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Students of the Pastoral Epistles are, of course, familiar with the five so-called Faithful Sayings which are distributed through these thirteen chapters, and with their introductory or concluding formula πιστός ὁ λόγος (1 Tim. 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim. 2:11; Titus 3:8).* Though the text of the last three examples of the formula is utterly secure, this is not the case at 1 Tim. 1:15 and particularly at 1 Tim. 3:1. The evidence for the variations is chiefly Latin. 

I 

Jerome is the first scholar to discuss the variant humanus, for fidelis, referring probably to 1:15 rather than 3:1, where the same variant occurs. Writing to Marcella in 384 (ep. 27), Jerome attributes the reading humanus (along with two others) to nameless opponents whom he testily dismisses as inferior men: quidam homunculi (could this be a play on their preference for humanus?), and even as inferior horses: asinus, nostri bipedes aselli and, bringing the series of insults to a rhetorical climax with a phrase from Plautus Aulularia 495, Gallici canterii. H.J. Vogels argued that Jerome had Ambrosiaster in mind, whose Pauline text and/or commentary does contain all the three renderings that Jerome repudiated with such scorn (the others are at Rom. 12:11 and 1 Tim. 5:19). But in fact 

* A version of this article was read as a lecture in May 1993 to the Institut für neustamentliche Textforschung, Münster i.W. I am very grateful to Professor Barbara Aland and her colleagues for their generous welcome and criticism. 
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Novum Testamentum XXXVII, 1.
Ambrosiaster is only repeating Old Latin renderings. A full statement of the evidence for *humanus* at these two places is as follows:

1:15 b m r vgR AMst AU PS-AU FAC? MSS ap HI PS-HYG JUL-E MAR-M PS-PEL 1. PS-VIG; 3:1 D* (*κρηστός*) b d g m AMst PS-AU FAC? PS-HI SED-S.

At the beginning of the modern era in the study of the New Testament text stands Erasmus. Already in his 1516 edition he had noticed Ambrosiaster’s reading at 1 Tim. 3:1, but it was not until the 1519 edition that he ventured to add an explanation of it: Ambrosiaster had read *κρηστός* instead of *πιστός*. Erasmus first

---

2 These two reports are fuller than Nestle-Aland and even UBS. For Old Latin MSS I use the lower case sigla adopted by Nestle-Aland (716f.), and for the Latin fathers the sigla developed at Beuron. For full references and details I refer to the Beuron edition of the Pastoral Epistles prepared by H. J. Frede in *VL* 25 (Freiburg im Br. 1978-1983). r is not extant for 1 Tim. 3:1. The reading of vgR (*humanus*, sic) is found twice and is reported by H. Quentin, *Manuscripthandbücher*, *RBe* 28, 1911, 257-269: 262, 266 (cp. 260, n. 21), and by A. Dold, *Die im Codex Vat. Reg. lat. 9 Vorgefehlte Liste paulinischer Lesungen für die Messfeier* (Beuron 1944), = TAB 35, 12, 24. AU is familiar with both *fidelis sermo* and *humanus sermo*; he preached three sermons on both forms of the text in 412-414. It is not clear whether FAC is referring to 1:15 or 3:1. D’s original reading is changed by two correctors to *πιστός*. g has a double rendering: *humanus (aut) fidelis sermo*, written over *πιστός* δ *λόγος* only at 3:1 (contra UBS which added it for 1:15 as well). In his three articles on Die Doppelsübersetzungen im lateinischen Texte des cod. Boernerianus der Paulinischen Briefe, in *ZWTh* 25, 1885, 488-509; 26, 1883, 73-99; 309-344, H. Rösch classified all these double renderings in g and of course noted 1 Tim. 3:1 (26, 1883, 86), but why did he include it in the category Verschiedene Bedeutungen des griechischen Wortes (84) rather than in Griechische Textvarianten (87)? Surely he evaluated the reading of D* more highly than the sort of suggestions proposed by Petavius and Mill(s) (see below), i.e. that it was a synonym or marginal gloss. Cf. Tinnefeld (n. 3), 30.

3 Can we attempt to date the source of these Latin quotations? F. H. Tinnefeld, *Untersuchungen zur alllatinaischen Überlieferung des I. Timotheusbreviers. Der lateinische Paulustext in den handschriftlichen DEFG und in den Kommentaren des Ambrosiaster und des Pelagius* (Wiesbaden 1963), = KPS 26, refers to 1:15 and 3:1 at 30, 51, 99, 110f., and, most importantly for our purpose, at 56f. Here, in a section entitled Der rekonstruierte Text z (z = the archetype of d(e)fg; cf. 5), he reads *humanus* at 3:1 but not at 1:15. But Tinnefeld nowhere conjectures a date for z; however, its presence in quotations from 1 Tim. in the writings of Lucifer of Cagliari (12, 62) takes z back to the middle of the fourth century. Unfortunately, neither Lucifer nor a frequent source, Cyprian, quotes 1:15 or 3:1. Tinnefeld’s 1963 monograph could not take account of Frede’s 1964 and 1973-74 studies of the Monza and Budapest MSS (recorded in text as m b; cf. AGLB 4; 7-8), both of which read *humanus* at both places. Frede confirms the midfourth century date for the archetype; cf. AGLB 4:94; 7-78. *VL* 25 reveals that no Latin father before Jerome shows any knowledge of *fidelis*. There can be no doubt that *humanus* is attested earlier than *fidelis* in both continuous texts and in quotations. For speculation about the OL of 1 Tim., see n. 26.