the easy change of O or OC into ΘC, inviting them to do it; and, if this was become the orthodox authentic reading, to set right the text in Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, and wherever else they found it (in their opinion), corrupted by heretics.

XV. And the man that first began thus to alter the sacred text, was Macedonius, the patriarch of Constantinople, in the beginning of the sixth century; for the Emperor Anastasius banished him for corrupting it. At that time the Greek church had been long divided about the council of Chalcedon. Many who allowed the condemnation of Eutyches, rejected the council; by

reason of its decreeing, by the influence of the bishop of Rome's letter against Eutyches, that Christ subsisted not only *ex duabus naturis*, which Eutyches allowed, but also *in duabus naturis*; which language was new to the Greeks, and by a great part of that church taken for Nestorianism. For they understood, that as the body and soul made the nature of Man, so God and Man made the nature of Christ; assigning the nature to the person of Christ, as well as to all other things, and not considering that in all compounds the several parts have also their several natures. Hence each party endeavoured to render the other suspected of heresy; as if they that were for the council secretly favoured the Nestorians, and they that were against it the Eutychians. For one part, in maintaining two distinct natures in Christ, were thought to deny the nature of one person with Nestorius; and the other party, in opposing two distinct natures in him, were thought to deny the truth of one of the natures with Eutyches. Both parties, therefore, to clear themselves of those imputations, anathematized both those heresies; and therefore, whilst they thus differed in their modes of speaking, they agreed in their sense, as Evagrius well observes. But the bishops of Rome and Alexandria being engaged against one another, and for a long time distracting the East by these disputes; at length the Emperor Zeno, to quiet his empire, and perhaps to secure it from the encroachment of the bishop of Rome, who,

by this verbal contest<sup>1</sup>, aspired to the name and authority of universal bishop, sent about an *he-noticum*, or pacificatory decree; wherein he anathematized both Nestorius and Eutyches with their followers on the one hand, and abrogated the Pope's letter and the council on the other; and his successor, Anastasius, for the same end, laboured for to have this decree signed by all the bishops. And Macedonius at first subscribed it; but afterwards heading those who stood up for the council<sup>2</sup>, was, for corrupting the Scriptures in favour of his opinion, and such other things as were laid to his charge, deposed and banished, ann. C. 512<sup>3</sup>. But his own party, which at length prevailed, defended him, as if oppressed by calumnies; and so received that reading for genuine, which he had put about among them. For how ready are all parties to receive what they reckon on their side, Jerome well knew, when he recommended the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" by its usefulness; and we have a notable instance of it in the last age, when the churches, both Eastern and Western, received this testimony in a moment in their Greek Testaments, and still continue with great zeal and pas-

<sup>1</sup> Vide Baronium, anno 451; sect. 149, 150, 151.

<sup>2</sup> Evagrius, lib. iii. cap. xxi. 44.—Theodorus lector, lib. ii. and Marcellini Chronicon.

<sup>3</sup> Flavian was banished in the year of Antioch 561, as Evagrius notes; and Macedonius was banished the same year, or the year before.

sion to defend it for the ancient reading, against the authority of all the Greek manuscripts.

XVI. But now I have told you the original of the corruption, I must tell you my author; and he is Liberatus, archdeacon of the church of Carthage, who lived in that very age. For in his Breviary, which he wrote in the year 535, or soon after, and collected, as he saith in his preface, out of Greek records, he delivers it in these words<sup>1</sup>: "*Hoc tempore Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus ab imperatore Anastasio dicitur expulsus, tanquam evangelia falsaret; et maxime illud apostoli dictum, Quia apparuit in carne, justificatum in spiritu. Hunc enim mutasse, ubi habet qui . . . hoc est . . . monosyllabum Græcum, literâ mutatâ in . . . vertisse et fecisse . . . id est, ut esset Deus, apparuit per carnem. Tanquam Nestorianus ergo culpatus expellitur per severum Monachum<sup>2</sup>.*" The Greek letters here omitted are, in the second edition of Sunius, and in those of the councils, thus inserted: "*Ubi habet ðc, hoc est qui, monosyllabum Græcum, literâ mutatâ o in ω, vertisse et fecisse ðc; id est, ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem.*" But this interpolation was surely made by conjecture; for if Θεοc was in the sacred text before the corruption, then ðc or ó was not in, and so could not be changed into ðc; but if Θεοc was not in, it could not be brought in by this change. The interpolation therefore is in-

<sup>1</sup> Liberati Brev. cap. xix.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Baronii Annal. 510. sect. 9.

consistent and spurious, and seems to have been occasioned by straining to make out Nestorianism here; the scribes, for that end<sup>1</sup>, referring the words *ut esset* to the sacred text; and then the interpolator writing ðc for *ut*. Whereas they should have referred *ut esset* to the words of Liberatus, thus distinguished from the sacred text; "*Id est, ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem.*" I had rather, therefore, waive the conjecture of this interpolator, and fill up the *lacunæ* by the authority of an ancient author, Hincmarus; who above eight hundred years ago<sup>2</sup> related the fact out of Liberatus after this manner: "*Quidam ipsas Scripturas verbis illicitis imposturaverunt; sicut Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus, qui ab Anastasio Imperatore ideo a civitate expulsus legitur, quoniam falsavit evangelia; et illum apostoli locum, quod apparuit in carne, justificatum est in spiritu; per cognationem Græcarum literarum O et Θ hoc modo mutando falsavit. Ubi enim habuit, qui, hoc est OC, monosyllabum Græcum, literâ mutatâ O in Θ, mutavit, et fecit ΘC, id est, ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem; quapropter tanquam Nestori-*

<sup>1</sup> N.B. In Hincmari opusc. xxxiii. cap. 22. the words *ut esset* are in like manner referred to the sacred text; and somebody, to make out the sense, has in their stead added *ut appareret* to the words of Liberatus, and written *ut appareret, ut esset Deus, &c.* But the words *ut appareret* not being in Liberatus, must be struck out, and supplied by setting the comma after *ut esset*, to part these words from the sacred text.

<sup>2</sup> Hincmari opusc. artic. xxxiii. cap. 18.

*anus fuit expulsus.*" He was banished therefore for changing the ancient reading (which in some manuscripts was OC, as these authors have it, and in others O) into EC. But whereas he is here represented a Nestorian for doing this, the meaning is, that he was banished for corrupting the text in favour of the doctrine of two natures in Christ; which his enemies accounted Nestorianism, though it was not really so. Nestorius held only a human nature in Christ; and that God, *the Word*, dwelt in this nature, as the spirit in a holy man; and therefore interpreted ó of the human nature. This doctrine Macedonius anathematized, and maintained two natures in Christ; and, for proving this, corrupted the text, and made it *God manifested in the flesh*. This distinguishing Christ into two natures was, by the enemies of Macedonius, accounted Nestorianism in another language; and in this respect the historian saith, that they banished him as a Nestorian for corrupting the text, though he was not really of that opinion.

XVII. But whilst he is said to be banished as a Nestorian for this, without explaining what is here meant by a Nestorian, it looks like a trickish way of speaking, used by his friends to ridicule the proceedings against him as inconsistent; perhaps to invert the crime of falsation; as if a Nestorian would rather change EC into O. For they that read history with judgement, will too often meet with such trickish reports; and even in the very story of Macedonius I meet with some

other reports of the same kind. For Macedonius having in his keeping the original acts of the council of Chalcedon, signed by that emperor under whom it was called, and refusing to deliver up this book to the emperor Anastasius; some, to make this emperor perjured, distorted the story; as if, at his coming to the crown, he had promised under his hand and oath, that he would not act against the council of Chalcedon; and represented his subscribed promise to be the book, which Macedonius refused to deliver back to him. Macedonius had got his bishopric by being against the council of Chalcedon, and had subscribed the *henoticum*<sup>1</sup> of Zeno, in which that council was anathematized; and this being objected against him, his friends, to stifle the accusation, make a contrary story of the emperor; as if, when he came to the crown, he had done as much as that in behalf of the council. Another report was<sup>2</sup>, "That the people of Alexandria and all Egypt, great and small, bond and free, priests and monks, excepting only strangers, became about this time possessed with evil spirits, and being deprived of human speech, barked day and night like dogs; so that they were afterwards bound with iron chains, and drawn to the church, that they might recover their health. For they all ate their hands and arms. And then an angel appeared to some of the people, saying, that this happened to them

<sup>1</sup> Vide Annotationes Valesii in Evagr. &c. lib. iii. cap. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Victor Turonensis in Chronico.

because they anathematized the council of Chalcedon, and threatened that they should do so no more." Again, we are told in history<sup>1</sup>, "That the adversaries of Macedonius produced certain boys in judgement to accuse both him and themselves of sodomy; but that when they found his genitals were cut off, they betook themselves to other arts for deposing him." Now if you can believe that a eunuch had the beard and voice of another man; and that in a solemn council the great patriarch of the East was thus accused and thus acquitted, and yet deposed; you must acknowledge that there were many bishops among the Greeks who would not stick at as ill and shameless things as corrupting the Scriptures. But if all this be a sham invented to discredit the council, the need of such shams adds credit to their proceedings in condemning him for a falsary.

XVIII. This council, if I mistake not, sat first at Constantinople, being that council which Theodorus calls "a company of mercenary wretches;" and Nicephorus, "a convention of heretics, assembled against Macedonius." Upon their adding to the "thrice holy" these words<sup>2</sup>, "who art crucified for us," the people fell into a tumult; and afterwards, when Macedonius came to be accused, they fell into a greater tumult, crying out, "The time of persecution is at hand; let no man

<sup>1</sup> Evagrius, lib. iii. cap. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Theodor. lib. ii.—Nicephor. lib. xvi. cap. 26.—Evagr. lib. iii. cap. 44.

desert the father;" meaning Macedonius. In this tumult, which was said to be stirred up by the clergy of Constantinople, many parts of the city were burnt, and the nobles and emperor brought into the greatest danger; insomuch that the emperor was forced to proffer the resignation of his empire, before he could quiet the multitude. Then seeing that, if Macedonius were judged, the people would defend him, he caused him to be carried by force in the night to Chalcedon; and thence into banishment, as Theodorus writes. Whence I gather, that the council removed also to Chalcedon to avoid the tumult, and finish their proceeding there. For the story of his being accused in judgement by boys, Nicephorus places after this tumult; and all agree that he was condemned; and the monks of Palestine, in an epistle recorded by Evagrius, say that Xenaias and Dioscorus, joined with many bishops, banished him. When his condemnation was sent him, signed by the emperor, he asked, whether they that had condemned him received the council of Chalcedon; and when they that brought him the sentence denied it, he replied, "If Arians and Macedonians had sent me a book of condemnation, could I receive it?" So that it seems he stood upon the illegality of the council. The next day one Timothy was made bishop of Constantinople, and he sent about the condemnation of Macedonius to all the absent bishops to be subscribed<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Theophanes, p. 135.



Whence I think it will easily be granted, that he was condemned as a falsary by the greatest part of the Eastern empire ; and by consequence, that the genuine reading was till then, by the churches of that empire, accounted  $\acute{o}$ . For had not the public reading then been  $\acute{o}$ , there could have been no colour for pretending that he changed it into  $\Theta C$ .

XIX. About six years after Anastasius died, and his successors, Justin and Justinian, set up the authority of the council of Chalcedon again, together with that of the Pope over the Eastern churches, as universal bishop ; and from that time the friends of Macedonius prevailing, it is probable, that in opposition to the heretics, which condemned him, and for promoting and establishing the doctrine of two natures in Christ, they received and spread abroad the reading  $\Theta C$ . But as for the authority of the Pope, that fell again with Rome in the Gothic wars, and slept till Phocas revived it.

XX. I told you of several shams put about by the friends of Macedonius, to discredit the proceedings of the council against him. There is one which notably confirms what has hitherto been said, and makes it plain that his friends received his corruptions as genuine Scripture. For whereas Macedonius was banished for corrupting the New Testament, his friends retorted the crime upon the council, as if they had taken upon them, under colour of purging the Scriptures from the

corruptions of Macedonius, to correct in them whatever they thought the Apostles, as unskilful men and idiots, had written amiss. For this I gather from an ironical report of this kind put about in the West, and thus recorded by Victor Tironensis: "*Messald V. C. consulibus, Constantinopoli, jubente Anastasio Imperatore, sancta evangelia, tanquam ab idiotis composita, reprehenduntur et emendantur;*" that is, "In the consulship of Messala, the holy gospels, by the command of the emperor Anastasius, were censured and corrected at Constantinople, as if written by evangelists that were idiots." Here Victor errs in the year. For Messala was consul anno Christi 506, that is, six years before the banishment of Macedonius. But Victor is very uncertain in dates of the years ; for he places the banishment of Macedonius in the consulship of Avienus 502 ; and the above-mentioned tumult about the *Trisagium* in the consulship of Probus, anno Christi 513 ; whereas all these things happened in the same year. For it is plain by this chronicle, that the Scriptures were examined and corrected about this time by a council at Constantinople, by the order of Anastasius ; and I meet with no other council to which this character can agree, besides that which deposed Macedonius. Now that they should censure and correct the gospels, as if written by idiots, is too plainly ironical to be true history ; and therefore it must be an abusive report, invented and put about to ridicule



and shame the council, and to propagate the corruptions of Macedonius as the genuine apostolic reading of the Scriptures, which the council had rashly corrected.

XXI. So then the falsation was set on foot in the beginning of the fifth century, and is now of about twelve hundred years standing; and therefore since it lay but in a letter, and so was more easily spread abroad in the Greek manuscripts than the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" in the Latin ones, we need not wonder if the old reading be scarce to be met with in any Greek manuscripts now extant; and yet it is in some.

XXII. For though Beza tells us that all the Greek manuscripts read Θεοσ, yet I must tell Beza's readers, that all his manuscripts read ο. For he had no other manuscripts of the epistles besides the Claromontan; and in this manuscript, as Morinus by ocular inspection has since informed us, the ancient reading was ο<sup>1</sup>: but yet in another hand, and with other ink, the letter Θ has been written out of the line; and the letter O, thickened to make a C, appears; which instance shows sufficiently by whom the ancient reading has been

<sup>1</sup> Aliâ manu et atramento, extra lineæ seriem, addita est litera Θ, et ambesa paululum O, ut appareret sigma. Sed præpostera emendatio facile conspicitur. *Hæc Morinus in Exercitationibus Biblicis, lib. i. Exercitat. ii. cap. 4.*—At Beza nobis aliqua invidit, ut ex ejus epistolâ ad Academiam Cantabrigiensem a Waltonò editâ, liquet; ubi variantes aliquas lectiones celandas esse admonet.

changed. Valesius also read ο in one of the Spanish manuscripts; and so did the author of the Oxford edition of the New Testament, ann. Ch. 1675, in the manuscript of Lincoln College library, which is the oldest of the Oxford manuscripts. The Alexandrian manuscript<sup>1</sup> and one of Colbert's, and Cyril, c. 12. Scholiorum (teste Photio MS. com. in Epist.), read OC. So then there are some ancient Greek manuscripts which read ο, and others οσ; but I do not hear of any Latin ones, either ancient or modern, which read Θεοσ.

XXIII. And besides to read Θεοσ makes the sense obscure and difficult. For how can it properly be said, "that God was justified in the spi-

<sup>1</sup> Alio atramento jam ducta cernitur tam lineola per medium literæ O, quam virgula superna; ut jam legatur OC. Putat autem Millius, lineolas illas olim tenues fuisse et prope evanidas, et novo dein atramento incrassatas fuisse; eo quod per-lustrato attentius loco, lineolæ per medium Θ ductæ, quæ primam aciem fugerat, ductus quosdam ac vestigia satis certa deprehendere visus esset; præsertim ad partem sinistram, quæ peripheriam literæ pertingit; luculentiora multo habiturus nisi obstante literâ quam dixit hodiernâ lineolæ ipsi superinductâ. Verum si lineola antiquitus tam conspicua esset, ut usque nunc per medium lineæ crassioris, alio atramento superinductæ, cerni possit; quid opus esset, ut a lineâ illâ superinductâ incrassaretur? Sin olim tam evanida esset, ut cerni vix posset; mirum est, quod ejus ductus et vestigia satis certa, per medium literæ illius superinductæ, etiam nunc appareant. Doceant verba evanida aliis in locis atramento novo incrassata fuisse, vel fateantur OC hic mutatum in ΘC.

rit?"\* But to read *ó*, and interpret it of Christ, as the ancient Christians did, without restraining it to his divinity, makes the sense very easy. For the promised and long-expected Messiah, the hope of Israel, is to us "the great mystery of godliness." And this mystery was at length manifested to the Jews from the time of his baptism, and justified to be the person whom they expected.

XXIV. I have now given you an account of the corruption of the text, the sum of which is this; the difference between the Greek and the ancient versions puts it past dispute, that either the Greeks have corrupted their manuscripts, or the Latins, Syrians, and Ethiopians their versions; and it is more reasonable to lay the fault upon the Greeks than upon the other three, for these considerations. It was easier for one nation to do it than for three to conspire. It was easier to change a letter or two in the Greek, than six words in the Latin. In the Greek, the sense is obscure; in the versions, clear. It was agreeable to the interest of the Greeks to make the change,

\* *How is it said in St. Luke, that "publicans justified God" by receiving John's baptism? If to read Θεος gives a difficult sense in this clause, to read ó, will it give an easy sense in others? Are the propositions, that a mystery was manifested in the flesh, a mystery was received up into glory, both which arise from the reading ó, very easily intelligible? Is it easy to understand what mystery was manifested in the flesh, if our Lord's divinity is set out of the question? If it be allowed that his divinity makes the mystery, the two readings will be equivalent in sense, but Θεος makes the best construction.—Bp. Horsley.*

but against the interest of other nations to do it; and men are never false to their interest. The Greek reading was unknown in the times of the Arian controversy; but that of the versions then in use amongst both Greeks and Latins. Some Greek manuscripts render the Greek reading dubious; but those of the versions hitherto collated agree. There are no signs of corruption in the versions hitherto discovered; but in the Greek we have showed you particularly when, on what occasion, and by whom, the text was corrupted.

XXV: I know not whether it be worth the while to tell you, that in the printed works of Athanasius, there is an epistle *De incarnatione verbi*, which reads Θεος. For this epistle relates to the Nestorian heresy, and so was written by a much later author than Athanasius, and may also possibly have been since corrected, like the works of Chrysostom and Cyril, by the corrected texts of St. Paul's Epistles. I have had so short a time to run my eye over authors, that I cannot tell whether, upon further search, more passages about this falsation may not hereafter occur pertinent to the argument. But if there should, I presume it will not be difficult, now the falsation is thus far laid open, to know what construction to put upon them, and how to apply them.

XXVI. You see what freedom I have used in this discourse, and I hope you will interpret it candidly. For if the ancient churches, in debating

and deciding the greatest mysteries of religion, knew nothing of these two texts, I understand not, why we should be so fond of them now the debates are over. And whilst it is the character of an honest man to be pleased, and of a man of interest to be troubled at the detection of frauds, and of both to run most into those passions when the detection is made plainest ; I hope this letter will, to one of your integrity, prove so much the more acceptable, as it makes a further discovery than you have hitherto met with in commentators.

THE END.