THE TEXT OF THE NEWLY DISCOVERED SCHOLIA
OF ORIGEN ON THE APOCALYPSE. 1

I. Scholia i–xxvii.

i. ll. 7–10 ἐν γούν ταῖς ἐπιστολαίς αἷς γράφομαι, ὡς ἄλλοι τὰ θνητῶν ἀξιώματα, προτάττουσι τούτο αὐτό. καὶ γούν ὁ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Παῦλος καὶ οἱ οὖσαν συμφώνως πράττουσι τὸ αὐτό.

Perhaps προτάττουσι should be read a second time instead of πράττουσι.

iii. ll. 4, 5 τὸ γὰρ συνετῶς ἀναγινώσκειν καὶ μὴ προχείρως ἀκούειν ἄλλα πιστῶς μακαριζέται.

µακαριζείται is Harnack’s emendation for the MS reading μακαρισοῦσι (?). Wohlenberg proposes doubtfully μακαρισώνη : I should prefer μακαρίους (πό)ει.

iv. ll. 1, 4 τὸς τρεῖς χρόνον περιελήφην ὁ λόγος ... τοιάτα περὶ τοῦ λόγου νοῦς.

This would be more intelligible to the reader if it were printed ὁ λόγος ... τοῦ λόγου.

v. ll. 1–3 οὖ γίνεται ατεχνός ἐν ὦς ἐν οὐδὲ πολλὰ ὡς μέρη ὁ νῖος, ἄλλα ὡς πάντα ἐν ἐνθεν καὶ ἄλλως πάντα ἐν· κύκλος γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς πασῶν τῶν δυνάμεων εἰς ἐν . . .

1 [I owe to Dr Armitage Robinson’s paper in the January number of the Journal my first acquaintance at close quarters with the new fragments of Origen and the editio princeps of Harnack and Diobouniotis. I owe also to his private kindness the opportunity of seeing two contributions to the criticism of the fragments which appeared almost simultaneously with his own—one by Dr G. Wohlenberg in the Theologisches Literaturblatt for January 19 and February 2, the other by Dr Otto Stählin, the eminent editor of Clemens Alexandrinus, in the Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift for February 3—and of printing (within square brackets) some fresh suggestions of his. A complete edition of the fragments, on the model of the editions of the Greek Origen on Ephesians, 1 Corinthians, and Romans, may some day, I hope, appear in the Journal. Meanwhile the object of the following notes is both to put together for English readers the net result of the labours of Robinson, Wohlenberg, and Stählin, and to add some further suggestions of my own for the consideration of any scholars who may later on occupy themselves with the text. I should wish to add that, though it is inevitable to differ somewhat frequently from Harnack’s readings or punctuation or exegesis of the fragments, the theological world does lie under a very deep debt of gratitude to him not only for his identification of the author of the Scholia, but also for his prompt publication of them. Scholars into whose hands an anecdota fall are too often tempted to consult rather their own reputation than the public benefit, and to keep back their work indefinitely in the hope of continually improving it.—C.H.T.]
Harnack gives up the attempt to emend; ‘locus corruptus est.’ Wohlenberg rightly sees that ἄλλως πάντα ἐν suggests dittography of the preceding ἄλλ’ ὡς πάντα ἐν, but his further suggestions are unconvincing ‘ἐνθεν: ἐνθεον, oder besser ὡς πάντα ἐν ἐνθεν καὶ αὐτ ὡς πάντα ἐν ἐνθεν’—which hardly sounds like Greek. Stählin points out that the whole Scholion (whether incorporated by Origen in a work of his own or no) comes really from Clement Strom. iv 156, and that the reading there is ἄλλ’ ὡς πάντα ἐν. ἐνθεν καὶ πάντα.

v II. 4, 5 οὐ μόνον τὸ τέλος ἀρχὴ γίνεται καὶ τελευτῆ πάλιν, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνωθέν ἀρχὴν οὐδαμοῦ διαστασιν λαβών.

The punctuation seems perverse: omit the comma or transpose it after ἀρχὴν, and translate ‘ends again at the original beginning’.

v I. 6 διὰ δὴ κἀ τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ δὲ αὐτῷ πιστεύει μοναδικόν ἑστὶ γενέσθαι ἀπεριστάτως ἐνομένον ἐν αὐτῷ, τὸ δὲ ἀποτεῦθη διαστάσιν ἑστὶ καὶ διαστάσει καὶ μερισθήναι.

The meaning, I think, is that just as the Word is Himself a circle in which end and beginning are one, so our faith in Christ is a union which goes from Him to us (δὲ αὐτῷ) and from us to Him (εἰς αὐτόν) without any break in the continuous process. The reference is rather to Col. i 16 than (with Harnack) to Rom. xi 36.

vi II. 3, 4 εἰ γὰρ ἑστὶν ὑπὲρ δικαίων καὶ βέλη ἐκλεκτὰ καὶ μάχαιρα ἔπαινη.

Wohlenberg satisfactorily explains the middle term of the three by reference to Is. xlix 2 ἔθηκε μὲ ὡς βέλος ἐκλεκτὸν. Perhaps the ὑπὲρ δικαίων are an echo of 2 Cor. vi 6 καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης or more probably of Ps. v 13 ὅτι σὺ εὐλογήσεις δίκαιον, κύριε, ὡς ὑπὸ εὐδοκίας κτλ. To what passage exactly the ‘sword that is praiseworthy’ points I cannot say, unless it is Eph. vi 17. [μάχαιρα ἔπαινη] is sufficiently accounted for by the passage from Isaiah, xlix 2, since it includes the phrase καὶ ἔθηκεν τὸ στόμα μου ὡς μάχαιραν διεῖν. And is not Rom. vi 13 in mind in the passage generally? Compare ὑπὲρ δικίας τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ καὶ ὑπὲρ δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ with ll. 5, 6, ὀφειλομένων ... τῷ θεῷ ... καὶ τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ. The plural βέλη ἐκλεκτὰ is in harmony with Orig. in Ps. cxx (cxix) 4 οὐκ ἂν δὲ φαρέτρα ἐν τῷ θεῷ δὲ ἐν βέλος, κ.π.λ.: see the context for the βέλος ἀγάπης and τετρομένην, ll. 16, 17.—J. A. R.]

vi II. 3-7 εἰ γὰρ ἑστὶν ... οὐδὲ ἀμφιβάλλειν περὶ τῶν ἑπτάθα εἰρημένων.

As the εἰ γὰρ clause is the protasis, the οὐδὲ ἀμφιβάλλειν clause must be the apodosis and must contain the main verb of the sentence. Read therefore οὐ δὲ(ε) ἀμφιβάλλειν.

vi II. 11, 12 οἱ μὲν οὖν φαινοντο μελετήσαντες ὑπὲρ τῶν ψευδῶν δογμάτων τῶν νοῶν ἵκονεσαν ὡς μάχαιραν διεῖν ἐπὶ κακῶν τῶν ἀκούστων.

Ps. lxiv (lxxii) 3 ἤκονεσαν ὡς ῥομφαίας τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν. In the first part of the clause τῶν νοῶν is Harnack’s addition (assimilating
line 12 to line 13); but if ἰκανός is correct, μελετήσαντες ἰκανός must, I suppose, be taken together, and τῶν νοσῶν is out of place between them. [For ἰκανός compare Orig. in Ps. lxiv (lxiii) 3 oί ἰκανοὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ψευδῶν δογμάτων κ.τ.λ.—J. A. R.]

No wonder that Harnack noted 'locus corruptus est'. But he was wrong in supposing further that something had fallen out; Wohlenberg completely restores text and sense by pointing to the two biblical passages which Origen has in mind, Prov. xii 18 εἰσὶν οἱ λέγοντες τιτρώσκουσι μαχαίρα γλῶσσα δὲ σοφίαν ἱστώσει τῷ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἀγάπῃ οὐν ἐπρωτεύει ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος.

Clearly if the text is right as printed, Harnack is right that 'aliquid deest'. Wohlenberg makes an approach to giving the sentence a construction by supplying νοσήματα after νοσῶν. Stählin suggests οὗτος for ἰκανός. Even these alterations leave a great deal that is to me unintelligible. To Harnack are due (1) correction of ἀνεφημένων for MS ἀνοιγμένων, (2) the marks of a lacuna after τιμή, (3) the insertion of τὸ before τέλος, (4) the insertion of τὸ before ω. It may be remarked in passing that it is extraordinarily misleading to have words printed in the text which are not in the MS and are not in any way distinguished typographically from the rest; no edition which claims to be called critical has the right to do this, least of all an editio princeps. Of the four changes introduced the last seems certainly right, but none of the rest are certain and perhaps none are probable; the third is obviously unnecessary, since the phrase τέλος ἐπάγων occurs again without the article two lines lower down. With ἀνοιγμένων of the MS compare xxv 7 ἡνοίξθαι MS ἡνεῴχθαι Harnack: late Greek departed so commonly from the Attic forms of ἀνοίξθαι that I should rather scruple to alter the MS readings. In the words αὐτῶν προσφέρεται δόξα καὶ τιμή allusion is I think meant to be made to Apoc. ν 12, 13.

The MS gives ὁ αὐτῶν ἀρχή for τὸν αὐτῶν ἀρχήν, and with an improved punctuation there is no reason at all why the MS reading
should not be retained: ὁ ταῦτα μαθὼν τὰ γράμματα, τὸ α ἄρχει καὶ τὸ ω, οὐ τὰ αἰσϑητὰ ἄλλα ἀπερ γράφει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον οὐδὲν. ὁ αὐτὸς ἄρχει τῶν δύνα καὶ τέλου τῶν ἀπάντων κτλ. ‘He who has learnt all this knows that the letters, α and ω, are not the material letters of the alphabet, but those which the Holy Spirit writes.’ So far the clause is closely connected with the preceding sentences; a new paragraph might begin with the next words.

ix 11. 2-5 ἐπεὶ οὖν ἠλιος ὑμέραν καὶ οὐ νύκτα φωτίζει, τούς εἰν νυκτὶ διάγοι σε χρεία λυχνίας οὐ φωτός. τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ κατὰ τὴν θείαν παιδείαν φωτίζουν τοὺς ἀκούοντας. καὶ ἐπεὶ μὴ ἀλλαχοῦ αὐτὸ δεῖ ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, λυχνίας τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἀνόμαισιν.

I do not understand how, on this reading, it is proposed to construe the sentence τοῦτο ... φωτίζου, seeing that φῶς is the only neuter noun, and that it has just been said ‘there is no need of light’. Read, for χρεία λυχνίας οὐ φωτός, χρεία λυχνίας(διὰ) φωτός: ‘those who cannot get daylight must needs have candle-light.’ Again, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἀλλαχοῦ αὐτὸ δεῖ cannot be right: Wohlenberg sees this, but his suggestion αὐτὸ λάμπει is unnecessarily violent, and we want nothing more drastic than αὐτὸ(ν) δεῖ. ‘Because it is just in the churches that the candle-light is wanted, he called the churches candlesticks.’

ix ll. 6, 7 τῷ ζῷ ἀριθμῷ, μυστικῷ ὄντι, διὸ ἀγίος καὶ εὐλογημένος ἑστίν.

Compare Scholion xxviii 1. 7 εἰ οὖν ... ἐχεὶ λοιπόν ἐπὶ κέρατα, ἀγίαν βασιλεῖαν καὶ εὐλογημένην ἔχει. Seven in both cases is ‘holy and blessed’, because God ‘blessed the seventh day and hallowed it’, εὐλογησεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐβδομήν καὶ ἤγαςεν αὐτήν, Gen. ii 3 = Exod. xx 11. So also Schol. xxvii 1. 7 θεῖω ἄριθμῳ σφραγίδων.

ix 1. 9 ῆν οὖν ἀφελήσῃ τοὺς δυναμένους ὅ τὸν λύχνον ἅφας.

The biblical reference is rather to Luke, who alone uses the phrase λύχνον ἅφας (viii 16, xi 33), than with Harnack to Matt. Harnack, perhaps rightly, doubts τοὺς δυναμένους, and tentatively suggests the very remote substitute τοὺς ἀνθρώπους: possibly τοὺς δεσμένους, cf. δεῖ in l. 5.

[ix 1. 10 ἐπὶ τῷ προφορικῷ λόγῳ ὡς ἐπὶ λυχνία ἐπίθετο αὐτῶν.

The MS has ἐπὶ τοῦ προφορικοῦ λόγου ὡς ἐπὶ λυχνία: and the genitive of the MS should stand in the first clause, and ἐπὶ λυχνίας (with Luke viii 16) should be read in the second, εἶ and ἐ being often confused in the MS.—J. A. R.] ix ll. 14-16 ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ λείπονται τοῖς οἷς νυκτερίνης κατάστασιν ἐχοιτες, ἀλλ' οὖν φωτίζονται ὑπὸ λύχνου ἐκείθεν ἀφθέντος.

The MS has ἀλλ' οὖ, for which Diobouniotis conjectures and Harnack accepts ἀλλ' οὖν. I believe they are quite right, though Wohlenberg wants to return to ἀλλ'.
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xi 11. 1, 2 τὰ ἔργα καὶ τῶν κόπων καὶ τὴν ὑπομονὴν, ἢ σύν ἀγάπη κατορθοῦται.
ἀγάπης is perhaps a reference to Rom. v 3-5.

Better perhaps εἰ καθάπαξ ἐνεκαλεῖτο ἀποβαλεί τήν ἀγάπην.

Better perhaps εἰ καθάπαξ ἐνεκαλεῖ τὸ ἀποβαλέω τὴν ἀ.—J. A. R.]

xi 11. 5, 6 ὥς μὴ δικηθῆται ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τοῦ μὴ βλαβῆται.

Typography should come to the assistance of the reader here: ὥς μὴ δικηθῆται ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘μὴ βλαβῆται’.

xi 11. 8, 9 ἵσοδοναμεὶ δὲ τοῦτο τῷ φθείρεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν ναὸν αὐτοῦ.

MS τούτῳ τό: I should prefer ἵσοδοναμεὶ δὲ τοῦτῳ τῷ φθείρεσθαι κτλ.

xi 11. 9–12 οὐκ ἀδικεῖται δὲ οὐδὲ ἐκ τοῦτον τῷ δευτέρου θανάτου. οἶμονὸς τις ἀδύνατα εἶναι περὶ ἁγγέλου ἔκλαβείν ἀπολυθῆσαι τοῦ περισσαρμοῦ γυνὸς ὡς πάσα λογικὴ φύσις δεκτικὴ ἐστὶ τῶν ἀποδεθῶντων σημανομάνων περὶ τοῦ θανάτου. ἱσως δὲ ὁ ταραττόμενος τὸν κοινὸν θάνατον ἐν νῦ λαβὼν πέποθεν ταραχής.

Harnack, who notes ‘usus insuetus’ of the word περισσαρμοῦ, supplies three parallels from Origen (p. 50); I can add two more, from Orig. in Eph. iv 15 (J. T. S. iii 415 ll. 91, 92) and (still closer) in Rom. vi 12 ἀπολῶν ἡμᾶς περισσαρμοῦ. I find more difficulty in seeing meaning or connexion in the text as it stands; and I suggest οὐκ ἀδικεῖται δὲ οὐδὲ ἐκ τοῦτον. τὸ(ν) δεύτερο(ν) θάνατο(ν) οἶμονὸς τις ἀδύνατα εἶναι περὶ ἁγγέλου ἔκλαβείν κτλ. ‘And he is not injured even by this.’ If any one thinks that it is impossible to interpret of an angel [sc. the angel of the church of Smyrna] the “second death”, his doubts will be solved when he recognizes’ &c. There should be a full stop after ἐκ τοῦτον, and only a colon after ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου: Dr Armitage Robinson has rightly divined that the final clause in the passage merely means ‘he who doubts on this point perhaps in reality only doubts because he has been thinking of natural death’ (J. T. S. Jan. 1912 p. 295). Harnack has rightly accepted ἱσως for the MS ἵσως: Wohlenberg thinks of ἵσως.

xiii 1. 3 οὐκ ἀπεγνωστέον καὶ περὶ ἀσάρκων τινῶν ψευδομάντεων ταῦτα εἰρήσθαι δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως γὰρ ἐδείχθη τῷ ἀποστόλῳ.

Presumably the words should be οὐκ ἀπόγνωστόν, and the meaning ‘we must not reject the idea that . . . ’ The ἀσάρκοι ψευδομάντεις are surely not human, though both Harnack and Stählin interpret them as heretical teachers; the point of the last clause is exactly that the reference to immaterial spirits is natural enough in a ‘revelation’ of things hidden.

xiv 11. 4, 5 τοῦτο ἐστι τὸ μάνη τὸ κεκρυμμένον καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ψυφὸν ὄνομα καυνῶν.

Full stop after κεκρυμμένον, and here the first part of the comment ends. The succeeding words are simply the lemma from Apoc. ii 17,
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which the rest of this scholion expounds: see Dr Armitage Robinson p. 295.

xiv l. 5, 6 ἐπειδὴ δὲ περὶ πνευματικῶν ὁ λόγος ἀνωτέρω, χωριστέων παντὸς αἰτηθεὶν δηλοῦμένον περὶ τῆς ψήφου.

'Corrupta videntur' Harnack. Wohlenberg restores text and sense by placing the comma after λόγος, and from the MS reading χωριστῶν deducing χωρητέων instead of χωριστέων. 'We must rise above all material ideas.'

xiv l. 9–15 ἐπεὶ γὰρ κατὰ πᾶσαν προκοπὴν οίκειον τῇ ἐκ τῆς προκοπῆς ποιώντι ἔχει τις προσηγοριάν, ἀεὶ τῶν ὑμμάτων τῶν προτέρων παρερχομένων, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσι γραφόμενον ὄνομα τοῦ τελειωθέντος, οὐκ ἔχον ἔτερον μετὰ τοῦτο, ἀεὶ καὶνόν ἐστι κατὰ τὴν ἄδιαδον Καυὴν Διαίθηκν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κρυπτοῦ τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπων παραστατικῶν. τοῦτο οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμβάνων μόνος.

Harnack's text is here quite unintelligible; but we owe to him one excellent emendation, τοῦ κρυπτοῦ τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ τοῦ κρυόστου (?) of the MS. In restoring a consecutive meaning to the passage, we will begin by dividing it in the middle, at the point where the break comes between the comment on καυὸν and the comment on ὁ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν: place a full stop therefore after Καυὴν Διαίθηκν. What follows ought to be easy enough: ἐπὶ is in the MS ἐπί, and αὐτῶν is αὐτῷ: read therefore καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κρυπτοῦ τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπων παραστατικῶν τοῦτο, οὐδεὶς αὐτῷ οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμβάνων. 'And since this new name is indicative of the "secret man of the heart", no one knows it save he who receives it.'

The first sentence is not quite so simple: but there are no differences of reading to record, save that ἔχον of the text is ἔχων in the MS. It is fairly clear that we have to do with two premisses and a conclusion. The first premiss, ἐπεὶ γὰρ ... παρερχομένων, presents no difficulty; the crux lies in the second, and in the point where it passes over to the conclusion. Possibly the comma at τελειωθέντος should go, and ἔχων should be emended not into ἔχον but into ἔχει (ei for ω is very easy). Read in that case τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσι γραφόμενον ὄνομα τοῦ τελειωθέντος οὐκ ἔχει(ε) ἔτερον μετὰ τοῦτο, ἀεὶ καὶνόν ἐστι: and translate 'for since in every advance a man has a title corresponding to the quality of the advance, the former names on each occasion passing away [Apos. xxi 4], and since the final "name which is written" on him who is perfected admits no other after it, it is always "new" just as the New Testament has no successor and is always new'.

xv l. 8–12 ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ, καθ' οὓς ἐπιπορέουται τῷ παντὶ διαφορήσας, διὰ τοῦ χαλκολιβάνου παραβάλλονται—διὰ τὸ θεῖον λίβανος, χαλκὸς διὰ τὸ τοὺς κτίσματα συγκαταβαίνειν ἔχον ποιεῖν ἐπιπορευόμενων διεγερτικῶν τῶν κοιμωμένων.
Harnack's text differs from the MS mainly by the correction of ἐπιτερεούμενος to ἐπιτερεόμενον: but he has rightly queried the word ἤχον, for which Wohlenberg and Stählin both make the simple but brilliant emendation ἥχον. Some smaller supplementary changes are however necessary to complete the restoration. The whole clause from χαλκός onwards must be taken together: the feet are not compared to brass because He condescends to creation, but because as He moves about the clang of His footsteps is meant to rouse the sleepers. Retain therefore the MS reading ἐπιτερεούμενος, and write χαλκός διὰ τὸ τοῖς κτίσμασι συγκαταβαίνων ἦχον ποιεῖν ἐπιτερεούμενος διεγερτικὸν τῶν κοιμομένων. The first part of the sentence might stand as it is, if παραβάλλοντας can mean 'set before us’, 'presented to us’; but if, as I rather think, it can only mean 'compared’, I suppose we must alter text and punctuation as follows—οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ, καθ’ αὐτός ἐπιτερεύεται τῷ παντὶ διαφορτήσας δι’ αὐτοῦ, χαλκολιθάνῳ παραβάλλοντα. This also has the advantage of echoing rather more closely the wording of the biblical text 'like to fine brass’.

xvi 1. ἐπίστησον μη ἐφαρμόζῃ.

Here, and in xix 2, 3 ἐπίστησον μη...δώσω, Harnack emends the indicatives of the MS, ἐφαρμόζει and εἰσίν, into subjunctives. I think he is wrong, and that Origen uses ἐπίστησον μη with the indicative.

xvi II. 2-4 διὰ τὸ τὰ ἐργα τῆς γυνώμης ἐκείνης προσφήβαι τῇ Ἰεζαβέλ εἰς πορνείαν καταστασάσθη καὶ χρῆσθαι εἰδωλοθυτῶν πειρωμένη.

χρῆσθαι cannot be accusative after πειρωμένη. If the editors had understood that the definition at the end of the clause is attached to τῆς γυνώμης ἐκείνης and not to τῇ Ἰεζαβέλ, they would not have needlessly altered the readings of the MS καταστών and πειρωμένης. Render 'because the practices of that theology are attached to the name of Jezebel, since it attempts to drag men into fornication and the use of ιδολοθυτα’. [So too Stählin.]

xxii 1. 3 πρὸ ἀνατολῆς τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἥλιον.

Mal. iv 2 ἀνατελεῖ ὡμῖν...ἥλιος δικαιοσύνης.

xix 1. 4 ἀσυντρόχαστον.

Not in L. S., who recognize only ἀσυντρόχος: but see συντροχίως.

Harnack notes that Origen uses ἀσυντρόχαστον in the de oratione.

XX 1. 1 ἄγιος, ἀληθινὸς ὁ μη μετοικεῖ ἀλλ’ οὐσία ἰδίων τοιοῦτος, αὐτὸς ἐστιν ὁ θεός λόγος.

The first two words should be separately printed, as a lemma from Ἀποκ. iii 7: the comment begins with ὁ μη.

XX II. 8-10 διὸ οὖν ἀνοίξει τὰ κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου, οὐκέτι ἐφεξῆς τὰ λοιπὰ φιλαχθῆναι χωρὶς ἔχοντα. ἀνοίγει μὲν τὰ δυνατὰ ἀνθρώπους νοσθῆναι, κλείει δὲ ὅσα μὴ δύναται ἐν τῇ παροδίᾳ γνώρισαι.

MS οὐκετί φυ ὑφεξεῖ τα λοιπα λαχθήναι, and Dr Armitage Robinson
pointed out (J. T. S. Jan. p. 295) that the words υφέξεις τὰ λοιπά have nothing to do with the text, which reads straightforwardly if they are omitted, ‘the literal meaning of the Law has no longer any place for observance’. υφέξεις τὰ λοιπά is perhaps a direction to the copyist, jotted down in the margin of the MS, and unintelligently incorporated as a gloss. Certainly the last line does not seem to be Origen’s: the interpretation of ‘opening’ and ‘shutting’ is inconsistent with what precedes, and is rather suggestive of a more literal school of interpretation. ἡ παρούσα reminds us of the Antiochene writers, and their favourite contrast between ἡ παρούσα κατάστασις and ἡ μελλοντα κατάστασις. But they did not accept the Apocalypse.

Wohlenberg has done excellent service here, having seen that this is no biblical citation but an introduction by Origen to the citation from Job which follows: καὶ ἐπιμετεωρίζονται οὗτοι εὐσεβείας καὶ ἀρετῆς πτεροῖς. λέγεται περὶ αὐτῶν κτλ.

For αὐτῶν onwards in this sentence exactly half the words are given by the editors in a form different from the MS, which reads διὰ τὸ βέβαιον καὶ συνιά εἶναι ἀληθινὸς γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀληθινὸς εἶναι. Both Stahlin and Wohlenberg make their proposals for improvement: the former writes διὰ τὸ βέβαιον καὶ συνιά εἶναι ἀληθινὸς γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀληθινὸς εἶναι, the latter διὰ τὸ βέβαιον καὶ συνιά εἶναι ἀληθινὸς γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ συνιά εἶναι ἀληθινὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς εἶναι.

I am sure that Wohlenberg is right against Harnack and Stahlin in retaining the nominatives of the MS with τὸ . . . εἶναι. I think too that συνιά of the MS is right, comparing xx i ὁ μὴ μετουσία ἀλλὰ συνιά ὑπὲρ τυχόντος. And lastly Wohlenberg’s ἀληθινὸς γὰρ τὸ αὕτο ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀληθείᾳ . . . εἶναι, ‘for “True” is the same thing in his case with being “the Truth”’, seems to give just the sense we want with the minimum of change in the wording of the MS. But I should propose to transfer the second ἀληθινὸς into the first part of the sentence, so that the whole would read διὰ τὸ βέβαιον καὶ συνιά εἶναι ἀληθινὸς ἀληθινὸς γὰρ τὸ αὕτο ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀληθείᾳ εἶναι.
xxii ll. 14–18  το αὑτὸ δ᾽ ἐστὶν λέγειν· μέλλω σε ἐμέσασαι, καὶ τὸ· ἐγενήθητε μοι εἰς πλησμονὴν, οἶονεὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ πόλλα ἔστε [?] εἰς ἔμοι ὅταν γὰρ τὴν περὶ τινος μνήμην ἀποκαλεῖ ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ ὁ κύριος, τὸν τωοῦνην ἢμασεν, γενόμενον αὐτῷ εἰς πλησμονὴν καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀπάτης καὶ κακίας παχύτητα μὴ χωροῦντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

For ἐπὶ πόλλα ἔστε—truly a counsel of despair—the MS gives ἐπὶ πολλαῖς, and the true reading suggested itself independently to Stählin, Wohlenberg, and myself, ἐπιπολάξετε 'you remain undigested', literally 'you keep on the surface of the stomach'. ἀποκαλεῖ: the word means 'to stigmatize' (as in the next scholion, l. 6 δ ἄλαι καὶ κυβίαν ἀπεκάλεσεν ὁ ἀπόστολος) and is out of place here, as Stahlin too has seen. His suggestion is ἀπολεῖ, comparing Sap. iv 19 ἢ μνήμη αὐτῶν ἀπολεῖα: what had occurred to me is rather ἀπο(β)αλεῖ or ἀπο(β)αλοῦ. For διὰ τὴν ἀπάτης καὶ κακίας παχύτητα the MS has διὰ τὴν ἀπάτης κακίας παχύτητα, from which Wohlenberg has rightly restored διὰ τὴν ἀπάτης κακίας παχύτητα.

xxiv b. At the foot of the page Harnack prints the following, which in the MS follows Schol. xxiv, and which he regards as an impassioned address to Origen by an admiring reader: Ὄ σου πάντως ἀκοῦεις ἐστὶν ἐπιστημονικὰ λέγοντος [cod λέγων] ὡς [cod ἦ] μόνον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην ἤνθισμένου [cod ἤθισμένου]: οὕτω σου πάντως ἐστὶν ἀκούειν τοῦ πνεύματος ὡς [cod ἦ] μόνον τοῦ πνευματικοῦ [cod πνευματικοῦ] ἐχώντος [cod ἐχώντως] ὁπτὸν προσπέθηκέν μοι ὁτίνος τοῦ ἀκούειν [Is. 15] τὸ γὰρ τῆς αἰσθήσεως τῆς ἄκουστικῆς ὀργανοῦ καὶ τὰ ἄλογα ἔχουσι, μόνοις [cod μόνον] τοῖς κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα σοφῶν ἔχοντος τὸ τῆς συνέσεως ὁτίνος, περὶ οὗ ὁ σωτὴρ πληθυντικῶς εἶπεν· ὁ ἔχων ὅτα ἀκούειν ἀκοῦετω [Matt. xi 15].

Robinson, Wohlenberg, and Stählin have each seen that we have here simply another scholion of Origen. On iii 22, ὁ ἔχων οὕς ἀκουσάτω τι τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, he writes according to their restored text ὡς οὖ παντὸς ἀκούειν ἐστὶν ἐπιστημονικῶν λόγων [ἐπιστημονικὰ λέγοντος Stählin] ἢ μόνον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην εὐθυμιοβιομένων οὕτως οὖ παντὸς ἔστιν ἀκούειν τοῦ πνεύματος ἢ μόνον τοῦ πνευματικοῦ κτλ. For ἐπιστημονικὰ λέγων of the MS I venture to suggest ἐπιστημονικὰ λέγ(άντων).

xxv ll. 6–11 διὸ ὅταν λέγῃ θύραν ἤνεχθαι ἐν τῷ ὀφρανῷ, τὴν κατὰ σαφῆνες διαίρεσιν τῶν νοητῶν ἐκλαμβάνομεν, καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν ἀναβάινων τις ἐκεῖ τῶν ἀγίων λέγῃ τὰς πιστῶσεις, πιστῶσεις δὲ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ γεγράφθαι.
The MS has in l. 8 ἀναβαίνειν for ἀναβαίνων: in l. 9 λέγει for λέγη, and πιστώσει δὲ for πιστώσεις δὲ; in l. 10 ἐτερός τι ἄνελαβε for ἐτερόν τινα ἄνελαβε. Stählin and Wohlenberg have of course seen that the full stop at γεγράμθαι must disappear and ἄνελαβε of the MS return into the text: ‘Scripture does not say that John was taken up, like Elijah, by some force or being (ἐτερός τις Stählin, ἐτερόν τι Wohlenberg) external to himself; he was bidden to go up of his own motion’—from which it follows (as Stählin points out) that the ‘heaven’ must be understood allegorically. But the difficulties of the passage do not end there. I do not feel that λέγη τάς πιστώσεις πιστώσεις δὲ can be right, though Harnack has found a parallel to the very rare word πιστώσεις in Orig. de exhortatione martyrīi 26 αἰ δὲ ὄρκων πιστώσεις, and the verb πιστῶνται occurs in Schol. xxi. 16. Whether the editorial note πιστώσει δὲ is meant to imply that the MS gives πιστώσει instead of the double πιστώσεις or only of the second πιστώσεις of the text, I cannot say. But in any case for ὅταν ἀναβαίνων τις ἐκεῖ τῶν ἀγίων λέγη τάς (MS ἀναβαίνειν and λέγει) I am much tempted to read ὅταν ἀναβαίνειν τις ἐκεῖ τῶν ἀγίων λέγηται: ‘“heaven” in Scripture commonly means “the nature of things immaterial”, so when it says “a door was opened in heaven” we take it to mean “the clear insight into supramundane things”, more especially if any of the Saints is said actually to “ascend thither”’. For confusion between ἐ and ἐ compare above vi. 16, ix. 3, and Dr Robinson’s note on ix. 10. The phrase takes up of course the λέγων Ἀνάβα ὑδε of Aproc. iv. 1. For πιστώσεις or πιστώσει the sense might be best satisfied by πιστωθέντες, referring back to ἐκλαμβάνομεν (ἐκλαμβάνομεν): but I do not propose so violent a change, and though the transition to the second person singular is a little awkward, I think the MS reading πιστώσει, as second person singular of the future middle, may really quite well stand.

This makes good enough sense no doubt; but it departs a little widely from the MS tradition τῶν οὕτω λεχθέν τὴν τῆς ἐννοήσεως μεγαλοφωνίαν μετὰ σαφείται γενομένης πρὸς αὐτού. And as the run of the sentence seems perhaps to suggest that the seer is still the subject, perhaps we should do better to read σημαίνει δὲ τῷ οὕτῳ λεχθέντι τῇ εἰκόνῃ μεγαλοφωνίαν. I do not know how the editors would translate this sentence, and it does not seem worth while to depart from the MS except to make a translateable text. The MS gives not τούτῳ τὸ ὅν but τούτῳ ὅν; and
if, by a very small change, we read οὗ ποιὸν τὸ ὅν κτίζεται ἄλλα τὸ κτιζόμενον ἐστὶ, we at least get something we can construe. Origen is commenting on the phrase ἦσαν καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν, and begins by pointing out the difficulty of the order of the two verbs. 'We should not I suppose naturally say that that which is is created, but conversely that that which is created is.'

Wohlenberg points out that this should be printed αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶπεν, φησίν καὶ ἐγεννήθησαν, αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν.

The whole point of the reference to Eph. ii 10 is that both words ποιήσω and κτίζω occur there in conjunction; αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐσμὲν ποιήμα κτυσθέντες κτλ. Consequently ποιήμα at least ought also to be spaced.

Reference to L. S. shewed that ἐκτίσατο could not have anything to do with κτίζω, so it was clear that we must read ἐκτίσατο. Robinson saw that the sentence must be interrogative, thus cutting the ground from under Harnack's deduction that 'God is not Himself the Creator and Former'. But we owe to Wohlenberg the clearing up of the whole difficulty by identifying the sentence as a quotation from Deut. xxxii 6: as however the word κτίζειν is wanted somewhere—otherwise the citation would not bear on the ἦσαν καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν—and as Origen does actually cite the verse in his de oratione in the form ἐκτίσατο σε καὶ ἐποίησεν σε καὶ ἐπλασάν σε.

The MS omits ἡδείᾳ καὶ ἀδηδώ. I do not know how it is proposed to construe the printed text. I keep close to the MS and read καθ' ἐν κρίσις θεου ἐπάγεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἤδεα τε καὶ ἀδηδώ, 'according to which judgement from God upon men is being brought of this sort (i.e. of the sort described in the fifth chapter) because it is being brought now'; because the processes of Divine judgement are at work already, they are at work in this present world, in war, famine, and pestilence.
A beautiful emendation of Harnack's for \(\omegaν\) σφύγγεσται of the MS; but he could have kept closer to the tradition by writing συνσφύγγεσται.

xxvii l. 12 οὔδείς γενητῶς ... ἄξιος εὑρήσαι.

MS γενητῶς, and it is a rash procedure to change the word. If we are to establish on a secure basis an induction as to the earliest use of γενητῶς γενητῶς ἀγένητος ἄγενητος, we must not begin by deserting MS authority.

xxvii l. 13 τὸν τῆς προνοίας λόγον διακρίσεως καὶ διουκήσεως φανερῶσαι.

Wohlenberg much improves the sentence by writing διὰ κρίσεως as two words.

xxvii ll. 16–19 οὗτος ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα λέων, ἡ μῆδα Δαυίδ, τὸ ἄρνιον τὸ ἐσφαγμένον τυχάνει περὶ τοῦτου τοῦ βιβλίου. καὶ Μωίσῆς ἔγραψεν καὶ ἐν Ἰσαία γέγραπται κτλ.

All the critics, Robinson, Stählin, Wohlenberg, have seen that the new sentence must begin not at καὶ Μωίσῆς, but four words earlier at περὶ τοῦτου τοῦ βιβλίου. The reference to Isaiah is I suppose to Is. xxix 11 καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν τὰ ῥήματα πάντα ταῦτα ὦς οἱ λόγοι τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου τοῦτου κτλ. I do not know whether the Mosaic reference is to Deut. xxxii (a chapter which we have twice found cited in these scholia) 34 οὐκ ἴδον ταῦτα συνήκται παρ’ ἐμοί, καὶ ἐσφράγισται ἐν τοῖς βυσσανοῖς μου;

xxvii l. 19 ἐπεὶ πρώτης ἐπιτηδείας κτλ.

The editors have rightly corrected ἐπὶ of the MS to ἐπεί; they should have gone on, as Wohlenberg has noted, to correct πρώτης into πρὸ τῆς.

C. H. Turner.