

THE  
GENUINENESS  
OF THE TEXT OF THE  
First Epistle of Saint *JOHN*.  
*chapter v. verse. 7.*

*There are Three in Heaven, &c.*

Demonstrated by Proofs which are beyond all Exception, taken from the Testimonies of the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches, and particularly from a *Greek* MS. of the New Testament, found in *Ireland*.

---

---

By *DAVID MARTIN*

Rector of the *French* Church at *Utrecht*.

Author of *the Dissertation upon this Text*, etc.

---

---

Translated from the *French*.

---

---

*LONDON:*

Printed for W. and J. INNYS at the Prince's Arms at the *West* End of *St. Paul's* Church-yard.

MDCCXXII.

## PREFACE

THOUGH I engage a third time upon the subject of this famous Text in St. *John's* Epistle, *There are three in Heaven which bear record, the Father the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one*; it is not to Continue the defense of it against Mr. *Emlyn*. There would be no end in removing the mistakes he commits in this matter, and I am naturally an enemy to strife and debates. I have always been of opinion, that when a truth is sufficiently cleared up, all that is added thereto by reiterated disputes, rather carries it off from its true point of sight, than is capable of fixing the mind upon it. Questions are multiplied, new difficulties are started that are foreign to the principal subject, personal interests are insensibly mixed with it, and in this confusion the Reader's mind, divided betwixt so many different matters, gives but an imperfect attention to the subject upon which it should be wholly employed.

Mr. *Emlyn* has lately published a Piece, under the name of a Reply to the Examination I had made of his Answer, by which he had pretended to confute my Dissertation upon the passage of St. *John*, but as he has but slightly run over some passages, and not touched upon divers others which carry demonstration and conviction along with them, I shall have no need to return frequently to him; and if this was all I had to do, I might have dispensed with writing again upon the same subject. The only thing which could have engaged me in it, would have been to defend my innocence in the quotation I had made of a Manuscript of *Berlin*; upon occasion of which Mr. *Emlyn* has thought fit to triumph; but one or two Sheets inserted in some one of the Critical Journals would have sufficed for this, and all the rest of his Piece.

Mr. *Emlyn* therefore and his Reply will be here but incidentally spoken

of, and according as the matters I shall have to treat of will require: the principal design of this Work does not turn upon that, and the purpose of it is of more concern to Christians, who owning no other foundation of their Faith than the sacred Scripture, cannot but with singular edification see a Text, in which the mystery of the Trinity is evidently taught, defended against those, who through the malignant force of prejudice, or an express hatred to this sacred mystery, endeavour to take from it this Apostolic passage, and deny it to be *St. John's*.

I had proved the genuineness of it by the most solid arguments, that can be urged for a fact of this nature; and these proofs are so numerous, and of so many different kinds, that it is impossible not to be convinced by them, unless an obstinate resolution formed of set purpose against this sacred Text, shuts men's eyes to Reason itself. I have produced the testimony of the *Latin Church* from the second Age up to the last; the testimony of the *Greek Church*; and lastly, the *Greek Manuscripts* of *St. John's Epistle*, in the first of all the Editions which were made of the New Testament in *Greek*, in which Cardinal *Ximenes* employed several learned Men, and which was printed at *Complutum* from excellent Manuscripts in 1513. After this famous Edition comes that of *Erasmus* in 1522, in which this learned Critic and Divine, inserted this passage of *St. John* in the manner it lay in a Manuscript found in *England*. These two ancient Editions were followed by those of *Robert Stephens*, who in the year 1546 and 1549, published the *Greek New Testament* with this Text, agreeably to several Manuscripts which he had from the Library of King *Francis the First*, and some other Libraries of that time.

Divers attempts have been made to enervate the force of this proof; I have given them in my two former Treatises, and have shown the weakness of them. But *F. le Long*<sup>1</sup>, of the Oratory, has lately taken a new

---

<sup>1</sup> F. le Long's Letter dated April 12. 1710. and inserted in the *Journal des Savans* in June.

method of opposing the Editions of *Robert Stephens*, namely, by producing the Manuscripts he thinks to have been those of this learned Printer, in which the passage of *St John* is not found. I have shown that this Father, as learned as he is, has been too credulous in taking the Manuscript he produces from the King's Library for those of *Stephens's*, and I prove invincibly from the Manuscripts themselves, that they cannot have been those of *Stephens*. This is a point wholly new, which has never been brought into this Controversy, and which deserves to be examined with so much the more accuracy and exactness, as the subject of it is extremely momentous, and the manner *F. le Long* has followed, is dazzling and apt to lead into mistake.

To return now to the Testimonies of the *Latin Churches*, I confirm the quotation which *Tertullian* and *St. Cyprian* have made of the Text of the witnesses in Heaven with new reasons, and I add withal to the instances by which I had proved that this passage was anciently in the *Italic Version*, and in that of *St. Jerome*, several authorities, taken from divers *Divines*, which had never been quoted, at least that I know of, upon this important subject.

Coming then to the *Greek Church*, I show that it has owned this Text to be authentic in the past ages as well as the present; and I do it by the testimony of the *Muscovite Church*, which, as all the world knows, is an ancient branch of the *Greek*. I have not seen that hitherto any of the *Divines*, who have written upon this Text, have made use of this proof, to show it to be authentic. I have had upon this all the information I judged necessary, and was possible for me, and I hope that every Reader, who seeks after edification, will be satisfied therewith.

Another sort of proof, which had no less than the former escaped the enquiry of the critics and *Divines*, is a very curious Edition of the New Testament in modern *Greek* made in 1618, placed over against the literal

*Greek* in two Columns, by a *Greek* Monk, named *Maximus*, of the Town of *Callipolis*, which is a suffragan Bishopric to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*. The famous *Cyril Lucar*, a Patriarch zealous for the instruction of his Flock, in a Preface set before this Edition, has recommended in pressing terms the reading of this Work, which is a sort of translation of the New Testament into modern *Greek*. It will be seen from the remarks I have made upon the nature of this Version, what advantage it affords us for the genuineness of the Text of St. *John's* Epistle.

Lastly, we shall find in this Discourse an authentic Piece never yet produced, and which gives the finishing stroke to all the proofs urged for the genuineness of this Text; and this is the extract of an ancient *Greek* Manuscript of the New Testament found at *Dublin* in the University Library. I am indebted for this Extract to the good nature and zeal of Mr. *Ycard*, formerly Minister in *France*, and now Dean of *Aconry* at *Dublin*. I received it about the end of last *October*, when I began to recover from a languishing state of illness, which joined to my great age, was likely to put an end to my life. It was no small joy to me to see the sacred Text, which found so many contradictors, arise from the obscurity in which it had lain hid with the Manuscript that contains it. Mr. *Ycard* sent me a very long discourse with the Extract, which tended to show that this Manuscript is the same which was expressed in the *English Polyglot* by the name of *Mont*. abridged from that of *Montfortius*, to whom it had formerly belonged, and which was afterward the famous *Usher's*, Archbishop of *Armagh* in *Ireland*. I have made use of some particular observations upon divers passages of this excellent Manuscript, which are also communicated to me by the same Mr. *Ycard*, with whom I have since had, upon this occasion, correspondence by Letters. If I had judged it necessary to produce a greater number of this sort of particulars, I should not have failed to do it; but I contented myself with those which have

appeared to me most proper to show the nature of the Manuscript, whose testimony and authority are so advantageous to the proofs I have urged for the genuineness of the passage of St. *John's* Epistle. They have required a Manuscript owned to be ancient and genuine, which has this passage; here is one found and produced; thanks to the Divine Providence which has preserved it to us, to take away all pretense from the incredulity of the one, and to confirm the Faith of the others.

.....

### REGARDING REWORKING THE TEXT INTO MORE MODERN AND READABLE ENGLISH

THIS book was originally published in 1722, three-hundred years ago. At that time the letter “s”, unless it was the last letter in a word, looked more like an “f”. Words were used like “’twas” for “it was” and “’tis” for “it is”. The adjective “its”, *of or relating to it or itself as possessor or object of an action*, was spelled “it’s”, *which is a contraction for “it is” or “it has”*. Also many words that ended in *ed* such as *placed*, were spelled *plac’d*. The word *complete* was spelled *compleat*. In my effort to bring this work before the public in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, I took the liberty to modernize the *spelling* and *punctuation*, but WITHOUT (being very careful not to) change any meaning of the text.

Also, many words used 300 years ago have become obsolete. When I encountered such words, I consulted various dictionaries and other sources for definitions and clarifications. Any footnotes inserted for this purpose are accompanied by my initials RVH.

Ray V. Hoggard

January, 2023

## An Explanation Regarding the Greek “Translation”

The original file contained various cursive symbols to represent the combination of Greek letters for various Greek words, prefixes, or suffixes. Here are three simple examples: (1) the symbol “κ̄” with a grave or varia accent mark over it stands for the Greek word καὶ; (2) the symbol that looks like the number “8” with the top opened or cut off represented the Greek diphthong “ου”; (3) the Greek letter “τ” with a small squiggly line above it that resembles a very small “m” is a symbol for the Greek article “των.” Other examples are where the Greek letter has two dots above it; like “τ̄” or “ᾱ” with two dots above them. In fact on page 170 in the original document there is a comparison of the Greek word μαρτυροῦντες. The Manuscript of the Council has it spelled as μαρτυροῦντες. The Manuscript of Dublin has it spelled with the last letter being “τ̄” with two dots above it. This “τ̄” with two dots above it is the Greek symbol for “τες” showing that the two words are identical and not different words. The unique letter “ς̄” is sometimes found in the middle of a word and it is almost identical to the final sigma (“ς”) but if one looks closely he can see the difference. The symbol “π̄” is for Greek letter “π” and in some cases I substituted it accordingly except when it was used in comparing two separate manuscripts or readings where this was the only difference in the spelling of the same word. Another difficulty was where there were markings or blurred characters as a result of being unable to obtain a clear copy from the older PDF document. This may have caused me to overlook, miss, or add an accent mark or letter in some cases. Obviously, this is a danger in trying to convert or retype an older document from a PDF or image format into a text document. There are some letters with their accent marks that are questionable that are also shaded with green. This made the “translation” of the Greek to match what we normally see in our modern Greek New Testament or interlinear extremely tedious and difficult. For the Greek scholar or for the individual that desires to see the exact difference supplied by the writer, I would suggest that he study the original document for a better picture and clearer understanding as shown by the author. While I tried to be totally accurate it is likely that I overlooked some spellings or accent marks that matched the original text. It is hoped that you will cast a mantle of charity

over the imperfections of my attempt to provide an accurate “translation” of the Greek letters, words, phrases, or verses.

Jimmy Barber  
November, 2022



## THE CONTENTS.

### PART I.

In which it is most evidently shown, that the *Latin Church* has always owned this Text to be authentic

#### CHAP. I.

*THAT to maintain the genuineness of this Text is of great importance to the doctrine of the Trinity.* Page 1

#### CHAP. II.

*The Text of the three witnesses in Heaven cleared up, for the better understanding the importance and force of it, which were spoken of in the foregoing Chapter.* p. 6

#### CHAP. III.

*Of the nature of the proofs on which the genuineness of the Text of the three witnesses in Heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, must be established; and of the nullity of those, which are urged against it.* p. 16

#### CHAP. IV.

*That the Text of the three witnesses in Heaven was from the first Ages in the Italic version, proved from the quotations of Tertullian and St. Cyprian.* p. 20

#### CHAP. V.

*Other proofs that the Text of the witnesses in Heaven was in the old Italic version.* p. 27

#### CHAP. VI.

*Containing some new reflections upon the Profession of Faith, which was presented to Huneric by the African Bishops.* p. 33

## THE CONTENTS.

## CHAP. VII.

*Other quotations of the Italic Version in favour of the passage in St. John's Epistle, taken from two ancient Tracts, ascribed to St. Fulgentius* p. 38

## CHAP. VIII.

*Of the judgment St. Jerome has made of this Text, in his Prologue to the seven Catholic Epistles.* p. 41

## CHAP. IX.

*That the Text of the three witnesses, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one, was always in St. Jerome's Version.* p. 47

## CHAP. X.

*What judgment must be passed upon the Latin Manuscripts of the Vulgate of St. Jerome, which have not the Text of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.* P. 51

## PART II.

In which, the passage of St. *John's* Epistle, *There are three in Heaven, &c.* is proved to be genuine from the *Greek* Copies, and the use of the *Greek* Church.

## CHAP. I.

*THAT the two ancient Latin Versions. the Italic and the Vulgate of St. Jerome, are a proof that the disputed passage was in the Greek Copies.*  
p.56

## THE CONTENTS.

## CHAP. II.

*Of the first Greek Editions, in which the Text of the three witnesses in Heaven is read, and of those in which this Text is not inserted.* p. 60

## CHAP. III.

*The passage of St. John proved to be genuine from the Greek Manuscripts with some particular considerations upon the Manuscripts of Laurentius Valla, upon that of Complutum, and that of England or the Codex Britannicus.* p. 65

## CHAP. IV.

*Of Robert Stephens's Manuscripts.* p. 74

## CHAP. V.

*Of the obelus placed in the middle of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse, There are three in Heaven, &c. of the Manuscripts mentioned by the Divines of Louvain, and of that of which F. Amelotte says he saw at Rome.* p. 80

## CHAP. VI.

*A Defense of the Manuscripts of Robert Stephens against certain Manuscripts produced from the Library of the King of France, which are pretended to be the same that Stephens used in his Editions.* p. 89

## CHAP. VII.

*Of the Manuscript of Berlin.* p. 101

## CHAP. VIII.

*Particular reflections upon the genuineness or forgery of the Manuscript of the Greek New Testament which is at Berlin in the King's Library.* p. 107

## THE CONTENTS.

## CHAP. IX.

*Of the ancient Greek Writers, who have quoted this Text of the first Epistle of St. John, There are three, which bear record, &c.* p. 119

## CHAP. X.

*That the Greek Church has always owned this Text to be genuine: proved from its Rituals, its Confessions of faith, and the testimony of the Muscovite Church.* p. 124

## CHAP. XI.

*Of the Version of the New Testament in modern Greek, by Maximus a Monk, of Gallipolis, in which is the Text of the three witnesses in Heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.* p. 132

## CHAP. XII.

*Of the ancient Greek Manuscript found at Dublin, which has the passage that makes the subject of this Dissertation.* p. 136

## CHAP. XIII.

*The Panoplia dogmatica of Euthymius Zygabenus, the Manuscript of Dublin, the Greek Translation of the Council of Latran, and the Codex Britannicus of Erasmus, blended together, and reciprocally giving light to each other, in behalf of the genuineness of the passage of St. John, There are in Heaven, which bear record, &c.* p. 146

## CHAP. XIV.

*A brief recapitulation of the principal proofs urged for the genuineness of the passage of St. John's first Epistle, There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.* p. 154

\*  
*The 7<sup>th</sup> Verse of the v<sup>th</sup> chapter of St. John's first Epistle, There are three, &c. proved to be genuine beyond all Exception, from the ancient Latin Bibles, the Quotations of the Fathers, the Testimony of the Greek Church, and lastly from an old Greek MS. of the New Testament in the Library at Dublin.*

## **PART I.**

In which it is most evidently shown, that the *Latin* Church has always owned this Text to be authentic.

### **CHAP. I.**

*That to maintain the genuineness of this Text is of great importance to the doctrine of the Trinity.*

THE first ground of all religion in general is to believe that there is a God; and the great foundation of the Christian Religion in particular, is to believe three divine Persons in one only and the same divinity. The sole light of natural reason may suffice to every one, who is carefully attentive to consult it, for the simple belief of a God, an eternal and almighty Being, from whom everything that exists has derived its original; but the brightest and purest lights of natural reason, could never attain to the belief of one God in three Persons; faith alone can soar so high, and that only by the assistance of divine Revelation. This Revelation is contained in the Holy Scripture, but is most plainly disclosed in the Books of the New Testament. The great truth of one God in three Persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, which lay hid to all human understanding, and in the first ages of the Church was discerned by faith amidst the shadows of an obscure Revelation, has happily seen that obscurity disappear at the approach of the Gospel day: faith is no longer at a loss to acknowledge

that to be there, which it finds spread through every part; since with God the Father is in all places found the Son of God, his only Son, his own Son, Creator of the world; and with this eternal Son, the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, the Author and principle of the faith of the elect, the adorable source of all spiritual gifts, and sanctifier of souls. These three divine Persons are seen together in several Texts of Holy Scripture, in which their distinction is so clearly expressed, that faith discerns them with the eye that reads them. The command which *Jesus Christ* gave the Apostles to baptize *in the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, has rendered the Trinity of persons in one Godhead in a manner visible in Baptism: the distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, each with the essential characters of true God, presents itself at one single view in the xii<sup>th</sup> chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, from the 4<sup>th</sup> verse to the 11<sup>th</sup> inclusively: and the Prayer of St. *Paul* for the same *Corinthians* at the close of his second Epistle has united these three adorable Persons, as forming all three together the fruitful source of all benedictions. *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, (i.e. God the Father,) and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with you all.* Lastly, the Apostle St. *John* in the 7<sup>th</sup> verse of the v<sup>th</sup> chapter of his first general Epistle presents at once the same Trinity of divine Persons, and in a manner so express, that it is impossible not to be sensible of it: *There are three, says he, which bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.*

Heresy has formed no opposition against the genuineness of the three other passages I have just mentioned; it has been contented to elude their force and conviction, as well as it could: but for the latter, which is that of St. *John*, it cannot resolve with itself to own it for the genuine Text of the Apostle. For fifteen hundred years a forced silence has been kept as to this matter; but the farther ages have been advanced, and the more remote they are grown from those first times, when the Churches had that Scripture in

the holy Apostle's own hand writing, the *antitrinitarian* heresy has become proportionately bold to deny, that this sacred Text was really St. *John's*. This happened not until after the year one thousand five hundred and eighteen, or twenty; as I have observed in my Dissertation upon this celebrated Text.

It has found, and yet finds, among the Orthodox, zealous defenders of its genuineness, and their zeal is so far from being *without knowledge*, that on the contrary it proceeds from the exact enquiry they have made into this particular subject. If among the real Christians, who sincerely believe the mystery of the Trinity, some persons are found, who dazzled with the false light of the objections brought by the Heterodox, continue in a manner undetermined whether this Text be genuine or no; I will venture to say, that it is only for want of giving themselves the trouble to weigh maturely the reasons on both sides: they might find in my Dissertation all those of the opposite party, with the solid answers I have given to them, and against which the enemy of the Text I have defended has been able to make but slender efforts; but for the proofs which make out this passage to be genuine, they are so evident and strong in the same Discourse, and will receive such an additional augmentation in this, that for the future no doubt can remain concerning a truth of this importance.

To this want of examination and study, there is joined in some men's minds, I know not what confidence in the other proofs of the adorable Trinity, taken from passages which the Heretics do not dispute to be genuine; and imagining hereupon that this may be dispensed with, they do not think themselves much concerned to retain it. We have, say they, so many others, which teach us this profound mystery, and even several that are no less strong than that of St. *John*, that nothing would be lost, though we had not this passage, or though the question should be left undetermined, whether it really belongs to the Epistle of that Apostle, or is an interpolation.

I own, I find no edification in such an opinion, and in my judgment a Christian ought not to be so indifferent concerning a passage, which he finds in the Holy Scriptures. If the Holy Ghost has placed it there, it is a crime to give it up to the audacious criticism of the enemies to the doctrine it contains; and I conceive nothing more injudicious, I will even say, nothing which comes nearer contempt, than to assert that this Text may well be dispensed with, for this frivolous reason, because we have many others in which the doctrine of the Trinity is clearly made good. The opposite error could not be better gratified, than by seeing a Text disappear, by which it finds itself confounded. It yields, it falls under the weight of the rest, but this gives the finishing stroke, and prevents all means of rising again. In all the other Texts, that are urged against it, the three Persons of the Trinity are seen; but they are in none set down by the precise number *three*; that of the Epistle of St. *John* is the only one where this number is expressed, and it is by the force of the word *three*, that the ancient Fathers opposed the error of *Praxeas*, and of *Sabellius*, who acknowledging in the Divinity the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, yet refused to allow of *three*, and made but one person, of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The *Arians* have, with us, owned the *three*; and having formed after their manner a sort of Trinity, they baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, without owning the Son to be God co-essential with the Father, but God notwithstanding, according to their deceitful way of explication, as the *Socinians* do now; and for the Holy Spirit, they made such a person of him, as they pleased, and their heresy could admit of; but they did not own him to be God, as the Son, nor did they believe him to be a divine Person. It is for this reason I have said in my Examination against Mr. *Emlyn*, that they did not own the Holy Ghost *to be a person really existing*, so as to make with the Father and the Son a Trinity of divine Persons. According to them, the Holy Ghost is but a kind of Angel, who was created by the Son, and is

infinitely inferior to him.

However it be, the *Arians* have owned three persons. Now the Texts which I have quoted, *viz.* that of the administration of Baptism, and the two others, taken from the Epistle of St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, go no farther than to denote these three persons. To convince then the *Arians* entirely by one Text of Scripture, in this Text the Trinity and Unity both together must be equally set before their eyes; for it is the unity in the number three, which is the stumbling-block to the *Arians* and the subject of their incredulity. The only Text which comprehends all this, (the Trinity, I say, and the Unity,) is this passage of St. *John*, *There are three, which bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.* If the *Arian* gives me up this Text, he leaves in my hands the strongest weapon I can employ against him, and he will hope in vain to secure himself by mean subtleties and imaginary distinctions. The advantage then, which so visibly accrues to us from these words against the most pestilent of all heresies, the *Arian* or *Socinian*, should make it be looked on, at least by all the Christians who believe the mystery of the Trinity, as an Apostolic Text, and entirely remove from their minds, that sort of indifference, which they pretend to have for its being authentic. If those, who openly oppose it, as the *Socinian* party does, or those who waver betwixt its being genuine and supposititious, had arguments to urge against us, which it was not possible to give very satisfactory solutions to; or if we, who defend its genuineness, had not any good proofs to support it, I own that in all these cases it would be the wisest conduct to suspend our judgment upon a question of fact, which might then pass for problematical: but this Text is found in all our Bibles; it is in all the Greek Editions of the New Testament, except three only, two of *Erasmus*, and one of *Aldus*; the whole Church owns it to be genuine, and this is enough to form a conclusion in favour of its being so. But should they yet urge against all this, arguments which were very near

of the same force, and which might justly strike upon the mind; then, I say, there might be room for doubts and uncertainties. But the case is very different: The evidence, force, and number of proofs all speak the passage of the three witnesses in heaven to be genuine, and they have nothing to urge against it, but conjectures drawn from the silence of some old *Greek*, and *Latin* Fathers, of some MSS. of the New Testament, in which this passage is not found; and lastly, of some ancient Versions, in which it is wanting. As for real proofs, and proofs of fact which impugn this passage, and are contradictory to those which are drawn from the ancient Versions, the quotations of antiquity, and the *Greek* and *Latin* MSS to show that it really belongs to the Epistle of St. *John*, they have not been able to produce one, after so many attempts they have made to find it; and without any hazard, I will venture to say, they never will find one of this sort.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

## CHAP. II

*The Text of the three witnesses in heaven cleared up, for the better understanding the importance and force of it, which were spoken of in the foregoing Chapter.*

THE first thing, which here offers itself to be cleared up, and which may create some difficulty in the minds of those persons, who rather seek for a pretense to doubt of the Text's being genuine, than to be convinced of its authority, is that it is there said of the three witnesses, that they bear record *in heaven*: for how is it possible, they straight cry, that an Apostle should have said, that it is in heaven the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost bear record in honour of Jesus Christ, in order to prove that he is really the Son of God, and the *Messiah*? A testimony is given in the places, and before the Persons, it is necessary it should be given, either through ignorance of the matter in debate, or the contradictions that incredulity

opposes to it; but as nothing of all this can be found in heaven, of what use are these witnesses and their testimony? I have slightly touched upon this small difficulty in my *Dissertation*, and in my *Examination*; but because without enlarging farther upon it, I contented myself with saying, that it was one of those transpositions of words, which are very common in all languages, especially in the more ancient; and that even divers instances were seen of it in Holy Scripture, without giving myself the pains to produce one, it will not be inexpedient, if as I design in this treatise to take my leave of this passage, (that I may not return to it again,) I should here set down some instances of transpositions of words in the style of the sacred Writers. I say then that these two words *in heaven* are transposed in the Text under examination, and put out of their natural and grammatical place; for instead of saying, *there are three that bear record in heaven*, the order of the construction in the *Greek* phrase should be, *there are three in heaven that bear record*. I have observed that *Socinus* himself has allowed of this in his Commentary upon these words of the Epistle of St. *John*, and I have withal insinuated in favour of those, who are not acquainted with the *Greek* tongue, that the transposition of these words is far less sensible in the phrase of the Original, than in our Versions; but if instances are required, here are some taken from the Old and New Testament.

We read in the book of Genesis, chapter xv. verse 13, these words of God to *Abraham*; *Know of a surety, that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred years*. These words *four hundred years* are most certainly there out of their true place; for the bondage and persecution of the people of God in *Egypt* endured but about an hundred years, as I have shown in my note upon this passage: thus these last words must be construed with that of *being* or *sojourning*, which is in the beginning of the verse; *thy seed shall be a stranger four hundred years, &c.* which was verified in

the abode they made in *Canaan* and *Egypt*. Here then is a transposition somewhat more harsh, than the bare placing the two words of St. John's passage out of their natural order.

In the Epistle to the *Romans*, these last words of the 4th verse of the 1<sup>st</sup> chapter, *Jesus Christ our Lord*, should be joined to these *concerning his Son*, which are at the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> verse. In the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, chapter i. verse 3. *their Lord and ours*, are also out of their natural place. In the 2 *Cor.* chapter v. verse 19, we see a transposition, which small as it is, has yet given place to an observation not worthy the Divines who have made it: The words of the Text are, *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself*: The word *reconciling* is transposed from the verb *was*, with which it must be construed in this manner, *God was reconciling the world*, that is, *God has reconciled the world* to himself by *Jesus Christ*; this transposition is evident, yet for want of attending to it, many of those ancient Divines, who out of respect are styled by the venerable name of *Fathers*, reading *God was in Christ*, and stopping there, as if these words made the sense complete without the word following, have formed them into a proof of the essential unity of *Jesus Christ* with the Father, and to show that the Divinity of the Father was the same as in the Son.

Lastly, (for to what purpose should we multiply instances in so clear a case?) in the 8th verse of the xvii<sup>th</sup> chapter of the Revelation, mention is made of those, *whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world*: Now who is there that does not see these words *from the foundation of the world* are transposed, and that they should be joined in this manner to the foregoing word, were not written *from the foundation of the world*? Thus then in the Text of the same Apostle by placing backward the words *in heaven* before that of *bearing witness or record*, (for this word precisely answers to the *Greek* phrase,) our translation will stand thus; *There are three in heaven which bear record*,

&c. for it is thus in reality that this Text is quoted in the dispute printed among the works of St. *Fulgentius*, against *Pinta the Arian*; *Tres funt in coelo qui testimonium reddunt*, &c. “There are three in heaven which bear record, &c.”

After having thus first cleared up the phrase of the sacred Text, we must come to the subject itself, and enquire narrowly into it.

I find three sorts of heresies which have been started one after another against the sacred Trinity, a sublime truth which has always been a stumbling stone to the pride and haughtiness of human understanding. The first of these heresies was that of *Praxeas* in the second Century, and pushed on with yet more vigour by *Sabellius* in the age following. It allowed of the sole person of the Father in the Divinity, and reduced the Son and Holy Ghost to mere names, or attributes, of the person of the Father.

The second *antitrinitarian* heresy was that of *Arius*, a Century after. This at the first solely terminated in the person of the Son, depriving him of the degree of perfect and eternal equality which he has with the Father, in order to place him a degree lower, and leaving him only a sort of resemblance with the person of the Father; a God, without being God. As to what regards the Holy Ghost, we do not learn from history that *Arius* in the beginning fell foul upon his divinity, but we may well imagine, that his judgment was not more sound with reference to him than to the person of the Son: what followed soon made it appear; the Holy Ghost was degraded by that heresy of the dignity of God; they did not leave him the very name; they made him no more, as I have already observed, than a sort of Angel, created by the Son.

In these last times *Socinus* invented a third heresy, which is in a manner made up of the two foregoing: It approaches to that of the *Sabellians* in this, that it confounds the Holy Ghost with the person of the Father, not

allowing the Spirit, or Holy Ghost, to be a person, but merely spiritual gifts, which being named in Scripture the Spirit, or the Holy Ghost, are there in some sort *personalized*, that is, described and represented under the name of Spirit, as if they were a Person. On the other hand the heresy of *Socinus* adheres to that of *Arius* in this, that it takes away from the Son the quality of true God co-essential with the Father, and co-eternal; and makes him no more than a *titulary* God, in virtue of his offices and dignity: But *Socinus* does not pretend that the Son had any real existence before he was born of *Mary*; whereas *Arius*, in part at least, keeping more closely to the Texts of the Holy Scripture, which express the eternity of the Son, left him a part, or shadow of that eternity, by saying that he was created of the Father before all Worlds.

The Text, which I undertake to defend, is equally opposite to all these heretics. It manifestly destroys that of *Sabellius*, who owned but one Person in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, whereas this Text says there are three.

By the same number of three thus distinctly specified, at the same time, the impious boldness of *Socinus* is confounded; for as he resolves not to own the Holy Ghost for a Person, but only for the spiritual and divine gifts of the eternal Father, it is then the same thing as the Father himself in these gifts; so that there remains no more than these two, the Father and the Son; whereas this Text of St. *John* reckons up *three*.

The heresy of *Arius* admits of all *three*, since it acknowledges three persons, but it cannot show us three *witnesses*; and yet it is this the Text clearly teaches us. In short, if the Son, as *Arius* pretends by reducing him to the number of the creatures, be only the Minister of the Father, and the Holy Ghost the Minister of the Father and the Son, there will be no more than one witness, which is the Father; for whether he has given his witness himself immediately, or has caused it to be given by his Son, and by the Holy Ghost, it is always himself, properly speaking, who is the witness:

Now St. *John* says *three witnesses*; in like manner as he says afterward, *three that bear record in earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood*: and as these last are not really three witnesses, but because the Testimony of the one is not comprehended in the testimony of the other, so that it is not the Spirit itself, which bears record by the Water, nor the Water by the Blood; in like manner that they may be three witnesses in Heaven, each of these three must be himself a witness, and not all be only one of them, who after having given witness himself, bears record again by the two others.

Thus these two heresies, that of *Arius*, which for above two hundred years stirred up the East, the West, and the South against the Christian Faith; and the heresy of *Socinus*, the fatal off-spring of the former, are separately opposed by these words of the sacred Text, *There are three that bear record in heaven*. But those which the Apostle adds at the close of the verse, fall upon all these heresies joined together, and strike them down at one blow: *These three*, says he, *are one*. The *Arian* and the *Socinian* would willingly give us up the *three*, if this number, reduced to one, was not the total overthrow of their heresy; thus they do all they can to secure themselves from the stroke. By these extraordinary words, three are one, the unity of nature in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, presents itself without difficulty to the understanding and faith of a Christian, which has its nurture in the sacred Scriptures; and the whole ancient Church saw there this adorable unity with the same eyes, that we see it there now; we have proof of this in *Tertullian*, in St. *Cyprian*, in *Vigilius*, in S. *Fulgentius*, and in three or four hundred African Bishops, who all acknowledged and adored the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as being but one God; and have all said with St. *John*, *These three are one*.

The *Greek* word of the original, ἓν, which is of the gender which the Grammarians call the *neuter*, cannot be explained in our language but by the word *thing*, that is, *one* thing; and this expression is somewhat

indeterminate, and does not give a distinct idea of the particular subject of which it is to be understood; so the *Greek* word *ἓν* is also a vague expression, the meaning of which depends upon the subject it is applied to. The *Socinian* and the *Arian* take an advantage from this general way of speaking, and by *the thing* of which St. *John* says, *these three are one and the same thing*, they understand one and the same will, one opinion, one testimony in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. To favour this explication; they defend themselves with some other Texts of Scripture, where the same word *ἓν* denotes this sort of moral unity, improperly so called, which is nothing else, but a sort of agreement of opinions, or state, and condition, between different persons. The most expressive of these passages are taken from the xvii<sup>th</sup> chapter of St. *John*'s Gospel, in which the Prayer of *Jesus Christ* to God his Father is recited: *Holy Father*, says he recommending to him his disciples, whom he was shortly to leave behind him, *keep through thine own name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one.—Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also that shall believe on me through their word, that they also may be one in us.—And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one, as we are one,—that they may be made perfect in one.* In all these verses, where the expression that *they may be one*, and *we are one*, which is the same with that of the Text in St. *John*'s Epistle, returns so often; it is evident, that it is there used in two different senses, in one it signifies an *unity of opinions*, in opposition to all schism and division among themselves; and in the other it denotes an unity of happiness and glory, after they shall have finished their ministry in holiness, that *they may be made perfect in one*. The first of these two senses only can have been transferred by our adversaries upon these words of St. *John*'s Epistle, namely, the unity of will, sentiment, and testimony.

The Abbot *Joachim*, who at the close of the 12<sup>th</sup> Century seems to have had a design of introducing *Arianism* afresh, did not fail to refer these

words of *Jesus Christ*, that they *may be one*, to those of the Text of the three witnesses in heaven, *these three are one*, as parallel passages. The modern *Arians*, and the *Socinians*, their companions, urge the same conformity of passages in their defense, and not only make them their strong-hold, but I may venture to say, their only one.

Before I lay open the weakness of it, I shall make one general remark, the application of which will be very easy to the present subject; and this is, that in several Texts of Scripture one and the same expression, or one and the same phrase; has different meanings, according to the different subjects they relate to. I have given several instances of this in the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of the second part of my Discourse of revealed Religion. At present I will content myself with these two. It is said in the vii<sup>th</sup> chapter of the Book of *Job*, *What is man that thou visitest him?* We read also these words in the viii<sup>th</sup> *Psalms*, but the sense is certainly not the same in these two places; as is easily to be seen. It is said in several places of the sacred Books, that *God takes away Sins*, and that he *blots them out*: The same thing is also said of *Jesus Christ*, that he *takes away our sins*, and that he *blots them out*, or *wipes them away*; yet this is in very different senses: God takes them away by *pardon*; *Jesus Christ* takes them away by *expiation*. A bare conformity sometimes sufficing thus to make use of the same terms upon different subjects. We have a proof of this ready in the passages of *Jesus Christ's* prayer, which they compare with the Text of *St. John's* Epistle. Will anyone venture to say, that in the words of *Jesus Christ*, that they *may be one as we are one*, the expression *to be one*, which is found there twice together, is absolutely in the same sense, and not barely in a sense of conformity, and by a sort of resemblance?

I know very well that the *Arian* and *Socinian* would persuade us that the case is thus, in order to reduce the unity of the Son with the Father to a bare unity of will and sentiments, such as that of the Disciples with each other was, and thus to take away from *Jesus Christ* that adorable

unity, by which he is co-essential with his Father. These unhappy heretics turn all their thoughts this way; but to compass their point they must first take away from *Jesus Christ* the title of *God*, of *true God*, of the *great God*, which the Scripture ascribes to him; they must deprive him of the august dignity of *Creator*, and that of *God over all, blessed for ever*, which the same Scripture attributes to him. Could they indeed show that *Jesus Christ* is no more than merely the Minister of the eternal Father, then truly they might find the unity he has with his Father to be no other than that which the Disciples had with one another, an unity of sentiments, and not an unity of essence and nature: But when will they be able to take away from *Jesus Christ* all these sublime characters of Divinity?

Let us suppose for a moment, with *Arius* and *Socinus*, that the Son is only a creature of the first rank, and that the Holy Ghost, as *Arius* taught, is of an order far inferior to the Son, a Spirit created by him; or, as *Socinus* has imagined, the spiritual gifts, *personalized* under the name of *Spirit*; would there be the bare shadow of good sense in placing them in company with the person of the Father, the sovereign and eternal God, so as to say, that *they are one with him*, under pretext that they had no other Sentiments than he? I should as soon choose to say it of an Angel, and of one of the glorified Saints, since this Angel and Saint can have no other will than that of God; and yet what man will attempt to make them one with God, and say of them, as St. *John* has said of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, *these three are one*? Let them own then, that these words of the sacred Text have a sense infinitely more profound than that of an unity of sentiments and will, and consequently that they express that unity of essence and nature, which makes the three to be but one God.

It is with this passage as with that of the institution of Baptism, *in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. The ancient Fathers, who have quoted these words against the *Arians*, have observed that it is

not said, *in the names, in nominibus*, in the plural; but *in the name, in nomine*, in the singular, as designing an authority common to these three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the unity of nature being thus included in the unity of *Name*, which is that of God, since Baptism is administered in the name of God alone. As then the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are joined together in Baptism under this unity of Name, which is no other than the very unity of a God, it must necessarily be thus in these words of St. *John*, *these three are one*.

The illusion which is formed in the explication of these words arises from the name of *witnesses*, which is there given to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; for from thence they conceive that they may terminate in their testimony, and signify that *these three are one*, as witnesses, and with regard to the record they have borne.

But the falsity of this notion may easily be perceived by comparing a testimony with proofs. When these different proofs of one and the same fact are alleged, they will never say that they are one and the same thing, though they all tend to the same purpose, because the one is not the other. To be able then to say of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, *these three are one*, from an unity of Testimony, their testimony must necessarily have been but one and the same; but this is not fact, for the Father has borne witness in one manner, the Son in another, and the Holy Ghost in another also, so that they were really three different witnesses of one and the same truth. And as the three proofs of a fact respect the same fact, yet without being one and the same thing; so these three testimonies, that of the Father, that of the Son, and that of the Holy Ghost, do not make these three witnesses to be one, since their testimonies are in number three, (very distinct, and not capable of being confounded one with another,) though they have all three reference to the same subject. This is so evidently true, that St. *John* has expressed himself in a very different manner, when after having said of the witnesses in heaven, *these three are*

*one*, he came to speak of the three witnesses in earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood; for he did not then go on to say, *these three are one*, but changing entirely both the idea and expression, he has said, *these three agree in one*; because in reality these three last being each of a different nature from the other, he could only say, that they had relation to the same thing. Will they never open their eyes to see so clear a difference, and discern a truth which is so evidently displayed in the very Text of St. *John*?

From all that I have said in this and the foregoing Chapter, I deduce the confirmation and proof of what I had proposed to make good, namely, that it is the honour and interest of every person, who is really orthodox, constantly to defend the genuineness of St. *John*'s passage, against the artifice of the modern heretics, who use their utmost endeavour to degrade it, or if they cannot do that, at least to render it dubious.

.....

### CHAP. III.

*Of the nature of the proofs on which the genuineness of the Text of the three witnesses in heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, must be established; and of the nullity of those, which are urged against it.*

IT would be of no service, that these words contained the great and sublime notion of the Trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in one only divine nature, if they did not really belong to St. *John*, and were fraudulently inserted into his Epistle, for the support of the doctrine of the Trinity. We are therefore now to enquire into the nature of the proofs for and against the truth of this passage.

When the wonderful art of printing Books, which till then were all Manuscripts, was found out about the middle of the fifteenth Century,

divers Bibles were printed in several Countries from the Manuscripts which were in the hands of all the World, and the Text here in dispute was inserted in the Epistle of St. *John*, in the same place and after the same manner it has been ever since. No person exclaimed against these impressions; they had then the same MSS. they have now, in which this passage is wanting, but this was not thought of moment against its being authentic; they judged it to be a mere omission in these MSS., a case which was not peculiar to this Text; nothing on the other hand being more frequent than such omissions in written Copies. This solemn acquiescence of all Christians in favour of a Text which they were accustomed to read in the Epistle of St. *John*, cannot be validly contradicted but by strong and solid arguments to prove the Text supposititious. If we could have recourse to the original copy of the Epistle, the matter would soon be decided, but in all likelihood it is now above fifteen hundred years since the original of the Canonical Epistles were lost; the transcripts which have been made from age to age, and the early Versions into the vulgar tongue of the people then alive, are since that time the only means, by which we can be assured of the truth of facts of this kind. The Books of the New Testament were written in the *Greek* language, and consequently the *Greek* Editions must have been made from *Greek* MSS. The *Latin* is the language of the most ancient Version of these sacred Books; and it is thus the *Latin* Editions must have been made from the *Greek*. If those who published the first *Greek* Editions of the Epistle of St. *John*, and who have inserted this passage in the body of the Text, did not place it there but upon the credit of MSS. their printed Books must now have the same authority as the MSS. themselves had formerly. And for this authority of the MSS. from which the Editions were made, it is not necessary that all the rest should be found to agree with them in the Text we are upon; first, because what may have been an omission in the one is no proof of its having been an interpolation in the others; a thousand instances make out

the contrary. 2. If the *Greek* MSS. in which this Text is not, are such as want also several entire passages in divers places, which yet are owned to belong to the sacred Text, because they are in other MSS. the want of this passage in any MSS. whatever, is not a sufficient reason to conclude, that it is supposititious in the Manuscripts in which it is found. 3. The greater or smaller number of MSS. in which this passage is not read, cannot invalidate those in which it is read, no more than twenty or thirty Historians, who shall have written history, successively and in divers ages, in which a certain fact, though of very great importance, shall not be found, but which seven or eight other Historians of undoubted credit shall have mentioned, can be alleged in proof from a mere omission of this fact, against the veracity of the others, who mention it. 4. If the *Greek* Church has owned as genuine the passage, which is not found in this number of *Greek* MSS, this defect can be looked on only as a pure omission, which has passed from one to another; or which even through the inadvertency of a transcriber has been introduced into their MSS. Now what is regarded as an omission avails nothing against a passage quoted and approved; we shall see in the sequel, that it is not a supposition without ground which I here make of the judgment of the *Greek* Church in defense of the truth of this Text; I have elsewhere given certain proofs of it; and I shall yet produce others, which I am inclined to think our adversaries have not considered.

I have spoken of the ancient Versions, which may lead us back very near to the time of the Originals of the sacred Books. I do not think, that any person ever attempted to dispute the antiquity of the *Latin* Version, called the *Italic*; it is upon this that St. *Jerome* formed his Version or Correction at the close of the fourth Century, and it was this which the whole Western and Southern Church in *Europe* and in *Africa*, made use of from the age in which the Apostle St. *John* died: If then the Text of the three witnesses in heaven be found in a Version so ancient and authentic,

it is one of the strongest proofs we can have for the Texts being genuine; especially if it has been owned by the ancient Fathers, in the times, and countries, where the *Italic* Version was used by the Churches: it is a fact which I shall undertake to prove in the following Chapters, and which I hope to let in a new light, though what I have said in my Dissertation has put our adversaries out of the condition of giving any answer to it, that has so much as the appearance of reason; as may be seen in the Examination which I have written against Mr. *Emlyn*.

To return to the *Italic* Version, and the proof which we draw thence; I know not how it has happened, but those who dispute the genuineness of St. *John's* passage, urge against it the *Oriental* Versions, the *Syriac*, the *Arabic*, the *Coptic*, in which this Text is omitted. As the bare name of these Versions carries with it a certain air of learning and erudition, which is apt to dazzle and lead astray, they fail not to make a great noise about it, and as the *Syriac* is the most ancient of all these, they cry it up in such a manner as seems to bring it near to the original: they forget that it is defective in many other important Texts, as well as in that of the Epistle of St. *John*, as I have shown in my Dissertation, page 166. But the *Syriac* Version, which they have now, must not be confounded with that which was made in the first ages; the most able persons in this kind of learning are of the same opinion; and Mr. *Simon* himself thought so too, since he owns in his *Critical History*, that this Version is more modern than the *Latin* Versions, *i. e.* than the *Italic*, and even the Version of St. *Jerome*. Besides this, there are two great differences which set the *Syriac* Version far below these ancient Versions; the first consists in this, that the *Syriac* Version was used only by some people in the remotest part of the East, who understood neither *Greek* nor *Latin*, and consequently it was of no great note in the Church; whilst on the contrary the *Italic* Version first, and then the vulgate of St. *Jerome*, had a progress through all the Churches of the *Latin* World; and were received as Books of great

authority. 2. This Version fell under the eyes and pens of the most celebrated Fathers of the Church, who have quoted it in their Writings; and was also the Bible of all the Councils of *Europe* and *Africa*. Nothing in general could contribute more to the authority of this Version; as then the *Syriac* does not come near it, the omission of the passage of St. *John* in this Version cannot balance the authority of the *Italic* Version, and destroy a Text, which that has owned. What remains is to bring proof of this; and that shall be the subject of several following Chapters; for it is too copious to be confined to one.

.....

#### CHAP. IV.

*That the Text of the three witnesses in heaven was from the first Ages in the Italic Version, proved from the quotations of Tertullian and St. Cyprian.*

IT is not from the MSS. themselves of the *Italic* Version, that we can know whether such or such a passage was in it; these MSS. have been lost for many ages: Time which consumes everything, and carelessness in preserving them, not only in the hands of private persons, but withal in the Libraries of Convents, Princes, and learned Men, who were curious in these matters, has so ordered it, that not one Copy, as I know of, of this famous Version of the New Testament is now extant. From the time that St. *Jerome's* gained the ascendant over the *Italic* in the Churches, as being far more correct than the copies of the former were, into which, through the succession of time, a great number of faults were crept, the MSS. of that Version were by little and little suffered to be lost. All that we have of it is in the Writings of the Fathers, who have made Commentaries upon some Books of the New Testament; or in the quotations of several Texts of that ancient Version, in divers passages of their Works.

The most ancient Book, in which the passage of St. *John* is quoted, is the Treatise of *Tertullian* against the heretic *Praxeas*; it would be impossible to go back to a more remote age, since *Tertullian* lived in the same age this famous Version was made, namely, the second Century. I have quoted the passage, which regards this Text, in my Dissertation, and I would not return to it now, if I had not new observations to make upon it, in order to defend it against the false glosses of those persons, who allege that *Tertullian* had not the passage of St. *John* in view, under pretense that he has not made an express quotation. It is thus that ancient Doctor speaks in the 25<sup>th</sup> chapter against *Praxeas*. “*Jesus Christ* speaking of the Holy Ghost said, *He shall take of mine*, as of himself had taken of the Father; and thus the connection of the Father with the Son, and of the Son with the Holy Ghost causes these three to be united together; *which three are one*, as it is said, *I and my Father are one*.” There we see clearly expressed the last words of the passage in St. *John*’s Epistle, *Three are One*; in like manner as we see there the very words of *Jesus Christ* in the x<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the same Apostle’s Gospel, *I and the Father are one*. *Tertullian* has not been content with barely quoting the words of the Epistle, *Tres unum funt*, but he has withal made there an observation, in order to illustrate the sense, and to show that the word *Unum* has express relation to the nature and essence of the three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and not to their persons, *qui tres*, says he, *UNUM funt, non UNUS*: which he confirms by the authority of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, who expressed himself after the same manner by the word *Unum*, and not by that of *Unus*, when he spoken of himself and his Father, *quomodo dictum est*, adds *Tertullian*, *Ego & Pater UNUM sumus*. Can anything be more express? Yet, instead of sincerely owning, that this is the sense and meaning of *Tertullian*, they take what pains they can to elude the force of this proof. They pretend, that it was of himself, and without a view to any particular Text of Scripture, that *Tertullian* said, *qui tret unum funt*, under

pretext that the words are put there without any sign of quotation; as if it was not very common in the writings of the Fathers, and particularly in *Tertullian*, to quote passages of Holy Scripture without any indication which marks them to be passages taken from Scripture; they need but open the Book of that ancient Doctor, and numbers of instances will offer themselves to their eyes. Was then the remark he makes upon the word *unum*, to show the great difference betwixt *unum* and *unus*, with a view towards clearing up his own expression, and not that of a sacred Text? This is absurd to imagine, and still more so, because he had just made the same observation upon the word *Unum* used by *Jesus Christ* in the 22<sup>nd</sup> chapter, *Ego & Pater UNUM sumus*, I and the Father are ONE. He said, *UNUM sumus, non UNUS sumus.—Unum dicit neutrali verbo, quod non pertinet ad singularitatem, sed ad unitatem.* “*Jesus Christ* said, *I and the Father are one*, and this *one* in the neuter gender does not imply there was but one person in God, (which was the error of *Praxeas*,) *but it denotes their unity.*” The observation then which *Tertullian* had just made upon the difference of *unum* and *unus*, to explain the meaning of these words of the Son of God, *I and the Father are one*, he here makes upon these, *three are one*, and yet they will have it, that he had not this Text of the sacred Scripture in view! I desire every person, who sincerely seeks after truth, to give heed to this observation.

A second, which terminates in the same views, and will confirm the former, is the agreement of this passage of *Tertullian* with that of *St. Cyprian* in his Book of the Unity of the Church. *St. Cyprian* joins together, as two Texts which mutually support each other, that, of *Jesus Christ*, *I and the Father are one*, and this of *St. John’s* Epistle, *it is written of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, these three are one.* Why then shall not the words *these three are one*, joined in *Tertullian* with *I and the Father are one*, and with the same design too, namely, to prove the plurality of persons in the unity of the divine nature, be the passage of *St.*

*John's Epistle, as they are in St. Cyprian?*

To dwell a little longer upon this remark. The same words, *Tres unum funt*, "Three are one," are found thus alone, and without the rest of the same Text, in *St. Cyprian's Epistle to Jubaianus*; in *Vigilius of Tapsum*, in two passages of his *Discourse concerning the Trinity*; and in the Fragments against *Fabian* among the works of *St. Fulgentius*? I here quote only the Authors, who have used the same Version with *Tertullian*. Now in all these passages the words, *three are one*, are indisputably inferred as belonging to *St. John's Epistle*: and yet they shall not have been in *Tertullian's Book*! They must have very strong proofs to convince an impartial mind of it, which shall have read the same *Italic Version* in these different Authors, and have found there the same words.

This observation leads us to a third, with which I shall conclude my reflections upon *Tertullian*. Let them maintain, as long as they will, that these words, *Three are one*, are properly *Tertullian's*, who spoke them of his own head, and without having taken them from *St. John*, upon this supposition, that they were not in the *Latin Version* of that Apostle's Epistle; they cannot at least deny, but that several of the Ancients, famous for their orthodox belief in the sacred Trinity, did read them in their days in the same Version: I have produced so many quotations of it, to which I shall presently join so many others, that this cannot be disputed me; whence then comes it, that these words, *Three are one*, shall be found in the *Italic Version* in the age of *St. Cyprian*, and the ages following; and the same words shall have been used by *Tertullian*, yet without having been in the Version, where the others found them? I believe they will wait long for an answer to this powerful difficulty, if they expect an answer that removes it: let them examine it, and look thoroughly into its consequences; I desire no more. I stop here, and pass on to *St. Cyprian*.

This holy Bishop of *Carthage*, who suffered martyrdom for the

Christian Faith in the year 258, has quoted the passage of St. *John* in two of his Treatises. He produces the last words in the Epistle to *Jubaianus*, and almost the entire passage in the Book of the Unity of the Church, and in these two places he quotes it upon different subjects. That of his Epistle to *Jubaianus* is to show the necessity there was of re-baptizing, or rather, as he expresses himself in the beginning of that Epistle, of *baptizing* those, who had received baptism in the Communion of the heretics, who did not believe the Trinity, because this could not have been looked on as true Baptism, since Baptism was conferred in the Name of the Trinity: *He who receives Baptism, says he, is sanctified and becomes the Temple of God; But of what God? Of the Creator? This cannot be, for he does not believe in him. Of Christ? But how can he be the Temple of Christ, who does not acknowledge him to be God? Is he then the Temple of the Holy Ghost, since THESE THREE ARE ONE? Cùm tres unum sint.* These words then are there quoted as a proof of the Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in one only divine essence.

He urges the same passage upon quite another design, and somewhat more at large, in his Discourse *of the Unity of the Church*. He wrote it against the schism of the *Novatians*; and he reasons there strongly, with that lively and noble eloquence, which was natural to him, against the Schism in general, in order to set out the horror of it. It is there, that, after having said, that he cannot have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his Mother, he adds, *the Lord has said, I and the Father are one; and again, it is written of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and THESE THREE ARE ONE.*

All that the enemies to the genuineness of this passage of St. *John* have been capable of imagining to render useless the express quotation St. *Cyprian* has made of it, amounts to this, that it has respect to the 8<sup>th</sup> verse, where the Apostle speaking of the three witnesses which are in Earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, says that *these three are one*, according

to the *Latin* Version, which has translated the last words of the 8<sup>th</sup> verse, and those of the 7<sup>th</sup> in the same manner, though they are very different in the *Greek*, as I have elsewhere shown. I have confuted this illusion with so much force and by such demonstrative arguments in my Critical Dissertation, that the opposite party has been at a loss what answer to give, and all that Mr. *Emlyn*, who at present maintains the contrary side in *England*, has been able to do, is to quote St. *Eucherius*, who has said that several explained the three witnesses of the 8<sup>th</sup> verse mystically of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and then to produce *Facundus*, who has observed, that St. *Cyprian* explained after this mystical manner in his Treatise of the Unity of the Church, what is there said of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. But I have given such repulsive strokes to these last efforts of a deplorable cause, in my Examination of that Writer's answer, that they have not ventured to appear again in the late Piece he has published, under the title of a *Reply to the Examination of M. Martin*: The Reply has here, as almost everywhere else, been mute, and passed over the proofs and arguments which my Book is full of, in silence and confusion. I have shown under this particular article of St. *Cyprian*, with how little understanding or justice Mr. *Emlyn* had urged the words of St. *Eucherius*; and how absurd it is to make *Facundus*, (who out of pure fancy has ascribed a meaning to him which that ancient Writer has not given the least hint of,) a supreme judge of the sense and intention of St. *Cyprian*; which will appear yet more and more from the new observations I am going to make upon it; for I avoid, as much as I can, tautology and repetition.

I begin with the Epistle to *Jubaianus*: As *Facundus* has made no mention of the passage of this Epistle which I have quoted, with regard to this he leaves us the field free, to take the quotation which St. *Cyprian* has there made of these words of St. *John*, *these three are one*, according to the sense and views which they can have there; There will be no difficulty

in being assured, that it is the unity of essence in the Father, the Creator of the World; in the Son, whose Temple no one can be, if he is not really God; and in the Holy Ghost, whose Temples likewise we are, and who is one with the Father and the Son. Now what have the *Spirit*, the *Water*, and the *Blood*, which St. *John* says are three witnesses in earth, and which are reduced to one in this, that they all three bear the same record, in common with these reasonings and these expressions? *Facundus* here fails the *Socinian*, and Reason is against him too.

Let us now bring this passage of the Epistle to *Jubaianus*, and that of the Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church both together. St. *Cyprian* had there the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood of the 8<sup>th</sup> verse no more in view, than in his Epistle to *Jubaianus*: We see there only the proper and ordinary names of the three divine persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; by what means then will they introduce the *Spirit* under the name of Father; the *Water* under the name of Holy Ghost; and the *Blood* under the name of Son? Reason will never envy an imagination, which thus abuses it. We have lately seen in *Tertullian* the Text of the Gospel, *I and the Father are one*, placed in conjunction with these words of St. *John*, *these three are one*; we find in the same manner these two passages joined together in the quotation of St. *Cyprian*, why then shall not this be here the *three one* of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse, as it is in *Tertullian*; or why shall not the *three are one* in *Tertullian* be the *three one* of the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, if it is so in St. *Cyprian*?

This reasoning is so much the more firm and solid, as St. *Cyprian* does not add these words of the Epistle of St. *John*, but in the same sense as the former, *I and my Father are one*: Now as according to him, and all the Fathers of the Church, these signify an unity of nature betwixt the Father and the Son, the same unity must be expressed in the other passage, which is parallel to the former, *these three are one*; and consequently they cannot, even in the very meaning of St. *Cyprian*, be understood of the

Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, which far from having this unity of nature, are three very different natures. But we tarry too long in answering an illusion, which has not the least appearance of reality, and in defense of which they have not been able to produce one reason, that is taken either from the language of St. *Cyprian*, or the subject of the Treatise in which this passage is read, or from any hypothesis of this holy Bishop which can favour it. Is not this to make an Author say what he has not said, and which cannot even have come into his thoughts? The Text then of the witnesses in heaven was in *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian*'s time in the *Italic Version*, and we shall see it there again in the succeeding ages.

.....

## CHAP. V.

*Other proofs that the Text of the witnesses in heaven was in the old Italic Version.*

To the age of St. *Cyprian* immediately succeeded that, in which St. *Jerome* flourished. The first *Latin Version* had already been made three hundred years, and in less time many faults must have crept into the Copies, which were continually dispersed for the use of the Churches and private Persons. It was then a trade to transcribe Books, as it is now to print them. Both learned and ignorant were equally employed in writing and copying: it was a means of getting their livelihood; and as they were more or less dexterous at it, they made their profit. Everyone, who could write and read, became his own scribe for himself and family; no person had the inspection of his work, or was appointed to make in it the necessary corrections. Books must thus often fall into bad hands, and be insensibly filled with faults. Sometimes an ignorant transcriber took one word for another, and put that which he understood in the place of that which he did not. Sometimes, wearied with a labour, which requires a

continual attention, he suffered words to escape his eyes and his pen, and even lines, especially when the one began with the same words which the other had ended with; instances of these omissions are very common in the ancient MSS. Sometimes a copier, more bold than learned, made alterations in the passage, where he thought the copy, which he transcribed, was faulty. These were so many fatal springs from whence numbers of faults arose. St. *Jerome* has specified all these sources of irregularity and defeats in his Epistle to Pope *Damasus*; who earnestly exhorted him to make an exact revise of the MSS. of the Gospels. Though this work appeared to him very toilsome and difficult, because, said he, of the great diversity he saw in the Manuscripts, and the almost innumerable faults, which had crept into them, though for the most part very slight, and which did not affect the essential of Religion, he yet resolved to undertake it. He performed it with all imaginable care, comparing several MSS. together, and forming his corrections upon the *Greek*. He did the same sometime after to the other Books of the New Testament, which makes him say in the Catalogue of his works placed at the end of his Treatise of Ecclesiastical Writers, that he had revised the New Testament by the *Greek Copies*, as he had before done that of the Old by the *Hebrew*.

The Text of the three witnesses in heaven was in the *Italic Version*, as we have seen from the use *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian* had made of it. This Version fell under the eyes of St. *Jerome*; there then he saw this sacred Text; and he saw it there, either as a fault to be corrected, or as a genuine Text. If the latter, St. *Jerome* owned it to be the Apostle St. *John*'s; if the other, he must have cast it out of the Epistle in his revise; but very far from having rejected it, he left it there with the Text of the three witnesses, which are upon earth, and the whole Church has read it there since, as it had read it there before: I have given indisputable proofs of this in my Dissertation, and shall give more in this. I speak not here of the Prologue to the seven Canonical Epistles, in which St. *Jerome* complains of some

particular Version, from which this Text was taken away, through the unfaithfulness, as he believed, of the Authors of that Version; it is a point of Criticism, upon which I have already written, and to which I shall be obliged to return, in order to remove the difficulty Mr. *Emlyn* has formed, and with which he imagines I must be very much perplexed.

Those who have read with any care the writings of St. *Jerome* cannot be ignorant, that when he has happened to deviate in some places from the *Italic* Version, he has marked them out, and given his reasons. If it was necessary to quote instances, I could give several, which withal concern only one word, or some such other inconsiderable alteration; but this would lead me too far, and carry me off too much from my subject: the matter of fact is known, and disputed by no body. If then St. *Jerome* had inserted this passage of St. *John* in his Version without having found it in *the Italic*; or having found it there did not insert it in his revise; for one of these two must necessarily be fact, is it to be conceived, that so exact and careful as he was to justify himself upon the smallest points, against his envious adversaries, who fought for an occasion to quarrel with his conduct in relation to his Version, as he has complained in several of his Epistles, yet he should have negligently forbore to set down in some of his works the reasons which he had, not to follow the ancient Version with regard to this Text, which is one of the most important in all the New Testament? His perfect silence then is a certain mark, that he had nothing to say upon it, no more than upon all the other passages, where he had left things as he found them.

This reasoning is one of those which the Philosophers name a *dilemma*, the force of which consists in an alternative, in which two cases being proposed, you must choose to admit of the one, and reject the other. Here then let them take which side they will; I matter not; my argument will always be convincing.

But what need is there to urge this reasoning from the genius and character of *St. Jerome*, when we have express proofs of the fact in question, namely, that in his time the ancient *Latin* Version contained the passage of *St. John's* Epistle? *St. Eucherius* lived at the same time with *St. Jerome*, though somewhat younger than he; the Church had then no other Version in use but the *Italic*; *St. Jerome's* revise, made at *Bethlehem*, could not yet have passed the mountains to be known in *France*, where *St. Eucherius* flourished in the famous Monastery of *Lerins*, and afterwards at *Lyons*, where he was Bishop. He has quoted in his Tract *de formulis spiritualibus* the two passages of *St. John's* Epistle, which speak of the three witnesses in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and of the three witnesses in Earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood. One cannot believe how much pains *Mr. Emlyn* has taken to invalidate this quotation; but the more he has turned about to different sides, the more he has shown the perplexity he was in, and the difficulty of getting rid of it; he himself is become so sensible of it by the answers, which I have made to all his objections, that he has prudently thought fit to be silent in the affair. One thing, which seems to have given him the most satisfaction, was an imagination, that the passage where *St. Eucherius* speaks of the three witnesses of heaven, was falsified by some transcribers, because, he said, he did not comprehend how that ancient Bishop could have quoted in the same passage the Text of the three witnesses in Earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, which were mystically explained of the three divine persons, since that of the witnesses in heaven would have proved of itself, and without recourse to mystical meanings, the Trinity of the persons in the divinity. I have shown him, that, this was an illusion, which he had formed from imagining that *S. Eucherius* quoted these two passages to prove the doctrine of the Trinity; and I next produced to him two instances taken from the Decretal Epistles of *Isidorus Mercator*, in which these two Texts of *St. John's*

Epistle are quoted together, and even with regard to this doctrine. We have withal a third instance taken from an Author more ancient than the Author of the Decretals; it is *Vigilius* Bishop of *Tapsum*, who has written so much against the *Arians*, and who has urged against them the passage of the witnesses in heaven no less than five times in divers places of his Discourse concerning the Trinity. Being at *Naples*, whither he had retired from *Africa*, that he might continue no longer exposed to the persecution of the Emperor *Huneric*, he composed under the name of *Idacius Clarus*, a famous Bishop in *Spain* in the preceding age, a Treatise against *Varimadus*, an *Arian* Deacon, in which he inserts the principal objections of the *Arians* against the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, with the answers that were to be made to them: *If they urge against you, says he, these words of the Son of God, The Father is greater than I: Answer, The Father is greater than the Son considered as man, having taken human nature upon him; but the Son is equal to the Father, in his divine nature; according to what he has said, I and the Father are one: agreeable to which is that which St. John has said in his Epistle to the Parthians, (for it is thus that several of the ancients have styled this first Epistle of St. John) There are three that bear record in earth, &c. and three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, &c.*

From this quotation I draw two advantages; the first, which is the least, is that it finally disconcerts Mr. *Emlyn's* scheme against the passage of St. *Eucherius*; the second, which is far more considerable, and is very much to my purpose, is that the Text of the witnesses in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, was in the *Italic* Version; for *Vigilius*, and the other writers of his age, made use of no other. This pious Bishop lived in the same age with St. *Jerome*; for though he had already gained a great reputation towards the close of the fourth Century, he passed a good part of his life in the fifth for which reason he is commonly ranked with the Writers of the fifth Century, with St. *Paulinus*, *Rufinus*, St. *Augustine*, and

others. This remark would not be very important, and which I should never have thought of making, if it did not serve to remove an illusion, which Mr. *Emlyn* has formed, and which he would be glad to realize to impose it upon others; which is, that says he, *Vigilius, Eugenius*, and the other Prelates, who have mentioned this Text, came too late, for they lived in the fifth Century: I have shown the extravagance of this answer, and have met with no reply: but to draw an advantage from the remark I have made upon the age in which St. *Jerome* is ranked, namely, the same with that of *Vigilius*, Bishop of *Tapsum*, and the other *African* Prelates, whom I have quoted; if the argument taken from their being of the fifth Century renders their deposition useless, what can that of St. *Jerome*, or that of St. *Augustine*, have more, unless it derives its authority from the dignity and merit of their persons; which would be the most absurd thing to urge in the world. *Vigilius* of *Tapsum* was no less religious than St. *Augustine*, and he had this advantage above him, that he suffered great persecutions in *Africa*, which had not been raised there in the time of St. *Augustine*. St. *Eugenius* also, Primate of the *African* Churches, and a Counselor for the Faith, was a person of no less dignity than the Bishop of *Hippo*; and the three or four hundred Bishops who in their profession of faith, presented to *Huneric*, defended the doctrine of the Trinity by the Text of St. *John*, *There are three which bear record in heaven, &c.* in the same age with St. *Augustine* and St. *Jerome*, amounts in my opinion to as much as a quotation which should be found among the works of those two excellent servants of God. It seems as if they had a mind to pass in the world for men who shut their eyes against the clearest truths; or who prostitute their sincerity, when they make use of such pitiful evasions.

In short, though the times had been far more distant from each other than those of St. *Jerome* and St. *Augustine* were from that of these *African* Bishops, the sole life of a man, might yet have seen them both: There were but sixty-four years from St. *Jerome* to the time these Bishops wrote; and

scarce more than fifty-two or fifty-three from the death of *St. Augustine*; now does this make it worth the while to say with scorn, they are writers of the fifth Century? If I had been in that age, and it had pleased God I had lived so long, as I have done in this, I should not only have been able to see *St. Jerome*, *Vigilius*, and the rest, but also to have exercised the sacred Ministry for near three years of *St. Augustine's* life, and withal in the days of the three hundred *African* Bishops, who drew up that excellent Confession of faith, in which the passage of *St. John* confronts the *Arian* heresy, since I have had the honour to be a Minister 77 years, and am now in the eighty-first year of my Age. Opinions may change in passing from one age to another; and in these cases it is true one cannot infer from the prevalence of such or such an opinion in the world in one age, that they had been so an age or two before; of this we have an hundred instances: but that the quotation of a passage from a Book known, and esteemed, and which is withal in the hands of all the world, loses of its weight, because of its being made in one age more ancient than another, is what nobody has ever thought, and yet it is this which *Mr. Emlyn* has several times ventured to assert.

.....

## CHAP. VI.

*Containing some new reflections upon the Profession of faith, which was presented to Huneric by the African Bishops.*

IN speaking of *Vigilius* Bishop of *Tapsum*, and the frequent quotations he has made of the passage of *St. John*, I have had occasion to place with him the three or four hundred Bishops, who had inserted this triumphant Text into their Profession of faith; I have quoted in my Dissertation, and in the Examination of *Mr. Emlyn's* Answer, the place which concerns this passage; he has been able to make no reply, so that I look upon this matter

as concluded: but I am here about to consider it again in another light.

It remains indisputably proven that all the *African* Bishops, as well in their own name, as in that of their Churches have owned as a Text of St. *John* that of the witnesses in heaven, which they have urged in the most authentic instrument that perhaps was ever drawn up, and in the nicest circumstances that the Churches of several great Provinces, and of divers other Countries beyond Sea, such as the Churches of *Majorca*, *Minorca*, *Sardinia*, and *Corsica*, which were in the same interests with those of *Africa* were ever found in. It is certain then, that this Confession of faith was actually put into the hands of the *Arians*, who had their Bibles, as the Orthodox had theirs, and were acquainted with the *Greek* tongue, as well as they, and were, no less than the Orthodox, exercised in reading the sacred Scripture, and in dispute. Lastly, it is most sure, that they gave no other answer to this Tract of the Bishop than by stirring up against them the rage of the Emperor *Huneric*; all these facts are taken from History. This sole recital, though very much abridged, and destitute of the reflections I have added to it in my Dissertation, convinces by its own evidence, that at that time neither Orthodox, nor *Arians*, had any doubt but that the passage really belonged to St. *John*'s Epistle. The *Arians* would not have desired anything better than to find in an Act prepared with so much care, and upon which four Bishops employed to draw it up had spent several Months, a forged passage, and especially a passage, upon which the Orthodox relied so much in the defense of the doctrine of the Trinity. Those cunning and obstinate heretics knew how to exclaim against the simple words of οὐσία and ὁμοούσιον, *essence* and *co-essential*, which in the Council of *Nice* had been appropriated to the Consubstantial Divinity of the Son with the Father. Show us, said they continually, the words *essence* and *co-essential* in some Text of Scripture; how then did they not here, where the subject is of more than one word, and where a whole Text is opposed to their error, answer that the Text is not in the

Scripture, and that it could not be shown to be there? They would have discerned the mote, and not have seen the beam!

*Vigilius of Tapsum* entered the lists against them; *St. Fulgentius* also had with them divers disputes; the passage of *St. John* was urged by them both: We find in all these disputes the answers and the arguments of the *Arians* upon divers Texts of Scripture: nothing appears upon this, which looks like the rejecting it as forged.

When any passages are brought against them, upon which they can urge the difference of Copies, they never fail to make use of this plea: this may be seen in the case of *Rom. viii. Verse 11*, in the second Vol. of *St. Athanasius's* works, p. 228. and upon another passage in the same Volume, page 610. but we meet with nothing like this upon the Text of *St. John's* Epistle.

Their whole answer to all the passages urged against them out of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* in defense of our Saviour *Jesus Christ's* Divinity, which is there expressed in so many places, is that this Epistle is not Canonical: *The Arians*, says *Mr. Simon*, were the first in the Eastern Church, who obstinately rejected the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, seeing it was not favourable to their new opinions. Urge against them the Text of *St. John's* Epistle! They allege nothing against its being authentic, nor charge it with forgery.

How then, says *Mr. Emlyn* in his late Tract, page 45, do they say nothing, and suffer themselves to fall by a Text, which gives victory to their adversaries, without making the least defense? Those, says he, who have urged this passage, must have either necessarily suppressed the answers of the *Arians*, or they are lost, since they are not come down to us. As to their being lost, it is impossible, since as they must have been joined to the objection, and the objection is by different ways come down to us in the Writings of the Fathers, the answers could not fail of coming

in like manner. Nor did even Mr. *Emlyn* think so; he uses this *dilemma*<sup>2</sup> in his reasoning only to manage a little the opposite question, and not too inconsiderately to assert that the ancient Fathers had suppressed the answers of their adversaries. If he meant to say this, he may find certain persons who out of prejudice and dislike to the Writings of the Fathers will not disallow of it; but natural equity joined to good sense, which ought everywhere to preside, can never approve of a suspicion so injurious to the ecclesiastical Writers, who have recommended themselves so many different ways, and to which their manner of relating the disputes which they had with the heretics, has given no place. So far from this, that we everywhere find the passages of Scripture, that seem most favourable to *Arianism*, set in their fullest light, and urged with all the force that was possible to the *Arians*. We see there the most subtle and artful reasonings that the *Arians*, and their fellow-brethren the *Socinians*, are able to form at present, sometimes against the Mystery of the Trinity; sometimes against the Divinity and eternal generation of the Son and sometimes against the procession of the Holy Ghost, and the Divinity of his Person. Consult but what they have said upon the 22<sup>nd</sup> verse of the viii<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the *Proverbs* against the eternity of the Son: *The Lord has created me*, &c. relying upon the translation of the LXX. who have thus rendered it instead of, *The Lord has possessed me*, &c. as the *Hebrew* Text imports: Upon the 32<sup>nd</sup> verse of the xiii<sup>th</sup> Chapter of *St. Mark*, in order to deprive *Jesus Christ* of his infinite knowledge, *But of that day knoweth no man, no not the Son*, &c. Upon the 29<sup>th</sup> verse of the x<sup>th</sup> Chapter of *St. John*, to take off from the supreme dignity of the Son, by these words which he had said himself; *My Father is greater than I*. The Fathers withal have not been forgetful to give us instances of their artfulness in eluding the Texts of Scripture urged against them; several are seen in what I have produced

---

<sup>2</sup> Hist. des verit. du Texte de N. Testam. chapter xvi.

above; I shall add but one more, that I may not too much multiply things of this nature. The Orthodox made use of the Text, where *Jesus Christ* says, *I and my Father are one*, to prove his unity of nature with the Father, as being but one and the same God. The *Arians* evaded, or pretended to evade this proof by the distinction of unity of nature, and unity of will, explaining these words of *Jesus Christ* of the latter; and it was necessary for the Divines of those times to strengthen themselves with other Texts in defense of that. We must not imagine that these subtle *Arians* did not urge the same answer to the passage of St. *John's* Epistle, since *the three are one* of this Text is the same thing with these words of *Jesus Christ*, *I and the Father are one*. This is manifestly the sum of the seventh Dialogue of *Vigilius of Tapsum*, printed among the Works of St. *Athanasius*, Vol. 2. of the *Cologne* Edition: where he says, that where the names of the persons are expressed, there they believe different natures to be expressed by those names; so that they assign to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost an unity of will only, and not an unity of divine nature: And it was also after this manner, that the Abbot *Joachim*, who revived *Arianism*, explained the Text of St. *John's* Epistle in the 12<sup>th</sup> Century; as we see in the Acts of the Council of *Lateran*, held in 1215<sup>3</sup>.

But though we were not so well satisfied as we are concerning the answer which the *Arians* may have given to this passage, what advantage could accrue to Mr. *Emlyn*, or what consequence could he draw thence? Our question turns only upon this, whether, these words of St. *John's* Epistle, *For there are three, who bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one*, were in the old *Italic* Version, and were urged by the Fathers against the *Arians*; I prove it by abundance of authorities; and there is not one which they can dispute,

---

<sup>3</sup> Sic sentiunt, ut ubi nomina in personis indicant, ibi simul in ipsis nomimbus & singulas vel diversas substantias esse pronuntiant, ut unitatem in concordia tantum charitatis esse assignant, & non in unita plepitudine Divinitatis.

either as falsely alleged, or as uncertain; but would it be less true, that the passages extracted from the writings of the Fathers, which I have produced, are in their Books, though we should be wholly ignorant of what the *Arians* may have answered? I am not acquainted with Mr. *Emlyn*'s Logic, but no man was ever less regular in fixing his principles, and drawing his consequences: I have made this remark in another place.

.....

## CHAP. VII.

*Other quotations of the Italic Version in favour of the passage in St. John's Epistle, taken from two ancient Tracts, ascribed to St. Fulgentius.*

ST. *Fulgentius*, Bishop of *Ruspe* in *Africa*, lived in those sorrowful times, when *Arianism* was upon the throne, and true Christianity very much persecuted. I have<sup>4</sup> set down in my Dissertation two passages where this holy Bishop makes mention of the passage of St. *John*, but as I have not given the express words, I think it convenient to give them here.

The first of these passages, which is in his Answers to ten Objections of the *Arians*, is expressed in these terms: <sup>5</sup>*We acknowledge the unity of essence in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; yet without confounding the persons, for it is this which St. John testifies, when he says, There are three which bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* The other passage is in a Discourse, which he wrote concerning the Trinity at the request of one of his friends named *Felix*, to explain to him that great subject, which was so much disputed. <sup>6</sup>*I will say then to you in few words, that the Father is*

---

<sup>4</sup> Page 61.

<sup>5</sup> Fulg. Rusp. Ad 10. Object.

<sup>6</sup> Fulg. de Trinit. ad Felicem Notarium, cap. iv. .

*one, the Son another, and the Holy Ghost another; distinct I say, as to their persons; but not distinct as to their nature: and for this reason it is said, I and the Father are one: the word ONE respects the nature, the term ARE denotes the persons; in like manner, it is said, There are three, which bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.*

After such express quotations of St. *John's* passage, let them come and boldly tell us it was not in the *Italic* Version, or that St. *Fulgentius* had not this Version, which was received in all the Churches, before his eyes, nor took thence the passages he quoted in his Writings; this will be an unpardonable ignorance in those persons who through prejudice deny a truth which is disagreeable to them; or a want of sincerity, yet worse than that ignorance, shameful in men who profess themselves Scholars.

In the last Editions of this holy Bishop's Works, and in the ninth Volume of the *Bibliotheca Nova Patrum*, we find two Tracts under the name of St. *Fulgentius*. The one is against an *Arian* Bishop named *Pinta*; and the other is a collection of divers Fragments against an *Arian* also, named *Fabian*.

As to the former Mr. *Du Pin*; in the article of St. *Fulgentius*, proves that this Work does not belong to that famous Bishop, and he gives very good reasons, which if they please they may see in the place I have mentioned. Dr. *Cave* in his History is of the same opinion, and I know no person who has stiffly maintained the contrary. It is at least true, that this Tract is very ancient. The Author, who drew it up, quotes there several Texts of the sacred Scripture in defense of the Trinity, after which he sets down this: *In the Epistle of St. John. There are three in heaven, which bear record; the Father, the Word, and the Spirit; and these three are one.*

As to the collection of the Fragments of ten Books, which St. *Fulgentius* had written, as the Author of his Life says, against the false

accusations of *Fabian, F. Chisslet*, a Jesuit, who published them upon the credit of some MSS. does not doubt, but that they really are the Fragments, which someone had collected from the Work of St. *Fulgentius*. I have no concern to engage myself in this point of Criticism: but I will venture to say, that I find in some of these Fragments such things, as in my opinion, suit not with the character and genius of this learned *African*. In the third fragment of the first Book we see remarks upon the *Greek*, unworthy the great skill St. *Fulgentius* had in that language; and a distinction betwixt the Latin words *ministrare* and *subministrare*, which does not agree with such a man, as he was. I leave the stricter enquiry into these matters to those who are critics by profession; I shall here insist no longer upon it. Yet if I have done right in not confounding the Author of these Fragments with St. *Fulgentius*, no more than with the Author of the Tract against *Pinta*, the quotation of St. *John's* passage in these Fragments, wherein the Texts of Scripture are all taken from the *Italic* Version, will be a new proof that this Text was read in that Version.

The title of the 21<sup>st</sup> Fragment of the sixth Book is, *The Trinity in Persons, and the Unity in Nature proved from holy Scripture*; under this extraordinary title are read these words at the close of the Chapter, *The Apostle St. John has evidently said, and three are one, in speaking of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*: this is express.

Upon occasion of the manner, after which this passage is quoted, I return to the quotation St. *Cyprian* has made in his Treatise of the Unity of the Church; *It is written*, says he, *of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and these three are one*. I see here no difference with the quotation of the Fragment; in the latter, it is indisputably the 7<sup>th</sup> verse, since it can only be said of that verse, *St. John has evidently said*; the consequence tends directly to St. *Cyprian*, and confirms the reflections I have made upon him.

If those, who venture to deny the passage we are upon to have been in the *Italic* Version, have never read the Authors I have quoted, their ignorance in a matter, they ought to be acquainted with before they so resolutely deny it as they do, is inexcusable in Men of learning; and if they have read them, and taken notice of the passages in them I have quoted, their sincerity becomes very much suspected: this is a grievous *dilemma* for them.

.....

## CHAP. VIII.

*Of the judgment St. Jerome has made of this Text, in his Prologue to the seven Catholic Epistles.*

IT is impossible but that St. *Jerome* must have seen in the *Italic* Version a Text which *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian* had read there before him, and which all the world had seen there as well as they, and which the great number of Bishops who lived in the same age with St. *Jerome* read there also. The toilsome and difficult pains he gave himself to purge that Version from the faults, which had crept into it, did not allow him to spare a Text, which would have been the greatest of all the faults he had to correct, if it did not really belong to St. *John*'s Epistle; but far from taking it away, he on the contrary has complained in very strong terms, in his Prologue to the seven Epistles, of the omission of this Text in some private Version, which appeared in his time; the Authors of which he treats as *unfaithful Translators*: a reproach unjust as well as rash, if this passage had not been in the *Italic* Version, which was used by the whole Church; and if withal it was not in the *Greek* of the New Testament, since it was from the *Greek*, as from the Original, that the *Latin* Versions were made.

These consequences are natural, and it is impossible to overturn them, but by destroying the principle from which they proceed, which is

absolutely to deny that this Prologue is *St. Jerome's*. And thus Mr. *Simon* has bent his whole force this way with a view to exclude the passage it treats of, as a forged and supposititious Text: Dr. *Mill* and *F. Martianay* have gone into the same opinion concerning the Prologue, but yet with different views, for they believed the passage of *St. John* genuine; their prejudice reached no farther than the Prologue. I have collected from the Writings of each all the reasons they have urged to show that *St. Jerome* is not the Author: I have examined them step by step one after another, and have shown them to be so weak, that <sup>7</sup>Mr. *Emlyn* who has twice entered the lists *since* upon these matters, he has not been able to destroy one of my arguments.

The most specious of those which had been urged against this Preface, was that the seven Epistles are there called *Canonical*, a name which *F. Martianay*, who is the Author of this remark, pretends was not given to these Epistles, until after the sixth Century, and consequently that it could not be *St. Jerome*, who wrote the Preface, where they are called by this name. This reason would be good, if the remark was just, but I have shown from several Authors, that it is not: I shall not offend, if I here add two other instances. The first is from *Vigilius*, Bishop of *Tapsum* in the fifth Century, who in his Book against *Varimadus* says, it is *written in the Canonical Epistles, my little children, this is the last time*: the quotation is from the first Epistle of *St. John*. The other instance is taken from *St. Jerome* himself, who in an Epistle to *Paul, Marcellus, and Eustochium*, the same *Eustochium* to whom the Prologue is addressed, says to them, *Jude the Apostle and Brother of James had said in his Canonical Epistle, &c.* *F. Martianay*, who has read so often over the works of *St. Jerome*, of which he has given us a most beautiful Edition, and adorned them with

---

<sup>7</sup> See the fifth Chapter of my Dissertation upon the passage of *St. John*, and the fourth Chapter of the Exam. of Mr. *Emlyn's Answer*.

the most learned Prefaces which have appeared, would be much surprised, was he alive, to see his Criticism upon the word *Canonical*, confuted by St. *Jerome* himself; but the most learned men are subject to such mistakes.

Though it be a main point for those Gentlemen who dispute the Text of the witnesses in heaven to be genuine, to take from it the suffrage of St. *Jerome* in the Prologue here in question, yet Mr. *Emlyn* will not answer for the reasons which have been urged against this Prologue, and he does not find them strong enough for him to keep close behind so *weak* a bulwark; Mr. *Martin*,<sup>8</sup> says he, *may be one of those Writers, who are sure to defend what others have said upon a subject in debate; but for my part, I undertake to defend that only, which I think valid and conclusive.* Let us pass by what he says of me, he does not know me: let us dwell upon what he tells us of his own turn of genius; *I undertake*, says he, *to defend that only which I think valid and conclusive.* He might at this rate have spared himself the trouble of writing his two last pieces in order to defend what others had said before him against the passage of St. *John*; he in this had less consulted his strength than his inclination, which has carried him to enter into an engagement which he would have done well not to have meddled with; he gets no honour by it. But whence is it, that after having engaged so deeply in it, he gives up all the proofs urged against a Preface, which, if it subsists, is the total ruin of his side of the question? It is, he says, because he does not undertake to defend reasons which do not appear to him solid and conclusive: such a confession does not make much for their honour, and makes much for me, who have had the same opinion of it before him. Yet you must not believe that he entirely abandons the dispute; he has one shift left which appears to him secure, and with which alone he thinks to triumph. If St. *Jerome*, says he, was the Author of this Prologue, in which the passage that speaks of the three witnesses in

---

<sup>8</sup> *Reply*, page 37

heaven is characterized as the principal support of the faith, and the omission of this passage in some Versions marked with the odious name of unfaithfulness, would it be possible after this that St. *Jerome* should have never produced so terrible a passage against the *Arians*, when he opposed them in his Writings? I had largely answered this, and amongst other things had said, that this objection supposed this holy Doctor to have written ;some particular Treatise against *Arianism*: whereas there is no such piece found among all the great Volumes we have of his; and that he had but scarce touched upon it as it came in his way in some of his Commentaries. Mr. *Emlyn* returns to me upon this subject, and contents himself with alleging in general the Comment upon *Ezekiel*, without marking any passage where *Arianism* is mentioned. This vague and confused manner of quoting a Book has its profit and advantages for those who judge that it is more secure to lurk behind this general form of speaking, than to appear in a distinct and express quotation. I have read St. *Jerome's* Commentary upon *Ezekiel* more than once, and have found him so far from expressly engaging against *Arianism*, that he speaks not of the Holy Trinity but upon occasion of the mystical exposition of some expressions, which are found in this Prophet, and the passages which he quotes, though rarely, are always such whose ideas have relation to those of the mystical terms and explications he gives, and which are often far-fetched: instances of this observation may be seen in the xi<sup>th</sup> Chapter, verse 1, in the xl<sup>th</sup> Chapter, verse. 44, and in divers other places.

To this I add, that a very considerable time having passed betwixt the Prologue and the Commentary upon *Ezekiel*; it is by no means surprising that St. *Jerome* not being concerned in the least with the affair of *Arianism*, should not have present in his mind a Text of which he had spoken with so much force upon a quite different occasion, as that of the revise of St. *John's* Epistle was. He was working upon this revise about the year 389 or 390; for giving in the year 392 (which he notes to be the

14<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of *Theodosius*) a Catalogue of his Works, he sets down in the number the review of the New Testament: now he did not finish, as is gathered from his Works, his Commentary upon *Ezekiel* until the year 414, and consequently 24 or 25 years after he drew up the Prologue to the seven Epistles. Will Mr. *Emlyn* find that after so long a space of time St. *Jerome* must have present in his mind the noble vivacity with which he had spoken of the Text of the witnesses in heaven against the unfaithful Translators, who had not inserted it in their Version, that this Text must have placed itself under his pen, and be necessarily repeated there? If he thinks so, those who know mankind better, and how men of the greatest parts do not always think upon the same thing, how the most judicious content themselves with saying or writing what is most to their purpose, and how 24 or 25 years time are capable of fixing the mind to one thing, without prejudice to that which made a lively impression upon it 24 years before, will not find the least difficulty in comprehending, how it is possible that St. *Jerome*; after all the reasons I have given, should not have quoted the passage of St. *John*, of which he had spoken with so much zeal and force in the Prologue to the Canonical Epistles.

Mr. *Emlyn* carries his reasoning yet one step higher, and to give it the greater advantage, he represents the Author of the Prologue as taking upon him the Character of *Restorer* and *Preserver* of this passage, against the omission which he condemns in some *Latin* Versions; from whence Mr. *Emlyn* infers, that these characters cannot belong to St. *Jerome*, since he has made no mention of this Text in his Commentaries, nor in his Epistles.

The Author of the Prologue does not give himself the great titles of *Restorer* and *Preserver*, nor represents himself under any of these ideas; it is from himself Mr. *Emlyn* has taken them. The word and idea of *Restorer* would reach much farther than to those particular Versions, which are specified in the Prologue, and which, as we learn from St.

*Augustine*, were almost of no consideration in comparison of the *Italic*, which was called the *Common Version*, because as I have several times observed, it was that of all the Churches: and the passage of *St. John* not being wanting in this Version, which was in the hands of all the world, the name of *Restorer* of this Text could not belong to the Censurer of those other obscure Versions, which at most were only in the hands of some private persons. I say the same thing of the word *Preserver*, which is no less a stranger to this Preface than the other. The Text in hand had no need of any other Preserver than the original *Greek*, and the Bible of the Churches.

But has Mr. *Emlyn* well considered that in making the Author of this Preface, whoever he was, since he will have him not to be *St. Jerome*, speak thus of himself, he makes him say by a necessary consequence, that this Text was in the *Greek*, and in the ancient Editions; for how otherwise would he have been the *Preserver* of it? And will Mr. *Emlyn* acknowledge this? *He is taken*, as said the Royal Prophet, *in the net which he had laid*. But whilst he extricates himself out of it as well as he can, let us resume his reasoning, and draw an advantage from it in favour of the truth I maintain. The Author of the Prologue charges the Translators with unfaithfulness, who had not inferred this passage in their translation; therefore he must himself have placed it in his; for the *Latin Poets* observation was always just, *it is shameful for a man to reprove others and fall himself into the same fault he blames in them*. But this is what *St. Jerome* cannot be charged with, if this passage was placed in his Version, which these *unfaithful Translators* had not inserted in theirs. Now this passage was no less in *St. Jerome's* Version than in the *Italic*; it is a fact which consists in proof; I have given a great number in my Dissertation, and I shall resume and continue that subject in the following Chapter.

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

## CHAP. IX.

*That the Text of the three witnesses, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one, was always in St. Jerome's Version.*

MR. *Emlyn* does not deny but this Text has been in the Manuscripts of the *Latin* Bibles since the time of *Charles the Great*, who lived at the close of the eighth Century; the testimonies I have produced have not left him the least room to dispute it. But how could so remarkable a Text as this, both in its matter and form, be found in the Manuscripts of the New Testament, dispersed through all Countries among the Clergy and the People?

If it was a Stranger, newly come, it must be owned they were very easy who admitted it into the Sanctuary of the sacred Scriptures, without having given it any opposition in any country of the world. These Manuscript Bibles were several times revised, the smallest errors of transcribers were corrected as much as possible, and yet they must have shown so excessive an indulgence to this entire Text, lately introduced, as to leave it in possession of a place it had so undeservedly usurped! Does Mr. *Emlyn* really believe this?

I went back yet farther than the time in which the famous revise was made by the order of *Charles the Great*, wherein we have seen this Text of St. *John*; there is no artifice and Criticism, which can evade this revise; it is beyond all the subterfuges which prejudice, and error can raise against it; I have set it beyond the reach of both, as may be seen from what I have said.

Passing farther than the time of this famous revise, I searched into the *Decretal* Epistles of *Isidorus Mercator*, and I showed that the two Texts of St. *John*, one of which speaks of the three witnesses in heaven, and the other of the three witnesses on earth, were read in two of these Epistles. The Bible of St. *Jerome* was then only in common use with the Church

and its Doctors; this Bible had then the passage of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse which is that of the witnesses in heaven.

As *Germany* furnished me with this very certain proof in the Writings of *Mercator*; *Italy* affords me a like one in the Commentary of a learned Abbot in the Kingdom of *Naples*; this is *Ambrose Anthbert*, Or *Ansbert*, whose words I have quoted, and which I am willing to repeat here, because of the new observations I have to make upon them. *Ansbert* then commenting upon these words in the first Chapter of the *Revelation*, *the faithful witness, and the first-begotten of the dead, and the prince of the Kings of the earth*, says, that though the expression of *faithful witness* has there reference only to *Jesus Christ*, it is yet a character, which equally belongs to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; according to these words of St. *John*, *There are three, which bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one*. The remarks I have to make upon this quotation deserve a particular attention.

*Ambrose Ansbert*, a native of *Provence*, retired into the Kingdom of *Naples*, and was there very much esteemed: he wrote there several Works which gained him a great reputation withal though they drew upon him the envy of many. They accused him of pride, rashness, and in a manner of impiety, for having attempted to write a Commentary upon the *Revelation*, to the great contempt, they cried, of that terrible Sentence in the xxii<sup>nd</sup> Chapter, *If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this Book*. It was easy for *Ansbert* to show this accusation ridiculous; but as his innocence was not a buckler strong enough to defend him against his enemies, he implored the protection of Pope *Stephen*, to whom he dedicated his Commentaries. Would a man so unjustly defamed in public, and so rashly accused of making additions to the Book of the *Revelation*, under pretense of the explications he gave of it, would he have unadvisedly quoted in this very Commentary a passage, which had not been in the Bible, and said, *it is*

written, *There are three, which bear record, &c.* if it had not been written? Now it was St. *Jerome's* Bible which was then read in the Churches, and which private families had before their eyes. The old *Italic*<sup>9</sup> Version had given place to this, which was far more correct, as I have already observed; and this alteration of the Version had been introduced into the Church but about a Century, or a Century and an half, before the *Italic* Version had kept its ground until towards the close of the seventh Century, and *Ambrose Ansbert* wrote about the middle of the following. We cannot then have a greater certainty of the fact in question, namely, that the Text of the witnesses in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, &c. were from the first ages, as in the Age of *Charles the Great*, in St. *Jerome's* Bible.

Another instance, very like the former, and of the same Century, is that of *Etherius*, Bishop of *Uxame* in *Spain*, and of *Beatus*, Priest in the *Asturias*. *Elipandus* Archbishop of *Toledo*, and *Felix* Bishop of *Urgel*, taught that *Jesus Christ* considered as man was only the Son of God by adoption, and thus they struck at the hypostatic union of the two natures in *Jesus Christ*: their doctrine prevailed mightily in *Spain* out of regard to these two Prelates, whose reputation there was considerable, especially *Elipandus*, who was Primate of all *Spain*. *Etherius*, though his Suffragan,<sup>10</sup> and *Beatus*, who was but a bare Priest, wrote against the error of the Archbishop; and the Archbishop in his turn writes a Letter of Spirit against them, to an Abbot, called *Fidelis*, in which he charges them with being *Eutyrians*<sup>11</sup>. To justify themselves, and at the same time to oppose

---

<sup>9</sup> P. Simon Hist. Critic, des Versions du N. Testam. chapter ii. 8.9.

<sup>10</sup> 1. A bishop elected or appointed as an assistant to the bishop or ordinary of a diocese, having administrative and episcopal responsibilities but no jurisdictional functions.

2. A bishop regarded in position as subordinate to an archbishop or a metropolitan. (RVH)

<sup>11</sup> The heresy was named after *Eutyches* of Constantinople. The view of Eutyches was that Christ had only one nature

the Error of *Elipandus* and *Felix*, they wrote a Book, in which they quoted a good part of the first Epistle of St. *John*; and among the rest the entire passage of the fifth Chapter, which speaks of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

It was already a great undertaking in *Etherius* and *Beatus* to venture openly to oppose their Archbishop and Primate; and it would have been not only an imprudence in them, but impious withal, to blend a forged passage among the genuine Texts of St. *John*'s Epistle, and thus to corrupt the sacred Scripture, if this passage had not been generally in the Bibles of those times. This must necessarily have brought upon them the censure of their Superior, who was already but too much provoked at their boldness in opposing his doctrine with such open force; they, who according to the ordinary course of Subordination should have regulated their sentiments by his. The conclusion is, and this a very certain conclusion, that the record of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, one God in three persons, was really in St. *Jerome*'s Version; which was all I had to prove.

Now wherein are these proofs defective? We are upon a fact, and a fact which must have been public, exposed to the eyes of the whole Church, and we have seen in this Chapter the testimonies from *Germany* in the Works of *Isidorus Mercator*; testimonies from *Italy* in the Writings of *Ambrose Ansbert*; testimonies from *Spain* and the *Asturias* in the Book of *Etherius* and *Beatus*. All these testimonies exactly agree, they all depose that the Text of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost was in the Epistle of St. *John*; and all these four witnesses report it as having read it, and reading it in the Version of St. *Jerome*; without any person, even their

---

- a confused mixture of human and divine. Eutycianism is also known as monophysitism from *monos* (single) and *physis* (nature). It assumes that Christ can have only one nature, which is a mixture of divine nature and human natures, such that the human becomes divine and the divine human. This confuses both Christ's true humanity and his true deity. (RVH)

greatest enemies, accusing them of a false translation: and yet nine hundred years after there shall be found men who will venture to assert that these words were not in St. I's Bible! A little more equity, but especially more candor, would submit to the genuineness of this Text.

\*\*\*\*\*

## CHAP. X.

*What judgment must be passed upon the Latin Manuscripts of the Vulgate of St. Jerome, which have not the Text of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*

WERE we so happy as to have the Manuscripts of the Bible which had passed under St. *Jerome's* eyes, or only the Manuscripts which had been made very near the time that ancient Clergyman was upon his revise, we might clear up very many passages, which have given place, for several Criticisms. We should see whether the passage they dispute with us was originally in that Version. But all the Manuscripts which are preserved fall far short of the time when it was made, the most ancient source come within four or five hundred years of it; since *F. le Long* reckons for the most ancient that of *Theodulphus*, made in the year 790, and consequently more modern by half a Century than the quotation of *Ambrose Ansbert*. But suppose they should find, if they will, some other yet more ancient, let it be a thousand years old, and the Text of St. *John's* Epistle not read in it; will this be any more than an omission, a fault of the transcriber, like many others of the same nature? The more ancient this shall have been, the more it may have been copied by others since, in which the same fault shall have escaped through the inadvertency of the transcribers: as we have often seen the faults of an impression to pass from one edition to another, in the very printing of the sacred Books, where the revisers and correctors of the press ought to use all possible care to prevent such

mistakes. The helps of Correctors, which are fixed in every Printing-house, being wanting to the generality of transcribers, the faults which escaped their pen remained in their Manuscripts; this Manuscript came into the hands of the buyer, who sometimes was a man less careful in reading, than in forming a Library for pomp and show: nothing is more frequent in the world than this, and we must not imagine that it was ever otherwise. When such a Manuscript met with a buyer who used it, and read it for devotion, he might either not perceive the omission, or leave it there without giving himself the trouble to correct it; either because he could not write, (for that art was not always so common as it is in our days;) or if he could, through negligence in correcting it; or because of an overcurious niceness he was afraid of spoiling the beauty of his Book. There are at present men of all these Characters, the negligent, the indolent, and the affectedly neat; and men who lived a thousand years ago were formed no otherwise than these who have come after them. The omissions thus remaining in one Manuscript which has been preserved for many ages, of what weight can this Manuscript and others of the same sort be in a matter which owes its first Original to the carelessness of a transcriber, and which is preserved only by a like carelessness, or ignorance, or the laziness and negligence of the persons into whose hands it shall have passed successively? It even happens, that when such an omission is grown old in a Manuscript, the ages which have passed upon it without making any alteration in it, have gained it on the other hand a sort of venerable prescription; so that the older a Manuscript is, the more venerable it grows, even until the very faults of it sometimes hold the place of law and determination.

When a transcriber looking over his copy happened to observe something forgotten, if he was a man who had the perfection of the Text of the sacred Author more at heart, than the neatness or beauty of his Manuscript, he himself inserted the passage he had omitted in the margin;

and this is what Mr. *Simon* and others have observed concerning the passage of St. *John*, that not being in the very Body of the Epistle, it is found written in the margin, by the same hand, and with the same ink as the rest. In other Manuscripts where this Text is not in the body of the Epistle, some of those who had possessed this copy from that time, or a little after, having perceived that the Text of the three witnesses in heaven was wanting to it, had written it in the margin over against the place where it ought to have been.

All these wise and pious precautions, as well of the transcribers of the sacred Scripture, as of the buyers, or religious readers, are so many condemnations brought against the other Manuscripts in which this passage is found wanting; and are a certain proof that this defect must be looked on but as a mere omission, and consequently as a matter, which is of no consideration against the authenticness of this Text.

This reasoning, which is so evident and natural, and lets us see of how little moment it is with regard to the passage we are upon, that it is not found in some Manuscripts of seven or eight hundred years old, and which are very few; this reasoning, I say, is confirmed and rendered insuperable by the quotations, which I have produced in the foregoing Chapter. The Authors of them were not mere transcribers, transcribers unknown, who got their bread by writing, as Printers do now-a-days; they are men of letters, and for the most part of a venerable character in the Church, learned Divines who wrote upon religious Subjects, who had the Bible at hand, and who, in the same age; (from which they offer us some Manuscripts unknown otherwise than from their single quality of Manuscripts in which this passage of St. *John* is not found,) come to us by their Works, each with his Bible, and upon opening them lay before our Eyes in the Epistle of St. *John* the Text they have quoted. It is then with regard to this Text quite as much, as if we had their very Copy, as it is with regard to all the other passages, which are set down in their

quotations. I see there five of the most ancient Manuscripts they have, I know from what hand they come to me; those from whom I receive them assure me by the use they have made of the passage in St. *John*'s Epistle, that it really belongs to the Epistle of that Apostle. Have they the same assurance of any Manuscripts in which this passage is not seen; and is there the least comparison to be made betwixt the one and the other?

They will be confirmed in this thought, if, placing on one side the few Manuscripts in which this Text is wanting with the innumerable multitude of those which have it, (since they are forced to own that within these seven or eight hundred years it is generally found in the Manuscripts) they attend to the regard which was anciently paid to one and the other. If before the eighth Century there were some Copies in which this passage of St. *John* was wanting, they must necessarily have been but little known in public; or if they were, they gave themselves no more trouble about them, than we do now about the faults of a printed book, and even of the Bible; all that is done in this respect is to avoid the same faults in another Edition. And it is thus the Ancients were wont to act in what concerns the passage of St. *John*; the fault or omission remained where it was, and they took care not to let it pass into other Copies.

They went farther, when, at the close of the eighth Century, they made by order of *Charles the Great* that excellent revise of the Copies of the New Testament, of which so much has been said. The learned men who were chosen to make a judgment of the Copies and the faults to be corrected, either met with none of those Manuscripts which wanted this passage, (which would be a sign of their scarceness,) or if they had some of them before their eyes, among the great number of others which were necessary to their design, they placed the omission of this Text among the faults that were to be corrected; otherwise, one cannot conceive why they should have placed it themselves in the Epistle of St. *John*, as has been proved. Unless they had directly explained themselves against the

omission of this Text, they could not better make it known to be a fault of the transcribers, than by following themselves the quite opposite Manuscripts, and inserting from them this forgotten Text. This was all that belonged to their design, and the nature of their work; critical remarks upon particular Texts, whether they were omitted in some Copies, or were found faulty in some of their expressions, would have gone too far, and not have been necessary for the use of the faithful, which is what *Charles the Great* had solely proposed: a good revise, and an exact and faithful correction: that was all.

They acted no otherwise in the *Correctorium* of the *Sorbonne*, in the tenth Century. Always the Manuscripts in which the Text of the three witnesses in heaven was not, were rejected, as defective in this point; and the only ones in which it is found were followed in these *Correctoria*, If then they had no regard to the Copies, which have not this sacred Text, upon the occasions of a regular correction, what esteem do they deserve six or seven hundred years after, unless an error is changed into truth by tract of time?

Lastly, the constant and universal use the Church has made of the Version and Copies in which this Text was read, without having ever gainsaid those, in which it was not found, is the most certain approbation they can have of the former, and an indisputable disowning of the latter. Let these Manuscripts make, as much as they will, one of the curiosities in Libraries; they may be valuable in other respects, but the esteem must never be extended so far as to their faults.

***The End of the First Part.***

## PART the SECOND.

In which, the passage of St. *John's* Epistle, *There are three in heaven, &c.* is proved to be genuine from the *Greek* Copies, and the use of the *Greek* Church.

### CHAP. I.

*That the two ancient Latin Versions, the Italic, and the Vulgate of St. Jerome, are a proof that the disputed passage was in the Greek Copies.*

THE *Italic* Version being the most ancient of all those of the New Testament, it can have been made only from the *Greek*: it is a fact of which no person has ever doubted, and which Mr. *Simon* speaking of this Version in his *Critical History* has owned. Yet this is not to say, that this Version, how ancient soever it may have been, had not its faults; there is none exempt, and that is a good one which has the fewest. But these faults, which most frequently proceed either from a certain weariness the mind contracts in a long and difficult work; or from a want of a thorough acquaintance with the full meaning of certain words in the original language, and sometimes even with the words of the language into which the translation is made, that are most proper to the subject; these faults, I say, though they were in the *Italic* Version, were not carried so far as to cut off a Text which was in the *Greek*, nor to insert one which was not there. This would have been a most audacious crime, and which those pious translators, who in those first ages made a Version designed for the instruction of the Church, could not have been guilty of.

The Text of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse of the v<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the first Epistle of St. *John* was inserted in that Version; it was read there from the first ages; *Tertullian*, St. *Cyprian*, *Vigilius*, St. *Fulgentius*, and the others who have

quoted it from this Version, understood the *Greek*, the last especially was skilled in it, as we read in his Life, prefixed before his Works: what room is there left after all this to doubt whether this Text was in the *Greek*? To doubt of it with any sort of grounds, they must be able to deny that this Version was made from the *Greek*; and who will deny it? or they must be able to prove, that it was so unfaithful as to have inserted for Texts of Scripture whole passages, which never were there, and which no body had read there; but how can they prove so odious an imputation, and which none of the Christians and Doctors of the remote ages has ever charged upon a Version so venerable? Or lastly, they must be able to advance that none of those who have taken the passage of St. *John* from this Version was capable of comparing it with the *Greek*, or that if they were capable, they had neither the zeal, nor the care to do it: but for a man to ascribe such sentiments to them, would be to expose himself to the derision of all the world. Nothing then would remain but absolutely to deny, that the Text we speak of was in the *Italic* Version; but can they deny this after the proofs I have given of it? Though there should be now extant in our days one or more ancient Manuscripts of that Version, and the passage of St. *John* be read in them, could they see it there better than those famous Authors did, who have copied it from thence? And would the report of the Learned among the moderns, who should declare this passage to be in those ancient Copies, deserve more credit with us, than the testimonies which have been by the *Tertullians*, the *Cyprians*, the *Vigilius*, the *Fulgentius*, and the three, or four hundred *African* Bishops? Since then none of these things I have mentioned can be denied, they cannot but own, that this first proposition, which is inseparably connected with all the rest, namely, that the Text of St. *John* was in the *Greek*, is by this very means put beyond all contradiction.

I say the same thing with regard to St. *Jerome*'s Version, and the proof of it is more easily to be given. We have no need to suppose that St.

*Jerome* was well-skilled in the *Greek* Tongue, no person ever disputed it; no more have we need to suppose that in revising the *Italic* Version of the New Testament, he not only chose the most correct and most exact Manuscripts, but that he had also the *Greek* Copies in his hand, in order to regulate his corrections by those Copies: He has himself declared that he followed this method; *Novum -Testamentum*,<sup>12</sup> so says he, *Graecae sidei reddidi*. “I have corrected the Version of the New Testament exactly after the *Greek* Copies.” Though he had not said it, it is seen enough from the abundance of remarks he has made in his Commentaries. He had found in the Version, which he revised in order to make it more correct, the passage of the Epistle of St. *John*; and if in comparing the Version of that Epistle with the *Greek*, he had seen that it differed from the *Greek* in what regards this Text, is it conceivable that he would have left it there, and that industrious, as he was, to make alterations in many places, which may seem slight, he would have let pass in his Version so manifest a depravation of the original Text of that Epistle? The absurdity is palpable; he saw then this passage in the *Greek*, as he found it in the *Latin*.

The error which opposes itself to the truth of this Text necessarily yields to the force of this reason, unless it extricates itself by the help of another error, boldly and confidently asserted; and this is to deny that St. *Jerome* has inserted this passage in his Version. But how can they maintain this after the testimonies which I have brought to the contrary? The *Romish* Censors say in their Preface to *Clement* the Eighth’s Bible, as reported by Mr. *Simon*<sup>13</sup>, that since nine hundred years all the Authors who have flourished in the Church, have only made use of St. *Jerome*’s Version; it is then from them, and the quotations of that Version which are found in their Books, that we may be informed with most certainty of

---

<sup>12</sup> De Scriptor. Ecclesiast.

<sup>13</sup> Hist. Critiq. des Vers. du N. Testament. chapter vii. p. 75.

what was read in that Version; and the certainty which will arise with relation to any particular passage, will be far greater, and beyond all doubt, if this passage is found quoted by several of these famous Doctors. We have here all this, as I have shown in the ninth Chapter of the first Part; and these Authors are expressly of the same age the *Romish* Censors speak of. These Authors are some of above eight hundred years, and others above nine hundred and near a thousand. This fact being thus proved, and this last refuge taken away from those, who declaim against the genuineness of this passage, they will be forced to own that St. *Jerome* must have found it in the *Greek*, because for upwards of nine hundred years the most celebrated Writers have shown us, that they read it in St. *Jerome*'s Bible.

I had briefly touched upon this reasoning drawn from the ancient *Latin* Versions in my<sup>14</sup> first Dissertation, to show that the Text of the witnesses in heaven, which was always read in these Versions, must necessarily have been found in the *Greek*. The shortness I used in my explication should not have hindered Mr. *Emlyn* from taking notice of it and answering it; but he has thought good not to meddle with it. As I have now been as large upon this proof, as it deserves, its force will be better perceived; and I question whether any answer can be given to it, that will satisfy a person, who seeks after truth and solidity.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

<sup>14</sup> Dissert. Fur le 7 verse du chapter v. de la I ep. de S. Jean page 94.

## CHAP. II.

*Of the first Greek Editions, in which the Text of the three witnesses in heaven is read, and of those in which this Text is not inserted.*

BEFORE I come to speak of the *Greek* Manuscripts which serve to defend the truth of the passage of St. *John*, I think it will not be amiss to make some observations upon the first *Greek* Editions of the New Testament with relation to this famous Text.

The *Latin* Bibles were the first that were printed, about the middle of the 15<sup>th</sup> Century; the little use which was then made of the *Greek* Tongue in reading the holy Scripture, was without doubt the cause, why they made no haste to print it in that language. It was not till the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> Century, that Cardinal *Ximenes* having formed the great and noble design of printing a Bible in several languages, collected with immense care and charge all the Manuscripts he could find for this purpose, and committed the examination to several learned men, who were employed in that Edition. That of the New Testament was finished, not as Mr. *Simon* has said through mistake in 1515, but in 1514, the 10<sup>th</sup> day of *January*,<sup>15</sup> as it is set down in the very Edition, which was made at *Complutum*.

The passage of St. *John* is in this *Greek* Edition, which is the first that was made, and which was made from Manuscripts; but it did not appear in the world until some years after, by reason of several accidents, which intervened at that time, and are nothing to our subject.

During this delay of the publication of the *Polyglot* Bible of *Ximenes*, known by the name of the *Complutensian*, from *Complutum* the place where it was printed, *Erasmus* having got together four or five *Greek*

---

<sup>15</sup> F. le Long. Bibl. Sacr. Tom. 1. page 13.

Manuscripts of the New Testament, put out an Edition at *Basil* in 1516. The passage of St. *John*'s Epistle was not in this Edition.

In the year 1518 the *Greek* New Testament was printed at *Venice*; in which also they have not put the passage of St. *John*; this is the Edition that goes under the name of *Aldus*.

That of *Erasmus* in 1516 was reprinted in 1519 without any alteration; at least with respect to this passage.

He published a third in 1522 in which this Text was restored.

*Robert Stephens* having gathered together from the Library of King *Francis* the First, and divers other places, several *Greek* Manuscripts, put out in 1546 a very fine Edition of the New Testament with the passage of St. *John*'s Epistle, such as we have it in the common Editions; he put out a second in 1549 from this first.

By this exact account of the first *Greek* Editions of the New Testament, we see those which were made from Manuscripts which had the Text of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost in the Epistle of St. *John* and those where it was wanting.

As both had been taken from Manuscripts, all those which have since been sent abroad, were copied from these first Editions.

I know but three which have followed that of *Aldus*, and the two first of *Erasmus* in what regards the omission of this passage in dispute; that of *Haguenan* in 1521, that of *Strasburg* in 1524, and that of *Simon Coliniaeus* at *Paris* in 1534, all the rest of the same age, and since that time have regularly followed the former; which read the passage of St. *John*: there is not a translation even to the *German* Version of the New Testament made by the *Socinians*, and printed at *Racovia* in 1630 which has not preserved this passage.

The small vogue which the Edition of *Aldus*, and that of *Erasmus* in

1516 had in this respect, is an evident mark of the disapprobation of the Christian World. They looked upon them as<sup>16</sup> Editions defective in this point, which did not deserve to have any regard paid to them, nor that any advantage should be drawn thence against the other Editions, in which the Text of the witnesses in heaven were found. Yet those who believe the Text supposititious pretend this to be of force against its being authentic; but it is not difficult to show them that they are under a mistake. Mr. *Simon* himself, that Mr. *Simon* who has raised the standard so high against this sacred Text, shall speak for me, and supply me with the arguments I shall use. Let us hear him explain himself upon the subject of these Editions. *I do not believe,*<sup>17</sup> says he, *that either that of Strasbourg in 1524 or that of Simon Colinaeus at Paris in 1534 were taken from Manuscripts. Wolfius, who published that of Strasbourg, says nothing of it in his Preface; he there witnesses, on the contrary, that he only reprinted in new characters and in a new form what had already been printed. Simon Colinaeus has put no Preface before his Greek Edition, which makes me believe that he adjusted it according to his own sense from the foregoing Editions. All the pretended authority of these Editions cannot be more expressly made void, and the proof which men, either of little understanding, or great prejudice, would draw thence against the Text of the holy Apostle. Mr. Simon sends us back to the Manuscripts; they alone hold the place of the Original in the Editions; and those which want this support are but Copies, of no authority in themselves. Thus he brings us back, as at one step, to the first Editions, which were copied by Wolfius, and Simon Colinaeus; let us then go back with him so far as to them.*

Being thus come to the first Edition of *Erasmus* in 1516 and that of *Aldus* in 1518 our business will be to see from what Manuscripts they

---

<sup>16</sup> Synops. Burmanni lib. i. 33.

<sup>17</sup> Hist. du Texte du N. Testam. chapter xviii.

were both made. As to that of *Aldus*, we know nothing at all about it and though I do not doubt but that he had some Manuscripts from which he printed the Epistle of St. *John* without the Text of the witnesses in heaven, nevertheless as we do not know whether he had several such, and whether what he had was of any esteem or no, his Edition can be of no great weight in what concerns the omission of this Text.

The case is not the same with the Edition of *Erasmus*; he informs us that he had four or five Manuscripts, but whether they were very ancient or no, is not known; there is but one, which he says a friend of his sent him an extract of from *Rome*, that is known to be ancient.

Let us now compare these Manuscripts in which the passage of St. *John* is found to be wanting, with the other from which the Editions, of *Complutum*, that of *Erasmus* in 1522 and that of *Robert Stephens* in 1546 which have all this Verse, were made. I here touch upon what regards these Manuscripts only by the by, and so far as the way of comparison requires I shall have occasion presently to speak of them more at large. We know that Cardinal *Ximenes* had abundance of Manuscripts, and the best that he could find; and that these Manuscripts were put into the hands of able men, who examined them with care: Nothing like this can be said in favour of the Edition of *Aldus*; and as to that of *Erasmus*, there were but few, and it cannot enter into competition with the three Editions of *Complutum*, of *Erasmus* himself in 1522, and *R. Stephen's* in 1546 either with regard to the number of Manuscripts taken all together, since they all agree in having this Text; or with regard to their antiquity, of which *Stephens* says, speaking of those from which he made his Edition, that they were of the most venerable antiquity; *codices vactus aliquot ipse vetustatis specie pene adorandos.*

Here again let us hear Mr. *Simon*; <sup>18</sup>*We must judge of the readings of the Manuscripts according to the rules of Criticism, and see, with Hilary the Deacon, which of these Copies are supported by reason, history, and authority: the Greek where these three things shall meet, will be the most ancient and the most correct whether it be found in old Manuscripts, or in printed Books.*

The Editions of *Complutum*, of *Erasmus*, and *Stephens* have visibly these three advantages above those of 1516 and 1518 which have not the Text of St. *John*; the reason taken from the end and design of the Epistle, as well as the connection of this verse with the following, favours the Text of the Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost in one only divine essence. The History of the quotations of this passage is entirely for its being genuine; and the authority of the Authors who have quoted it is equally venerable for their antiquity, and their great name in the Church. Can anything like this be produced in favour of the Editions, in which this passage is omitted? Let those Editions then pass for nothing so far as concerns the omission of this Text.

The same arguments will also serve for the *Syriac* Version, which they say is the only one of the *Oriental* Versions, that was taken from the *Greek*: if it is true, as they pretend, that it was made from the *Greek*, and that the Manuscripts from which it was made had not this Text, it was a defect and an omission, since it appears from the proofs drawn from ecclesiastical Authors, more ancient than the *Syriac* Version, that it was in the *Italic* and with it fell under the eyes of the whole Church: and if it was not wanting in the Manuscripts, it is an omission which must be laid to the account of the *Syriac* Version. I should even believe this last rather than the former. In short, if the want of this verse in that Version was a necessary consequence that it was not in the *Greek*, the same consequence

---

<sup>18</sup> Hist. du. Texte Grec du N. Testam. chapter xxix. p. 351.

must have place in all the other passages, which are wanting to this Version; now as the number of these passages is not small, it would follow that they were not in the *Greek Copies*, when that Version was made, which yet is very false. Mr. *Simon* tells us, that the other *Oriental Versions*, the *Arabic*, the *Coptic*, the *Persian*, were made from the *Syriac*: now as there is not one of these Versions which does not want some passage, it would follow that the same defeats would be in the *Syriac* but the contrary is clearly seen by comparing these Versions with that, which served them in some sort for an original. It is not then a good reason to say that the Text of the 7th verse was not in the *Greek Manuscripts*, because it is not in the *Syriac Version*.

.....

### CHAP. III.

*The passage of St. John proved to be genuine from the Greek Manuscripts with some particular considerations upon the Manuscripts of Laurentius Valla, upon that of Complutum, and that of England or the Codex Britannicus.*

IT would be very surprising that two of the three parts of the Christian World, namely, *Europe* and *Africa*, should have constantly had in *St. John's Epistle* the Text which speaks of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that the *Italic Version* made in the second Century from the *Greek Copies*, and the Version of *St. Jerome*, exactly compared with the most faithful Manuscripts as Mr. *Simon* owns; it would be, I say, very surprising, that all these sorts of Copies should have entirely vanished in these latter ages, so that there should not be found one from which to make a *Greek Edition* of the New Testament in favour of a Text so recommended; yet this its adversaries pretend. Hear them, and one would believe there never were such Copies, and under pretext that the Libraries

in *England, France, Germany, and Italy*, have some in which this passage is not read, they boldly and positively conclude, that the Text is not, nor was, in any *Greek Copy*. These sort of conclusions drawn from a particular to an universal are condemned by all Philosophers as false and illusory: one or two instances to the contrary are enough to destroy them. In the present case two Manuscripts which had this passage would hinder that universal conclusion, that all the *Greek Manuscripts* have omitted it, that it is in none. At most, they could only oppose the great number of those, where it is not, to the small number of those where it would be; but even this decides nothing: Mr. *Simon* shall here again speak for me: *We must prefer,*<sup>19</sup> says he, *the fewer number of Greek Copies to the greater, when these few Copies are conformable with the most ancient Latin Fathers.* He makes this reasoning upon the clause of the Lord's Prayer, *For thine is the kingdom, &c.* but he did not dream that one might make use of it against himself in favour of the passage of *St. John*; truth made him speak it, and we reap the profit. We have withal this advantage of him in this reasoning, that he has formed it in opposition to almost all the *Greek Copies* of the Lord's Prayer, which except one or two have all these last words, *For thine is the kingdom, &c.* and which even by his own confession are found quoted *in some ancient Fathers of the Greek Church*: whereas there is no Father, either *Greek* or *Latin*, whom they can allege against the passage of *St. John*: so far from this, that we have several *Greeks* who have quoted it, and the *Latins* have constantly made use of it.

Besides this, there is a great difference betwixt the Manuscripts in which an entire passage is found, and those where it is not found at all; the former are a positive proof; the latter form only a difficulty, a conjecture: but a positive and express proof is by no law in the world

---

<sup>19</sup> Hist. Crit. du Texte Grec. chap xxxii.

destroyed by a conjecture, or a simple difficulty. If this was once not received in the World, it would oft happen that facts the best averred by positive and express proofs would be overturned by the difficulties and conjectures which would be found to urge against them.

To come then to the *Greek* Manuscripts which authorize the Text we are upon to be genuine. I have quoted those which the learned critic *Laurentius Valla* had carefully collected in order to correct divers faults which he found in the vulgar Version of the New Testament. I had said they were *seven*, Mr. *Emlyn* has said only *three*. This was one of his least mistakes in these matters; I thought he would have recollected himself when I had produced the express declaration of *Valla*, who in a Note upon *St. John* speaks of seven Manuscripts, and who had never said that he had but three; but since Mr. *Emlyn* does not submit to these testimonies, under the shadow of giving a different sense to them, I will add one word farther upon the subject; the matter is of no great consequence, but we must however pay this honour to truth; my own will be found in it.

*Erasmus* is the person, to whom the Public is indebted for the impression of *Laurentius Valla's* Works, the Manuscript of which was forgot in a place where the moisture and worms would have infallibly consumed it. Having drawn it out thence, and read it with all the attention and regard such a Work deserves, he says that *Valla* had seven very valuable Manuscripts from which to make his annotations; as he himself, says he, has declared, <sup>20</sup>*Laurentius Valla septem bonae fidei codices se secutum fuisse testatur*. For this once perhaps Mr. *Emlyn* will own that I had reason, and that he had none to say, *this can only prove the number of Manuscripts he had upon the Gospel, and not upon the Epistle of St. John*. I cannot comprehend how he could form to himself such an illusion,

---

<sup>20</sup> Erasmi Apol. Edit. N. Test. 1522.

since at this rate one might as well say, that he had not even three, though Mr. *Emlyn* had adopted that small number: but this is to amuse ourselves about trifles. The Main of the affair is that *Valla* had *Greek* Manuscripts of St. *John's* Epistle; that he has found fault with the *Latin* Version for not having followed the *Greek* in several passages of that Epistle; that he has withal made an observation against a particular word added in that Version, and which was not in the *Greek*; it is the word *Simus* of the 1<sup>st</sup> verse of the iii<sup>rd</sup> Chapter, *Behold, what manner of love the Father has bestowed upon us, that we should be called and be the children of God*; for it is thus in the *Vulgate*. But says *Laurentius Valla* upon this, the word *be* is not in the *Greek*: the addition of this word was of no consequence, yet *Valla* would not let it pass: how then could so severe a Censor have let go this whole verse of the v<sup>th</sup> Chapter, *There are three, that bear record in heaven, &c.*, which was in the *Vulgate*, without making a remark, that it was not in the *Greek*, if in reality he did not find it there? *Valla* was very attentive to the additions, he met with in the *Latin* Version, to correct them by the *Greek*; I could fill more than two pages with this sort of observations, or corrections, which he has made upon the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, if it was necessary to copy them here. In this he only followed the plan he had formed for that Work; this plan did not lead him to set down the places where the *Latin* was found to agree with the *Greek*: saying nothing then of the Text of the witnesses in heaven, it is as much as if he had said, that the *Greek* and the *Latin* agreed. This reasoning which I have urged in the Examination of Mr. *Emlyn's* Answer to my Dissertation, has been but slightly glanced at in his Reply: he has not touched upon the main matter; its force always subsists: it is evident; there I fix.

A few years after the death of *Laurentius Valla* the famous Edition of Cardinal *Ximenes* was made at *Complutum* in *Spain*, of which I have already spoken. As we have not a particular account of the Manuscripts

which were used on this occasion, and yet less of those which served for the edition of the Canonical Epistles, we cannot know exactly whether that from which the Text in question was taken was the only one in which it was found, or whether they preferred it to the rest; it is withal of very little importance to know it. What is certain, is first, that this passage was printed at a time when no one had yet undertaken to dispute its being genuine; for it was not until some years after, and upon the occasion of *Erasmus's* not inserting it in his Editions of 1516, and 1519, that they began to suspect these words might have crept into that place of *St. John's* Epistle in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity. So that they cannot say, It was prejudice of party, which prevailed upon Cardinal *Ximenes*, or the other learned men who were employed in that Edition, to forge this Text, in order to oppose it to the Editions of *Aldus*, and *Erasmus*. Mr. *Simon* has imagined, that *Ximenes*, and these Editors, seeing this sacred Text in the *Latin* Bible, and not finding it in any *Greek* Copy, that they might not leave this place of the Epistle empty, and to make the *Greek* answer to the *Latin* forged amongst themselves this new Text. I question whether Mr. *Simon*, who has been so dexterous in inventing such turns of cunning would have been capable of making use of them himself, had he been in the place of *Ximenes* and the Editors: Charity forbids me to pass such a judgment upon him; especially since being no longer in the World he cannot answer for himself. But the same charity which I am willing we should have for him, ought to have hindered him from forming so injurious an accusation of an enterprise he had no proof of, and against persons famous both for their dignity and their learning, and whose probity was never brought under any suspicion. Thus we see that *Erasmus*, who, as I have elsewhere observed, does not appear to have been prejudiced in favour of the genuineness of the passage of *St. John*, has shown a great respect to the *Complutensian* Bible with relation to the same Text; and *Robert Stephens* so much valued it, that he gave it the first place

amongst all the Manuscripts which he used in his Editions of the New Testament.

So black an imputation as that of Mr. *Simon* would deserve no other treatment than to be sent back to its Author. But because those, who maintain this passage is not found in any *Greek* Manuscripts, are concerned to let this accusation be current, in order to destroy the Manuscript of *Ximenes*, I would demand of them whether if they had a mind to form a *Greek* passage, that should answer to the *Latin*, they would have placed in that, οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν, to answer to the *Latin*, *hi tres unum sunt*? The difference of the sense of the *Greek* and *Latin* is very evident, and it was so easy to put in the *Greek*, οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι, which is expressly what the *Latin* imports, that it is inconceivable how men of parts, and who were very well acquainted with both languages, would have made so gross a mistake, and so foreign to their purpose. Since Mr. *Emlyn* took in hand to answer my Dissertation, in which I had defended the *Complutensian* Manuscript against Mr. *Simon*, he ought to signalize his zeal for this head of the party, and the interest which he himself takes in his cause. But because it may be that I did not sufficiently apply myself to show the full absurdity of this gross imputation, I think that as I design to put an end to all these matters in this Discourse, I ought to pass by nothing that I think worthy my observation.

In this view I shall again make this observation upon the Editors of the *Complutensian* Bible: as they saw that these words of their Manuscript, οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν, which regularly speaking are not the same thing with those, οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι, in some measure corrected the notion which St. *Thomas* had formed, though without reason, that these words of the *Latin* Version, *hi tres unum sunt*, [*these three are one*] had been added by the *Arians* at the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse, they placed in the margin of their Edition the very words of St. *Thomas*, so sincere were they in the matter. For what occasion was there for this long remark, and the quotation of the

passage from St. *Thomas*, if the form of these words in their Manuscript had not been different from the *tres unum sunt*, [*three are one*] which the Abbot *Joachim* had abused, and upon account of which St. *Thomas* had made the observation just mentioned?

I admire divine Providence upon this occasion; the first *Greek* Manuscript exposed to the World by printing, presents us this marvelous Text with these last words οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι, which are taken from the 8<sup>th</sup> verse and which in that Edition are wanting at the close of that Verse; six years after the same Verse of the witnesses in heaven appeared again in an Edition of *Erasmus*, who finds it in a Manuscript different from that of *Complutum*, and in this Edition the last words of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse are those which are peculiar to it, οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι, and the 8<sup>th</sup> verse keeps those which belong to it, and which the Manuscripts of *Erasmus* and *Aldus* had kept, οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν. Lastly come the Manuscripts of *Robert Stephens*, which have the Text of the three witnesses in heaven, with some slight differences in the *Greek* articles, but which are nothing to the thing itself. These small variations in the Manuscripts of the *Greek* Editions seem to have been so ordered by Providence, to prevent the thought that some had been copied from the rest, and that one sole Manuscript had been the foundation of all the three, or even that it had been a forged Manuscript.

That of *Erasmus* was the second from whence the passage of St. *John's* Epistle came into the hands of the public, with a *Latin* Version. *Erasmus* had recovered it from *England*, and it was for this reason that he gave it the name of *Codex Britannicus*. This Manuscript has met with no better treatment than that of *Complutum* from Mr. *Simon* and Mr. *Emlyn*: both have treated it as forged and imaginary. It was a Manuscript says Mr. *Emlyn*, which nobody has ever seen, nor any other ever spoken of but *Erasmus*, either before him, or after him, except from what he says of it himself. Mr. *Simon* has not absolutely denied the reality of this

Manuscript, nor has he imputed the forgery of it to *Erasmus*; he does not deny also but that the Text of St. *John*'s Epistle was there such as *Erasmus* gives it. Well! and have we not then at least one *Greek* Manuscript of the passage in question? It seems so, but Mr. *Simon* knew soon how to take it from us; this, says he, was no other than a Copy from the *Greek* of the Council of *Lateran*, and the *Greek* of this Council, held in 1215 was made from the *Latin*, and thus by a little artifice we are brought back from the *Greek* to the *Latin*, and consequently there is no *Greek* Copy for this Text.

<sup>21</sup> I have sapped the foundation of all these Fictions, which only have their source from an incorrigible obstinacy in rejecting this passage, and an unlimited assurance to deny the most certain facts and most undeniably proved: my confutation has stood without a reply. Mr. *Emlyn* would have touched upon it in his first piece, and have cast some blemish on it, but the examination I have made has taken from him the desire of returning to it again in his last, which he calls a Reply. *The Editors*, <sup>22</sup> says he, *of the Complutensian Bible had no Manuscript for this text; Erasmus inserted it in his Edition against his own opinion, for fear of calumny.* This is called *deciding*; and deciding clearly; but to decide is, is not to answer: reasons are demanded, and Mr. *Emlyn* gives none. I do not know what he means when he says that *Erasmus* inserted the passage of St. *John* in his edition of 1522 against his own opinion. If he means the opinion of *Erasmus* concerning the genuineness of the passage itself, it is not absolutely true; *Erasmus* never declared against its being authentic: nothing like it will be found either in his Commentary, or in his answers to *Stunica* and *Ley*; all that is seen there is only a kind of perplexity into which the want of this passage in the Manuscripts from which he had made his two first Editions had thrown him; and the same defect in a

---

<sup>21</sup> Dissert. on this passage, chapter xi.

<sup>22</sup> Repl. chapter ii. 34.

certain old *Latin* Manuscript which he highly valued, to which he joined what he had observed concerning *S. Cyril* principally, that he had not quoted this passage upon occasions, where it would have been very much to his purpose. All this held his mind for some time in doubt betwixt these and the contrary reasons he had for believing the Text genuine. Thus when *Ley* and *Stunica* had written against him upon his leaving it out of his two *Greek* Editions, he gives no other answer, but that he followed his Manuscripts closely, and that if they would show him one which had the passage, he would straight put out another Edition, in which it should be inserted. Upon this he meets with a Manuscript in *England* where he finds this passage, and without hesitation or offering the least violence to himself, he gives it a place in his Edition. By this means he satisfies his conscience, and silences his calumniators, who spread abroad against him scandalous reports, as if he had meant to favour *Arianism* by suppressing so plain a Text. Mr. *Emlyn* should have better observed the frank and open conduct of *Erasmus* in this whole affair, and have thus shown somewhat more regard to the judgment he had passed himself upon the *Codex Britannicus*. He had spoken of it as of an imaginary Manuscript, forged and supposititious; now how can this be reconciled with what he has just said, that *Erasmus* had produced it against his own opinion, for fear of calumny? But what calumny? That he did not insert in a new Edition a passage which he found in a Manuscript that nobody besides himself had ever seen? Certainly Mr. *Emlyn* did not think of the matter. The Manuscript which *Erasmus* spoke of really existed, and the Text of *St. John* was in this Manuscript; to attempt to form doubts in so clear a case is to seek for darkness in broad day.

.....  
 .....

## CHAP. IV.

### *Of Robert Stephens's Manuscripts.*

WE have seen in the foregoing Chapter the extreme perplexity in which Mr. *Simon* and Mr. *Emlyn* are found with reference to the Manuscripts of *Complutum* and *Erasmus*; they could not extricate themselves but by denying that the passage of St. *John* was in any of these Manuscripts. The difficulty is considerably augmented by the Manuscripts of *Robert Stephens*: but here again it is the same refuge; they have no other; they must deny that the Text of St. *John* was in these Manuscripts: but yet *Robert Stephens* saw it there, and took it thence to place it in his Editions. The Editions speak the passage to be there! What have they to say to all this? They must rack their brains, and amass a heap of trifles, which serve to no other purpose than to perplex the matter; I shall dispatch them in this Treatise, and keep close to what is called the trunk of the tree, and leave Mr. *Emlyn* to catch at the branches.

To this end, I shall say but two words upon the number of Manuscript Copies in general, which *Robert Stephens* had. They pretend that he had but fifteen of this kind, and he says in his Preface that he had sixteen. *I compared*, says he, *very vastly my Edition of the New Testament with sixteen very old written Copies*: the *Complutensian* Copy which he speaks of afterward was a printed Book, which consequently cannot be comprehended in the number of sixteen, which *Stephens* does not call by the general name of *Manuscripts*, but by the particular name of *written Copies*; *cum vetustissimis sedecim SCRIPTIS*.

*Beza* had in his hands the Manuscripts of his great friend *Robert Stephens*, when he went upon the Version and Notes of the New Testament, and he says in the Preface to his Editions of 1582 and 1589 that he had seventeen Copies of *Robert Stephens*; because he reckoned in this number the *Complutensian* Copy which *Stephens* had made use

of.

In the year 1589 he put out his last Edition of the same Book, and setting down as in the foregoing, the Copies he had in hand, he puts down nineteen, namely, seventeen of *Stephens's*, and two others: one was the old Manuscript he had from *Lyons*, which contained the Gospels and the Acts, which he presented to the University of *Cambridge*, where it now is; and the other, which contained the Epistles of *St. Paul*, was that which he called the Copy of *Clermont*, which is at present in the *French King's* Library.

Mr. *Emlyn* has gone so far as to deny that *Beza* saw and read these Manuscripts, and by a turn of imagination altogether new, has said that what *Beza* has so often set down in his Annotations, speaking of *Robert Stephens's* Manuscripts, vidimus, legimus, in Roberti nostri Codicibus invenimus, &c., meant no more, than that he had seen in *Robert Stephens's* Edition in 1550 the *Greek* numeral Letters, by which that learned Man had expressed each of his Manuscripts in the margin of that Edition. He has perceived by my answer that he had made his Readers smile, who could not avoid being merry upon the occasion; he has not returned to it again, and has handsomely given up that ingenious thought.

*Beza* however has not been absolutely discharged for this. Mr. *Emlyn* no longer disputes his having had these Manuscripts in his hands, since *Beza* says it, and *Robert Stephens* has said it also in the Advertisement put at the end of *Beza's* Edition of the New Testament in 1556. But he accuses him of not having clearly enough expressed himself in what he has said of these Manuscripts upon the Text of the witnesses in heaven; as if he had there intended artifice, and had left with design some obscurity in the Notes, which particularly required, by reason of the nicety and importance of the subject, that he should not leave there the least shadow of obscurity. It is with this Mr. *Emlyn* there finds fault, and

by this he thinks to take from us the testimony of this venerable divine and learned critic, as if *Beza* had not actually found this excellent passage of St. *John*'s Epistle in *Stephens*'s Manuscripts.

To know whether this reproach is well grounded, we need but copy here the two annotations which *Beza* has made upon this Text: *This passage*, says he, *There are three in heaven, &c., clearly explains what the Apostle had said of six witnesses, three in heaven, and three in earth; yet neither the Syriac Translator, nor the old Latin, nor Gregory Nazianzen, nor Athanasius, nor Didymus, nor Chrysostom, nor Hilary, nor Augustine, nor Bede, read it; i.e. they have not quoted it; but St. Jerome read it, and Erasmus found it in a Manuscript of England, it is also in the Complutensian Edition, and in some ancient Manuscripts of Robert Stephens.* What is there wanting to this? Why, what is wanting, says Mr. *Emlyn*, is that *Beza* should have expressed the Manuscripts of *Stephens*, in which he says this passage was, and not say in general and confusedly it is in *some* Manuscripts of *Stephens*. It is then the word *some* which seems to him to contain an obscurity and not to be placed there without design. Could I expect pardon from a discreet and understanding Reader, if he saw me running after so pitiful a trifle, and amusing myself with collecting from this very work of *Beza* abundance of instances of this very sort of annotations, *in plerisque* [in most rvh], or *in nonnullis exemplaribus* [in some copies, rvh], &c.? I endeavour to make a more prudent use of my Readers time and attention.

Well, say they, but he has observed in the following annotation, upon these words of the same verse, ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ *in heaven*, in how many Copies they were wanting; and why has he not done the same in the preceding Note? Why? Because it was of no great importance to tell us how many Manuscripts among *Stephens*'s had this Text. I wish for Mr. *Emlyn*'s sake he had done it; but will anyone venture to affirm after all this, that a critic so hard to be satisfied as he, would not yet find something

to say? We must not, says St. *Athanasius*, expect from an Author that he should express himself as we would, or as we think we should; it is enough that what he says may be easily understood. This rule flows from good sense, and there is no Author, either ancient or modern, but what stands in need of the same justice.

Let us continue to make the extract of *Beza's* Notes; coming to these words of the Text ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ *in heaven*, he says, *these words are wanting in seven ancient Manuscripts*: and these seven are those which *Robert Stephens* had marked in the margin by their numeral Letters. I had said, that this distinction of seven Manuscripts which wanted these words from those which *Beza*, saying of this verse that it was in some, had just mentioned, is an evident proof, first, that *Stephens* had more than seven Manuscripts of St. *John's* Epistle; and secondly, that he must necessarily have had several, two only, if they will, in which the verse was entire; since *Stephens* and *Beza* restrained those, in which the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ were wanting, to seven. A reasoning so clear and natural ought not to be subject to dispute; yet Mr. *Emlyn* has not failed to call it in question. He denies the Manuscripts *Beza* speaks of in these two annotations to be different; and the reason he gives is drawn from the most refined criticism. If these seven Manuscripts, says he, were not the same with those of which *Beza*, (speaking of the verse, that it was read in St. *Jerome*, in *Erasmus*, and in the *Complutensian*) said that it was also read *in nonnullis Stephani*, “in some of *Stephens's*;” he should have said in the following Note, *deest in septem aliis vetustis Codicibus*, it is wanting in seven *OTHERS*; not having then said *seven others*, but only *seven*, this, says he, does not distinguish these Manuscripts from the rest, but leaves room to judge that they are the same. What pity it is, I will not say to answer these things, the meanest Grammarian will do it for me, but that I cannot avoid transcribing them from Mr. *Emlyn's* writings into mine!

*Robert Stephens*, as I have elsewhere observed, had already made two

*Greek* Editions of the New Testament before that of 1550 upon which *Beza* made his annotations. This last was in every respect like the two former, and differed from them only in the largeness of the characters, and the form of the volume, this being *in folio*, with large margins, and the two former in 16°, and consequently with very small margins. The Manuscripts of the last of these three Editions were the same as of the first and second; *Stephens* says it in express terms, *cum iisdem contulimus, &c.* Now the verse of the witnesses in heaven was inserted entire in the two former. This learned man acted in this according to what prudence and the rules of strict Criticism required, and what all prudent and able Editors have done in like cases; which is to have regarded the two words which were wanting in seven Manuscripts as a mere omission, because he found them in the rest, in the *Complutensian*, in *Erasmus*, and in the *Latin* Versions, and because also the nature of the opposition which is seen in the words of the following verse, ἐν τῇ γῆ, *in earth*, with these foregoing, ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, *in heaven*, evidently enough show that the words *in heaven* must be joined with the witnesses which are named in the 7<sup>th</sup> verse. If *Stephens* had only kept to these two Editions, and had not with the exactness of an honest man and a learned critic put out this third, in which, as I may say, he gives an exact account of the Manuscripts from which he had made his two former, what would they have said, who upon occasion of this great exactness in setting down in the margin the various readings he had found among all his Manuscripts pretend that this Text was not in any? If the case be so, we cannot avoid looking upon *Stephens* as an egregious Imposter for having given us as a Text of the Apostle St. *John*, an entire verse forged by himself, or others like him: Mr. *Emlyn* finds that I am too severe in drawing consequences which reflect upon the honour of *Stephens* in making him pass for a profligate forger of supposititious passages; but would one imagine whence this indulgence should proceed?

<sup>23</sup>he fancied that I spoke of a pretended negligence of this learned Printer in correcting an error of the press, with regard to the *obelus* which ends at the word οὐρανῶ, whereas, says he, it should not have ended till the middle of the 8<sup>th</sup> verse, and after the words, ἐν τῇ γῆ, *in earth*. What a pleasant notion was this? <sup>24</sup>*Either* Robert Stephens, said I, *had the Manuscripts in which the Text of St. John was found, which he inserted into four Editions, one after another, or he had not: If he had, all is over, and our cause is gained; If he had not, Stephens was an impostor, an infamous fellow, who deserved the utmost contempt: Mr. Emlyn will place better at another time his soft speeches, and his regard for the memory of Stephens.*

I had spoken in advantageous terms of the sincerity and exactness of this learned man, in giving nothing a place in his Edition of the sacred Scripture, which was not in the Manuscripts: and I had confirmed this by the testimony of *Beza*, and *Hentenius*, Professor in Divinity at *Louvain*; *but for my part*, <sup>25</sup>says Mr. *Emlyn*, *I do not rely so much as Mr. Martin, upon the integrity and exactness of Stephens*. And why not? Because, says he, Dr. *Mill* has observed, that *Stephens* had omitted above seven hundred various readings betwixt his Edition and that of *Complutum*. Is it then to want either integrity or exactness not to fill an Edition with all the various readings that are found in the Manuscripts? Truly, *Stephens* would have made a fine work of it, if he had filled his margin with a thousand variations of no significancy: he chose, like a skillful man as he was, those which appeared to him the most considerable.

These sort of criticisms concerning the nature of the variations which are met with in the ancient Manuscripts, have nothing common with the

---

<sup>23</sup> Reply page 29.

<sup>24</sup> Exam. page 148, 149.

<sup>25</sup> Reply, page 29.

addition of a Text which was not in any; for the question here is only concerning that. I come back then to this, that if *Stephens* did not find in his ancient Manuscripts the passage which speaks of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, he was guilty of forgery, for having inserted it in his Editions, *compared*, as he says, with his Manuscripts. *France*, which assuredly did not love him, though they could not but esteem him, received his first Editions, made at *Paris*, with the applauses they deserved: and it was not, until since a party has been formed as by concert against the genuineness of the passage of St. *John*, that an attempt has been made to sap the foundation of these Editions, by attacking the Manuscripts from which they were made. Let us now pass to the *obelus* which in the third Edition was set before the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, and which has given occasion to a malicious Criticism against this passage.

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

## CHAP. V.

*Of the obelus placed in the middle of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse, There are three in heaven, &c. of the Manuscripts mentioned by the Divines of Louvain, and of that which F. Amelotte says he saw at Rome.*

WE have seen that among the Manuscripts of *Robert Stephens* there were found seven, in which the passage of St. *John* was not entire, for they wanted these words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, i. e. *in heaven*: but as notwithstanding this he did insert them in his Edition, for the reasons I have given, he marked them with two small points, which he set at the upper end of the line, one before the word ἐν, and the other after οὐρανῷ, which thus formed a kind of parenthesis named an *obelus*, as if one should, say somewhat *pointed*, or *sharp*. This *obelus*, placed as it is, and ending with the word οὐρανῷ, shews that all the rest of the Verse was in the same Manuscripts, but this not suiting with those who will have the

Text to be supposititious, they pretend that the end of this *obelus* is misplaced, by an error of the press, and that it ought to be put after these words of the following Verse, ἐν τῇ γῆ, *in earth*.<sup>26</sup> It is pretended that the Divines of *Louvain* passed the same judgment upon the misplacing this *obelus* 150 years ago: but they have only said that the Manuscripts of *Stephens* had the Text of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse entire, and so as it is printed, *unless the obelus be placed wrong*: I would myself say as much, though I maintain that it is in its true place. As it is a point of mere Criticism, which requires a nice application and enquiry, no one must be surprised that Dr. *Mill*, who had his mind full of learning, and who could not but be very much wearied with the large Work of the Edition of the New Testament he has left us, has not allowed all the time and pains necessary to clear up this matter; one man cannot do everything. Where the Doctor failed in attention, I have endeavoured to supply with mine; it may be seen through the whole of what I have said in the x<sup>th</sup> Chapter of my Dissertation, where I have very largely treated of this matter, and in the xiii<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the Examination of Mr. *Emlyn*'s Answer, that there is no reason to doubt but the *obelus* must be in the place where it is put in the Edition without carrying it any farther.

Mr. *Emlyn* has not touched upon the reasons I have given, and he had no other way to take, than by calling out for the Manuscripts of *Robert Stephens*; to demand what is become of them; let them produce them; that they cannot be lost; and such other matters which show a man reduced to the last extremity.

Without tarrying to show that it belongs neither to me nor any other to give an account what is become of old Manuscripts for upwards of 150 years, which may so easily have had the fate of so many others no less considerable, which are lost, I would beg of Mr. *Emlyn* to tell us whither

---

<sup>26</sup> Reply, page 27.

this objection tends, which appears to him so pressing. For my part, I cannot see that it aims at anything else, but to insinuate that it is a fable, spread by *Robert Stephens*, and confirmed by *Beza*, his good friend; that there were Manuscripts which had the passage of *St. John*, some the entire passage, others without these two words, *in heaven*. Unless they accuse first *Robert Stephens*, and then *Beza*, of having acted one after the other, and then both together, the infamous part of cheats and impostors, I do not see to what end they call for these Manuscripts. If Mr. *Emlyn* can form suspicions against the probity and honour of these two learned men, whose reputation has been, and is yet, in veneration; there will be no candor and sincerity, which in this kind can be secure against his injurious suspicions. There would be withal so much extravagance in this, that I am not willing to believe him capable of it. Though then these Manuscripts should be lost since the time that *Stephens* had them in his hands, and though no person at present knows what is become of them, all that we lose thereby, is the satisfaction of seeing there the same Texts, which *Stephens* and *Beza* saw there. The truth of the fact remains always the same: a degree of more or less evidence takes away nothing from the truth, and the evidence is here great enough for the reason I have given, without any need of our seeing these Manuscripts ourselves; which they say they saw.

If the *obelus* ought to have been carried so far as the middle of the 8<sup>th</sup> Verse, and all the words together, *in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one: And there are three that bear record in earth*, be thus cut off at one stroke, in order to join the first words of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse, *For there are three, which bear record*, with these other of the 8<sup>th</sup>, *Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, &c.* as Mr. *Simon* and Mr. *Emlyn* imagine, *Robert Stephens* could not have condemned himself in stronger terms, and given himself up as an impostor to the Public: For having inserted the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse entire in two following Editions, and the 8<sup>th</sup>

Verse entire also; making together six witnesses; three in heaven, *the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, and three in earth, *the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood*. This reason carries with it its own conviction.

It will be withal confirmed by the conduct which *Stephens* continued to observe after the Edition in which he had placed the *obelus*, which was that of 1550. As all his Editions were sold off, almost as fast as they came out of the press, the first, which was that of 1546 had been followed by that of 1549, this by the Edition in 1550, and to this third immediately succeeded a fourth, which was made in the year 1551. If the *obelus* had been wrong placed in the Edition of 1550, which is the only one in which it was inserted, as this misplacing would have introduced into the Epistle a false Text, namely that of the witnesses in heaven, can one conceive that *Robert Stephens* would not have cast out of this Edition in 1551 a passage which he had printed and rejected by the *obelus* of the preceding year? By such use of forming chimaeras, a man must have got such a power over his own mind, as to be able to believe whatever he pleases. This would be more than enough to prove to any reasonable person, that the *obelus* of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse respects only the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, and ought not to be carried farther; but I yet reserve for the close a demonstrative proof of the same truth; I know not whether any one has ever discovered it; for my part, I have observed it but within these few days, as I was reviewing this subject.

Extraordinary pains have been taken, to reduce all the Manuscripts which *Stephens* had of the first Epistle of St. *John* to the number of *seven*, and to show that they were only the *seven* which are set down in the margin with reference to the *obelus* of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse, and as they pretended this *obelus* was inserted in order to cast out of the Epistle the whole Text of the witnesses in heaven, they concluded from thence that this Text not being in his seven Manuscripts it was not therefore in any. I have here and elsewhere shown in the passages which I have alleged the falsity of all

these suppositions, but without so many reasons, and having recourse to a discussion upon which they form several difficulties, here is a short and certain way to come at the same end: which is, that the very reason they rely so much upon, destroys itself, and carries with it the conviction of quite the contrary.

The *obelus* refers to seven Manuscripts marked in the margin by these *Greek* numeral Letters, δ. ε. ζ. θ. ι. ια. ιγ. to signify that in these the words marked by the *obelus* were wanting; now this is so far from proving that *Stephens* had none but these very Manuscripts of St. *John's* Epistle, that it is a convincing proof he had several beside.

To be satisfied of this they need but run over with their eyes *Stephen's* Edition, they will there see from one end to the other abundance of Texts marked like this with an *obelus*, sometimes upon one word only, sometimes several, and sometimes half a Verse, with the reference of some Manuscripts set down in the margin: some of these *obeluses* refer but to one Manuscript, others to two or three, and several to nine or ten, but this very thing shows that they were not all the Manuscripts of the Gospel or the Epistle, or the like Book of the New Testament which are specified by this sort of references, but that beside these he had others withal.

When *Stephens* marked with an *obelus* one or more words which he did not find in his Manuscripts he put in the margin ἐν πᾶσι, *in all*, to signify that these words were wanting in all: most frequently he set down by abbreviation the single letter π. which being the first of the *Greek* word πᾶνλα, expressed the same thing; but when the passage of the Text where he put an *obelus* was wanting only in some, he marked by the numeral letters. I have mentioned each of those which had not the words, and it is then a perfect demonstration that he had others in which the words were read.

For instance; In the iii<sup>rd</sup> Chapter of *Matthew*, verse 11. *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire*, the last words *and with fire* are marked by an *obelus*, and in the margin are placed these seven Greek Letters, α. γ. δ. ε. ζ. ρ. ιβ. which signified seven Copies, where these words were wanting; In the vi<sup>th</sup> Chapter, in which the Lord's Prayer is recited, there is an *obelus* over these words, *For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, for ever and ever, Amen*; and in the margin is put the letter β. which specified the Copy in which these words, which were found in all the rest, were not. In the same Gospel chapter viii. verse 21 the Word *first*, is marked with an *obelus*, which refers to one Manuscript only, because there was but that which had it not. In the ix<sup>th</sup> Chapter, verse 13 these Words *to repentance*, are read in all the Manuscripts excepting two, which are expressed in the margin by β. & ιβ. It would be endless to quote all the other parallel instances. As then it would be certainly wrong to imagine that *Stephens* had but such Books of the New Testament, as answer to the number of Manuscripts marked in the margin by *obeluses* in the Gospels or in the Epistles, they may thence see whether they have reason to say that he had only the seven Manuscripts to which the *obelus* of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse refers of the first Epistle of St. *John*, besides the *Complutensian* Bible: since on the contrary it is everywhere a certain proof that he had several others, and that in them the words were read which were wanting in those denoted by the *obelus*.

It is a constant use, and a practice so universally observed, in such cases not to carry the references of the *obeluses* and such other marks, farther than the sole Copies, upon occasion of which they were inserted, that there never yet was made an Edition when the matter was otherwise. Before *Robert Stephens* had made his *Greek* Edition of 1550 he had printed several fine *Latin* Bibles, for which he had made an excellent choice of the most extraordinary Manuscripts. When he did not find a word or a sentence in some which were generally in the others, he marked these

Manuscripts with an *obelus*: his Editions afford abundance of examples; we have one among the rest upon this very Verse of the v<sup>th</sup> Chapter of St. *John*'s Epistle, which<sup>27</sup> Mr. *Simon* has not forgot, and upon occasion of which he commends the exactness of *Stephens*. The passage is entire in this *Latin* Edition, which was made in 1540, but it is there with an *obelus* or *parenthesis*, which includes all these words of the *Latin* Text, *in Coelo, Pater, Verbum, & Spiritus Sanctus, & qui testimonium dant in terra*; which were in all his Manuscripts except three or four, in which they were wanting, and which are noted in the margin to answer to the *obelus*; but for this very reason that only these Manuscripts are there specified, it is an infallible proof that he had several others in which the Text was entire.

*Hentenius*, Professor of Divinity at *Louvain*, printed in 1547 a very beautiful *Latin* Bible, and not finding in five Manuscripts these very words of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse *in coelo*, which answer to the *Greek* ἐν οὐρανῶ, which were wanting in seven Manuscripts of *Stephens*, *Hentenius*, I say, places there an *obelus* with a reference to five Manuscripts. Now as it would be absurd to infer that *Hentenius* had only these five Manuscripts of St. *John*'s Epistle, it is just the same to say that *Stephens* had but seven Manuscripts of this Epistle, under pretext that the *obelus* mentions but seven; since on the contrary *Hentenius* taking notice but of five in which the words *in coelo* were not read, he has shown by this very thing that they were read in the others: the case is the same with regard to the seven *Greek* Manuscripts of *Stephens*, which had not the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῶ.

The only thing they can object is to say that *Stephens* having besides these seven MSS. the *Complutensian* Edition, in which the passage of St. *John*'s Epistle was entire; he ought not to have put, as he has so frequently done in other places, ἐν ἁῶσι, or simply ἁ. since it was not wanting in all:

---

<sup>27</sup> Hist. Crit. de Vers. du N. Test. Chapter xi. p. 133.

but ought only to have marked those, in which it was wanting, which are these seven.

This answer might take place, first, if it was true that *Stephens* had taken the Text we are upon from the *Complutensian* Edition; but nothing is more evidently false: I have shown it in my Dissertation upon this passage; and to repeat it here in two words, the Edition of *Complutum* has καὶ οἱ τρεῖς, these words of *Stephens*, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς; the *Complutensian* says, εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι, *Robert Stephens*, ἓν εἰσι. Which makes a very great difference. In the 8<sup>th</sup> Verse the *Complutensian* reads ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. *Stephens* ἐν τῇ γῆ the last clause of this Verse, οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι, is wanting in the Edition of *Complutum*, where the words are placed at the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse; there is nothing like this in the Editions of *Stephens*, and these words are at the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> Verse, as they ought to be agreeably to the other *Greek* Manuscripts and the *Latin*. *Stephens* cannot then have had that Edition in view.

Secondly, When upon putting an *obelus*, there remained but one or two Copies which had the words, that the *obelus* marked to be wanting in some Manuscripts; it was his custom to set in the margin ἐν πᾶσι, or π. with the *Greek* word πλὴν, which signifies *except*, to denote that these words were wanting in all, except such or such Copies: for instance, in *St. John*, chapter vi. verse 45 he places an *obelus* over the word ἀκούσας, and in the margin π. πλὴν τοῦ γ. καὶ τοῦ η. to express, *in all except* the two Manuscripts γ. & η. In *St. Matthew*, chapter v. verse 33 πάλιν, in the margin, π. πλὴν ιβ. *i.e.* in all, except the Manuscript ιβ. In chapter xii. v. 35. τῆς καρδίας, in the margin, π. πλὴν τοῦ η. in all except the Manuscript η. In *St. John*, chapter iii. Verse 25 *Ιουδαίαν* in the margin, π. πλὴν τοῦ α. *i.e.* in all except the Copy α, which is in the *Complutensian* Edition: and it is this very Edition they would make to be an exception to the list of the seven Manuscripts marked with an *obelus* in *St. John's* Epistle, as if it was the only Copy which *Stephens* had besides those seven, and the

only one in which the Text was. But *Stephens* has not put, as in other places  $\omega\lambda\eta\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha$ , except the *Complutensian*, and they have no right to make him say what he has not said, and what is withal very different from his common custom. All this shows that if *Stephens* had only had these seven Manuscripts of St. *John*'s Epistle, he would not have stood to have named them one after another, to let us understand that the *obelus* he had put in the Text respected only these.

*Beza*, who had *Stephens*'s Manuscripts, and who had made his annotations upon these very Manuscripts, leaves no room to doubt of the truth I have just demonstrated, since speaking of the words  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\tilde{\omega}$ , over which we find the *obelus*, he says they were wanting in seven Manuscripts, but with regard to the whole Verse, for it is of this he treats in his Note, it was in some of *Stephens*'s Manuscripts, besides the *Complutensian Bible*: *Erasmus*, says he, read this Verse in the *Codex Britannicus*; it is in the *Complutensian Edition*; and we read it also in some old Manuscripts of our dear friend *Stephens*.

What remains is only to say two words upon the other Manuscripts mentioned in the title of this Chapter, those which are spoken of by the Divines of *Louvain*, and that which *F. Amelotte* says he saw at *Rome*.

I had quoted in my Dissertation upon this Text a considerable passage from the Divines of *Louvain*, who having printed a *Latin Bible* in the year 1574 speaking of the *Greek Copies* say in their Preface, that besides that of the *Complutum*, the *Codex Britannicus* of *Erasmus*, and the Manuscripts of *Robert Stephens*, they had seen several others of the same sort; that is to say, in what concerns the passage of St. *John*, for it is of this they were speaking. Mr. *Emlyn* had answered, that this must only be understood of the *Latin Editions*. I showed the impropriety of that answer; and he has stopped there; thus leaving me by his conviction the *Greek Manuscripts* in which this passage was, which the Divines of *Louvain* said

they had seen.

Next came the testimony of *Amelotte* a Father of the Oratory, who says in a Note upon the Text of *St. John*, that he had seen it at *Rome* in a very ancient *Greek* Manuscript of the *Vatican* Library. Mr. *Emlyn* had borrowed from Mr. *Simon*, (who in several respects appears to have been no good friend to F. *Amelotte*) all that he had advanced to render his integrity doubtful. I have examined all his reasons, and confuted them. Mr. *Emlyn*, who had held himself secure of his fact under the authority of Mr. *Simon*, yields to them; and F. *Amelotte's* integrity has remained safe as to that matter; nothing that I have said has been confuted: here again then is another very ancient *Greek* Manuscript in which the Text of the three witnesses in heaven is found, as in the *Complutensian*, the Manuscript of *Erasmus*, those of *Robert Stephens*, and some others which had fallen under the eyes of the Divines of *Louvain*: will they after this say, that it is in no Manuscript?

---

## CHAP. VI.

*A Defense of the Manuscripts of Robert Stephens against certain Manuscripts produced from the Library of the King of France, which are pretended to be the same that Stephens used in his Editions.*

THE proof which all those who have written before me upon this subject have drawn from the Editions of *Robert Stephens*, and which I have used after them, for the authenticness of the Text of the three witnesses in heaven, must not be looked on as a matter of small importance upon the occasion. This Text, it is true, is several other ways proved to be genuine, as is seen in this Treatise, and in the two others of which this is but the sequel, but yet to take from it the testimony of *Robert Stephens*, or rather of the ancient Manuscripts from which he made his

*Greek* Editions of the New Testament, would be to deprive it of one of its principal supports.

Those who have written against the authenticity of this Text have demanded where these Manuscripts of *Stephens's* are, that we may be satisfied with our own eyes whether this passage is in them or no. The Library of the King of *France*, which abounds in Manuscripts, and from whence *Stephens* had several, was the proper place to seek for them; but I have not yet seen anything positive produced from thence. Mr. *l'Abbé Roger*, Dean of the Metropolitcal See of *Bourges*, who printed in 1713. a *Latin* Dissertation to prove this passage genuine, received several informations with relation to these Manuscripts. *Fa. le Long*, Priest of the Oratory, a learned Man, and very industrious in this sort of enquiries, has endeavoured to give the finishing stroke to this, and to inform the Public by a Letter which was inserted in the *Journal des Savans*, the last *June*, and which was addressed to me, as if it had actually been written to me. It is dated the 12<sup>th</sup> of *April*, but I did not see it till the end of the month of *July*. My Book was in the press, and the impression already got very near as far as the matters which respect *Robert Stephens's* Manuscripts. Thus this Chapter, in which I am about to examine *F. le Long's* Letter, must be looked on an addition to this Work, which had been finished some months before.

*F. le Long's* Letter is written in a very genteel manner with regard to my particular subject. He there declares from the beginning that he does not enter upon the genuineness of the passage of *St. John*, and that what he proposes to clear up is only a point of Criticism. He pretends they are much deceived, who believe this passage was in *Robert Stephens's* Manuscripts, and his reasoning and proof amounts to this.

*Robert Stephens* , says he, had borrowed from *Henry II's* Library the eight Manuscripts he has spoken of in the Preface of the Edition of 1550.

He restored them again to the King's Library, and it is there they are found with the ordinary mark of the Manuscripts of that Prince, which is a Crown with an H crowned above, and each with the Greek numeral Letter by which *Stephens* had marked his Manuscripts. Of the eight which were lent him out of the King's Library, there were seven which contained the Canonical Epistles, and these seven, says he, are precisely the same with those which are marked in the margin of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse of the v<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the first Epistle of St. *John*: This Text is wanting entire in these Manuscripts, from whence it follows, says *F. le Long*, that the *obelus* which by an error of the press ends at οὐρανῶ, should have been placed after the words ἐν τῇ γῆ, which in the ordinary Editions are read in the middle of the 8<sup>th</sup> Verse, so that there should only have been in *Stephens*'s Text these words, *For there are three that bear record; the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, and these three agree in one.* *F. le Long* has seen these Manuscripts several times, and having had, he says, the foresight to compare several places of the inward margins of the Edition of 1550. with some of the Manuscripts which are there denoted by their *Greek* Letters, he has found they were the same. All this, asserted and related by a man of probity whom we have no cause to mistrust, surprises the mind, and is capable of staggering it. *F. le Long* was first dazzled, and others may well be so after him, and from his example; but with a little attention to the reflections I am about to make upon all these matters, the surprise will soon be over, and the former persuasion take its place, as well with regard to the genuineness of the Text itself of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse, as the Manuscripts from which *Stephens* inserted it into his Editions.

There is indeed a very great mistake in all this. First, the Manuscripts we are upon were not borrowed from *Henry II*'s Library; it was from the Library of *Francis I.* since the first Edition made from these Manuscripts came abroad whilst this Prince was living in 1546. Now how much time must be spent by a man so constantly employed as *Stephens* was in

examining so many Manuscripts collecting from each the different readings, then comparing them together with one another, and thus forming by so difficult, so long, so laborious a collection, the result from which arose that famous Edition of the year 1550. Those only who know all the difficulties attending works of this kind can tell us how much it must have cost *Stephens*, and consequently how long he must have had these Manuscripts in his hands.

2. I see from the account of *F. le Long* that *Robert Stephens* says in his Discourse to the Divines of *Paris*, that he had returned to the King's Library the Manuscripts he had borrowed thence, which were only to the number of eight; the seven others were borrowed elsewhere, and from divers places, as *Stephens* says in his Preface. Yet *F. le Long* finds in the King's Library all the fifteen which *Stephens* has quoted, and he gives us them all, one after another, quoted by the same numeral letters. This, I own, appeared to me very suspicious, and raised the thought that somebody had formerly taken upon them to set the same letters upon these Manuscripts, in order to advance their credit by the famed name of *Stephens*. For lastly, it is not natural to believe that a man of reputation for honour and probity, such as *Stephens* was, should not have restored such valuable Manuscripts as these were, to the persons who had been so kind as to lend them him. I should require very good warrants to believe this upon, and none are brought.

I was withal more and more confirmed in the thought that these *Greek* letters set upon the Manuscripts *F. le Long* speaks of were a fraud, when I came to examine narrowly into these Manuscripts: then the forgery appeared so evident, and presented itself to me in so many different views, that there no longer remained any cause to doubt of it.

In short, I saw that in the Catalogue of *F. le Long*, where there is the same number of Manuscripts, as are set down in *Robert Stephens's*

Edition, there is only the *Complutensian* Bible which has the New Testament entire; so that none of the rest has the *Apocalypse*; and I see on the other hand that *Stephens* takes notice of three Manuscripts, besides the *Complutensian* Bible, in his Edition of this Book; he marks them in that of 1550 by their numeral letters, ια, that is, the eleventh; ιε, which is the fifteenth; and ις, the sixteenth. How can this agree with the Manuscripts of the King's Library; where I find indeed the same numbers, or *Greek* letters, though I nowhere find the Book of the *Revelation* under the mark of the same letters? It is surprising that *F. le Long* did not perceive so great a difference.

This observation leads us to another, which is, that there are not so many Manuscripts of a Book, if we follow *F. le Long*'s Catalogue, as are set down by *Robert Stephens*. For instance, the Gospel of St. *Matthew* has one Manuscript less in *F. le Long*'s Catalogue, than in the list of those of *Stephens*.

The Gospel of St. *Luke* has also one less in the Manuscripts of the King's Library, than in the Edition of *Stephens*.

In the Gospel of St. *John*, the Catalogue of *F. le Long* comprehends but twelve Manuscripts, if we take in the *Complutensian*; the Edition of *Stephens* sets down fourteen with the Bible of *Complutum*.

In *F. le Long*'s Catalogue, there is found but eight Copies of the Book of the *Acts*, with the *Complutensian*; the margins of *Stephens*'s New Testament set down ten comprehending the Edition of *Complutum*.

In *Stephens*'s Edition, there is one Manuscript more of the Epistle to the *Romans*, than in the Catalogue of Manuscripts which *F. le Long* has given us.

So in the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, there is one Manuscript more than in the said Catalogue.

There is also one more in *Stephens's* of the second Epistle to the *Corinthians*.

The second Epistle of St. *Peter* has nine Manuscripts specified in *Stephens's*; *F. le Long* owns but eight in his Catalogue.

All the Manuscripts of the Catalogue having the same numeral letters with those of *Stephens's*, and there not being a greater number mentioned in *Stephens*, than in the Catalogue, these differences can have arisen only from this, that such Manuscripts which in the King's Library contain only such or such Books of the New Testament, contain more under the same numeral letter in *Robert Stephens's* Edition; from whence it follows, that though they have set the same marks upon these Manuscripts of the King's Library, as *Robert Stephens* had set upon his, yet they are most assuredly not the same: they are counterfeit.

Among the Manuscripts of *Stephens*, there were eight which were borrowed from the Library of *Francis I.* He names them in his Preface, the 3<sup>rd</sup>, the 4<sup>th</sup>, the 5<sup>th</sup>, the 6<sup>th</sup>, the 7<sup>th</sup>, the 8<sup>th</sup>, the 10<sup>th</sup>, the 15<sup>th</sup>, and to these numbers the *Greek* numeral letters answer, which are set down in the margins, γ. δ. ε. ζ. η. ι. ιε. In *F. le Long's* list, I see the same *Greek* letters set upon eight Manuscripts, but he says only seven of these eight belong to the King's Library, namely, γ. δ. ε. ζ. η. ι. ιε. there wants the Manuscript ζ. and yet we see one in this new list that has the same mark; now whence could this come, since that belonged to one of the King's Manuscripts, and this is not one of them? This shows that they have put upon the Manuscripts, which *F. le Long* has given us an account of such marks as they have thought fit. We shall see withal from the observations upon each in particular, that the Manuscripts where they have put them, do not at all square with those of *Stephens*, which had these marks.

The Manuscript marked β. in those of *F. le Long* contains only the four Gospels, and the Book of the *Acts*; that which *Stephens* had marked β.

contained also the Epistle to the *Romans*, for he quotes it upon the 10<sup>th</sup> Verse of the iii<sup>rd</sup> Chapter.

The Manuscript marked ζ. in the King's Library has not the Book of the *Acts*; that which *Stephens* has specified by the same letter ζ. has this Book: it is cited at Verse 5<sup>th</sup>, of the xvii<sup>th</sup> Chapter; the mark therefore of the King's, is counterfeit.

I observe the same thing concerning the Manuscripts where they have put the letter η in imitation of one of those of *Stephens*, but the fraud is here more gross; for this Manuscript has only the four Gospels, whereas that of *Stephens* contained also the Book of the *Acts*; it is quoted in two places; at chapter xxiv. verse. 7. and chapter xxv. verse 14.

Another of these Manuscripts which is falsely pretended to be *Robert Stephens's*, is that which they have marked with the letter ι. which contains only the *Acts* and the *Epistles*: but that which in *Stephens's* Edition is denoted by this letter of the *Greek* alphabet had also the Gospels of St. *Luke* and St. *John*; a various reading of this Manuscript is seen, *Luke* chapter verse 19. and another upon *St. John*, chapter ii. verse 17.

The artifice of the forgery has succeeded no better in some other Manuscripts. That which they have marked with these two letters together *ia*. has only the *Acts* and the *Epistles*; the Manuscript of *Stephens* contained beside this the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, the Gospel of St. *John*, and the *Revelation*; as may be seen in St. *Matthew*, chapter x. verse 8, and 10. in St. *John*, chapter ii. Verse 17. in the *Revelation*; chapter xiii. verse. 4.

Next to this Manuscript comes according to the order of the alphabetical letters the Manuscript ιβ. That which is seen in the King's Library has only the four Gospels; the Manuscript of *Stephens* had also the Epistle to the *Corinthians* since there is a various reading in chapter xv. Verse 44.

One of *Stephens's* Manuscripts was marked with these two letters ιγ. They have counterfeited one with the same mark, but they have taken no care to counterfeit one that has more than the *Acts* and *Epistles*, whereas that of *Stephens* had also the Gospel of St. *John*; for he gives us a reading thence on the 17<sup>th</sup> Verse of the ii<sup>nd</sup> Chapter. To go on; there now remains but three Manuscripts to be considered.

The first of these three is that which is marked ιδ. amongst those of the King's Library: it has only the Gospels of St. *Matthew*, St. *Luke*, and St. *John*, but I find it also produced by *Stephens* upon the second Epistle of St. *Peter*, chapter i. verse 4. I had alleged it in my Dissertation; *F. le Long* maintains that it is a fault, and should have been ιγ. instead of ιδ. his reason is, because the Manuscript ιδ. contains only the Gospels; a very weak reason after all the instances we have seen, and which are yet about to be confirmed by the following. For if they cannot extricate themselves in all the others the numbers of which are so remarkable, but by saying, it is an error of the press, I do not see how they can securely say so here, since they can do it in neither case without supposing the point in question, and which I show to be false, namely, that these Manuscripts produced from the King's Library are expressly the same with those which *Robert Stephens* had.

After the Manuscript ιδ. which is the fourteenth, comes the fifteenth, which was marked by these *Greek* numeral letters ιε. That of the King's Library, on which they have set the same letters, begins with the first Epistle to the *Corinthians* and contains only six other Epistles of the same Apostle, but besides these Epistles, the Manuscript ιε. of *Robert Stephens* contained the *Apocalypse*; it is seen there in every page.

To conclude, the last Manuscript quoted by *Stephens* in the margin with the foregoing was the sixteenth, the *Greek* numeral letters of which are ις. In order to fill up the same number, and thus complete the fraud, it was

requisite to mark one of the King's Manuscripts with the same letters but here again they have done it with so little reflection and discretion, that they have put these two letters upon the back of a Manuscript, which, says *F. le Long*, has only the two Evangelists, *St. Luke*, and *St. John*. I have not been able to perceive in all the Gospel of *St. John* one single passage, where the Manuscript ις. is quoted by *Robert Stephens*; but what is here decisive is that the Manuscript which bore this mark among those of *Stephens*, contained the second Epistle to the *Corinthians*, for it is quoted at the 11<sup>th</sup> Verse of the xii<sup>th</sup> Chapters and the *Revelation*, where its quotations are very frequent.

Are these then the same Manuscripts of *Stephens's*? Can we oppose them to his Editions, and say with confidence the Text of the three witnesses in heaven in *St. John's* Epistle was in no Manuscript of *Stephens's*, because it is in none of those of the King's Library? No certainly, the falsehood is too apparent. It was proper to examine exactly into all these matters: the disquisition is tiresome, but the labour of it must be supported in regard of the advantage which thence accrues to the truth.

To set the same truth in a yet stronger light, and to carry its conviction to the highest degree of evidence, let us here bring *Robert Stephens* himself upon the stage. No person could better inform us than he concerning the Manuscripts which he had, and the *obelus* he has inserted in his Edition of 1550. in order to decide the grand question, whether this *obelus* should continue still at the end of the word οὐρανῶ or be carried beyond the words ἐν τῇ γῆ of the 8<sup>th</sup> Verse; this way is the most secure, and altogether the most short and easy.

*Stephens* tells us in the Preface to the Edition of 1550, in which he uses the *obelus*, that this was the third time he printed the *Greek* New Testament after having compared it *with the same Manuscripts*, from which he had made his two foregoing Editions; without any other

difference, save that, not having set down in those the different readings of the Manuscripts because of their small margins, he gave them a place in this, which being in a large form could well contain these various readings in the inner margins.

By this advertisement the discreet Printer and learned critic informs us of two things; the one, that the *Greek* Text of this third Edition is the same as in the foregoing; and the other, that he had revised it a third time by the Manuscripts borrowed from the King's Library, and from divers other places. As then in the Editions of 1546 and 1549, the Texts of the *six* witnesses which are mentioned in St. *John*'s Epistle, *three* in heaven, and *three* in earth were inserted, and we find them again in this third Edition, compared *with the same Manuscripts*: It follows from hence, First, that the *obelus* of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse was not inserted therein in order to suppress the three witnesses which are named there; and Secondly, That *Stephens* had found in his Manuscripts the three witnesses in heaven, and the three witnesses on earth. Though he should tell us so in so many words, we could not be more sure of it than we are from his Preface, and his Editions.

Thus by joining the Preface of 1550 to the Editions of 1546 and 1549, it is clearly seen upon what the *obelus* of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse can turn: It cannot be upon the three witnesses which are named in this Verse, so as to take them away, as if they had been inserted there against the authority of the Manuscripts. Nothing would be more senseless and absurd, than to have put them into the two following Editions, without their having been in any Manuscript, and to replace them again in a third, in order to take them away at the same time by an *obelus* which would utterly exclude them. But by leaving the *obelus* where it is placed, all will be even, and there will remain no shadow of difficulty: the six witnesses will continue in the Edition where the *obelus* is, as they were before in the Editions of 1546 and 1549, only we shall learn from the last of the three, that the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ were wanting in seven Manuscripts, which

like the rest had the Text of the three first witnesses, except these words. The *obelus* stops there, there it is fixed, and so is reason too; and *Robert Stephens* is security for both.

He confirms us withal in this opinion by a fourth Edition, which He published the year after, i. e. in 1551. The 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Verses were inserted there in the same manner as they had been in the two first, and can it be believed, if the *obelus* had been put, but the year before, in the folio Edition, with design to show that the 7<sup>th</sup> verse was not found in any Manuscript, that *Stephens* after such a declaration, would have had the imprudence, the rashness, the dishonesty, to give it a place in this last? They will tell me perhaps that he had inserted the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ in his first Editions, and that he had also replaced them in his last, though they were wanting in seven Manuscripts. It is true, but the case is very different: these words were in the other Manuscripts, in the *Complutensian*; and in the Edition of *Erasmus*, which showed that it was only a mere omission in the seven Manuscripts in which it was wanting. Now *Stephens* was not obliged to comply with an omission to the prejudice of the other Manuscripts, and contrary to the reason he otherwise had for placing these words in the Text: Nothing like this can be alleged to justify *Stephens* for having replaced a whole Text in the Edition of 1551. which he had marked by an *obelus* in the edition of 1550. as that ought to be taken away.

Here is withal another manner of knowing certainly his opinion in relation to all this. After having seen the *obelus* in the middle of the verse, and marked in the margin the Manuscripts which had given occasions of it, he gives upon these other words of the same verse, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι, *these three are one*, a various lection, or different reading, taken from the *Complutensian* Bible, in which instead of οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι, *these three are one*, we read, οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι, *these three agree in one*. Here again *Stephens* must not have known what he

hid, and his head must have been turned, to give, as he has done, a different reading in these words of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse with the Manuscripts, from which he had made his Editions, if these words were not in his Manuscripts. I cannot believe that those, who have embraced the opinion concerning the *obelus* which I oppose, have ever attended to this variation in the *Complutensian* Bible in the view I have just considered it; indeed it is impossible not be struck with it, and to resist the evidence of the truth it so plainly teaches.

Lastly, if we were to judge of *Robert Stephens's* Manuscripts from those which are now in the Library of the King of *France*, the words ἐν τῆ γῆ, which *Stephens* had inserted in the 8<sup>th</sup> verse in four following Editions, would not have been in the Manuscripts which he had borrowed from the Library of *Francis I*, since they are at present in none of those of the King's Library; and in this case, he should have put there an *obelus*, as over the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse, but it is certain that they were in the Manuscripts of *Stephens*, such as we find them in his Editions. *Beza* had all these Manuscripts in his hands, and made use of them in writing his annotations upon the New Testament; he says it in an hundred places, and *Robert Stephens* himself has declared it in the advertisement, which he put at the end the Edition of that work of *Beza*, in the year 1556. I have quoted it in the Examination I made last year of Mr. *Emlyn's* Answer. Now *Beza* has made an express note upon these words of the 8<sup>th</sup> verse ἐν τῆ γῆ, which is decisive. *These words are not*, says he, *in the Syriac Version, nor in several very ancient Greek Copies; but they are in OUR GREEK MANUSCRIPTS and in the Latin Version.* What he calls *our* Greek Manuscripts were those of *Stephens*, his intimate Friend; nothing is more common in his Notes than this manner of expressing these Manuscripts. As then those of the King's Library at present, and those of several other Libraries, have not the words ἐν τῆ γῆ, they cannot be the Manuscripts of *Robert Stephens*. This was all the question betwixt *F. le*

*Long* and me, and it is determined to my advantage; unless they destroy all the proofs I have urged against the Manuscripts produced by *F. le Long* to show them to be counterfeit: but though one alone should remain, that one would suffice to disconcert the whole machine.

\*\*\*\*\*

## CHAP. VII.

### *Of the Manuscript of Berlin.*

IT IS here no longer that same Mr. *Emlyn*, who has been silent with regard to the Manuscripts mentioned in the Preface to the *Louvain* Doctors, and that which *F. Amelette* affirmed he saw at *Rome*; it is quite another thing when we come to the Manuscript of *Berlin*. Mr. *Emlyn* has here outdone himself; he is in ecstasies and triumph. Yet it costs him somewhat dear; an acknowledgment that he advanced and maintained that the Text of St. *John* was not in the lines of the Manuscript but in the Margin; he knew this, he said, from a good hand, and yet this passage was found to be in the body of the Text; I have proved it from the attestation of one of the King's Librarians, and it can no longer be questioned, since Mr. *la Croze*, another Librarian, has said it in the letter which Mr. *Emlyn* has very emphatically produced in the first Chapter of His Reply. Let us see that Letter, and clear up the fact.

I had said in my Dissertation that there was also a *Greek* Manuscript at *Berlin*, which was believed to be five hundred years old, which had the Text of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse, *there are three in heaven*, &c. Mr. *Emlyn* found means by some of his friends to know certainly the case. To this end application was made to a learned man in *Saxony*, who having written to Mr. *la Croze*, received this answer, "Vir Amplishme,—Miror, Codicem nostrum; librum nullius authoritatis, asserendae dubiae lectioni idoneum videri, cum jam ego compluribus viris eruditis, ipsique Reverendo

Martino, manifestum secerim eum codicem, qui falsarii cujudam fraude pro antiquo venditus est, & venditatur, mana recenti ex Editione Polygotta Complutensi fuisse descriptum; id statim vidi, cum anno 1716. Bibliothecam Regiam, peregrinorum more, non enim tunc me moras Berolini facturum putabam, perlustrarem, dixique palam Hendreichio τῷ μακρίτη; idque, ex quo Bibliotheca mihi credita est, candide apud omnes professus sum, neque id ignorat Cl. & Reverendus Martinus, cui idem *meo nomine* significatum est.” That is,—*It seems very strange to me, that ever our Manuscript, a Book of no Authority at all, should be alleged in confirmation of a dubious Reading, since I have already discovered it to very many learned Men, and even to the Reverend Mr. Martin himself, that this Manuscript, though much boasted of, and sold by a cunning Cheat for an ancient Book, is but a late transcript from the Polyglot of the Complutensian Edition; this I presently discerned, when as a Stranger only I viewed the King’s Library, before I had any thoughts of settling at Berlin, and I then declared the same openly to Hendreichius now deceased: and ever since this Library has been committed to my Care, I have freely owned it upon all Occasions without reserve; and the Reverend Mr. Martin knows it very well, who by my means has been informed of it.*

I do not blame Mr. *la Croze* for having written to his Friend in *Germany* what he thought concerning this Manuscript, since it was demanded of him; but as that Friend did not, nor could naturally ask him concerning me, what knowledge I had or had not concerning this Manuscript; Mr. *la Croze*, I think, might have forbore to speak of me without wronging his conscience in the least. However he has done it; as if he had designed to draw a particular attention to it: he repeats it twice together in this Letter, *I had made it evident to several learned Men, and to Mr. Martin himself,—* and some lines after, *Mr. Martin is not ignorant of this, since it has been declared to him from me.*

These final reflections, which without any necessity have fallen from the pen of Mr. *la Croze*, do not favour the candor I profess, and give an idea of me as of a man who affects to be ignorant of what he knows very well; that by means of this affected ignorance, he may more easily compass his design. I am not capable of such dissimulation, and himself shall clear me from it by the very Letter upon which he grounds what he says of me, in that which has been just produced by Mr. *Emlyn*.

One of our common Friends, who came from *Berlin* to study Divinity here, and who is now a Minister, being returned to *Berlin*, gave Mr. *la Croze* an account of a Work I was then engaged in, and which has since been printed under the title of a *Discourse concerning Revealed Religion*; amongst other things he spoke to him of the passage of *St. John*, which I maintained to be authentic; and as he desired to know the opinion of this learned man concerning that disputed passage, in order to communicate it to me, Mr. *la Croze* would give it him in writing, that it might be sent to me: his Letter will acquaint us with it.

SIR,

*I Read yesterday Dr. Mills's Dissertation upon the passage of St. John, and I found there almost all that I had thought upon the same subject: I shall be very glad if Mr. Martin confirms the authority of this testimony by new proofs; but betwixt you and me the matter appears to me very difficult. I am almost persuaded that it is a gloss formed upon the explication of St. Cyprian, which crept from the margin into the Text. All the ancient Greek and Latin Manuscripts in reckoning up the three witnesses mention only the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood. There is no account to be made of our Greek Manuscript of the New Testament; it is a Work, which, though it has deceived many, I never thought above eighty years old. In the year 1696. upon coming to Berlin, I went to see the Library, where they shewed me this Manuscript as being a thousand years*

*old: After having examined it a moment, I maintained that it was modern, and copied from the Edition of the Bible of Cardinal Ximenes. I convinced the late Mr. Spanheim, and the then Librarian by comparing of passages, the resemblance of the characters, and other sensible proofs: these passage of the three witnesses is there word for word, as in the Bible of Alcalá, and it could not be there otherwise—The ancient Fathers have never made use of so remarkable a passage—The Lectionary entitled Απόζολος or Πραξαπόζολος, in my opinion is of no great authority in this case; I do not doubt of its antiquity; but these ecclesiastic Books are more subject to alteration than others—I have written all this in performance of the promise I gave you; for I am persuaded that I have proposed no difficulty which has not been weighed by Mr. Martin, &c.*

Here is word for word what is most essential in that letter as to what regards me, and particularly all that concerns the Manuscript.

Two things are here evidently seen: The First, that this Manuscript which was bought for the Elector of *Brandenburg*, and sold for two hundred Rix Dollars, was thought to be very ancient, and even *a thousand years* old, that the then Librarian, Mr. *Hendreichius*, who, I have been told was a very learned man, had shown it to Mr. *la Croze*, as thinking it to be a very valuable Manuscript; that the famous Mr. *Spanheim*, so well versed in the study of ancient Medals and Inscriptions, had also believed this Manuscript to be genuine; and at the same time I saw that Mr. *la Croze* said he discerned it to be counterfeit *in a moment*, and convinced these Gentlemen of it, and several others in like manner; this I own appeared to me almost a paradox; for in truth, if seeing was enough to discern *in a moment* this Manuscript to be forged, since the calx or chalk of the parchment is yet fresh upon it, as Mr. *la Croze* describes it to his Friend in *Saxony*, I cannot comprehend how the eyes of the *Spanheim*'s, the *Hendreichius*'s, and so many other men of letters, who had seen this Manuscript, and some of whom had doubtless been employed to examine

it, before the Elector bought it as a treasure to enrich his Library, as an extraordinary Book brought out of the *East*; I say, I cannot conceive how their eyes were blinded to such a degree, as not to see what *in one moment* only Mr. *la Croze* had perceived. I have read withal in a letter of *Tollius* to the late Mr. *Graevius*, the famous Professor in this Town, written in 1687, that Mr. *Hendreichius* showing him at *Berlin* the curiosities in the celebrated Library of the Elector, presented to him this Manuscript, which I believe he would not have done, if the cheat had been so evident, as to be perceived *in a moment*: *Tollius* not being a man so easily to be imposed upon, though the Librarian himself had been so imprudent as not to stick at the account of drawing him into a mistake.

Besides this, I saw that a Librarian when consulted by a person of eminent note in the Court of *Berlin*, whether the passage was in the body of the Text, or in the margin only, and whether this Manuscript was five hundred years old, as I said it was reputed, or if it was only three hundred old, as Mr. *Emlyn* affirmed, answered by a note written with his own hand, and printed in my *Examination*, that the passage was in the body of the Text, but as to the antiquity of the Manuscript, they could assert nothing certain about it, *de antiquitate verò nil certi affirmari potest*. Was so much required to be opposed to the opinion of Mr. *la Croze*, and to make me follow that of so many learned men, as sufficient grounds for quoting this Manuscript in the plain manner I have done, without relying upon it as an indisputable foundation? Mr. *Jablonski*, who is so well skilled in the *Oriental* languages, having been before all this consulted about this Manuscript by Dr. *Ketner*, had hinted to him nothing of its being counterfeit, which Mr. *la Croze* says is so plainly to be seen; and he himself tells us in his Letter to his friend in *Saxony*, that even at present several persons cry it up as ancient; for that is the meaning of the word *venditatur*; which he has made use of.

The second thing which is so evidently seen in Mr. *la Croze*'s letter,

which was sent to me, is that there is nothing more than a bare account of his opinion, and the argument upon which it was founded; but can this be called the *having clearly showed me* that this Manuscript was forged? That in showing the Manuscript itself to the persons who desired to see it, he had evidently laid before them the marks of its being counterfeit, I have nothing to say to that; but that by one and the same expression he should confound me with these persons, as if the impression which their eyes and hands had made in their mind should have likewise passed into mine; by the bare account he has given, equity does not allow them to think me obliged to have the same sentiment. Mr. *la Croze* should not therefore have said, *jam ego compluribus viris eruditis, ipsique R. Martino manifestum secerim, &c.* nor repeat again, *neque id ignorat R. Martinus.* For what was I not ignorant of? That the Manuscript was counterfeit? By no means. But what I was not ignorant of is that Mr. *la Croze* believed it counterfeit; whilst other learned men, who had seen it, believed it genuine. I have done nothing therefore in quoting it that can cast the least reflection upon my integrity; I am even apt to flatter myself that this was not Mr. *la Croze's* intention.

Add to this, that his prejudice against the authority of the passage of St. *John* appeared to me so very great, that I might well suspect that he had suffered himself to fall into an opinion against a Manuscript which so many others believed authentic. As I know he has read my Dissertation upon the passage of St. *John*, and the Examination I made last year of Mr. *Emlyn's* Answer, he might have been convinced that this Text is not a Scholion, as he had suggested in his letter; and that it is not true that no ancient Author has quoted it, except what is related in *Victor* and *Fulgentius*. He might have seen also that the Lectionary called *Apostolos*, is of greater authority than he has imagined, and he may see it yet more in the sequel of this Discourse.

Lastly, no one can speak with more circumspection of the Manuscript

of *Berlin* than I have done. I have but barely quoted it in my Dissertation, page 116. *They say there is also a Manuscript at Berlin, said I, in the King's Library which they believe to be five hundred years old; F. le Long reports it upon the testimony of Saubertus and Tollius.*

Mr. *Emlyn* has formed upon this an accusation against me, as if I had ascribed to *Saubertus* and *Tollius* the having said that this Manuscript was five hundred years old. But he should have considered that the expression *they believe*; to which I refer the five hundred years, being a vague term, which expresses no person in particular, cannot be appropriated to *Saubertus* and *Tollius*. If he did not comprehend it, it was at least very easy for him to understand it, by seeing after what manner I have spoken of it in the Examination I made of his first Tract against me: *I contented myself* said I page 103, *with marking the antiquity of this Manuscript upon the testimony of Saubertus and Tollius, quoted by F. le Long in his Bibliotheca sacra: where indeed this Copy is called pervetustum; i. e. very ancient. They see neither there nor elsewhere that I have spoken of five hundred years, as from those two learned men: and in page 164 I quoted, said I, Saubertus and Tollius in relation to the Manuscript itself, and Ketner with regard to the passage of St. John: Mr. Emlyn might have done me more justice.*

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

## CHAP. VIII.

*Particular reflections upon the genuineness or forgery of the Manuscript of the Greek New Testament which is at Berlin in the King's Library.*

I DO not know whether we ought at present to make a problem of the genuineness or forgery of this Manuscript. If we were absolutely to judge: of it from the value the Librarians and other learned men set upon it, when

it was brought to *Berlin* in order to be put into the curious and noble Library of the Elector of *Brandenburg*, as a very extraordinary and ancient Manuscript brought out of the *East*, one could not avoid coming into the same sentiment. But Mr. *la Croze*, on the contrary, speaks with so much contempt of this Manuscript in the two letters lately produced, that day is not more opposite to night. As truth can never lose its rights, and that we ought solely to acquiesce in the dictates of Reason, if it be now found that Mr. *la Croze* has Reason evidently on his side, his opinion must be preferred to that of the Librarians his Predecessors, and all the other learned men, who have believed this Manuscript very ancient and genuine: But withal, whatever regard we have for Mr. *la Croze*'s learning, we must not entirely give up to him the opinion that has hitherto prevailed concerning the antiquity of this Manuscript.

The first knowledge I had of it, is from what *F. le Long* has said in his *Bibliotheca sacra*, where, upon the testimony of *Saubertus*, he calls it a *very ancient Manuscript brought out of the East*.

*Saubertus* was a Professor of Divinity at *Helmstad*, eminent for his study of the Languages and Criticism. He composed in this way of learning a work made up of different readings from the most excellent Manuscripts of St. *Matthew*'s Gospel, which was printed at *Helmstad* in 1672, and gained him a great reputation among the learned. Mr. *Simon* among others has spoken in praise of it in his Critical History of the Text of the New Testament. This work is become scarce, and though I had took a great deal of pains to meet with it, I did not succeed in them till a few days ago, and when this Treatise was already prepared to be printed.

The curiosity I had to see this Book of *Saubertus* was satisfied, even beyond my expectation, by the great number of different readings, which are there quoted from the Manuscript of *Berlin*, which *Saubertus* marks by the name of *Ravius*, and by abbreviation with the word *Rav.* as he

advertises in his Preface. There also he informs us, that all these different readings had been extracted by the care of Mr. *Ravius* at that time Librarian to the Elector, and upon this occasion he styles the Manuscript<sup>28</sup> *very ancient and very precious*, or *very scarce*, for the *Latin* signifies both. These two words are a great, though a short encomium; but it is not upon that I stop now. They are contrary to those of Mr. *la Croze*, who maintains this Manuscript is very modern, and that it is even no more than a Copy from the Bible of *Alcala*; to dwell then upon these advantageous expressions of *Saubertus* would be only to oppose one learned man to another, and judgment to judgment, which would be no determination. We must therefore follow another method, and do it by the examination of the Manuscript itself. Mr. *la Croze* leads us to this by the account he gives us in his two Letters; this then we must necessarily pursue.

The first thing which straight offers itself to the eye upon opening this Manuscript is the form of the letters, the manner of writing, the order of the words, the characters of the ink and parchment, all these, says Mr. *la Croze*, discover it to be modern, and betray the fraud of the writer.

*The parchment, says he, appears fresh; the chalk used in dressing the skin is yet seen, the ink is wholly white, the characters are like the Complutensian, so that he who has seen that Edition has seen the Manuscript, and he that sees the Manuscript sees that Edition; without excepting even the errors of the press which the ignorant transcriber (employed in this imposture by some man of letters) had not skill to correct.*<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Pervetustus & admodum pretiosus, *Prolog. page 41.*

<sup>29</sup> Qui codicem Complutensem vidit, is vidit & Manuscriptum codicem nostrum, ne demptis quidem meadia typographorum, quae scriba indoctus ita fideliter expressit, ut omnino constet hominem illiteratum ab erudito aliquo nebulone ci fraudi perficiendae fuisse praefectum. Et fane pro antiquo liber ille veuditus est, immani etian pretio, etsi membranae recenti adhuc calx five creta illa inhaereat, quae pellibus vitulinis parandis adhiberi solet; atramentum ubique albicans. *Mr. la Croze's Letter to his friend in Saxony, produced by Mr. Emlyn.*

As I have never seen this Manuscript, it does not belong to me to give my judgment upon all these particulars, I only find, that being so astonishing, at least those of the letters, ink, and parchment, as Mr. *la Croze* represents them to us; it is wonderful, as I have observed already, that none of those learned men who had seen and handled this Manuscript for upwards of fifty years, should have seen any thing of all this. One might think, without any diminution of the probity and merit of Mr. *la Croze*, that it is not impossible but, prejudice has here enlarged the object to his view. There is one thing at least, which he is not ignorant of, and of which he, who has seen so many valuable Libraries and ancient Manuscripts, has more instances of than I, that the marks taken from the parchment, the ink, and the form of the characters, are not always rules so surely to be depended on, as thereby to determine the genuineness or forgery of this kind of Manuscripts; but that men may be mistaken, and even are sometimes so, in spite of the greatest skill in this sort of studies.

I go here even yet farther, and say that the resemblance of the characters of this Manuscript with the *Complutensian* Bible, was it as perfect as Mr. *la Croze* would have us believe, is not a reason for inferring that one is copied from the other. The curious, who have taken the pains to transcribe the form of the *Greek* letters, which have been used from one age to another, inform us that several Manuscripts which have been made in the same age, or in ages near to each other, may very easily, and even must in some respect be alike in the form of their characters, and in the composition and order of the words, and yet one not have been copied from the other. Thus this argument from the resemblance is not conclusive in favour of Mr. *la Croze*'s opinion.

But this conclusion will be yet less capable of being drawn, if it is true that the writing of the Manuscript is different in several things from that of the *Complutensian* Edition. I have received from Berlin, at several times, extracts of the several ways of Writing in the Manuscript; and I

have also received divers others of the manner how the writing and the lines are disposed in the Edition made in the very Town of *Complutum* in 1513 and finished, as I have elsewhere observed, the 10th of *January*, 1514. I have seen one of these Copies at *Amsterdam* in the fine Library of Mr. *Vander Hagen*, Pastor of the *Dutch Church*, which is very much valued; and it is from thence I have received all that I have to produce from this famous Edition. The Manuscript of *Berlin* has no sort of punctuation in its lines and betwixt its words, which separates them from each other, nor any mark above the words, which holds there the place of the *Greek accents*. The *Complutensian* Edition has all this: points irregular in several places, and above the words composed of several syllables it has strokes or small points, in the place of the *Greek accents*, to express the pronunciation of the syllable over which these points are set, in like manner as in *French* we put them over the shut or close *é*, as in the words *vérité, pénétré, &c.* Thus in the *Complutensian* the *Greek words*, *ἐλθόντες, παιδίον, πνεύμα*, and others; of which the Editors of that Bible have given an advertisement in their Preface. These differences appear to me remarkable enough to show that one cannot be a copy of the other. Yet this is the least thing I have to say upon this subject; the principal remains behind, and decides the fact: in question.

Mr. *la Croze* says in his Letter to his friend, that he who has seen the *Complutensian* Copy, has seen by this also the Manuscript of *Berlin*; and in that which he had written some years before to be sent to me, he says, that it was by this great agreement of the one with the other, that he convinced Mr. *Spanheim* this Manuscript was only a Copy of the *Complutensian* Edition: *I convinced*, says he, *the late Mr. Spanheim, and the then Librarian, by confronting of passages, &c. i. e.* by confronting those in which the *Complutensian* Edition was different in some respects from the ordinary Editions of the *Greek New Testament*. This way is indeed the most secure, provided the scrutiny is exact, for otherwise it is

easy to be deceived, and led into mistake. It will soon be seen, that Mr. *la Croze* was first mistaken herein, and that Mr. *Spanheim*, Mr. *Hendreichius*, and others before whom he made this comparison of passages, were mistaken after him, as he assures us, but both only because their inquiry was made upon too superficial a view, for men of their learning and capacity; for I must be allowed to speak my thoughts freely upon this subject; which derogate nothing from the esteem that is otherwise due to their merit.

This reasoning of Mr. *la Croze*, and the manner after which he has expressed himself, imply a perfect agreement betwixt this Manuscript and the *Complutensian* Bible: This is evident. Now there is nothing less true than this agreement: *Saubertus* is the only person who has given me an opportunity of proving it; for not having, as I have said, in my hands either the *Complutensian* Edition, or the Manuscript of *Berlin*, I must have taken my ideas and knowledge from reading the Book of this curious and learned critic. He gives near two hundred various readings of the Manuscript of *Berlin* from the common *Greek* Text of the sole Gospel of St. *Matthew*; for, as I have already observed, his work is confined to this Gospel. Of these variations there are several upon the particles, or upon the articles, which are sometimes less, and sometimes more in the Manuscript than in the *Greek* Editions, either of *Complutum*, or others. I know that these differences, though inconsiderable in themselves, may yet be otherwise in an exact comparison; but as I must confine myself to the most important, in comparing one passage with the other, from the lights I have borrowed at second hand; I have contented myself with extracting a certain number of instances, which will abundantly suffice to show that the Manuscript of *Berlin* was not copied from the Edition of *Complutum*, nor by *an ignorant person*, as Mr. *la Croze* affirms; but on the contrary, by a man of understanding, who wrote nothing rashly, nor any thing which he had not before his eyes in an ancient Manuscript. Let us come to the

instances taken from *Saubertus*, and confirmed by the testimonies which I have received in the manner I mentioned.

*Matt.* chapter ii. verse 2, *We have seen his star*, the *Greek* word αὐτοῦ, which signifies *his*, is in the *Complutensian*, but is not in the Manuscript.

Chap. iii. verse. 13, instead of the word ἀπολέσαι, which is in the *Complutensian* and the common Editions, the Manuscript of *Berlin* has the word ἀποκτεῖναι<sup>30</sup> which is also in one of the Manuscripts of *Robert Stephens*.

In the 17<sup>th</sup> verse of the same Chapter, the ordinary Editions read, ὑπὸ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος, the Manuscript of *Berlin* ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ Ἱερεμίου, &c.

*Matt.* v. verse 32, ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ, in the common Editions and that of *Complutum*; but in the *Berlin* Manuscript ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων, in like manner as in five of *Stephens*, and in the Manuscript of *Montsortius*.

In the same Chapter verse 36, the *Greek* Editions and that of *Complutum* have these words thus disposed λευκὴν ἢ μέλαιναν ποιῆσαι. In the Manuscript of *Berlin* λευκὴν ποιῆσαι μέλαιναν and *Saubertus* observes, that they are so in *Brylinger*, in a Manuscript of *Stephens*, in one of *Casaubon*, and in the *Persick* Version.

These four or five instances are a certain proof that the Manuscript of *Berlin* was not copied from the *Complutensian*, but we have withal several others taken from the same *Saubertus*, and here is one very remarkable.

All the *Greek* Editions, and with them the *Complutensian* Bible have in the vi<sup>th</sup> Chapter, verse 13, at the end of the Lord's Prayer, *For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory for ever and ever. Amen.* *Robert Stephens* had but one Manuscript only in which this clause was not; it is

---

<sup>30</sup> The ēĩ is an ei diphthong with a circumflex accent.—JKB.

not also in the famous Manuscript of *Cambridge*, nor in the Vulgate of St. *Jerome*, all these words are wanting also, says *Saubertus*, in the Manuscript of *Berlin*, except the word *Amen*.

*Matt.* vii. 18, οὐδέ δένδρον *Complut.* But the Manuscript of *Berlin*, and one of *Stephens*'s have betwixt these two words, πάλιν.

*Ibid.* verse 24, ὁμοιώσω it is thus in the *Complutensian*; but in the Manuscript of *Berlin*, and four others produced by *Saubertus*, it is ὁμοιωθήσεται.

Chap. viii. 13, ἑκατοντάρχω is in the *Complutensian*, as *Mill* has observed; but in the Manuscript of *Berlin* and others it is ἑκατοντάρχη.

*Ibid.* verse 17, in the *Complutensian* and common Editions ἔλαβε but the Manuscript of *Berlin*, and some others have ἀντέλαβε.

Chap. ix. 18, ἐλθών, *Complut.* but the *Berlin* Manuscript, *Montfort*, and others have εἰσελθών.

*Ibid.* verse 30, ἀνεώχθησαν αὐτῶν, &c. *Complut.* and others but the Manuscript of *Berlin* and one of *Stephens*'s have over and above the word παραχρήμα.

Chap. x. verse 19, παραδιδώσιν, *Complut.* but *Berlin*, *Mont*, one of *Stephens*'s, &c. have παραδώσωσιν.

Chapter xii. verse 13, ἀποκατεζάθη· *Complut.* and others: but *Berlin*, says *Saubertus*, has ἀπεκατελάθη.

*Ibid.* verse 35, τῆς καρδίας; these words are wanting in the *Complutensian*; but they are in the Manuscript of *Berlin*; as I have been informed by letter.

Chap. xiii. Verse 4, after the word ταπεινὰ the Manuscript of *Berlin*, and several others which *Saubertus* sets down, add τοῦ οὐρανοῦ which are not in the *Complutensian*.

*Ibid.* verse 22, after the word λόγον, the Manuscript of *Berlin* adds the word τοῦτον, which is not in the *Complutensian*.

*Ibid.* verse 40, Κατακαίεται *Complut.* Καίεται: but the *Berlin* Manuscript has κείεται.

Chap. xv. verse 22, ἐκράυγασεν αὐτῷ. *Complut.* but the Manuscript of *Berlin*, one of *Stephens*, that of *Cambridge*, and others have ἔκραξεν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ.

Chap. xvi. verse 26, ὠφελεῖται. *Complut.* but *Saubertus* says; that the Manuscript of *Berlin*, one of *Stephens*, and some others, have ὠφελήθησεται.

Chap. xvii. Verse 2, ὡς τὸ φῶς. *Complut.* but one of the Manuscripts of *Stephens*'s, that of *Cambridge*, and that of *Berlin*, have ὡς Χιῶν.

Chap, xxvii. 29, ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν *Complut.* but *Berlin*, the *Alexandrian* Manuscript, and that of *Cambridge* have ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ.

It would be tiresome to run over *Saubertus*, and transcribe so many variations of the Manuscript of *Berlin* from the Edition of *Complutum*: but how many must there be in the whole New Testament, since such a number is found in the sole Gospel of St. *Matthew*? Especially since I am well assured that *Saubertus* has not produced all. For instance, here are two, which he has not set down, and though they are very remarkable, escaped the collection of *Ravius*, or the remarks of *Saubertus*. The first is upon the 11<sup>th</sup> Verse of the iii<sup>rd</sup> Chapter of St. *Matthew*, where the words καὶ πυρί, *and with Fire*, are wanting in the *Complutensian*, but which, as I am informed by letter; are in the Manuscript of *Berlin*: the other is that of the word τῆς καρδίας of the xii<sup>th</sup> chapter Verse 36, which I have produced..

It appears clearly from all this small collection of different readings from the Manuscript of *Berlin* and the *Complutensian* Edition, that there

is no grounds in the world for believing this Manuscript a Copy of the *Complutensian*, so that *he who sees one, sees the other*, as Mr. *la Croze* asserts. Besides this we see from the manner *Saubertus* gives the different readings of this Manuscript, that they are almost all the same with that of *Montfort*, some of *Stephens*'s, that of *Alexandria*, and the old Manuscript of *Cambridge*; all which agreements cannot but make this Manuscript of *Berlin* highly valuable, which Mr. *la Croze* so much despises.

But what will then become of his affirmation, that it was by comparing this Manuscript with the *Complutensian*, that he showed Mr. *Spanheim* and Mr. *Hendreichius* that this was no other than a Copy of this printed Bible? What will become of this? Why, as I have said, that this collation was too superficial and Mr. *la Croze* cannot take it ill, if leaving him, as I truly do, all the honour of integrity and sincerity, I say he has suffered himself to be overtaken by some agreements which he may have observed in divers places betwixt this Manuscript and the *Complutensian* Bible. I know a great number from the Book of *Saubertus*, and otherwise; but are some agreements enough to make one say roundly it is a Copy, so long as we see so many differences, and differences which can in no respect be taken for faults of the transcriber? Farther, even these agreements are not peculiar to the *Complutensian* Bible, they are common to it with several other Manuscripts; and this should have been first examined. It might have been done first by means of the work of *Saubertus*, where there is found a great number of this sort of variations, which are common to the *Berlin* Manuscript and several others, and of which there are also some that do not agree with the *Complutensian*. It would have been more easy for some years past, to have been satisfied by Dr. *Mill*'s New Testament, who has collected with inconceivable pains all the various readings he could find in a greater number of Manuscripts than *Saubertus*, who had written above forty years before him. If Mr. *la Croze* had found it convenient to make so particular an examination as that would have been, and had then

communicated it to Mr. *Spanheim* and Mr. *Hendreichius*, whom he says he convinced by comparing of passages that the Manuscript was copied from the *Complutensian* Bible, I will venture to say, that these Gentlemen would have been far from being convinced, and he will permit me to believe he would not have been so himself.

He may have observed perhaps in the disposition of the Books of the New Testament, that the *Acts* of the Apostles are placed betwixt the Epistles of St. *Paul*, and the seven Catholic Epistles, and that the case is the same in the Edition of *Complutum*; but it is the same also in the Manuscript of *Dublin*, and in many *Latin* ones. I say nothing concerning the great number of Texts where the various readings of the Manuscript are the same as in the *Complutensian*, we very seldom see them so with that Edition alone: nothing would be more tedious than to produce them here. I observe the same thing as to some others, which are known to me, and which may be of the number of those, upon which Mr. *la Croze* and the other Gentlemen cast their eyes; I speak of those in the *Apocalypse*. The most part agree with the *Complutensian*, and yet not with the *Complutensian* alone, but also with two Manuscripts of *Stephens* marked ιε. ις. Thus no more conclusion can be drawn from them for the Edition of *Complutum*, than for those two ancient Manuscripts, the case is evident.

In this very passage of St. *John*'s Epistle which has given occasion to so many Enquiries, it is not peculiar to the Manuscript of *Berlin*, that it agrees with the Edition of *Complutum* in the 8<sup>th</sup> verse, it agrees also with the *Codex Britannicus* of *Erasmus*; and with the Manuscript of *Dublin*, of which shall by and by produce the extract. The *Berlin* Manuscript agrees with the *Complutensian* Bible in this, that it has not these last words of the 8<sup>th</sup> Verse καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἔν εἰσι. Neither are they in the *Codex Britannicus* of *Erasmus*, nor the Manuscript of the University of *Dublin*. All the difference betwixt them is, that in the *Complutensian* Edition, and in the *Berlin* Manuscript they are placed at the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse; that

is all. But since it appears clearly from all these proofs which we have seen, that this Manuscript is different in so many places from the Edition of *Complutum*, and consequently that it must necessarily have been made from a Manuscript different from that Edition, is it not very natural to believe, that the Manuscript from which the *Berlin* Manuscript was copied had these very words at the end of the Text of the three witnesses, which the *Complutensian* Manuscript had there? If in the passages where the *Complutensian* Edition differs from the *Greek* Editions and several ancient and very valuable Manuscripts, that of *Berlin* agreed with the *Complutensian* and in like manner differed from the *Greek* Editions, and all the other ancient Manuscripts, my reasoning would not be conclusive, because I know very well it is a principle in Logic, *à possibili ad esse non valet consequentia*; “it does not follow that a thing is, because it may be.” But after having shown, as I have done, that the Manuscript of *Berlin* was not copied from the *Complutensian*, but from another very different, my consequence is very good, when I say, the transposition of these words was then in the Manuscript as in the *Complutensian*.

I hope that this will suffice to everyone who seeks only to be satisfied of the genuineness of this Manuscript, which had not hitherto been so carefully discussed as it deserves, though it were only with relation to the Text of the witnesses in heaven in St. *John*’s Epistle. The proof then, which is drawn from this Manuscript for the authenticness of a Text so advantageous to the Christian Faith, is fixed upon good grounds by the genuineness of the Manuscript itself, which supplies us with it.

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

## CHAP. IX.

*Of the ancient Greek Writers, who have quoted this Text of the first Epistle of St. John, There are three, which bear record, &c.*

ONE of the arguments which is urged against the genuineness of this Text is, that it has never been quoted by the *Greek* Writers, which they would not have failed to do upon several occasions if it had been in their Copies.

This objection falls no less upon the ancient Fathers of the *Latin* Church, than upon us. I would, therefore, know what they, who have so frequently quoted this passage, would answer to it. Whence have you taken it? Would the *Greeks* say to them. It is not in our Writers. The answer which the *Latins* would make is mine. It is in the *Greek*, they would say; and it is from thence that our Versions have taken it; and though your Authors have not quoted it, it is yet in the Epistle of the holy Apostle.

But it is false, that no ancient *Greek* Writer has quoted this Text. I have shown that it is directly expressed in the Synopsis ascribed to St. *Athanasius*, in the passage where running over the v<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the first Epistle of St. *John*, he says that this Apostle shows there the *unity of the Father and the Son*; words which can only have had respect to this Text of the Epistle, *These three are one*. Mr. *Emlyn* had pretended they might also be understood of what St. *John* had said in the ii<sup>nd</sup> chapter Verse 23, *Whoso denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father; but he that acknowledgeth the Son, hath the Father also*; (the rather, says he, because these words in the Synopsis are placed immediately after those of *the unity of the Father with the Son*: but they are there only as a consequence of that Unity, not in proof of the Unity itself; now the Author of the Synopsis says St. *John* speaks of the unity.

I had joined to this testimony given by the Author of the Synopsis, the

quotation of this passage of St. *John* in a *Greek Dialogue*, under the names of *Athanasius* and *Arius*; Mr. *Emlyn* had said nothing in his Answer to my Dissertation, which I have not fully confuted in my Examination; even to show how trifling an observation he had made, in order to turn aside this Author's words to the 8<sup>th</sup> Verse, which he had in no wise in view, but only the 7<sup>th</sup>.

He has yet taken pains to invent something farther; he says, it is *all at a venture*, that I have imagined the Author of this Dialogue was an *Orthodox Christian*. Now no person but such a one as Mr. *Emlyn* can doubt whether this Author was *Orthodox*. And one who does not believe the Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost in one and the same Godhead, will not most certainly find that an Author, who opposes *Arianism* in defense of it, is *Orthodox*.

As to the imputation he throws upon me of having taken up this opinion concerning this ancient Writer *at a venture*, how does he know it? I am sure that is said *at a venture*, and worse than so, for it is directly false. I can assure him, yet without pretending to give him an account of what I read, that I have read this Dialogue several times, from one end to the other, and that the more I have read and examined it, the more I have been surprised that Dr. *Cave*, who was in other respects a man of great learning, should have so far mistaken it as to say, that it was the work of some doting Monk.

Mr. *Simon* had passed a different judgment upon it, as may be seen in my Dissertation upon the passage of the Epistle of St. *John*; and except perhaps one only place where the Author has too much indulged his imagination, a very common case among the best writers of those ages, there is nothing in all that piece, which does not suit with the taste of those times, and which is not withal full of learning and piety.

Upon this occasion, I shall here set down a remark which I have made

in reading it over again, and which I leave to the examination of the learned critics.

I had thought, after Mr. *Simon*, that this Dialogue might have been written about the sixth Century, or towards the end of the fifth, but I find that it may belong to the very time of St. *Athanasius*, though I do not believe it *Athanasius*'s own. The Orthodox, represented in this Dialogue under the name of *Athanasius*, demands of the *Arian*, represented by the name of *Arius*,<sup>31</sup> *whether by saying the Emperor Constantine reigns by Sea and Land, they did thereby say that his Son Constantius did not reign there also.* The *Arian* answers, *it would be very dangerous to say that Constantius does not reign with Constantine his Father.*

It appears plainly from all this, that this Dialogue must have been composed whilst the Emperor *Constantine* was living, and at the time *Constantius* was sent into the *East*, where he made himself famous by the victories he gained over the enemies of the State, about the year 336, somewhat before the death of the great *Constantine*, which fell out on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of *May*, 337. which evidently proves that this Dialogue must have been written about the year of our Lord 336, and written withal in the *East*, where *Constantius* was that year.

From all this I draw also a convincing proof that the Author of this Dialogue is not the Author of the title we read to it, and upon account of which Dr. *Cave* and others have spoken with great contempt of the Dialogue and its Author. I have said in my Dissertation, that it was one of those additional titles which are seen at the head of several ancient Treatises, to which their Authors having given no title, there has been one formed, which often does not belong to them. This is evidently of that kind; it implies that the dispute contained in this Discourse was held in

---

<sup>31</sup> Athan. Tom. 1. page 126. ed. Colon.

the Town of *Nice* during the time the Council sat, in the year 315, a very gross and inexcusable mistake, since that famous Council was not held till the year 325. Now at that time *Constantius* was but a child of eight or nine years old, being born at *Arles*, according to some in 316, and according to others in 317. and though *Constantine* had already honoured him the year before with the illustrious title of *Caesar*, yet it would have been a ridiculous thing to say, that he had divided the power with *Constantine*, and that there would be *danger* in denying it, as they make the *Arian* say in this Dialogue; especially when *Crispus* and *Constantine*, his elder brothers, and created *Caesars* long before him, *Crispus* especially, who was a person of extraordinary merit, were with *Constantine* their Father at the helm of the Government.

It can only be urged against what I have been saying concerning the time in which this Dialogue may have been written, that the Divinity of the Holy Ghost is there spoken of as a doctrine which the *Arians* denied, and which the Orthodox there defends from Scripture; whereas *Arius* had not touched upon that matter. It is true, that *Arius* did not immediately explain himself upon this subject, but they saw very well that denying the external Divinity of the Son, which is proved by so many Texts of Scripture, he would soon come to declare against that of the Holy Ghost, the proofs of which are not so numerous, nor so evident. For they did not tarry long before they heard the *Arians* blaspheme against the Person of the Holy Ghost; as against that of the Son: the Council of *Nice*, in which *Arius* had been condemned upon the article of the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, had been held ten or twelve years when this Dialogue was written; now how many courses might not, and indeed did not, the antitrinitarian heresy run, during these ten or twelve years?

I return from my digression upon the time of this Dialogue, to the quotation which is there made of these words of St. *John*, *these three are one*. It is but at the end of the piece, says Mr. *Emlyn*, that these words are

set; *St. John* says, *and these three are one*, which, says he, *looks like a little postscriptum*, Mr. *Emlyn* makes a jest of the most serious thing in the world, and which requires the utmost veneration, by treating thus disdainfully *as a little postscriptum*, part of a Discourse so well connected, as the passage we are upon. From page 145. to the middle of page 147. the Orthodox Author, who defends the Divinity of the Holy Ghost against the *Arian*, after having established at large in this Dialogue the eternal and consubstantial Divinity of the Son, and proved by divers Texts of Scripture these two fundamental truths, that the Son is God with the Father, and that the Holy Ghost in like manner God with the Father and the Son, concludes the mystery of the Trinity, page 147. with some reflections upon *Moses*, *Elias*, and *St. Paul*. He says “that this Apostle was therefore carried up into the third Heaven because he bore the Trinity in his heart; God, says he, being willing to teach us by this example, that no person can ascend into Heaven, unless he has the same faith which *St. Paul* had. And, adds he, the quickening and salutary Baptism, by which we receive remission of sins, and without which no person was ever admitted into Heaven, is it not administered to the Faithful in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost? Besides all this *St. John* says, **AND THESE THREE ARE ONE.**”

Is then a Discourse so connected, a reasoning so closely kept up a little *postscriptum*, a postscript? And yet it is not the end of the Dialogue. But what did Mr. *Emlyn* pretend by this expression, which suits so ill with his subject. If he meant to insinuate into the mind of his Readers that it is an addition made after the work by a foreign hand, he has acted unfairly; and if he believed, and would have others believe, that they are the words of the same Author with the rest of the Dialogue, will it be less true upon this account that it is the quotation of the passage of *St. John*? Certainly, Mr. *Emlyn* knows not what to lay hold of.

A third *Greek*, writer which I have not yet quoted, and have found

since, shall be here joined to the two foregoing, in defense of the Text of the three witnesses in Heaven; it is *Euthymius Zygabemus*, a *Greek Monk*, who flourished at *Constantinople* at the end of the eleventh Century, and the beginning of the twelfth. Among several works, which gained him the esteem of the Public, he drew up, by the order of the Emperor *Alexis Comnenus*, who was raised to the Throne of *Constantinople* a collection of divers works of the *Greek Fathers*, who had written against the heresies. For this reason he called his work *Penoplia dogmatica*, which signifies a *complete armour for the doctrines of the Faith*. In the first part of this Book, *Tit. 7.* towards the end, he produces these words, *THREE ARE ONE*, to prove the unity of the divine persons in the unity of essence; his words are, τὸ ἓν ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοουσίῳν λέγεται, ἕνθα ταυτότης φύσεως μὲν, ἑτερότης δὲ ὑπόστασεων· ὡς τὸ, καὶ τὰ τρία ἓν. *The term ONE expresses things of the same essence, when the nature is the same, and the persons different, according to this, AND THREE ARE ONE.* These words then of *St. John*, which the Author of the Dialogue against the *Arians* had quoted in the fourth Century, or if they will in the sixth, *Euthymius*, both *Greeks*, urges in defense of the same doctrine of faith, in the eleventh Century.

## CHAP. X.

*That the Greek Church has always owned this Text to be genuine: proved from its Rituals, its Confessions of faith, and the testimony of the Muscovite Church.*

THE proofs of the truth which I have the honour and satisfaction to defend, present themselves, as crowding in, as it were, in a body, from all parts. The opposite error could not stand against the number and weight of those which the *Latin Church* has supplied us with; this modern error thought to be more secure in pretense of the *Greek Churches*, but it

everywhere lies open, and crushed down with authorities.

I had proved in the 13<sup>th</sup> Chapter of my Dissertation upon this Text, that the *Greek* Church owned it to be a genuine Text of St. *John*'s Epistle; and I had produced the express terms of its Confession of Faith, where it is inserted entire, so as we read it in the *Greek* of the New Testament: I went back from thence, as far as to the fifth Century, by means of a Book entitled *Apostolos*, which from that age was become a kind of public Lectionary, from which the *Greeks* read the passages which particularly belonged to each solemnity in the year. According to this custom the Text of the three witnesses in Heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, was read in the Church upon *Trinity Sunday*. By going back from the modern times to ages so remote, as the fifth Century, I cut off the answer that might have been made from the pretended novelty of this custom, and introduction of the Text of St. *John*'s Epistle. Mr. *Emlyn* has found no other shift to evade so pressing a proof, but by saying that the Lectionaries were subject to alterations which were made in them from time to time; and we have seen that Mr. *la Croze* had the same thought before him, and that in consequence of this, he paid little regard to the proof drawn from the *Apostolos*, or *Praxapostolos* of the *Greeks*, though he believes it very ancient. In the examination of Mr. *Emlyn*'s Piece, I have given an answer, to which he has made no reply, but this would be quite another thing, if I had been aware of a mistake, which those who have spoken of the *Apostolos* after *Leo Allatius* have led me into. They have all mentioned it as a Lectionary or Ritual; now a Ritual, or Lectionary, is an ecclesiastic work, drawn up by the Doctors for the use of public congregations. Thus the *Latin* Church has its Lectionaries, or Rituals; the *English* has its Liturgy, or Common Prayer; we have also ours; and the *Greeks* have withal a greater number of these Rituals, but their *Apostolos* is by no means of this order, it is but so far a Lectionary as it is read in the Church, and they choose, as I have observed, out of it the portions that are more

suitable to certain days, than they are to others. This then is the very Epistles of the Apostles, put all together in one Volume, which is for this reason called *Apostolos*, i. e. the *Apostle*; as the other Volume is called the *Gospel*, because it contains all the four Evangelists. I might have observed this, if I had attended to the manner Dr. *Tho. Smith*, who lived so long in *Greece*, has expressed himself concerning the *Apostolos*. For he says that it is a *Collection of the Epistles of the New Testament written or printed separately*, that is, separately from the *Gospel*. I might also have observed it in a passage which I have quoted from the *Euchologium of the Greeks*, where it is said, that *they present to him whom they are to ordain Reader, the Book in which are contained the Acts of the Apostles and their Epistles*. I owe the advantage of this remark which spreads so great a light over the present subject to two *Muscovite* Gentlemen, whose Letters I shall give. For since the *Apostolos* is the very Volume of the Epistles, the thought of alterations made from time to time in the Rituals can have no place here.

To come now to the new proof which I add to those of the *Greek* Rituals, and which I take from the use of the *Muscovite* Church; few men are ignorant, that this Church is a very ancient branch of the *Greek* Church. As the *Muscovites* or *Russians*, were converted by the *Greeks* at the end of the tenth Century, they received the Holy Scripture from them, took their Rites and Ceremonies in the exercise of their Religion, and owned for their Head the Patriarch of *Constantinople*. They remained fixed to him till the last age, when they made in their own Country a Patriarch of their own Nation, yet without breaking with him of *Constantinople*, with whom they held correspondence, as being the principal Head of the *Greek* Church. Their adherence to this Church has always made the *Latins* look upon them as Schismatics, in the same manner and for the same reasons they treat the *Greeks* as schismatical, namely the article of the procession of the Holy Ghost, whom they do not

believe to proceed from the Son, but from the Father only, and especially the article of the Pope's authority, which the *Greeks* and *Muscovites* have always refused to submit to, as the *Latins* do.

This great distance betwixt the *Muscovites* and *Latin* Churches, with which they have never had any communion, has kept them in all things steadfast to their ancient Religion, and to all its Rites. They took from them neither their Bibles nor their Legionaries, and if they are found therein to agree in some things, it is only so far as that which was brought there by the *Greeks* at the time of their conversion.

Since then their Bibles are absolutely the same with those of the *Greek* Church, without the introduction of any new Text from the *Latin* Bibles, if I show that the *Muscovites* have in St. *John*'s Epistle the same passage of the Trinity as we have in the *Greek* of that sacred Epistle, and if withal they have inserted it in their Confession of Faith, and read it publicly, as the *Greeks* do, on *Trinity Sunday*, I shall have demonstrated, that this passage is not lately introduced into the Copies of the Greek Church, and that this Church owns it to be genuine: now all this is easy to be proved.

The first of these three things, which is that the *Muscovites* read this Text always in their New Testament, here meets with an immediate difficulty which must be cleared up. We have in the Library of this Town a *Sclavonian* Bible, printed at *Moscow* in 1663. The Editors advertise in their Preface, that they have followed exactly an ancient Edition made at *Ostrogh* in *Poland*, in the time of one *Constantine* a Prince of that City, which may be about 130 or 140 years ago. The Text of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse, which speaks of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost is put in the margin, because the *Greek* Manuscript from which this *Sclavonian* translation was made, was one of those I have mentioned; in which this passage being omitted, the same hand, or another like it, had written it in the margin. To be convinced that this is properly but an omission, and not

an addition of a passage foreign to St. *John's* Epistle, we need only see the manner after which this and the following Verse is written; I shall therefore produce both as they stand in that Edition: these then are the words of the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse placed in the margin, *For there are three bearing record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one:* and those of the 8<sup>th</sup> Verse in the very line of the Text, *And there are three bearing record in Earth; the Spirit; the Water, and the Blood; and these three agree in one.*

In both Verses we see the *Greek* phrase εἰσι μαρτυροῦντες, *are bearing record, for that bear record,* and the *Greek* word ὅτι *for,* placed only in the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse, not in the 8<sup>th</sup>, as it should be, if the 7<sup>th</sup> was not there; but instead of the word ὅτι *for* the 8<sup>th</sup> Verse begins with the particle καὶ, *and,* which is a necessary consequence of what has gone before; as in reality, it is found in all the *Greek* and *Latin* Copies, where the six witnesses, the three in Heaven, and the three on Earth are expressed. I owe the reading and Version of these passages of the *Sclavonian* Bible to Messrs. *Oladin* and *Crouschos*, *Muscovite* Gentlemen, attendants upon Prince *Kourakin*, Ambassador from his *Czarian* Majesty at the *Hague*. It is to them also I owe the insight I am about to give into the use which their Church has always made of the passage of St. *John*, copied from the letters they did me the honour to write to me from the *Hague*, one dated the 27<sup>th</sup> of *April* in the year 1720, and the other *May* the 11<sup>th</sup> following.

SIR,

“THE Commission you have been pleased to honour us with, turns upon the 7<sup>th</sup> Verse of the v<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the first Epistle of St. *John*, whether it is in the Text of our New Testaments, in our Confession of Faith, and in our Lectionary. Upon which we assure you, that it is inserted in our Confession of Faith, printed at *Lipsick* in *Greek* and *Latin* in 1695, and at *Moscow* in 1709, entitled, *Orthodox Confession of the Faith of the Catholic, Apostolic, Oriental Church, translated from the Greek*, of which we send you a Copy, and which

has been approved by our *Greek* Patriarchs, by several Metropolitans, Archbishops, and others of the Clergy.

“In all our New Testaments this passage is also found, and everywhere in the body of the Text, and not in the margin, betwixt the 6<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Verses: it begins with, *for there are three, &c.* and the 8<sup>th</sup> with *And there are three, &c.*”

“The same verse is found withal in our *Apostol*, which the *Greeks* call *Aspostolos*, of which you have treated in your Dissertation upon the 7<sup>th</sup> verse, page 156.”

“*Leo Allatius* reckons it among the Rituals, in which he is mistaken, because all the Rituals that we have are translated from the *Greek*, and contain only the order how the Liturgy, those of St. *Chrysostom* and St. *Basil* the Great, with the other divine services, are to be celebrated in the Churches: whereas the *Apostolos* is nothing else but the New Testament itself without the four Evangelists, which is made thus expressly for the use of the Church; for the Epistles may be read during divine service by any Layman, who can read, but the Gospel cannot be read but by the Priest who celebrates the Liturgy, or by a Deacon, who officiates together with the Priest. For this reason the four Gospels and the Epistles are usually printed separate.—For the rest, this passage of the three witnesses in Heaven is read in our Church the *Thursday* of the thirty-fifth week after *Pentecost*; as it is set down in your Dissertation, page 157. Now, Sir, all that you have said in your Dissertation upon the three witnesses in heaven in page 158 and 159 is most certainly true, for all this is practiced in our Church, without the least alteration to this day.”

“As they print in our Country the Epistles of the Apostles separate from the Gospel for the use of the Church, they have begun for some time past to print the said Epistles of the Apostles conjointly with the Gospel for the convenience of travelers. When our nation began to visit foreign countries: then the first edition of the New Testament appeared at *Kios* in 1692, in 4<sup>o</sup>, another also at *Kios* in 1703, in 12<sup>o</sup>, at *Moscow* also in 8<sup>o</sup>. Here, Sir, are already three Editions of the New Testament which we have with us at the *Hague*. We have also the *Apostolos* printed at *Moscow* in 1679, and the Text of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse is in all these Editions.”

As these Gentlemen did not seem to me to have sufficiently explained

themselves as to the manner, after which the *Apostolos* is read in their Churches, I wrote to them my difficulties upon that article, to which they gave the following answer the eleventh of *May*.

“To satisfy, Sir, your curiosity we have the honour to tell you, that all you have taken from St. *Saba* is practiced in our Church very exactly, as well as in the *Greek* Church. We have Readers expressly appointed to read the Epistles, but not in all places; they are only in the Cathedral Churches of all the Bishoprics, in all the Cloisters, and in the Parochial Churches of some Dioceses; for there are some Dioceses in which there are no Readers appointed in the Parochial Churches, either for want of persons who will take upon them that ecclesiastic office, or rather through the negligence of the Bishops. Now where there are no Lectors and Chantors appointed, there private men have the liberty of chanting and reading the Epistles, either upon their own motion, or by the permission or order of the Priest, that the congregation may not be Deprived of the divine service—after which the Priest reads the Gospel.”

These particulars are not much known to the public, by reason of the little commerce the *Muscovites* have had with the rest of *Europe* till within these twenty years, that the present *Czar* has opened them the way to all Countries of *Europe*, having himself visited the principal parts.

We shall conclude this matter with extracting from the Confession of Faith, that has been sent me, the article which regards the passage of St. *John*.

QUESTION.

<sup>32</sup>*If there is but one God, it seems as if there must be but one Person.*

ANSWER.

*It does not follow; because God is one according to his Nature and Essence, but the number of three respects the Persons; for which reason*

---

<sup>32</sup> Part 1. Quaest. 9.

*what the Father is according to his Nature, the same is the Son, and the Holy Ghost: now as the Father is in his Nature true and eternal God, and creator of all things, both visible and invisible, such is the Son, such the Holy Ghost, being consubstantial one with the other; according to what the Evangelist St. John teaches, when he says, that there are three which bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.*

This Confession of Faith, which is a Treatise in form of a Catechism upon the principal parts of the Christian Religion was sent by the *Muscovites* to the *Greek Church*. *Parthenius*, who filled the Patriarchal See of *Constantinople*, assembled a Council of the Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jerusalem*, the Archbishops, and others of the Clergy in great numbers, who having read and examined this body of Doctrine all approved it, and subscribed it the tenth of *March* 1645. The manner in which this very solemn Act begins is remarkable. *Parthenius*, by the Mercy of God, *Archbishop of Constantinople, new Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch*. *Our mediocrity together with the Assembly of sovereign Pontiffs, and the Clergy has received the Book which has been sent us from our Sister, the Church of Lesser Russia, entitled, Confession of the Orthodox Faith, &c.*

An Act so authentic, in which the *Greek* and *Muscovite* Churches are in a manner blended together, proves equally that the *Greek* and *Muscovite* Church owns in the most solemn manner in the world, that the Text of the three witnesses in Heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is really a Text of *St. John's* Epistle. This is what I had undertook to prove, and I think there cannot be a more evident demonstration.

.....

.....

## CHAP. XI.

*Of the Version of the New Testament in modern Greek by Maximus a Monk of Callipolis, in which is the Text of the three witnesses in Heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.*

THIS sacred truth of the original Text of the Apostle finds withal an inviolable Sanctuary in a New Testament printed in modern *Greek*, or *Barbarian Greek*, as it is called, in distinction from the ancient *Greek* of the New Testament, and the other ancient Books. It has happened to the *Greek* tongue, as to the *Latin*, to degenerate by little and little in the countries and among the People, where it was the ordinary language; for of all the fine *Latin*, which was anciently spoken in *Italy*, there remains only some few same words and certain phrases derived from it. The ancient language of *Greece* is not indeed altogether so much lost among the modern *Greeks*; the words have continued more entire, and the constructions are less altered; yet this does not hinder but that people, naturally ignorant and very ill-taught, can scarce understand the *Greek* of the New Testament, though it is easy in comparison of the other Books of antiquity which are written in that language. *The Greeks*, says <sup>33</sup>Mr. *Simon*, *do not for some ages past speak their ancient Greek, which is no longer understood by the people.*

To remedy this ignorance, and provide for the instruction and consolation of the *Greek Churches*, a Monk, named *Maximus*, of the town of *Callipolis*, within the district of the *Dardanelles*, a suffragan Bishopric to the Archbishop of *Heraclea*, in the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, undertook a kind of Version, or Paraphrase of the original Text of the Books of the New Testament in vulgar *Greek*. The difficulty, or rather the

---

<sup>33</sup> Hist. des Versions du Nouveau Testament chapter xx.

impossibility of printing this Work in their own Country, was the cause why they sent it into *Europe*, by means of the Resident of the State's General at the *Port*; and upon the entreaty of the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, *Cyril Lucar*, whose zeal for the Christian Religion is very well known, as well as the persecutions which were raised against him by his enemies, and which did not end but with the cruel death the *Turks* inflicted on him in 1638. This New Testament sent into *Holland* with a very excellent and very pious Preface of the Patriarch *Cyril's*; was printed at *Leyden* by the *Elzivers* in 1638 in 4<sup>o</sup>, in two Columns; in one of which is the Greek Text of the New Testament, and in the other the vulgar Greek. The 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Verses of the 5<sup>th</sup> Chapter of *St. John's* Epistle are there in this twofold form, and as they may be seen here;

The *Greek* of *St. John's Epistle*.

v. 7. Οτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ πατήρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι.

v. 8. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆ, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν.

The vulgar Greek of the same Epistle.

v. 7. Οτι τρεῖς εἶσιν ἐκεῖνοι ὁ ποῦ μαρτυρουσιν εἰς τὴν οὐρανὸν, ὁ πατήρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐτοῦτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓνα εἶναι.

v. 8. Καὶ τρεῖς εἶναι ἐνεῖτοι ὁ ποῦ μαρτυροῦσιν εἰς τὴν γῆν, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς ἓνα εἶσαι.

The differences of one Greek from the other are very small in these passages, as in abundance of others of the same Version, but they are much greater in several places; and it is this which makes the ancient Greek no longer understood by the people, who besides their great ignorance, have sunk into an extreme negligence with regard to Religion and the sacred Scripture.

Mr. *Simon* expresses a great regard for this Version of *Maximus*; he says, *that it is one of the most exact and most judicious that has been made*

*in this last age, and that it answers up to the sense of the original Greek.* Yet it is in this Version that he must have seen this Text of the Epistle of St. *John*, which has caused him so many pains, and against which he has so frequently declared. Whence is it then, and from what original *Greek* did *Maximus* take it? If from the *Greek* Editions made in *Europe*, and the Manuscript Copies of the *Greek* Churches had not this very passage, *Cyril Lucar*, his Patriarch, would have been very ignorant, or very rash to stamp an authority upon this Version, and recommend it as he has done to the *Greek* Churches, especially considering the many enemies he had. What reproaches would not this have drawn both upon him and *Maximus*? We find too that a certain *Greek* Priest, named *Jeremy*, jealous perhaps of the Monk *Maximus* and his Work, has spoken with contempt of this Version, saying that no person scarce bought it in *Greece*, and that<sup>34</sup> they read there the New Testament in its proper Greek, without tying themselves to the vulgar Greek of a Version which was useless enough.

But this Priest would have had a quite different charge against this Version, if it had been unfaithful to such a degree as to contain a forged Text, and unknown to all the *Greek* Church; yet he only blames it as useless. But this *Greek* Priest evidently showed in this his hatred against *Maximus*, (who declares in his Preface that he had not undertook this work but to make the New Testament understood by his Nation) and against the Patriarch *Cyril*, who has complained in the same manner of the ignorance of his people, for want of understanding the *Greek* of the New Testament. If we must produce witnesses of this ignorance of the *Greeks* which *Cyril* and *Maximus* complain of, besides what Mr. *Simon* has said, let us hear the report of three eminent men, who have witnesses of it, as having been upon the spot, and known very well the sad condition of the *Greek* Churches; these are Sir *Paul Rycaut*, Mr. *Spon*, and Sir *George Wheler*.

---

<sup>34</sup> Langius quoted by F. le Long.

The first, who had lived long in *Greece* as Consul to the *English Nation*, has written *the History of the Greek Church*, and he says in his Preface, *That the English Tradesmen are generally better instructed, and more knowing than the Doctors of that Church*. What then must the common people be? Mr. *Spon* enters into a more large and particular account, for speaking of a certain Village, which is not far from *Callipolis*, and in which there were near an hundred *Greek families*,<sup>35</sup> he says, “there was a small Church, into which he and Mr. *Wheler*, his companion in the journey, going at the time of Vespers, the Priest chatted them after the most miserable manner in the world, not one word of what was said was understood: it is probable withal he understood nothing of it himself, for they are for the most part so ignorant in the Villages, that they do not know barely how to read their office, and what they say, they ordinarily say by heart. At least if they can read it, there are few who understood it, because it is in literal *Greek*, which is almost as different from the modern *Greek*, as the *Latin* is from the *Italian*.”

Sir *G. Wheler*, an *English Gentleman* of very great worth, who had travelled into *Greece* with Mr. *Spon*, and who published the account of it sometime after that of Mr. *Spon* came abroad, says, in the very curious description and full of learned enquiries which he gives of the Town of *Athens*, that though the *Athenians* have preserved more of the ancient *Greek* in their language, than any other modern *Greeks*, yet he found only at *Athens* the Archbishop, and *Ezechiel* the *Papa* of *Cyriani*, who understood the ancient *Greek*; *There was also*, adds he, *another Greek of Candia, who knew a little of the Greek of the Schools; there were but few others who understood it better than the Italians do Latin*.

All these testimonies prove but too much the necessity there was of

---

<sup>35</sup> Voyage de Mr. Spon en Grece, page 157.

giving *Greece* a New Testament in common *Greek*, as the Monk *Maximus* has done from the very *Greek* of the sacred Authors.

I will add for the close, that it is clearly seen from reading this Version, that *Maximus* had other *Greek* Copies than our printed ones. I have examined it from one end to the other, and compared it with the *Greek* of our Editions, and have collected a great number of instances, but shall content myself with these two: all our *Greek* Editions have these words in *St. Matthew*, Chap, xxvii. Verse 9. *as it was said by Jeremy the Prophet*; but the Edition of *Maximus* has barely, *as it was said by the Prophet*. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter verse. 23 of the first Epistle of *St. John*, the Editions of *Complutum*, of *Erasmus*, of *Aldus*, and *R. Stephens*, which are the only ones from which the others were made, have only this first part of the verse, *whoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father*; but the *Greek* of the Monk *Maximus* hath the other part of the verse, which has been found since these Editions of *Complutum*, *Erasmus* and others, in some ancient *Greek* Manuscript. *He that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also*.

The *Greek* Church had its own Copies which the foregoing ages had transmitted to it, there is no doubt of it; the Monk *Maximus*, a *Greek*, and translator had them also; neither can this be doubted of; the Text of the witnesses in Heaven is in his Version, *his version was exact, judicious, and made from the Greek original*, by Mr. *Simon*'s own confession; this Text was therefore in the *Greek* Copies.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

## CHAP. XII.

*Of an ancient Greek Manuscript found at Dublin, which has the passage that makes the subject of this Dissertation.*

THERE are a certain sort of men in the world, who under pretense of

seeking for satisfaction concerning a truth, use their utmost efforts to find means how to oppose it. These are two opposite extremes, and which are both faulty; to yield too easily to the proofs of a disputed question, and to be satisfied with nothing, or to take pains only to form objections to render these proofs useless. One is the mark of a superficial and too credulous mind; the other is that of a contentious spirit, and too fond of itself; to which we may very justly apply these words of the *Latin Poet*, *Feciunt nae intelligendo ut nihil intelligent.*

We find this sort of persons, more nice and difficult than solid, in the case of the present question. They would have us believe they should be very glad to be persuaded that the Text of St. *John* is genuine; because, say they, they acknowledge with us the mystery of the Trinity, which this passage contains, but they dare not affirm that it is really St. *John's*. They cannot indeed destroy the proofs we urge for the genuineness of this Text, at least there are several which appear convincing to them; but one thing is wanting, which is to produce to them an ancient *Greek* Manuscript that is indisputable, in which this passage is found.

This subtilty, (I must be allowed to say it) appears to me unworthy either a man of learning or candor, one or the other is wanting to it. A man of learning cannot be ignorant that the *Greek* Editions of *Ximenes*, *Erasmus*; and *Stephens* were made from ancient Manuscripts; and a man of candor cannot doubt of these Manuscripts no more than if they were set before his eyes, unless he suspects *Ximenes*, *Erasmus*, and *Stephens* to have been cheats and impostors.

I would ask them upon this, what would become an hundred or two hundred years hence, supposing such a Manuscript to be found now as they require, and that this Manuscript should then be lost like the rest, of the proof which would at present be drawn from thence, in favour of the disputed passage? Men would have equal grounds then as they have now

to require some Manuscript to be produced, which has this passage; that which is now a convincing proof will be no longer; such Manuscripts are not daily to be found; and thus this excellent passage will be but a float in men's minds, betwixt doubt and certainty, though from other very Solid reasons it is proved to be St. *John's*. Those persons who cry out so loudly *to the Manuscripts, to the Manuscripts*, as to the only decisive demonstration, should reflect upon the terrible inconvenience their principle leads them into; I hope they will open their eyes upon it: And in the meantime, I shall give them the satisfaction they demand.

Divine Providence, which visibly takes care to preserve in the Church the truth of a Text so valuable for the doctrine it contains, has thrown into my hands the extract of an ancient *Greek* Manuscript which I had no knowledge of, and which therefore it was impossible for me to think of. Mr. *Ycard*, a refugee Minister, whom I had known in *France*, and who is now Dean of *Aconry* at *Dublin*, sent me in *October* last an extract of this passage taken from an ancient Manuscript which is in the Library of that capital City of *Ireland*; this extract was compared with the original by the Librarian; and Mr. *Ycard* joined thereto several remarks, which all tended to show the nature of the Manuscript. Since that time I have had a pretty large correspondence with him by letters, in order to be satisfied concerning several particulars which I thought necessary. Before I enter into the account, which would be matter for a long Discourse, I shall begin with transcribing the *Greek* Text of three entire verses, the 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 9<sup>th</sup>, which have been communicated to me, and are written almost in the manner following.

Ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐνῶ, πῆρ, λόγος, καὶ πνᾶ ἅγιον, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσὶν· καὶ τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆ, πνᾶ, ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα· εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἁνῶν λαμβάνομεν, ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ θῷ μείζων ἐστὶν, ὅτι αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι· μεμαρτύρηκε περὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. [No corresponding accent marks for those highlighted in green.-JKB]

At the foot of this Text is written the attestation of the Librarian in these terms.

*Supra scriptae Graecae lineae novem, quae coelestium trium, triumque terrestrium Testium testimonium perbibent, hae lineae, inquam, exscriptae fuere ex manuscripto Codice Graeco totius Novi Testamenti; qui Codex in dorso inscriptus G. 97. membranaceus est in 8°, ex manuscriptis nomine Usserii nuncupatis, quod revera celeberrimi Praesulis Jacobi Usserii Armachani, dum in vivis, fuere. Insuper asseverans meipsum verbatim, ipsas scilicet lineas, cum Autographo suo, ex quo exscriptae fuere, contulisse, nullamque in iis, ne quidem in apice uno, discrepantiam ab ipso reperiisse. in cujus rei testimonium manum meam apposui, 25. die Augusti 1719. Gulielmus Lewis, Librarius Bibliothecae Collegii S. Trinitatis, Dublinii.* [Nine Greek lines are written above, which are of three heavenly bodies. These lines, I say, will bear witness to earthly witnesses, transcribed from the manuscript Greek Codex of the entire New Testament; which Codex inscribed on the back of G. 97. is membranaceous in 8°, from the manuscripts by name. You are called Usseri, because he was really the most famous ancestor of James Usserius of Armachan while you were still alive. Moreover, asserting that I myself had contributed verbatim, that is to say, the lines themselves, together with his Autograph, from which they were copied, and that he had not found any discrepancy in them, not even in a single point, from him. In witness whereof I have set my hand, on the 25th day of August, 1719. William Lewis, Librarian of the Library of St. Trinity College, Dublin. [Translated into English using an online translator. RVH]

Nothing can be more exact than this attestation. The *Greek* of the Extract is in nine lines in the sheet that was sent me, the faithfulness of

this Extract and its perfect Conformity with the Original, cannot be better expressed than in these words of the attestation, which implies that there is not the least difference betwixt them. The nature of the Manuscript is not there omitted, it is a Manuscript in parchment in 8<sup>o</sup>, which contains the whole New Testament, marked in the back by the Letter G. and the number 97. and what is yet very remarkable is, that it is one of those, which belonged to the famous *Usher*, in his life time, Archbishop of *Armagh*, in *Ireland*. This attestation is very full for the validity, both of the Extract, and the Original.

Few men are ignorant how *Usher*, who was born at *Dublin* in 1580. began early to gain a name among the Men of Letters, and to what degree his reputation afterwards was raised. As he was curious and indefatigable in his studies, so he was also in his enquiry after the best Books, and most valuable<sup>36</sup> Manuscripts. To this end, he run over all the most considerable places in *England*, and by means of labour and money, he formed a most excellent and valuable Library. It suffered several diminutions from the then civil wars, which caused it to be carried to divers places, but at last, it was brought from *England* into *Ireland*, and placed at *Dublin*, where it now is.

Among the *Greek* Manuscripts of the New Testament, that out of which the extract of these passages of *St. John* was taken and sent me, is the only one, which has the New Testament entire; and the only one, at least that we know of, from which *Usher* took the pains to collect the various readings, in order to have them inserted in the famous *Polyglot* published by *Walton*. This collection of *Usher's* reaches no farther than the first Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*, beginning with the Gospel of *St. Matthew*, according to what *Mills* has observed in the *Prolegomena* to his

---

<sup>36</sup>See the *Life of Usher* by Bernard in the Book entitled *Vitae selectorum aliquot virorum*, &c. printed at London in 1681.

New Testament, *Art.* 1379, and 1380.

The question will be now to know, whether the Manuscripts from which the three verses of St. *John*'s Epistle were copied, is the same with that which *Mills* has spoken of after *Walton*; and it is in this enquiry that Mr. *Ycard* has used all the pains and exactness that could be desired. The Dissertation I had written upon the disputed passage, was doubtless what did raise in him the curiosity to see whether it was in this Manuscript, and he had the satisfaction to find it there. Then running over several places of this Copy, he saw at the bottom of a page in St. *Matthew*'s Gospel, these words in *Latin*; *sum Thomae Clementis, olim fratris Froyht*, that is, *I belong to Thomas Clement, and formerly to Fryar Froyht*. These two words brought into his mind what he had read in *Walton*, and in *Mills*, that one of the Manuscripts whose various readings are given in the *Polyglot of England*, and in *Mills*, marked by the word *Mont*, which is the abridgment of *Montfortius*, had the same words, *sum Thomae Clementis, olim fratris Froyht*. This was almost enough to determine it to be the same Manuscript, but to be more fully assured of it, Mr. *Ycard* gave himself the trouble to compare the different readings which *Walton* and *Mills* have taken from the Manuscript *Mont*. with that which he had in hand; he saw that they were everywhere the same, and he found that some were by another hand than the Text of the Manuscript. He saw there also the Canons of *Ammonius*, and the Stichometry which *Mills* says was in *Mont*, and after all these so perfect agreements there was not the least cause to doubt, but the Manuscript he had before his eyes, was this Manuscript *Mont*, which had belonged to a Professor in Divinity, one *Montfortius*, from which by abbreviation, as I have observed, was made the word *Mont*, by which it is expressed by *Walton*, *Mills*, and others.

This Manuscript is remarkable in many respects: it is not gilded or illuminated, nor has any other like ornaments, which are only for show and pomp. It is written after a plain and ordinary manner, for the proper

use of the person who copied it from another, and not to be sold, as those were which were made by the men who were writers by Profession, such as since the Art of printing are the Booksellers. The writer of this has taken no pains to write it very fairly; he has even much neglected his hand in many places, and that which is very disagreeable to the eye but which is yet the mark of integrity in a Copier is that when in writing he perceived some word or several forgot, he erased out those he had written, and replaced them in the body of the Text, after he had written there those which he had forgotten; Mr. *Ycard* has taken notice of several of this kind of rasures and corrections, and has given me divers instances.

As to what regards the main of the Manuscript itself, there are few perhaps, which are more correct; the different readings which are found in *Walton*, and in *Mills*, show that they oft agree with the famous Manuscript of *Cambridge*, with that of *Alexandria*, with the old *Lincoln*, and such others as are most valued, I shall give two or three examples.

*Rom.* chapter xii. verse 11, several Manuscripts, and some *Greek* Editions have τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες, i. e. *serving the time*, or *complying with the time*. *Grotius* observes that the most ancient and best have instead of the word καιρῷ, which signifies time, that of κυρίῳ which signifies the Lord; and it is thus indeed that we read in our Bible, *serving the Lord*; the Manuscript of *Dublin*, or *Mont*, has the word κυρίῳ abbreviated in this manner κῷ.

The doxology which contains the three last verses of the Epistle to the *Romans*, *Now to him that is able to strengthen you, &c.* was inserted in all the Manuscripts of *Stephens*, and in several others, at the end of the xiv<sup>th</sup> Chapter, and it is there also, and not at the end of the last Chapter, that it is in the Manuscript of *Dublin*.

In the first Epistle of St. *John*, the 23<sup>rd</sup> verse of the ii<sup>nd</sup> Chapter has only these words in several Manuscripts, *he who denies the Son, has not the*

*Father*; the Manuscript of *Dublin*, as several others, has the words following, *He who acknowledges the Son, has the Father also.*

We may judge from all this of the goodness of this Copy, and how it may serve to mend several incorrect passages in some very ancient Copies. As to the time when it may have been made, it has this in common with most of the rest, that there is no certain demonstration of it. It is certain, that it is not before the eleventh Century, because it has the Prologues of *Theophylact*, who lived about the middle of that age; but nothing hinders withal but that it may belong to the close of that Century; nor would there be any room to doubt of it, if we could be satisfied that a date which is found there at the end of *St. Mark's Gospel*, was written by the same hand with the Copy; this, as it was sent me, runs thus, ἐγράφη μετὰ χρόνους δέκα τῆς τοῦ χϛ̄ ἀναλήψεως, i.e. *it was written ten Centuries after Christ's Ascension* which would express the eleventh Century.

But to advance nothing of my own head upon a matter so difficult as this, I shall content my self with giving some particulars concerning the writing of this Manuscript, upon which the learned, who are conversant in these studies, may form their judgment, and know almost exactly, what age it may be of.

The form of the letters is in the main the same with that of our *Greek Editions*, with accents, spirits, and the iota subscript; but one thing among others is considerable in the writing of the Texts of the Epistle of *St. John* which have been lately seen, and this is the ü vowel in the word μαρτυρίαν is marked with two points upon the top of it; that the ι also has the same two points in the words εἰσὶ and ὅτι, and withal in μαρτυρίαν. *F. Montfaucon*, who of all men living is most capable to judge of these matters, has said in the first Book of his *Palaeographia Graeca*, that this manner or marking the ι's and the υ's is above a thousand years old. I know very well, it does not thence follow that we can ascribe such an

antiquity to all the Manuscripts where it is found; but this may be inserted from it, with regard to this, that it was copied from another very ancient; which is confirmed withal from the agreement I have said, there is betwixt its different readings and those of the Manuscripts of *Cambridge*, *Alexandria*, and others.

Some attention perhaps may be given to the short manner of writing μαρτυροῦντες in this extract, and to the abbreviation in the word οὐνῶ for ούρανῶ, in πῆρ for πατήρ, in ἀνὼν for ἀνθρώπων, and in θῦ for θεοῦ. Some others also have fallen under my eyes in several quotations of Scriptures, which have been communicated to me upon other occasions, such as these; ἰλήμ for ἱερουσαλήμ, δαδ, for δαυιδ; ζρὸν for ζαυρὸν, Ις for Ιησοῦς, Χ`ς ὁ Κ`σ in the first Epistle of St. *Peter*, chapter ii. verse 3. for χριστὸς ὁ κῦριος Κῶ for κυριῶ, *Rom.* xii. verse 11. as I have observed already; πρὸς for πατρὸς, πρές for πατέρες, etc.

But whether one can or cannot draw from these ways of abridging certain words, and placing in some two points over the letters α, ι, and υ, certain proofs that the Manuscript in which these things are found is precisely of such an age, this will be yet a mark of antiquity, and even antiquity which may equal it, with the Manuscripts of the eleventh or twelfth Century. There are few of those that are collected in Libraries, which by Mr. *Simon*'s own confession, are above six or seven hundred years old; now this will have that age, though it were only of the twelfth or thirteenth Century. But was it yet more modern, being copied from one more ancient, as all that I have related shows, its antiquity would lead us farther back, and we should find our self upon the level with the other Manuscripts I have named.

Yet this is not what we have need of to give weight to the authority of this Manuscript, with relation to the Text of St. *John*'s Epistle; Mr. *Simon*, who of all men living is the least to be suspected in this matter, will give

us very sure rules to judge rightly of the validity of a Manuscript, and its just authority with regard to some particular passages in which it is found different from the rest, and he will inform us, that the genuineness of such or such a passage does not properly depend upon the antiquity of a Manuscript, and that often, on the contrary, a very modern Manuscript should be preferred to another far more ancient. See how he has explained himself in his Preface to the Critical History of the Text of the New Testament. *The most ancient Greek Copies of the New Testament which we have at present are not the best, since they are conformable to those Latin Copies; which St. Jerome found so altered, that he judged it convenient to reform them.* And in the very History of the Greek Text, chapter xxx. *We must not always prefer the reading of ancient Greek Copies to those which are now called modern; for these last may agree with those of St. Jerome.*

The Manuscript of *Dublin* is not properly one of those which may be called *modern*; since it can be no less than five or six hundred years old; but though it was actually one of the modern ones which were made a little before the use of printing, and which consequently would not be above three hundred years old, Mr. *Simon* determines that where these modern Manuscripts are found to agree with the Version of St. *Jerome*; they must be preferred to the old ones, which dissent from it. The consequence here forms itself; the Manuscript of *Dublin*, which has the passage of St. *John*'s Epistle in this agrees with the Bible of St. *Jerome*, which has itself this passage, as I have largely proved; it must then in this case be preferred to all the other Copies, which have not this Text, let their antiquity be what it will.

Let them no longer boast of the *Vatican* and *Alexandrian* Manuscripts, the two oldest which want this Text, since they are both later by several ages than St. *Jerome*'s Version. This omission, though it has grown old in their parchments, is of no authority against a Manuscript, which

notwithstanding its being more modern in its writing and parchment, is more ancient than the others in its agreement with those from which St. *Jerome* made the revise of the Epistle, in which this Text is read.

Here again to conclude this matter, another very important piece of advice of Mr. Simon, *We must,*<sup>37</sup> *says he, be very cautious in quoting this sort of Manuscripts which are not the better THEIR BEING VERY ANCIENT as I have several times observed.*

.....  
 .....  
**CHAP. XIII.**

*The Panoplia dogmatica of Euthymius Zygabenus, the Manuscript of Dublin, the Greek Translation of the Council of Latran, and the Codex Britannicus of Erasmus, blended together, and reciprocally giving light to each other, in behalf of the genuineness of the passage of St. John, There are three in Heaven, which bear record, &c.*

After having given the quotation of the passage of St. *John* in the *Panoplia* of *Euthymius Zygabenus*, and the passage itself entire, as it is seen in the Manuscript of *Dublin*, I think it will not be disagreeable to those, who as good Christians are concerned for the genuineness of this Text, to bring these two authorities together, and to join with them the *Greek Translation of the Council of Latran*, with the *Codex Britannicus* or Manuscripts of *England*, from which *Erasmus* restored this passage in the Edition of 1522. These four pieces belong to times so near to each other, and being in the same tongue, that serving all as witnesses to the genuineness of the Text of St. *John*, this important truth cannot but receive a new light from the combination of all these together, when it shall be

---

<sup>37</sup> Dissert. fur les Manuscrits, page 61.

seen that they reciprocally support each other.

As there can be no dispute about the time in which *Euthymius Zygabenus* lived, of which I have spoken in the 7<sup>th</sup> Chapter, nor concerning the quotation he has made of the passage of St. *John*, I do not see why we should not place the Manuscript of *Dublin* to the same time, which is towards the close of the eleventh Century, or at least the beginning of the twelfth, since there is nothing in this Manuscript to hinder our believing it to be of this age. It may withal in my opinion be very reasonably inserted, that this is its true antiquity; but though it should be one or two hundred years, if they will, more modern than the *Panoplia* of *Euthymius Zygabenus*, this Manuscript will yet not have been the first *Greek* New Testament, in which this Text was found, since *Zygabenus* had read it there two hundred years before.

At the beginning of the thirteenth Century, and in the year 1215, the Council of *Latran* quotes this Text; the Acts of this Council are in *Latin*, but they were no sooner carried into the *East* by the *Greeks*, who had assisted at the Council, than they translated them into *Greek*. We have only a very defective Copy of it, and full of *lacunae*, in a Manuscript of the *French King's* Library; but divine Providence has not suffered the passage where the *Latin* quotes the Text of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse of the 5<sup>th</sup> Chapter of St. *John's* Epistle to be one of those where the *lacunae* render the *Greek* Version defective; it is preserved there, and the *Greek* Text is read in it entire. There is nothing to be said against the antiquity of this Version; <sup>38</sup>Mr. *Simon* owns that it is as old as the Council, but in order to take from us all the advantage we might draw thence for the genuineness of the controverted Text, he advances with his usual boldness to disguise the clearest and most certain facts, that the *Greek* of this passage was not taken from any *Greek* Copy of the New Testament, and that it is only a

---

<sup>38</sup> Dissert. Critic, fur les Manuscripts, page 12, 13, &c.

copy of the *Latin* turned into *Greek*, and hereupon he says several things to depreciate this Translation, as a translation almost barbarous and bad *Greek*. These are cavils that I have no concern in. The translation into Greek may have been made by an impolite person, and who was not well acquainted with all the regularities of his own Tongue; but does it thence follow that the Text of the three witnesses in Heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, was not in the *Greek* Epistle of St. *John*, and that the Translator copied it from the *Latin*, and formed it upon the *Latin* expressions? I expect in a man of learning the natural Science of reasoning consequentially, and here I see it sink under prejudice, and an obstinate passion in resolving not to own that this passage was in any *Greek* Manuscript.

To give some colour to this prejudice against the *Greek* of the Council of *Latran*, Mr. *Simon* has advanced a fact which is evidently false, namely, *that a part of the passages of the New Testament are not there quoted as they stand in the original Greek, but after the manner they have been translated from the Latin.*

I can aver, on the contrary, that nothing has been advanced with less care and trouble. In all this Translation, which is very long, there are but thirteen passages of the New Testament where the *Greek* is preserved, fourteen with that of St. *John*'s Epistle; now there is not one of all those that can be said to have been taken entirely from the *Latin*, except a transposition, which is found in the 4<sup>th</sup> verse of the 7<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*; but this was not to take the *Greek* from the *Latin*, but to follow the order in which the *Latin* quoted this Text.

*F. F. Labbee* and *Cossart* have put this note upon the quotation which is there made of the last verse of the fifth Chapter of St. *Matthew*, *Non utitur verbis Textûs Graeci, praeterea legit Pater noster, non Vester.* The *Greek* of the Text says Εσεθε τέλειοι, the *Greek* of the Council has γίνεθε

τέλειοι· the Text of the New testament has ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, *which is in heaven*, the *Greek* of the Council reads ὁ οὐράνιος *heavenly*: but these are only different readings; for we see that St. *Athanasius* had quoted these words of *Jesus Christ* in the same manner in his Letter to the Bishops of *Africa*. And as to the word *your*, which is in the ordinary *Greek*, and in the *Latin* Version, it is very plain that the Translator did not follow the *Latin*, since he put *our* Father instead of *your* Father.

The *Latin* of the Council quotes the 29<sup>th</sup> verse of the x<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the Gospel of St. *John* in this manner, *Pater quod dedit mihi majus est omnibus*: the *Greek* of the Council gives it, as we read it in the New Testament πατήρ ὃς δέδωκέ μοι μείζων πάντων ἐσί.

The 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> verses of the xvii<sup>th</sup> Chapter of St. *John* are seen separately, as they are in the *Greek* of the Council, in the piece of *Eusebius* against *Marcellus* at the end of the xix<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the third Book.

The *Greek* μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε, of the 14<sup>th</sup> verse of the v<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the Gospel of St. *John*, which is the same as in the New Testament, cannot be looked on as *Greek* formed upon these *Latin* words, *amplius noli peccare*; the phrase and the words are very different.

2 Cor. ix. 6. *Qui parcè feminat, parcè & metet, & qui feminat in benedictionibus, de benedictionibus & metet in vitam aeternam*. The *Greek* of the Council is, ὁ σπείρων φειδομένως, φειδομένως καὶ θερίζει, καὶ ὁ σπείρων ἐπ' εὐλόγου, ἐπ' εὐλόγου θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Is this then *Greek* made from the *Latin*? The difference there is very visible in several respects.

With regard to the passage itself of St. *John*'s Epistle, the *Latin* of the Council says, *qui testimonium dant*, i. e. *who bear record*; the *Greek* of the Council, which is the same with that of the Epistle, expresses all this by the sole word μαρτυροῦντες, *bearing record*; is the one then made word for word from the other, the *Greek* from the *Latin*? I am somewhat

ashamed to take up my Readers time with these *minutiae*.

The Manuscript of *Dublin* will finally ruin all these vain subterfuges invented against the *Greek* of the Council of *Latran*; for this end I need but set them one over against the other, that with one cast of the eye they may see that one is no less than the other the original *Greek* of St. *John*'s Epistle. Mr. *Boivin*; Librarian of the Manuscripts in the *French* King's Library, and famous for his great learning, has been pleased to give himself the trouble, at the desire of one of my Friends, to take a Copy himself of this passage of the Council, in the same manner as the *Greek*

#### The Manuscript of the Council.

Οτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν οὐνῶ, ὁ πῆρ, λόγος, καὶ πνᾶ ἅγιον, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσίν.

#### The Manuscript of *Dublin*.

Οτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῶ οὐνῶ, πῆρ, λόγος, καὶ πνᾶ ἅγιον, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσίν.

Note: the **τες** as highlighted above is from the Greek symbol of "τ" with two dots above it meaning *τες*. JKB.

Text of St. *John* is written there; it stands thus.

We see not only the same thing and the same Words in the Manuscript of the Council, and in that of the New Testament of *Dublin*; but we find in both the same abbreviations οὐνῶ for οὐρανῶ πῆρ for πατήρ and πνᾶ for πνεῦμα, which draws the time in which both were written very near together. That of *Dublin* is the very *Greek* of the New Testament; why then should not that of the Council be so too? It appears, lastly, from this Copy which has been sent me, that there is in the King's Manuscript οὗτοι, and not τοῦτοι, as *F. F. Labbee* and *Cossart* have put it in their Edition.

After having defended the *Greek*, of the Council of *Latran* against the vain imagination of Mr. *Simon*, we must come to the *Codex Britannicus*, or Manuscript of *England*, which his bold Criticism has no more spared than the *Greek* of the Council.

The *Greek* Manuscript found in *England*, from which *Erasmus* inserted

in the Edition of 1522, the Text of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, has given Mr. *Simon* no less trouble than the *Greek* of the Council of *Latran*. This was an authentic Act in favour of the genuineness of this passage; he must provide against this Act, or own that the passage in dispute was in the Epistle of St. *John*; a thing that Mr. *Simon* was invincibly bent against. How shall he extricate himself from so terrible a difficulty? To suspect *Erasmus* of having introduced an imaginary Manuscript upon the stage, and which nobody had ever seen, were insinuations reserved for Mr. *Emlyn*'s pen. Mr. *Simon*, who was better acquainted with the character of *Erasmus*, left him all his reputation for uprightness and veracity; but for the *Codex Britannicus* he did not care to think it originally *Greek*; he sought for another rise for it, and from supposition to supposition he has made it descend from the *Latin*. This kind of genealogy is extremely curious; the *Greek* of *Erasmus* was taken from the *Codex Britannicus*; the *Codex Britannicus* came from the *Greek* of the Council of *Latran*, and the *Greek* of the Council of *Latran* was only *Latin* in another form;

*O curas hominum! O quantum est in rebus inane!*

How men make a sport of the most serious matters to satisfy their passion, and compass their end! I have shown the illusion that Mr. *Simon* has formed in all this. But without having recourse to what I have said in my

The Manuscript of  
*Dublin*.

v. 7. Ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσὶ οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, πῆρ, λόγος, καὶ πᾶ ἅγιον, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσιν.

v. 8. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆ, πᾶ, ὕδωρ, καὶ αἷμα.

Note: the τες as shaded above is from the Greek symbol of “τ” with two dots above it meaning τες. JKB.

The Manuscript of  
*England*.

v. 7. Οτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, πατήρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσίν.

v. 8. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσὶν μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆ, πνεῦμα, ὕδωρ, καὶ αἷμα

Dissertation upon the Text of St. *John*, we need but cast our eyes once more upon the Extract of the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> verses of the Manuscript of *Dublin*, and place them on the side of the Extract of the same two verses which *Erasmus* has left us in his Apology against *Stunica*, and in his Commentary upon the Epistle of St. *John*.

The resemblance of these two verses in the Manuscript of *Dublin*, and in that of *Erasmus* is so great, that I thought at first view the famous *Codex Britannicus*, of which no account can be given where it is, was found again in this Manuscript of *Dublin*, which had remained so long concealed; at least as to what concerns the two verses, of which we here give the Extract.

The great agreement we there see of the 8<sup>th</sup> verse with the *Codex Britannicus* of *Erasmus*, made me at first imagine that as this Manuscript of *Dublin* might be one of those which *Usher* had formerly collected in *England*, it might be also the same which *Erasmus* had formerly seen there, and of which no person has since said that he saw it, or knew what was become of it since that time. In this the last words are wanting, which in all the Editions, except that of *Complutum*, are part of the eighth verse, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι, *and these three agree in one*: neither are they in the Manuscript of *Dublin*; which is a very remarkable agreement; and the more so, because both these Manuscripts have the same last words of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι: *and these three are one*, which the Manuscript of *Complutum* has not, with which they yet agree in not having the last clause of the 8<sup>th</sup> verse. Thus far then nothing can be more alike in this respect than the Manuscript of *Dublin* and the *Codex Britannicus*.

I see there again another place in the same 8<sup>th</sup> verse in which they exactly agree; and this is that they both have the words ἐν τῇ γῆ, i. e. *in Earth*, which are wanting in all the Manuscripts I know of, which have

not the Text of the three witnesses in Heavens and which are withal not found in the two first Editions of *Erasmus* in 1516, and 1519, in that of *Aldus* in 1518, in that of *Cephaleus* in 1524, and in that of *Simon Colinaeus* in 1534. All these so particular agreements betwixt the Manuscript of *England* and that of *Dublin*, seemed at first view to show me these two Manuscripts reduced into one, and the famous *Codex Britannicus* of *Erasmus* found again in the Manuscript of *Ireland*. But two things hindered my being fixed in this thought; the first is, that the word ἅγιον of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse, which in the Manuscript of *Dublin* is joined to the word πνεῦμα, *the Holy Spirit*, was not in the Text which was extracted by *Erasmus* in several parts of his works, where he always quotes it with the word πνεῦμα only, *the Father, the Word, and the Spirit*: a difference too sensible to let us possibly blend these two Manuscripts, and take them for the same.

The second difference that is there met with, though less remarkable than the former, is however no less conclusive; it is the omission of the article οἱ in the *Codex Britannicus* before the word μαρτυροῦντες of the 8<sup>th</sup> verse, which is joined to this word in the Manuscript of *Dublin*, where we read οἱ μαρτυροῦντες. This difference would be nothing in bare Copies, but is essential here, when we talk of the Manuscript itself: because it is impossible that one and the same Manuscript should actually have and not have the same words, the same syllables.

These then are two ancient *Greek* Manuscripts which have both equally the Text of the witnesses in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, as it is in the common Editions: and in this respect the Manuscript of *England*, whether it has been lost since the time of *Erasmus*, like abundance of others, or that it yet subsists in some corner exposed to the mercy of worms and damp, finds again its authority under that of the Manuscripts of *Ireland*, by the agreement that it has with it in the Text of the three witnesses in Heaven, and this sacred Text thus receives from

these two ancient Manuscripts combined together, a new proof of its being authentic.

.....

#### CHAP. XIV.

*A brief recapitulation of the principal proofs urged for the genuineness of the passage of St. John's first Epistle, There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.*

QUESTIONS of fact the most clear in themselves usually become obscure by the difficulties which prejudice and party form against them. We have a sensible instance of it in what we have seen concerning the passage of St. *John's* Epistle.

To remove it from the place it has so long held in this sacred Epistle, and which was never disputed in any Country of the World, they must have very good reasons. Such a fact as this, and a fact which maintains its ground from the first ages of Christianity, cannot be treated as forged, unless other facts be produced directly contrary, or arguments that will admit of no reply, taken from certain and incontestable principles. I have proved in my Dissertations, that nothing of this kind can be brought against this Text, nor any ancient Ecclesiastic Writer be found, who has rejected it, or who has only suspected it not to be St. *John's*.

If there was any expression in this passage which did not belong to the language of Holy Scripture, this would be a good reason to oppose to it; but far from this, all the terms of it are sacred, and are even all peculiar to the Style of St. *John*: the term *Word* for that of the Son of God, is an expression, which St. *John* has in a manner made his own in his writings: the following words, *and these three are one*, do not differ from those,

which are read in his Gospel, *I and the Father are one*: the three witnesses of Heaven answer to the three witnesses of the Earth; and the verse which speaks of these last is universally owned to be St. *John's*. Lastly, if the doctrine, which the Text of the witnesses in Heaven contains, was not in some respect the same that it is in other places of the sacred Books, this reason alone would suffice to make us reject these words, and condemn them to an eternal silence; but the doctrine contained in this Text is far from being peculiar to it, and nowhere else to be found in Scripture; it is seen there throughout; and by the very confession of *Julian* the Apostate, shines nowhere in the New Testament with so much force and brightness as in the Writings of St. *John*. Lastly, if this was a passage that broke the thread and connection of the Discourse, and was foreign to it, this would be, perhaps, something to be said; but nothing would be more absurd than such an assertion: The three witnesses in Earth are perfectly connected with the three witnesses in Heaven, and their testimony is indeed but a sequel of that of the witnesses in Heaven. I have demonstrated all these things, and there is not so much as one, the truth of which can be shaken: they have not ventured to touch upon one of them.

Instead of these reasons and these proofs, which are the only ones that can justly be urged, they have nothing but conjectures and negative arguments, which at most can produce only doubts, and form difficulties; but doubts and difficulties can never be proofs, nor be grounds for a sure and solid principle, from which a certain conclusion may be drawn against a fact so well established.

All they have reduced themselves to is to urge against us that this Text is not in some ancient *Latin* Manuscripts. I have shown that it is in abundance of others, of the same or greater antiquity than those; and its being wanting in them is not conclusive against the others, in which this Text is expressed. This is indisputably evident. Farther, I have shown that

the quotation of a passage by Authors of the same or greater antiquity than the Manuscripts is beyond comparison of greater authority than the Manuscripts in which it is wanting, because in a quotation we have at once, both the Manuscript from which it was taken, and the confirmation of the Writer who uses it; and thus there are two proofs in one. It is requisite they should be able to answer this argument; but they never will.

They have had recourse to the Oriental Versions, the *Syriac*, the *Coptic*, and the *Arabic*, which have not this Text: This indeed may be said to those who do not know how modern all these Versions are in comparison of the *Italic* Version, and how defective they are in several very considerable Texts. If my answer is strictly true, the objection vanishes; but when will they show that I have advanced a falsehood in either of these two characters of the Oriental Versions, *viz.* their being modern, and defective.

Lastly, they have cried out upon the silence of some of the Ancients, who have not urged it against the *Arians*, to whose heresy it is so opposite, when yet this Text might have been very serviceable to them, if in their days it had been in St. *John*'s Epistle. I have cleared up this objection in such manner in the second part of my Dissertation upon this Text, and in the Confutation of Mr. *Emlyn*'s Answer, that it is impossible for the nicest subtlety to evade the proofs and instances those Tracts are full of.

Have I omitted any of the objections urged against this passage? Or have I by artificial terms weakened the force of those I have brought? They cannot reproach me with either of these, and I am incapable of such dissimulation. Let them then take all these reasons together, the omission of this passage in some *Latin* Copies, and yet more in the *Greek*: the omission of the same Text in four or five Oriental Versions; lastly, the omission in the controversial Tracts of the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers, of the fourth Century against the *Arians* of their times; these omissions, and others of the same nature cannot form a positive and real proof, against a

clear and certain fact; now this fact is, that this Text having been read by the whole Church for upwards of seven or eight hundred years in the Manuscripts of St. *John*'s Epistle, and for near three hundred years past been inserted in the printed Editions. All that these different omissions could do would be, as I have said, to perplex the mind, and lay it under some difficulties; but though we could not entirely remove them by demonstrative solutions, this would never make what in itself and its own nature is but a difficulty, or a negative argument, become a positive proof to overturn a well established fact. But we are not reduced to that state, that we cannot give satisfactory answers to these omissions; I think I have given such to everyone in the places I have just mentioned: I have constantly advanced nothing there but the truth in what concerns facts and quotations. The principle then is very certain; the consequence only would remain to be opposed; but it is so much according to the rules of the most exact Logic, that I have nothing to fear from that quarter.

The Text of the three witnesses in Heaven thus supporting itself by the weakness of the efforts which have been made to remove it from its place, one might dispense with proving that it is in rightful possession of it: a long Prescription in all cases holds the place of a sufficient proof, when nothing conclusive is urged against it. But I did not lay hold of this maxim of right, as to the genuineness of the passage. I have made it good by proofs almost without number, and taken from so many different places that it is impossible they should all concur in one and the same object, and be reunited there, as lines drawn from a circumference to one and the same center, without our clearly seeing therein the passage of St. *John* to be genuine.

My first proof was drawn from the old *Italic* Version, which from the second Century was used in all the Churches of *Europe* and *Africa*, and even by those of the *East*, where divine service was performed in the language of that famous Version. It prevailed in the Church till the seventh

Century: The Text of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, was in this Version, I have proved it from *Tertullian* down to *Fulgentius*. Let them dispute as long as they please, *Tertullian*'s having quoted it in his Book against *Praxeas*; they will dispute it in vain, because to do it with any grounds, they must prove the authorities I have brought to be false, or the consequences I have drawn from them; and this they cannot do.

As to St. *Cyprian*, who has quoted in his Book *de Unitate Ecclesiae* the express words of St. *John*, they will never compass their end of metamorphosing them into those of the 8<sup>th</sup> verse, unless they set up *Facundus* for an infallible interpreter; but there is no man who will not blush at this audacious proposition. The Epistle of St. *Cyprian* to *Jubaianus* speaks withal in favour of the genuineness of this passage; and there is neither ancient, or modern *Facundus* that can substitute there the 8<sup>th</sup> verse in the place of the 7<sup>th</sup>.

This idol after which they have so long run, that the words of the 8<sup>th</sup> verse, *the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood*, were mystically explained of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, has fallen at the feet of St.<sup>39</sup> *Eucherius, Vigilius, Etherius, Beatus, and Isidorus Mercator*, who have all distinguished these two Texts in their quotations, by quoting them separately from each other, and equally owning them both for the passages of St. *John*. They will never extricate themselves from the abyss into which all these quotations cast this idle pretense of changing the words of the 7<sup>th</sup> verse into those of the 8<sup>th</sup>; there is no mysticism which holds good against the allegations, which are there made of these two passages together. Besides, that not one of the Ancients ever took into his head the ridiculous notion of explaining *the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one*, mystically of the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, mentioned in the 8<sup>th</sup> verse. This where ever they are found, there they can

---

<sup>39</sup> See Part 1. chapter v.

only be in their natural sense.

*Vigilius of Tapsum*; and all the other *African* Bishops of his time looked upon this Text as so express for the doctrine of the Trinity, that they have produced it in their disputes and in their Confession of Faith as a Text entirely confounding the *Arian* heresy. With the Books of these holy Doctors we have in a manner the *Italic* Bible at hand, and under our eyes, in which they read it, and the *Arians* in like manner, according to what *Vigilius* says to them in his dispute concerning the unity in the Trinity:<sup>40</sup> *Cur, TRES UNUM SUNT, Johannem Evangelistam dixisse LEGITIS, si diversas naturas in personis esse accipitis?* i. e. “Why do you read that St. *John* the Evangelist said, *THREE ARE ONE*, if you hold that the Natures are different in the Persons?” Though we had no other passage than this in all the Writings of the Fathers, they should blush, who venture to say, the Fathers have never urged this Text against the *Arians*?

I have withal carried my reflections upon this subject, and my consequences yet farther; the *Arians*; said I, not only had this Text in their Bibles, but it must also have been in the *Greek* of the New Testament, for otherwise they, who were so well versed in the *Greek* tongue, which was well-known in that age, would not have owned it as a Text of St. *John*’s Epistle. And because this Text was quoted by all the *African* Bishops, in their Confession of Faith, a few years after the death of St. *Augustine*, I inserted also, that this Text was in the very Bible of that ancient Doctor, which was no other than the *Italic* Version, as appears from all his Writings. These reasonings flow from one and the same principle; the principle is proved, namely, that this Text was in the *Italic* Version; this would suffice for me; the consequences which I have drawn thence are all natural; the genuineness then of this Text finds in this its proof, its

---

<sup>40</sup> Vigil. Taps. lib. 7.

demonstration, and the opposite opinion its full conviction.

The *Italic* Version continued to be used publicly by the Churches until the seventh Century was pretty far advanced; that of St. *Jerome* made at the close of the fourth was all this time, that is to say, upwards of two hundred years, only a Library Book for the Learned and Curious. There is no room to doubt but the Text of the witnesses in Heaven, which had always remained, as I have observed, in the *Italic* Version, was withal in that of St. *Jerome*. This learned Doctor had in his Prologue to the seven Canonical Epistles declared himself in two strong terms against some Translators who had negligently forbore to insert this important Text in their Versions, to have left it out himself in his own. Yet they will have it that it was not inserted in it, and to this end they deny this Prologue to be St. *Jerome*'s. I have asserted his right to it in the fifth Chapter of my Dissertation upon this Text; and I have answered the new objections of Mr. *Emlyn*. This famous Prologue is in the most ancient Manuscripts of St. *Jerome*'s Bibles, *Walafrid Strabo*; Author of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, has quoted it as a Work of this ancient Father's and has also made some observations upon it: now *Walafrid Strabo* lived in the time of *Charles the Great*, and his authority cannot but be here of great weight, as well for the great reputation of that Author and his work, as for the age in which he lived. These are very certain facts; the quotations I have made cannot be charged with falsehood: they must betake themselves to the Prologue itself; and that is what they have done; but whoever will give himself the trouble to compare my answers with the objections, will very soon see the weakness of these, and for this very reason will conclude the Prologue is really St. *Jerome*'s.

But they will be withal more satisfied and convinced, that the passage which was in the *Italic* Version was no less in St. *Jerome*'s, if they come to the direct and express proofs, which I have produced from the ancient Authors, who have quoted it from this Bible.

To comprehend well the whole force of this proof; we must call to mind what I have said, after Mr. *Simon*; Mr. *Du Pin*, and several others, that the Version of St. *Jerome* was not publicly received by the Churches until the seventh Century; for it is easy to infer from thence, that the Copies of this Version were very scarce until that time; for which reason there are found so few whose antiquity reaches so high as the seventh Century; and I do not know even one which we can be assured is a thousand years old. *F le Long* of the Oratory who has searched very narrowly into this affair, has expressed himself to that effect in his *Bibliotheca sacra*, in the passage I have quoted.

The consequence which is naturally drawn from all this is, that there is no better means, nor surer way of knowing whether the passage of St. *John*'s Epistle was in St. *Jerome*'s Version, at the time it was publicly introduced into the Churches, and Divines began to quote the Texts of the New Testament in their Works from this Version, than, I say, by knowing whether the Text of the witnesses in Heaven is found quoted in the Books of these Doctors, who were the first that used the Version of St. *Jerome*, whereas until their time the Writers took the passages they quoted from the old *Italic*.

Before we hear these Authors themselves, it is necessary to fix this first fact, namely, that the quotations of the Texts of the New Testament were taken from the Version of St. *Jerome*, only since towards the end of the seventh Century, and the beginning of the eighth. To be informed of this, I have no need to search by long and laborious reading, Mr. *Simon* has spared me the pains by the care he has had to give us in the seventh Chapter of the Critical History of the Versions of the New Testament, the testimony of the *Romish* Censors, who say, that *Remi, Bede, Rabanus, Hugo, Rupert, Peter Lombard, and lastly all other Ecclesiastics since nine hundred years have followed the new Edition*. Those who have quoted the passage of St. *John* are Ecclesiastics of the same age with the first who

are there named. It may be seen in what I have said concerning the Abbot *Ansbert*, Bishop *Etherius*, and *Beatus* the *Presbyter*, in whose Works the Text of the three witnesses in Heaven is found: in that age, say the *Romish* Censors, the quotations of the passages of Scripture were taken from St. *Jerome*'s Version; the passage of St. *John* is quoted by all these Authors, it was then in St. *Jerome*'s Bible. This proof is decisive, and the more they seek to evade it, the more they will betray their obstinacy and want of integrity.

From the *Latins* I passed to the *Greeks*. It is here the enemies to the genuineness of this Text have thought to triumph; but I have shown the triumph to be imaginary. No *Greek* Author, said they, has quoted this Text. It is yet mentioned in the Synopsis of St. *Athanasius*; or such other Ancient, for it matters not whose it is; the name signifies nothing to it, it is its antiquity which is here of moment. Now this antiquity is upwards of eight hundred years. They have caviled upon the passage of the Epistle of St. *John*, which the Synopsis may have had in view; I have proved that it can have referred only to the fifth Chapter, and the verses of this Chapter, which denotes the unity of the Father and the Son, and this is the seventh Verse.

I have joined to the quotation of the Synopsis, the Dialogue under the names of *Athanasius* and *Arius*, printed among the Works of St. *Athanasius*. This testimony has given inconceivable pains to the enemies of this Text; it is there quoted, and the three divine Persons are there mentioned with the unity in which this Text represents them. But what forced constructions have they not given to enervate the force of this quotation? Sometimes they have fallen upon the person of the Author; they have said that he was a *Latin*, who had undertook to speak *Greek*, and not a *Greek*, who had written this Dialogue; a mere chimaera; I have proved it invincibly. Sometimes they have attempted to transfer the *Greek* of this Dialogue to those words of the *Latin* Version of the eighth verse,

*tres unum funt*: another chimaera, after which Mr. *Emlyn* had run; but which I have shown to be absurd.

To these two *Greek* witnesses, I have added a third, *Euthymius Zygabenus*; and I have quoted his own terms, extracted from an ancient Manuscript of the King of *France*'s Library, for which I am indebted to the generous good nature of Mr. *Boivin*: for though I had read it in the *Latin* Version of *Euthymius Zygabenus*, inserted in the nineteenth Volume of the *Maxima & Nova Bibliotheca Patrum*, yet for the greater certainty, I was glad to have this passage in its proper and original language.

From these *Greek* witnesses to the original Text of St. *John*'s Epistle, I came to the Copies of this Epistle themselves. The Manuscripts of *Laurentius Valla*, that of *Complutum*, that of *Erasmus* for the Edition of 1522, those of *R. Stephens*, that of the Version of the Council of *Latran*, and lastly that of the Library of *Dublin*, all these Manuscripts have presented to our eyes the Text which its Enemies have ventured to say is in none. They have perplexed themselves extremely in their debates upon each of these, [that of *Dublin* excepted, which was not then produced,] but the more they have laboured to extricate themselves, the more they have been entangled: I have taken care to secure them from escaping on every side.

Lastly, I have proved as clear as the day, that the *Greek* Church, no less than the *Latin*, owned this passage to be genuine. I have proved it from their New Testament in common *Greek*; from their Confession of Faith, in which this Text is inserted, and from their Book called *Apostolos*, which is mentioned in the Life of St. *Sabas*, in the fifth Century. I have corrected the error of those who believe that this Book was no other than a Ritual or Ecclesiastic Formulary, and I have shown that it is the very Volume of the Epistles of the Holy Apostles, in which the *Greeks* constantly read this Text on *Trinity Sunday*. To the *Greek* Church I have joined the *Muscovite*,

a very ancient branch of the *Greek*; and I have shown their entire agreement with it in what regards the Text of the three witnesses, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost.

In all this surprising number of facts, collected from so many different ages, and so many different climates, which all concur to form the proof of the genuineness of this Text, I dare boldly challenge its most obstinate enemies, to specify one which is false: An admirable consolation to all those, who with me have only the truth at heart, to see that of the passage of St. *John* confirmed by so many proofs; one half of which would have sufficed; but divine Providence has preserved them all for the triumph of a passage which was to find such great contradictions in those last ages, and which is one of the most firm supports of the Faith of one God in three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: to whom be Glory for ever and ever, *Amen*.

*FINIS.*

*BOOKS printed for WILLIAM and John INNYS.*

A Critical Dissertation upon the seventh Verse of the fifth Chapter of *St. John's* first Epistle, *There are Three that bear Record in Heaven, &c.* Wherein the Authenticness of this Text is fully proved against the Objections of Mr. *Simon* and the Modern *Arians*. Written originally in *French* by Mr. *Martin*, and now translated into *English*, 8vo. 1719.

A second Dissertation by Mr. *Martin*, in Defense of the Testimony given to our Saviour by *Josephus*. Wherein the Paragraph in the fourth Chapter of the eighteenth Book of his *Jewish Antiquities* is proved to be authentic. Written originally in *French*, and now translated into *English*, 8vo. 1719.

An Examination of Mr. *Emlyn's* Answer to the Dissertation upon the seventh Verse of the fifth Chapter of *St. John's* first Epistle, &c. By Mr. *Martin* Pastor of the *French Church* at *Utrecht*, 8vo. 1719.

——the same in *French*, 12<sup>mo</sup>, 1719.

A Discourse of Natural Religion, by Mr. *Martin*, 8vo. 1720.

Dr. *Waterland's* Sermons at *St. Paul's* in Defense of the Divinity of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, 8vo.

Dr. *Knight's* Sermons at the same Lecture, 8vo.

Mr. *Bayly's* Sermons, 2 Vols. 8vo. 1721.

The Nature and Necessity of Religious Zeal considered.

A Visitation Sermon preached at *Kingston upon Thames*, by *Jos. Clarke*, D. D.

The Lord Bishop of *London*'s Letter to his Clergy defended; wherein the constant Worship of Son and Holy Spirit, with the Father, during the first Ages, is set forth; and the Antiquity of the Doxology used by the Church of *England* asserted; 8vo. 1719.

Plain Notions of our Lord's Divinity. Set forth in a Sermon preached upon Christmas-day, at the Royal Chapel of *Whitehall*. Published at the Request of many of the Audience. By *Tho. Mangey*, LL. D. Chaplain to the Right Reverend Father in God, *John*, Lord Bishop of *London*: the 2nd Edition, 8vo. 1719.

—Practical Discourses upon the Lord's Prayer, preached before the Hon. Society of *Lincolns-Inn*. The 3rd Edition, 8vo.

—The eternal Existence of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. Set forth in a Sermon preached at the Lord Bishop of *Winchester*'s Visitation at *Chertsey* in the County of *Surrey*, on *Friday* the 22nd of *May*. Published at the Request of the Clergy there present, 8vo. 1719.

—Sermon before the House of Commons on the 30th of *January* 1719.  
8 vol.