

Pastoral Epistles”? I quote from the last Edition of 1869, only taking the liberty, (1) to break it up into short paragraphs; and, (2) to give fully the proper names which you abbreviate. Thus, instead of “Theod.” (which I take leave to point out to you might mean either Theodore of Heraclea or his namesake of Mopsuestia; either Theodotus the Gnostic or his namesake of Ancyra,) ‘Euthal.,’ I write Theodoret Euthalius.” And now for the external testimony *as you give it* concerning 1 Timothy 3:16:

The state of the evidence is briefly as follows:

(1) **ΟϚ** is read with A — *indisputably*; after minute personal inspection; see note, p. 104]C(1) [Tischendorf *Prolog. Cod. Ephraemi*; § 7, p. 39] F G **Ν** (see below); 17, 73, 181; Syr.-P. Philoxenian, Coptic, Sahidic, Gothic; also (**Ϛ** for **ϛ**) Syriac, Arabic (Erpenius), Ethiopic, Armenian; Cyril, Theodoros Mopsuest., Epiphanius, Gelasius, Hieronymus in *Esaiam* liii. 11.

(2) **ϛ**, with D, Vulgate; nearly all Latin Fathers.

(3) **ΘεϚς**, with D(3) K L; nearly all MSS.; Arabic (Polyglott), Slavonic; Didymus, Chrysostom (? see Tregelles, p. 227 note), Theodoret, Euthalius, Damascene, Theophylact, Eucumenius, Ignatius *Ephes.* 29 (but very doubtful), A hand of the twelfth century has prefixed **Θε** to **Ϛς**, the reading of **Ν**; see Tischendorf *edit. major*, Plate xvii of Scrivener’s Collation of **Ν** facsimile (13).

On reviewing this evidence, as not only the most important uncial MSS., but all the Versions older than the 7th century are distinctly in favor of a *relative*, as **ϛ** seems only a Latinizing of **Ϛς** — and lastly, as **Ϛς** is the more difficult, though really the more intelligible, reading (Hofmann, *Schriftb.* Vol. I. p. 143), and on every reason more likely to have been changed into **ΘεϚς** (Macedonius is actually said to have been expelled for making the change, *Liberti Diaconi Breviarium* cap. 19) than *vice versa*, we unhesitatingly decide in favor of **Ϛς**. (Ellicott, *Pastoral Epistles*, ed. 1869, pp. 51-2).

HOW BISHOP ELLICOTT IS MISTAKEN IN GIVING EVIDENCE

Such then is *your own statement* of the evidence on this subject. I proceed to demonstrate to you that *you are completely mistaken*: (a) mistaken as to what you say about **Ϛς**, (b) mistaken as to **ϛ**; (c) mistaken as to **ΘεϚς**; (d) mistaken in respect of Codices; (3) mistaken in respect of Versions; (f) mistaken in respect of Fathers.

Your slipshod, inaccurate statements (*all* obtained at second-hand) will occasion me a vast deal of trouble. But now at last I am determined, if the thing be possible, to set this question at rest. And that I may not be misunderstood, I beg to repeat that all I propose to myself is to *prove* beyond the possibility of denial that the evidence for **ΘεϚς** in 1 Tim. 3:16 *vastly preponderates over the evidence for either Ϛς or ϛ*. It will be for you afterwards to come forward and prove that, on the contrary, **ΘεϚς** is a *plain and clear error*, so plain and so clear that you and your fellow-Revisioners felt yourselves constrained to thrust it out from the place it has confessedly occupied in the New Testament for at least 1530 years.

You are further reminded, my lord Bishop, that unless you do this, you will be considered by the whole Church to have dealt unfaithfully with the Word of God. For it is yourself who have invited and provoked this inquiry. You devote twelve pages to it [in the *Quarterly Review*], “compelled to do so by the Reviewer;” you write, “Moreover (you announce) this case is of great importance as an example. It illustrates in a striking manner the complete isolation of the Reviewer’s (Burgon) position. If he is right all other Critics are

wrong,” etc., etc. Permit me to remind you of the warning, “*Let not him that girds on his harness boast himself as he that puts it off*” (1 Kings 20:11).

TESTIMONY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

First, as to the testimony of CODEX A:

You begin then with the manuscript evidence. And you venture to assert that **ΟϚ** is “indisputably” the reading of Codex A. I am at a loss to understand how a ‘professed Critic’ (who must be presumed to be acquainted with the facts of the case, and who is a lover of Truth) can permit himself to make such an assertion. Your certainty is based, you say, on “minute personal inspection.” In other words, you are so good as to explain that you once tried a coarse experiment by which you succeeded in convincing yourself that the suspected diameter of the **Ο** is exactly coincident with the sagitta of an *epsilon* (**Ε**) which happens to stand on the back of the page. But do you not see that unless you start with *this* for your major premiss, *Theta* cannot exist on one side of a page if *epsilon* stands immediately behind it on the other side; then your experiment is *nihil ad rem*, and proves nothing?

Your “inspection” happens however to be *inaccurate* besides. You performed your experiment unskillfully. A man need only hold up the leaf to the light on a very bright day (as Tregelles, Scrivener, and many besides, including your present correspondent have done) to be aware that the sagitta of the *epsilon* on fol. 145b does not cover much more than a third of the area of the *theta* on fol. 145a. Dr. Scrivener further points out that it cuts the circle *too high* to have been reasonably mistaken by a careful observer for the diameter of the *theta* (**Θ**). The experiment which you describe with such circumstantial gravity was simply nugatory therefore.

How is it, my lord Bishop, that you do not perceive that the way to ascertain the reading of Codex A at 1 Timothy 3:16 is: (1) to investigate *not* what is found at the back of the leaf, but what is written on the front of it; and, (2) Not so much to enquire what can be deciphered of the original writing by the aid of a powerful lens *now*, as to ascertain what was apparent to the eye of competent observers when the Codex was first brought to this country 250 years ago. That Patrick Young, the first custodian and collator of the Codex [1628-1652] read **ΟϚ** is certain — Young communicated the ‘various Readings’ of A to Archbishop Ussher — and the latter prior to 1653 communicated them to Hammond, who clearly knew nothing of **ΟϚ**. It is plain that **ΟϚ** was the reading seen by Huish when he sent his collation of the Codex (made, according to Bentley, with great exactness) to Brian Walton, who published the fifth volume of his Polyglott in 1657. Bishop Pearson, who was very curious in such matters, says, “We find not **Ϛς** in any copy,” a sufficient proof how *he* read the place in 1659. Bishop Fell, who published an edition of the N.T. in 1675 certainly considered **ΟϚ** the reading of Cod. A. Mill, who was at work on the Text of the N.T. from 1677 to 1707, expressly declares that he saw the remains of **ΟϚ** in this place. Bentley who had himself (1716) collated the MS. with the utmost accuracy knew nothing of any other reading. Emphatic testimony on the subject is borne by Wotton in 1718: “There can be no doubt” (he says) “that this MS. always exhibited **ΟϚ**. Of this any one may easily convince himself who will be at the pains to examine the place with attention.” Two years earlier (we have it on the testimony of John Creyk, of S. John’s College, Cambridge) “the old line in the letter **Θ** was plainly to be seen.” It was “*much about the same time*,” also (about 1716) that Wetstein acknowledged to the Rev. John Kippax, “who took

it down in writing from his own mouth, — that though the middle stroke of the Θ has been evidently retouched, yet the fine stroke which was originally in the body of the Θ is discoverable at each end of the fuller stroke of the corrector.”

And Berriman himself (who delivered a course of Lectures on the true reading of 1 Tim. 3:16, in 1737-8) attests emphatically that he had seen it also. He adds, “If therefore at any time hereafter the old line should become altogether undiscoverable, there will never be just cause to doubt but that the genuine, and original, reading of the MS. was $\Theta\Sigma$; and that the new strokes, added at the top and in the middle by the corrector were not designed to corrupt and falsify, but to preserve and perpetuate the true reading, which was in danger of being lost by the decay of Time” (Berriman, *Dissertation*, p. 156 — Berriman refers to the fact that some one in recent times, with a view apparently to establish the actual reading of the place, has clumsily thickened the superior stroke with common black ink, and introduced a rude dot into the middle of the Θ . There has been no attempt at fraud. Such a line and such a dot could deceive no one.) These memorable words were written in 1741. How you in 1882, after surveying all this accumulated and consistent testimony (borne by these men from A.D. 1628 to 1741) by eye-witnesses as competent to observe a fact of this kind as yourself; and fully as deserving of credit, when they solemnly declare what they have seen — how you, I say, after a survey of this evidence, can gravely sit down and inform the world that “there is no sufficient evidence that there ever was a time when this reading was patent as the reading which came from the original scribe” (p. 72) — this passes my comprehension. It shall only be added that Bengel, who was a very careful enquirer, had already cited Codex A as a witness for $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in 1734; and that Woide, the learned and conscientious editor of the Codex, declares that so late as 1765 he had seen traces of the Θ which twenty years later (in 1785) were visible no longer to him.

That Wetstein subsequently changed his mind, I am not unaware. He was one of those miserable men whose visual organs return a false report to their possessor whenever they are shown a text which witnesses *inconveniently to the Godhead of Jesus Christ*. I know, too, that Griesbach in 1785 announced himself of Wetstein’s opinion. It is suggestive however that ten years before (N.T. ed. 1775) he had rested the fact *not* on the testimony borne by the MS. itself, but on ‘the consent of Version, Copies, and Fathers which exhibit the Alexandrian Recension.’ Since Griesbach’s time, Davidson, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Ellicott have announced their opinion that $\Theta\Sigma$ was never written at 1 Tim. 3:16; confessedly only because $\Theta\Sigma$ is to them invisible one hundred years after $\Theta\Sigma$ has disappeared from sight. The fact remains, for all that, that the original reading of A is attested to so amply that no sincere lover of Truth can ever hereafter pretend to doubt it.

The sum of the matter is this: That it is too late by 150 years to contend on the negative side of this question. Nay, a famous living Critic assures us that when his eyes were 20 years younger (Feb. 7, 1861) he actually discerned, still lingering, a faint trace of the diameter of the Θ which Berriman in 1741 had seen so plainly: “I have examined Codex A at least twenty times within as many years, and seeing (as every one must) with my own eyes, I have always felt convinced that it reads $\Theta\Sigma$ ” (Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 553). For you to assert in reply to all this mass of positive evidence that the reading is *indisputably* Θ , and to contend that what makes this indisputable is the fact that behind part of *theta* (Θ) — but too high to mislead a skilful observer, — an *epsilon* stands on the reverse side of the page — strikes me as bordering inconveniently on the

ridiculous. If *this* by your notion of what does constitute “sufficient evidence,” well may the testimony of so many eye-tests by others seem to lack sufficiency to you. Your notions on these subjects are peculiar to yourself. You even fail to see that your statement (in Scrivener’s words) is “not relevant to the point at issue.” The plain fact concerning Cod. A is this: That at 1 Tim. 3:16 two delicate horizontal strokes in $\Theta\Sigma$ which were thoroughly patent in 1628 — which could be seen plainly down to 1737 — and which were discernible by an expert (Dr. Woide) so late as A.D. 1765 — have for the last hundred years entirely disappeared — which is precisely what Berriman (in 1741) predicted would be the case. Moreover, he solemnly warned men against drawing from this circumstance the mistaken inference which you, my lord Bishop, nevertheless *insist* on drawing, and representing as an “*indisputable*” fact.

I have treated so largely of the reading of the Codex Alexandrinus, not because I consider the testimony of a single copy, whether uncial or cursive, a matter of much importance — certainly not the testimony of Cod. A, which (in defiance of every other extant authority) exhibits *the body of God* in S. John 19:40 — but because you insist that A is a witness on your side — whereas it is demonstrable (and I claim to have demonstrated) that you cannot honestly do so. And I trust you will never do so any more.

THE TESTIMONY OF CODICES N AND C CONCERNING 1 Tim. 3:16

That N reads $\Theta\Sigma$ is admitted. Not so Codex C, which the excessive application of chemicals has rendered no longer decipherable in this place. Tischendorf (of course) insists that the original reading was $\Theta\Sigma$. Wetstein and Griesbach (as we should expect) avow the same opinion. Woide, Mill, Weber and Parquoi being just as confident that the original reading instead was $\Theta\Sigma$. As in the case of Cod. A, it is too late by full 100 years to re-open this question. It is observable that the witnesses yield contradictory evidence. Wetstein, writing 150 years ago, before the original writing had become so greatly defaced — (and Wetstein, inasmuch as he collated the MS. for Bentley in 1716, must have been thoroughly familiar with its contents) — only *thought* that he read $\Theta\Sigma$, ‘because the delicate horizontal stroke which makes Θ out of Θ ’ was to him *not apparent*. Woide on the contrary was convinced that $\Theta\Sigma$ had been written by the first hand, saying, ‘for though there exists no vestige of the delicate stroke which out of Θ makes Θ , the stroke written above the letters is by the first hand.’ What however to Wetstein and to Woide was not apparent, was visible enough to Weber, Wetstein’s contemporary. And Tischendorf, so late as 1843, expressed his astonishment that the stroke in question had hitherto escaped the eyes of every one, *having been repeatedly seen by himself*. He attributes it (just as we should expect) to a corrector of the MS.; partly because of its color; partly, because of its inclining upwards to the right. And yet, who cannot see that an argument derived from the color of a line which is already well-nigh invisible must be in a high degree precarious? While Scrivener aptly points out that the cross in Θ — the ninth letter further on (which has never been questioned) *also* ‘ascends toward the right.’ Therefore the hostile evidence collapses. In the meantime, what at least is certain is, that the subscribed musical notation indicates that a *thousand years ago*, a word of two syllables was read here. From a review of all this it is clear that the utmost which can be pretended is that some degree of uncertainty attaches to the testimony of Cod. C. Yet why such a plea should be either set up or allowed, I really do not see — except indeed by men who have made up their minds *beforehand* that $\Theta\Sigma$ shall