

# Biblical Trinity Views and the Ancient Nicenists

The Nicene statement of the Trinity comes from those who are called the *Greek Theologians*. The Greek Theologians made God the Father the source of God the Word and God the Holy Spirit. Nicenism teaches the terrible concept of the eternal generation of the Divine Being, God the eternal Word. It also teaches the terrible concept of the Eternal Procession of the Holy Spirit. These are incorrect concepts because they made the Eternal Word and the Holy Spirit both to come forth from God the Father.

## Controversy over Eternal Generation

In historical theology the controversy over eternal generation came to a head in the Arian controversy. In time the Nicenists won the contest and all became branded as heretics and Arians who denied the eternal generation of God the Eternal Word and later the Eternal Procession of God the Holy Spirit.

## The Macedonian Controversy

In historical theology, the controversy over the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit is known as the Macedonian controversy. This name comes from the chief location of opposition to Nicenian Pneumatology that arose just following the Nicenian Controversy.

## Is God the Father the Source of Other Divine Beings?

The Nicenian Creed teaches that God the Father is the source of God the Eternal Word and the Holy Spirit. Their statement regarding the origin of God the Word is terrible enough, but their assertion that God the Father joined with God the Son and They Two produced yet another Divine Being, the Holy Spirit, is terrible blasphemy. In the past I have called this *divine incest* and it ranks at or near the top of all the terrible blasphemies and false doctrines that the beast system has produced.

The background for Nicenism is Greek Mythology. Zeus is the Greek mythological god who is the father of all other gods and mankind. The Nicenists simply sprinkled holy water on Greek mythology and made it into the standard Trinity confession of false Christianity.

## Our Position on the Holy Trinity is:

That the Holy Trinity consists of God the Father, God the Eternal Word, and God the Holy Spirit, and these three Divine Beings are One in the Divine Nature. This is the heart and soul of the true and proper I John 5:7 as found in the Old Italic and ancient Greek Textus Receptus. This sets forth both the economy of the Holy Trinity, Three Divine Beings, and the Unity of the Holy Trinity, the One Divine Nature. If either the Economy or the Unity of the Holy Trinity is denied, in any way, then the Holy Trinity is not properly presented.

## Maintaining the Three Essential Divine Attributes

While many who consider themselves as Biblical Trinitarians deny this statement of the Holy Trinity, and yet affirm their Nicenian views of the Trinity, what they are doing is maintaining a *Trinity of successive Beings*, but they cannot affirm that the three essential attributes of Deity dwell within Each member of the Holy Trinity. They, of course, think they do, but they do not. Our definition of the Holy Trinity or Elohem, affirms that Each Divine Being is *self-existent*, not just the Father, but the Word and the Holy Spirit as well, *self-sufficient*, not just the Father, but God the Word and God the Holy Spirit as well, and *Immutable*. Nicenists want to claim that the Father is the only Divine Being Who is Ingenerate, and by this they deny the self-existence of the Word and Holy Spirit *in their Divine Beings*. Nicenists try to circumvent this by saying that their self-existence is in their Divine Nature, but this is theological double talk. At issue here is the grand distinction of essential attributes between the Biblical position of the Trinity and the Trinity as held by Nicenists and other Systemic Theologians. Do we believe in Three Divine Beings in succession or in Three Divine Beings Who are self-existent, self-sufficient and immutable in both their Nature and their Being?

### The Divine Attribute of Immutability

While the Nicenists claim that the Divine Attribute of Immutability belongs to each member of the Holy Trinity, they make this claim for the Divine nature and cannot make this in actual fact for the Divine Beings. The reason, if God the Father is not and has not always been God the Father, then He became something He was not before He was God the Father. If God the Word became the Eternal Word after eternal generation, that He was not God the Word before His supposed eternal generation. If God the Holy Spirit became God the Holy Spirit by and after proceeding forth from the Father, though the Son, then it is obvious that He was not God the Holy Spirit before His eternal procession. I realize that the Imperial ministers of the beast deny these conclusions, but if words have any meaning, and they do, these conclusions are valid. Each Divine Being in the Holy Trinity, Elohem, is *Immutable not only in His Divine Nature, but in His Divine Being* as well.

*The Biblical teaching of the Holy Trinity sets forth both the Immutability of the Divine Nature and the Immutability of the Divine Beings in Whom that Divine Nature Indwells. Nicenism does not.*

The Eternal Generation of Jesus Christ refers ONLY to His sacred Manhood, not His deity. The procession of the Holy Spirit refers ONLY to His timely work in the Covenant of Redemption, and not His supposed eternal origin from the Father.

### The Attribute of Self-Existence

The Eternal Generation of God the Word denies in fact, the Eternal Sonship of God the Word. He is, within and of Himself, the only Self-Existent Son in all existence. I know that Nicenists deny this conclusion, but again if words have any meaning, and they do, then this is a valid charge against Nicenism. God the Word did not become the Son of God by any act of the Father, but He is the Eternal Son and

**Self-Existent in both His Divine Being and His Divine Nature. Is this one reason why God the Word hypostasized Jesus Christ, in His Sacred Manhood, and not God the Father or God the Holy Spirit? I feel certain this is one of the reasons.**

**The same is true of God the Holy Sprit, both God the Holy Spirit and God the Word, are self-existent in their Divine Beings and their one common Divine Nature. God the Word and God the Holy Spirit are just as self-existent as God the Father in their Divine Beings and their Divine Nature. Neither of the Divine Beings owes their origin to each other or else they are not equal Divine Beings. How can Divine Beings be, One Ingenerate, another generate and yet another proceeding from both? Such defies all Revelation and Revealed Verbal Inspiration. Words do have meanings. Inspired words have inspired meanings. To the credit of the Greek branch of Imperial Churchism, they deny eternal procession leaving it to the Romans.**

### **The Attribute of Self-Sufficiency**

**Each Divine Being is totally and completely self-sufficient in both their Divine Being and their Divine nature. If God the Father is the originator of the Word and Holy Sprit, then it follows that they owe their origins to Him and are not Self-Sufficient. This is not the case as Each of the Three Divine Beings is Self-Sufficient in their Being and their Nature.**

**Therefore, we maintain that the Biblical statement of the Holy Trinity is correct and the Nicenian statement is incorrect. Let us now consider some further issues concerning Biblical Trinitarianism and the human invention of Nicenism.**

### **The Nicenian Bibles**

**The ancient Nicene Creed is joined by two ancient Greek Manuscripts, the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus. Each of these ancient Greek Manuscripts are so lacking that it is strange that anyone would call them “better and superior” manuscripts. However, I am not going to discuss their demerits, and there are many, but their historical connections to false doctrines and persecutions.**

**Nicenism is the result of Constantine the Great’s efforts to resolve the Arian controversy. The Nicenists sought to maintain the Deity of God the Son, the Word, as they say by Eternal Generation, and God the Holy Spirit by the terrible notion that both came from God the Father. Because the Father is Divine so is His Son and They Two produced the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is divine, they pretend, because He is the joint production of God the Father and God the Son, both Divine.**

**After Constantine’s Imperial Bishops produced the Nicene Creed, he commissioned Eusebius the Historian, to produce one common and correct uniform Bible for the Roman Empire. I call this the Constantine-Eusebius Bible.**

**This Eusebius did and as was the custom of the day among the Imperial Orthodox, he left out those scriptures that the so-called heretics relied upon to teach their concepts. This is why he left out the true and proper I John 5:7, as**

stated in the Old Italic and the Greek Textus Receptus. See Burgon's *The Causes of Corruptions*.

Before Constantine's union of Church and State, the Pagan-Civil Roman Empire murdered Christians by the thousands and burned and destroyed all the ancient Greek Biblical Manuscripts they could find. Constantine put an end to Pagan Rome's murdering Christians and burning Biblical Manuscripts, but it did not stop the murder of Christians or the destroying of the ancient texts.

*Priscillian* was the first Christian whom the New Imperial Church of Constantine put to death. He was a dissenting Bishop in Spain and a strong supporter of the true and proper I John 5:7 in the old Italic Textual family and cited such in his works. In fact, P's citation of the true and proper I John 5:7 was so important that the W-H followers tried to say that he is the first who placed it in the Old Italic Text. This has been disproved.

Henry D'Anvers is the *first* historian that I am aware of who deals with the Priscilianists and that only briefly. He stated:

### D'Anvers on The Priscilianists

Therefore not to insist upon it, whether there was such a one as Manichee's in (in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Centuries Eusebius tells us, from whom some supposed the name came); all agree that the Manichees Heresy were no other than the Phanatick, or the sect of the Mad men, know also by the names Cathari and Puriticans, viz. Puritans and Publicans. And we find that those professors called the Priscilianists, Messalians, Donatists, and Novatians, were called by these names in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Centuries. And as Dr. Usher tells us page 288 out of Jere. 22 *cp. Ad Eustochium, that Jerom observed in his day, that if a man looked seriously they would call him a miserable Manichee. Si Quem Vidissons palentens atquitristem, Nissericm Manichaum vatahant.* And these were the very names they attributed to the Waldenses and their followers in after Centuries. Therefore Perin c. 3 pages 9-10 tells us *Quelqut sois pourbes rendre plus exeorale ils les vendoyent complives des Ancient Heratiques and ie nemoins saus de pretexes ridicules, car d'extant qukls sui sayest profession de pureie enleur vie and Croyertice ils les appelloyent Cashares.* Sometimes, to make them more odious, they made them confederates with ancients Heretics but yet under more than ridiculous precipitous: for, because they made profession of purity in their lives, and of faith, they called them Catherasts.

Taken from my work *D'Anvers on the French Connection* and I shall research out the exact page from his *Treatise of Baptism*, London, 1675, that this quote is from.

While D'Anvers is the first I know about who has spoken of this man and his followers, he is not the only historian who has spoken of Priscillian, notice the following:

# Priscillian the Supposed Inventor of I John 5:7

Taken from *The Pilgrim Church*

by

EDMUND HAMER BROADBENT

350-385 In the fourth century a Reformer appeared, and a work of Reformation was wrought which affected wide circles in Spain, spread into Lusitania (Portugal) and to Aquitania in France, making itself felt in Rome also.

*Priscillian* was a Spaniard of wealth and position, a learned and eloquent man of unusual attainments. In common with many of his class he was unable to believe the old heathen religions, yet was not attracted by Christianity, and preferred classic literature to the Scriptures, so he had sought refuge for his soul in the prevalent philosophies, such as Neo-Platonism - [see glossary](#) and Manichaeism.

He was converted to Christ, was baptised, and began a new life of devotion to God and separation from the world. He became an enthusiastic student and lover of the Scriptures, lived an ascetic life as a help towards fuller union with Christ by making his body more fit to be a dwelling place of the Holy Spirit, and though a layman - [see glossary](#), preached and taught diligently. Soon conventicles were organised and meetings held with a view to making religion a reality which should affect the character, and large numbers of persons, especially of the educated class, were drawn into the movement. Priscillian was made Bishop of Avila, but it was not long before he encountered the hostility of a part of the Spanish clergy.

Bishop Hydatius, Metropolitan of Lusitania - [see glossary](#), led the opposition, and at a Synod held in 380 at Caesaraugusta (Saragossa) - [see glossary](#) accused him of Manichaean and Gnostic heresy. The proceedings were not successful until political necessities led the Emperor Maximus, who had murdered Gratian and usurped his place, to desire the aid of the Spanish clergy; but then, at a Synod in Burdigala (Bordeaux) in 384, Bishop Ithacus, a man of evil repute, joined the attack, accusing Priscillian and those to whom they attached the title "Priscillianists", of witchcraft and immorality, and the accused were brought to Treves (Trier), condemned by the Church, and handed over to the civil power for execution (385).

The eminent bishops, Martin of Tours and Ambrose of Milan, protested in vain against this; Priscillian and six others were beheaded, among them a distinguished lady, Euchrotia, widow of a well known poet and orator. This was the first instance of the execution of Christians by the Church, an example to be followed afterwards with such terrible frequency. After this Martin and Ambrose refused to have any fellowship whatever with Hydatius and the other bishops who were responsible, and when the Emperor Maximus fell, the cruel torture and murder of these saintly persons was recorded with abhorrence and Ithacus was deprived of his bishopric.

The bodies of Priscillian and his companions were brought to Spain and they were honored as martyrs. Nevertheless a Synod in Treves approved what had been done, thus giving the official sanction of the Roman Church to the execution, and this was confirmed by the Synod of Braga held 176 years later, so that the ruling Church not only persecuted those whom it called Priscillianists, but handed down as history that Priscillian and those who believed as he did were punished for holding Manichaean and Gnostic doctrine and because of the wickedness of their lives and this continued for centuries to be the generally received opinion of them.

Although Priscillian had written voluminously, it was thought that all his writings had disappeared, so diligently had they been destroyed. In 1886 Georg Schepss discovered in the library of the University of Wurzburg eleven of Priscillian's works, which he describes as being "contained in a precious Uncial M. S. - [see glossary](#) . . . which until now had remained unknown. "It is written in very old Latin and is one of the oldest Latin MSS - [see glossary](#) . known to exist. It consists of eleven tracts (some parts are missing) of which the first four contain details of the trial, and the remaining seven his teaching. The reading of these, Priscillian's own writings, shows that the account handed down of him was wholly untrue, that he was a man of saintly character, sound in doctrine, and an energetic reformer, and that those associated with him were companies of men and women who were true and devoted followers of Christ. Not content with murdering these people, exiling them, confiscating their goods, the Church authorities have persistently calumniated - [see glossary](#) their memory.

The style of Priscillian's writing is vivid and telling, he constantly quotes Scripture %% in support of what he advances and shows an intimate acquaintance with the whole of the Old and New Testaments. He maintained, however, the right of the Christian to read other literature, and this was made the occasion of accusing him of wishing to include the Apocrypha in the Canon of Scripture, which he did not do.

He defends himself and his friends for their habit of holding Bible readings in which laymen were active and women took part, also for their objection to taking the Lord's Supper - [see glossary](#) with frivolous and worldly minded persons.

{\* Priscillian ein Neuaufgefundener Lat. schriftsteller des 4 Jahrhunderts. Vortrag gehalten am 18 Mai, 1886, in der Philologisch-Historischen Gesellschaft zu Wurzburg von Dr. Georg Schepss K. Studienlehrer am Humanist. Gymnasium Mit einem Blatt in Originalgrosse Faksimiledruck des Manuscriptes, Wurzburg. A. Stuher 's Verlagbuchhandlung, 1886.}

{%% The quotations are from a translation earlier than that of Jerome (the Vulgate - [see glossary](#) ).}

For Priscillian the theological disputations in the Church had little value, for he knew the gift of God, and had accepted it by a living faith. He would not dispute as to the Trinity, being content to know that in Christ the true One God is laid hold of by the help of the Divine Spirit. \*

He taught that the object of redemption is that we should be turned to God and therefore an energetic turning from the world is needed, lest anything might hinder fellowship with God. This salvation is not a magical event brought about by some sacrament, but a spiritual act. The Church indeed publishes the confession, and baptises, and conveys the commands or Word of God, to men, but each one must decide for himself and believe for himself. If communion with Christ should be broken it is for each one to restore it by personal repentance. There is no special official grace, laymen have the Spirit as much as clergy. He exposes at length the evil and falsity of Manichaeism, and his teaching, from the Scriptures, is entirely opposed to it. Asceticism he regarded not as a chief thing in itself, but as a help towards that entire union of the whole person with God or Christ, from which the body cannot be excepted, because of its being the habitation of the Spirit. This is rest in Christ, experience of Divine love and leading, incorruptible blessing.

Faith in God, who has revealed Himself, is a personal act which involves the whole being in acknowledgment of dependence on God for life and for all things. It brings with it the desire and the decision to be wholly consecrated to Him. Moral works follow of themselves because in receiving the new life the believer has received into himself that which contains the very essence of morality. Scripture is not only historical truth, but is at the same time a means of grace. The spirit feeds upon it and finds that every portion of it contains revelation, instruction, and guidance for daily life. To see the allegorical meaning of Scripture requires no technical training, but faith. The Messianic-typical meaning of the Old Testament and the historical progress of the New are pointed out, and this not only for the sake of knowledge, but as showing that not some only, but all the saints are called to complete sanctification.

{\* *"Priscillianus Ein Reformator des vierten Jahrhunderts. Eine Kirchengeschichtliche Studie zugleich ein Kommentar zu den Erhaltenen Schriften Priscillians"* von Friedrich Paret Dr. Phil. Repetent am Evang. -Theol. Seminar in Tübingen. Würzburg A. Stuber's verlagsbuchhandlung. 1891}

Such teachings soon brought these circles into conflict with those of the Roman Church, especially as represented by such a scheming, political bishop as Hydatius. The clergy saw in the holy life of the ordinary believer that which assailed their peculiar position. The power of "apostolic succession" - [see glossary](#) and of the priestly office was shaken by teaching which insisted on holiness and constant renewal of life by the Holy Spirit and communion with God. The distinction between clergy and laity was broken down by this, especially when the magical working of the sacraments was exchanged for a living possession of salvation through faith.

The breach was irreparable because due to two distinct views of the Church. It was not only a question of suppressing conventicles or of opposing what threatened to become an order of monks apart from the Church, but of a complete difference of principle. The policy of Hydatius was to strengthen the power of the Metropolitan as representing the See of Rome - [see glossary](#), with a view to carrying out the *Roman centralizing organization* which was as yet unpopular in Spain and incomplete and was opposed by the lesser bishops. The circles with

which Priscillian was associated were in principle diametrically opposed to this; their occupation with Scripture and acceptance of it as their guide in all things led them to desire the *independence of each congregation*, and this they were already putting into practice. After the death of Priscillian and his companions the circles of those who shared their faith increased rapidly, but, although Martin of Tours succeeded in modifying the first burst of persecution which followed that tragic event, persecution was continued and severe; nevertheless it was not until some two centuries later that the meetings were finally dispersed.

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/thailand/PC-B-040.HTM>

Here is what the online 1911 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says about him:

The long prevalent estimation of Priscillian as a heretic and Manichaeian rested upon [Augustine](#), Turibius of Astorga, [Leo](#) the Great and Orosius, although at the Council of Toledo in 400, fifteen years after Priscillian's death, when his case was reviewed, the most serious charge that could be brought was the error of language involved in rendering a', 'ni [ros](#) by *innascibilis*. It was long thought that all the writings of the "heretic" himself had perished, but in 1885, G. Schepss discovered at Wiirzburg eleven genuine tracts, since published in the *Vienna Corpus*. " They contain nothing that is not orthodox and [commonplace](#),

<http://www.1911encyclopedia.org/Priscillian>

### **The New Church of Constantine and Eusebius Murdered Priscillian and Others**

The first Christian Constantine's new church murdered was Priscillian. He refused to use the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles and paid dearly for such. He held to and used the Old Italic that contained the true and proper I John 5:7. He refused to discuss the Trinity doctrine of Nicenism.

The case of Priscillian is simply one of many Christians that the Nicenists have put to death or have tried to ruin because of their rejection of the entire system of Constantine, his church and his Bibles.

### **Conclusion**

The Biblical doctrine of the Holy Trinity stands in direct opposition to the Nicenian doctrine of the Trinity.

1. Nicenists believe in the eternal generation of God the Eternal Word; Biblical Trinitarians do not, but rather believe in the generation of His sacred humanity only;
2. Nicenists believe in the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit, but Biblical Trinitarians do not, they believe in the convent procession of the Holy

Spirit in time, and this has nothing at all to do with His origin as a Divine Being.

3. Nicenists say they believe in the three basic attributes of the Divine Nature, but do not believe these apply to the Three Divine Beings in the Holy Trinity, but only to the Father. They hold that *the Father only is ingenerate and unproceeding as a Divined Being*.

Biblical Trinitarians believe that God the Father, God the Eternal Word, and God the Holy Spirit, each possess the basic attributes both in their one common Divine Nature and in their Divine Beings.

3. Nicenists say they believe in the three basic attributes of the Holy Trinity, but in works deny these. They say that the three basic attributes of Immutability, self-existence, and self-sufficiency refer to the One Divine Nature, and then proceed to affirm that the Divine Being of God the Eternal Word, as a distinct Being came forth from the Father by Eternal Generation, and the Divine Being of God the Holy Spirit came forth from God the Father through God the Son.

4. Biblical Trinitarians affirm that the three essential and basic Divine Attributes belong to the One Divine Nature *and* the Three Divine Beings in Whom the One Divine nature dwells.

5. The Nicenists are supported by the Constantine-Eusebius textual families headed up by the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrian, while the Biblical Trinitarians are supported by the Textus Receptus in Greek and the Old Italic in Latin.

Here are further comments about the Constantine-Eusebius Bible, Codex Sinaiticus:

**Codex Sinaiticus: The earliest Bible manuscript to appear on the Internet soon**

Scientists consider the parchment manuscript to be one of the 50 copies of the Holy Scriptures ordered by the Roman emperor Constantine

Scientists involved in digitization of the Codex Sinaiticus claimed that the copy of the famous manuscript would appear in the Internet in the nearest future. It may be possible that after publication of the ancient text all of the confessions will have to reconsider their dogmas. The fact is that Codex Sinaiticus includes a full text of the Bible. It contains the oldest version of the New Testament in the world as well as the Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint. The latter includes the books, which are now considered apocryphal.

The scientists consider the parchment manuscript to be one of the 50 copies of the Holy Scriptures ordered by the Roman emperor Constantine after he had been converted to Christianity. During the recent 20 years only 4 researchers had an access to the original text. The manuscript is called by the name of the place

where it is kept – Monastery of Saint Catherine on Sinai Peninsula in Egypt. The cloister is situated at the foot of Mount Sinai where Moses received the Ten Commandments.

The scrolls had been kept in the monastery until XIX century, when a German researcher Constantin von Tischendorf took away a part of them to Germany and Russia. There is still a belief in the monastery that the manuscript was stolen. However, the history proves the following.

Constantin von Tischendorf arrived in Egypt aiming to obtain the ancient manuscript by all the possible means. He found out about its existence while still studying at the University of Leipzig. He was obsessed with recovering the original text of the New Testament, because he thought that its numerous translations could lack something really important. For several years he had been traveling to many European cities where he studied the primary sources.

First of all he read Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus, also known as Codex Peresianus. In order to do so he had to scrape the later text off the parchment and to read the original text of the Greek Bible. It was considered to be written in the 5 century BC. In 1843 obstinate Tischendorf published a palimpsest (a manuscript on which an earlier text has been effaced and the vellum or parchment reused for another) of Codex Ephraemi and was given a chance to study Codex Alexandrinus. He was also striving for permission of Vatican to study Codex Vaticanus. Then the German sets out on his journey to Egypt. When he arrived at the Monastery of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai there were only 18 monks left there. They did not have much desire to communicate with a gentile, but the latter was not giving up and found 129 parchments. It was the Greek Translation of the Old Testament Septuagint (“LXX”). The texts of the New Testament were not discovered at that time.

In 1853 on his second visit to the Monastery of St. Catherine he offered the monks to sell him the remaining parts of the Codex. When they refused Constantin decided to ask for help of the Russian government, which was then patronizing the monastery. Back at the monastery the monks welcomed Tischendorf and the Superior gave him the ancient manuscript, which had been kept, in his cell. Tischendorf was celebrating! He received the primary sources, containing the complete New Testament as well as two apocryphal books. Neither Codex Vaticanus, nor Codex Alexandrinus had the full text of the New Testament. Moreover, the manuscript turned out to be older than the two codices known before! The discovery contained the majority of the Old Testament books and also The Epistle.

At first the Codex was given to Tischendorf for temporary possession. But afterwards when the great researcher got acquainted with Russian Grand Duke Constantine the monks donated the manuscript to Russia. For celebrations of the 1000th anniversary of Russia Constantin Tischendorf published Codex Sinaiticus and brought the book to St. Petersburg. It was published in Leipzig under the title “Codex Bibliorum Sinaiticus Petropolitanus auspiciis Imperatoris Alexandri II. Susceptæ” (which can be vaguely translated as Codex Sinaiticus, saved from the

dark under the patronage of His Imperial Majesty Alexander II). Tischendorf was congratulated on his success by European monarchs and the Pope himself. He was granted hereditary nobility in Russia.

The most important contribution of the scientist is the comparison of four manuscripts: Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Peresianus and Codex Vaticanus. By doing so Tischendorf proved that the New Testament of the modern Bible reached present time in its true value. However, the Ecumenical Council at Nicea had already approved the Canonical Gospels by that time. That is why it did not lead to any disturbance of the apologists of Christianity.

Later on Codex Sinaiticus was presented to the Russian Tsar. In 1933 it was sold to England and exhibited in the British Museum in London. Four fragments of the manuscript are known in the world. The largest one – 347 out of 400 pages – is kept in the British Library, the rest is kept in the library of the University of Leipzig (Germany), the National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg and in the Monastery of St. Catherine.

However, exposing the ancient manuscripts to public is just the first step on the way of discovering new parts of the New Testament. The apocryphal books have become the object of study of theologians as well as mere enthusiasts. The Qumran manuscripts found in 1947 in Israel contain many apocryphal works, which interpret questionable extracts of the Bible in a different way, have become a topic of discussion between priests who stick to their dogmas and researchers looking for the truth. Earlier on the sources were locked up in the libraries. Now they are slowly becoming exposed to public. When comparing such primary sources, which were disregarded as apocryphal books, one can see that the Old and the New Testaments lack a lot in their narration. This relates not only to minor details, but to the events of major importance as well. Anyway, according to prophets and saints people will solve the mysteries of the universe at the End of the World. And the future of the mankind will depend on how they will be able to use them.

Septuagint – (derived from the Latin word for “seventy”) the translation of the Old Testament commissioned by the Ptolemy. It was done by the Seventy Interpreters (that is how it received its title). It is considered basic for Orthodoxy. It was translated into other national languages. Catholicism uses Vulgate – the translation by St. Jerome

### **Codex Alexandrinus (British Museum)**

<http://www.katapi.org.uk/BibleMSS/Ch7.htm#A>

This has been one of the chief treasures of the British Museum since its foundation, and a volume of it may be seen, side by side with the Sinaiticus, by every visitor in one of the showcases in the Department of Manuscripts. Its history, at least in later years, is much less obscure than that of the Sinaiticus.

In 1624 it was offered by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, to Sir Thomas Roe, our ambassador in Turkey, for presentation to King James I. King James died before the manuscript started for England, and the offer was transferred to Charles I.

In 1627 the gift was actually accomplished, and the MS. remained in the possession of our sovereigns until the Royal Library was presented to the nation by George II, when it entered its present home.

Its earlier history is also partially traceable.

Cyril Lucar (according to contemporary statements) brought it to Constantinople from Alexandria, of which see he had previously been Patriarch; and an Arabic note at the beginning of the MS., signed by "Athanasius the humble" (possibly Athanasius III, Patriarch of Alexandria, who died about 1308), states that it was a gift to the Patriarchal cell in that town. A later Latin note adds that the gift was made in AD1098, but the authority for this statement is unknown.

Another Arabic note, written in the thirteenth or fourteenth century, states that the MS. was written by Thecia the martyr; and Cyril Lucar himself repeats this statement, with the additions that Thecia was a noble lady of Egypt, that she wrote it shortly after the Council of Nicaea (AD 325), and that her name was originally written at the end of the manuscript.

This, however, was only tradition, since the end of the MS. had been lost long before Cyril's time.

The authority for the tradition is quite unknown, and so early a date is hardly possible.

The occurrence in the manuscript of treatises ([see Ch.5, p.67](#)) by Eusebius (d. AD 340) and Athanasius (d. AD 373) makes it almost certain that it cannot be earlier than the middle of the fourth century, and competent authorities agree that the style of writing probably shows it to be somewhat later, in the first half of the fifth century.

It is certain that the writing of this MS. appears to be somewhat more advanced than that of the Vaticanus or Sinaiticus, especially in the enlargement of initial letters and similar elementary ornamentation; but it must be remembered that these characteristics are already found in earlier MSS., and that similar differences between contemporary MSS. may be found at all periods.

The dating of early Greek uncials on vellum is still very doubtful for want of materials to judge from, and it is possible that the tradition mentioned above is truer than is generally supposed; but for the present it is safer to acquiesce in the general judgment which assigns the manuscript to the fifth century.

Like the Codex Sinaiticus, it *contained originally* the whole Greek Bible, with the addition of the two Epistles of Clement of Rome, which in very early days ranked almost with the inspired books; and, in addition, the table of contents shows that it originally included the Psalms of Solomon, the title of which, however, is so separated from the rest of the books as to indicate that they were regarded as standing on a different footing.

The Old Testament has suffered some slight mutilations, which have been described already; *the New Testament more seriously, since the whole of St. Matthew's Gospel, as far as chapter xxv.6, is lost, together with leaves containing John vi.50-viii.52 (where, however, the number of pages missing shows that the doubtful passage, vii.53-viii.11, cannot have been present when the MS. was perfect), and 2 Cor.iv.13-6, one leaf of the first Epistle of Clement and the greater part of the second.*

The leaves measure 12.75 by 10.25 inches, having two columns to each page, written in large and well-formed hands of round shape, apparently by two scribes in the Old Testament and three in the New [Messrs. Milne and Skeat, in an appendix to their study of the Sinaiticus, identify the scribes of the New Testament with the first scribe of the Old Testament, chiefly on the ground of the forms of the flourishes at the ends of the several books; but this seems to ignore certain marked differences of script.], with initial letters enlarged and projecting into the margin.

*The text has been corrected throughout by several different hands, the first being nearly or quite contemporary with the original scribe. The facsimile given in Plate XVI shows the upper part of the page containing John iv.42-v.14.*

In column 1, line 6, it will be seen that this MS. contains the words "the Christ"; and a reference to the Variorum Bible footnote shows that it is supported by C3 (i.e., the third corrector of C), D, L (with the later MSS.), while  $\kappa$ , B, C (with the Old Latin, Vulgate, Bohairic, and Curetonian Syriac versions) omit the words, and are followed by all the editors except McClellan. Though D and L represent pre-Syrian testimony, the balance of that testimony, as contained in  $\kappa$ , B, and the versions, overweighs them.

More important readings will be seen in the second column, which contains the story of the cure of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda. It will be seen (lines 13, 14) that an alteration has been made in the MS., and that certain letters have been rewritten over an erasure, while others are added in the margin.

The words which are thus due to the corrector, and not to the original scribe, are those which are translated "halt, withered, *waiting for the moving of the water.* For an angel of the Lord."

*A close examination shows that the first and last parts of the passage originally occupied line 14, before the erasure; but the words in italics are an addition which was not in the original text.*

They are also omitted (see the Variorum Bible footnote) by  $\aleph$ , B, C, L, with the Guretonian Syriac and the Sahidic versions.

They are found only in D, the corrections of A and G, and later MSS., and are thus inevitably omitted by nearly all the editors. With regard to verse 4 the distribution of evidence is different.

It is omitted, like the former words, by  $\aleph$ , B, C, the Curetonian Syriac, most MSS. of the Bohairic and the Sahidic versions; and these are now joined by D, which in the previous case was on the other side. On the other hand, A and L have changed in the contrary direction, and are found to support the verse, in company with Thus the versions are fairly equally divided; but  $\aleph$ , B, C, D form a very strong group of early authority, as against A and the mass of later MSS. L and the Old Latin are, in fact, the only witnesses to the verse which can be considered as pre-Syrian, and consequently we find the Revised Version omits the verse, in common with Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort; Lachmann and McClellan alone appearing on the other side.

**(Brethren, please go to the site for this paragraph, for some reason it will not carry over without being missed up, I have tried several times, REP)**

B, C, D form a very strong group of early authority, as against A and the mass of later MSS. L and the Old Latin are, in fact, the only witnesses to the verse which can be considered as pre-Syrian, and consequently we find the Revised Version omits the verse, in common with Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort; Lachmann and McClellan alone appearing on the other side.

*Specimens of scribes' errors and their corrections may be seen in lines 1, 2, 26-28.*

*In the former the words first written have been erased, and the correct reading written above them; in the latter, some words had been written twice over by mistake (λεγει αυτω θελεις υγιης γενεσθαι λεγει αυτω θελεις υγιης γενεσθαι απεκριθη αυτω - legei auto theleis ugies gevesthai legei auto theleis ugies genesthai apekrithe auto).*

*The whole passage (from the first γενεσθαι) has been erased, and then correctly rewritten, with a slight variation (λεγει for απεκριθη); but as the correct reading was much shorter than that originally written, a considerable space is left blank, as the facsimile shows.*

As regards the quality of the text preserved in the Codex Alexandrinus, it must be admitted that it does not stand quite so high as its two predecessors in age,

κ and B. Different parts of the New Testament have evidently been copied from different originals; but in the Gospels, at any rate, A is the oldest and most pre-eminent example of that revised "Syrian" text which (to judge from the quotations in the Fathers) had become the predominant text as early as the fourth century. It will often be found at the head of the great mass of later uncials and cursives which support the received text; and although it is much superior to the late cursives from which the "received text" was in fact derived, it yet belongs to the same class, and will be found oftener in agreement with the Authorised Version than with the Revised. In the Acts and Epistles it ranks definitely with B and κ, and is perhaps an even better example of that class than they. In the Apocalypse also it belongs to the Neutral type, and is probably the best extant MS. of that book, with the possible exception of P<sup>47</sup>. The Epistles of Clement, which are very valuable for the history of the early Church, the first having been written about the end of the first century and the other before the middle of the second, were until quite recently not known to exist in any other manuscript. The Eusebian sections and canons, referred to above (p.132), are indicated in the margins of the Gospels, which also exhibit the earliest example of a division into chapters.

A similar division of the Acts and Epistles, ascribed to Euthalius of Alexandria, who wrote about AD 458, is not found in this manuscript; and this is an additional reason for believing it not to have been written later than the middle of the fifth century.

**(Please go to the original site as posted above)**

The Codex Alexandrinus was the first of the greater manuscripts to be made accessible to scholars.

The Epistles of Clement were published from it by Patrick Young in 1633, a collation of the New Testament and notes on the Pentateuch were published in Walton's Polyglot (1657), the Old Testament was printed by Grabe in 1707-20, and the New Testament by Woide in 1786.

In 1816-28 the Rev. H. H. Baber published the Old Testament in type resembling as closely as possible the writing of the original. Finally a photographic reproduction of the whole MS. was published in 1879-83, under the editorship of E. Maunde Thompson, then Principal Librarian of the British Museum. A reduced facsimile of the New Testament, and of the Old Testament as far as Judith, has since appeared (1909-36).

## Codex Alexandrinus

M S M Saifullah

© Islamic Awareness, All Rights Reserved.

First Composed: 4 April 2000

Last Updated: 4 April 2000

<http://www.islamic-awareness.org/Bible/Text/Mss/alexander.html>

---

## Name

**Codex Alexandrinus (A, 02, □ 4)**

## Date

**5th Century CE.**

## Size

**Written on vellum, 32.1 cm. x 26.4 cm. There are two columns and 46-52 lines to the column. The ink is brown.**

## Contents

**It has both the Old and New Testaments. The New Testament contains Four Gospels, Acts, Catholic Epistles and Pauline Epistles (including Hebrews), Apocalypse, and I and II Clement.**

**Total number of leaves are 773, out of which 143 belong to the New Testament.**

**The text is [Byzantine](#) in the Gospels and [Alexandrian](#) in the Pauline Epistles.**

## Writing

**The words are written continuously without separation. Accents are absent and breathing are rare. The Old Testament quotations are indicated.**

**It is believed that the codex is the work of *five scribes*, who are designated by the Roman numerals. The Old Testament was**

copied by two hands (I and II) and the New Testament by *three (III, IV and V)*. III wrote Matthew, Mark and I Corinthians 10:8 - Philemon 25; *IV copied* Luke, John, Acts, *the Catholic Epistles*, and Romans 1:1 - I Corinthians 10:8; and V wrote the Apocalypse.

### Salient Features

*Matthew 1:1-25:6 is lost*. The longer ending of Mark is given. Luke 22:43 f. is omitted. John 5:4 is present and not marked as doubtful or spurious. There is a lacuna at John 7:53-8:11. The doxology of Romans is found after 14:23 and also after 16:23, 16:24 being omitted. Hebrews follow immediately after II Thessalonians.

### Location

British Museum, London, United Kingdom.

---

### References

[1] W. H. P. Hatch, *The Principal Uncial Manuscripts Of The New Testament*, 1939, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Plate XVII.

[The New Testament Manuscripts](#)