

THE TEXT OF THE NEWLY DISCOVERED SCHOLIA  
OF ORIGEN ON THE APOCALYPSE.<sup>1</sup>

I. SCHOLIA i-xxvii.

i ll. 7-10 ἐν γοῦν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς αἷς γράφουσιν, ὡς ἄλλοι τὰ θνητῶν ἀξιώματα, προτάττουσι τοῦτο αὐτό. καὶ γοῦν ὁ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Παῦλος καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ συμφώνως πράττουσι τὸ αὐτό.

Perhaps προ(στ)άττουσι should be read a second time instead of πράττουσι.

iii ll. 4, 5 τὸ γὰρ συνετῶς ἀναγινώσκειν καὶ μὴ προχειρῶς ἀκούειν ἀλλὰ πιστῶς μακαρίζεται.

μακαρίζεται is Harnack's emendation for the MS reading μακαριων-σειῆ(?). Wohlenberg proposes doubtfully μακαριωσύνη: I should prefer μακαρίουσ (πο)ιεῖ.

iv ll. 1, 4 τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους περιεληφεν ὁ λόγος . . . τοιαῦτα περὶ τοῦ λόγου νοήσας.

This would be more intelligible to the reader if it were printed ὁ Λόγος . . . τοῦ Λόγου.

v ll. 1-3 οὐ γίνεται ἀτεχνῶς ἐν ὧς ἐν οὐδὲ πολλὰ ὡς μέρη ὁ υἱός, ἀλλ' ὡς πάντα ἐν ἔνθεν καὶ ἄλλως πάντα ἐν κύκλος γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς πασῶν τῶν δυνάμεων εἰς ἐν . . .

<sup>1</sup> [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* falls 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 ἔν suggests dittography of the preceding ἀλλ' ὡς πάντα ἔν, but his further suggestions are unconvincing 'ἔνθεν: ἔνθειον, oder besser ὡς πάντα ἔν ἔνθεν καὶ αὐτὸ ὡς πάντα ἔν ἔνθεν'—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 ἀλλ' ὡς πάντα ἔν. ἔνθεν καὶ πάντα.

v ll. 4, 5 οὐ μόνον τὸ τέλος ἀρχὴ γίνεται καὶ τελευτᾶ πάλιν, ἐπὶ τὴν ἄνωθεν ἀρχὴν οὐδαμοῦ διάστασιν λαβῶν.

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

v l. 6 διὸ δὴ καὶ τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ πιστεῦσαι μοναδικὸν ἐστὶ γενέσθαι ἀπερισπάστως ἐνουμένον ἐν αὐτῷ, τὸ δὲ ἀπιστῆσαι διαστάσαι ἐστὶν καὶ διασθῆναι καὶ μερισθῆναι.

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 (δι' αὐτοῦ) 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 ll. 3, 4 εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὄπλα δικαίων καὶ βέλη ἐκλεκτᾶ καὶ μάχαιρα ἐπαινετή.

Wohlenberg satisfactorily explains the middle term of the three by reference to Is. xlix 2 ἔθηκέ με ὡς βέλος ἐκλεκτόν. Perhaps the ὄπλα δικαίων are an echo of 2 Cor. vi 7 διὰ τῶν ὄπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης or more probably of Ps. v 13 ὅτι σὺ εὐλογῆσεις δίκαιον, κύριε, ὡς ὄπλω εὐδοκίας κτλ. To what passage exactly the 'sword that is praiseworthy' points I cannot say, unless it is Eph. vi 17. [μάχαιρα ἐπαινετή is sufficiently accounted for by the passage from Isaiah, xlix 2, since it includes the phrase καὶ ἔθηκεν τὸ στόμα μου ὡς μάχαιραν ὀξεῖαν. And is not Rom. vi 13 in mind in the passage generally? Compare ὄπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ and ὄπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ with ll. 5, 6, στρατευομένων . . . τῷ θεῷ . . . καὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. The plural βέλη ἐκλεκτᾶ is in harmony with Orig. *in Ps.* cxx (cxix) 4 οὐκ ἂν δὲ φαρέτρα ἦν τῷ θεῷ δι' ἔν βέλος, κ.τ.λ.: see the context for the βέλος ἀγάπης and τετρωμένη, ll. 16, 17.—J. A. R.]

vi ll. 3-7 εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶν . . . οὐδὲ ἀμφιβάλλειν περὶ τῶν ἐνταῦθα 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 δεῖ(ς) ἀμφιβάλλειν.

vi ll. 11, 12 οἱ μὲν οὖν φαῖλοι μελετήσαντες ὑπὲρ τῶν ψευδῶν δογμάτων τὸν νοῦν ἰκανῶς ἠκόνησαν ὡς μάχαιραν ὀξεῖαν ἐπὶ κακῶ τῶν ἀκουόντων.

Ps. lxiv (lxiii) 3 ἠκόνησαν ὡς ῥομφαίαν τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν. In the first part of the clause τὸν νοῦν is Harnack's addition (assimilating

line 12 to line 13); but if *ικανῶς* is correct, *μελετήσαντες ικανῶς* must, I suppose, be taken together, and *τὸν νοῦν* is out of place between them. [For *ικανῶς* compare Orig. *in Ps.* lxiv (lxiii) 3 οἱ ικανοὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ψευδῶν δογμάτων κ.τ.λ.—J. A. R.]

ll. 15, 16 οἱ μὲν γὰρ φαῦλοι τιτρώσκουσι μαχαίρα, †γλώσσας δὲ σοφίαν ἰῶντας† καὶ τιτρώκουσιν ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἀγάπῃ οὖν ἔτρωσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος.

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 οὗ λέγοντες τιτρώσκουσι μαχαίρα γλῶσσαι δὲ σοφῶν ἰῶνται, and Cant. ii 5 (= v 8) τετρωμένη ἀγάπης ἐγώ.

vii ll. 1-5 ὁ ταῦτας, ὡς ἔχει, θείας θεωρίας ἀνεωγμένως νοήσας τὸν θεὸν λόγον εἶναι τὸ ἄλφα, ἀρχὴν καὶ αἰτίαν τῶν ἀπάντων, πρῶτόν τε οὐ χρόνον ἀλλὰ τιμῆ—αὐτῷ γὰρ προσφέρεται δόξα καὶ τιμὴ . . . ὅτι ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰῶνων ὡς τὸ τέλος ἐπάγων τοῖς παρ' αὐτοῦ γινομένοις τὸ ω εἶναι εἴρηται. καὶ πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος πάλιν οὐ κατὰ χρόνον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ἐπάγων.

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 *νοήσει* after *νοήσας*. Stählin suggests οἶδεν for εἶναι. Even these alterations leave a great deal that is to me unintelligible. To Harnack are due (1) correction of *ἀνεωγμένως* for MS *ἀνοιγμένως*, (2) the marks of a *lacuna* after *τιμῆ*, (3) the insertion of *τό* before *τέλος*, (4) the insertion of *τό* 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 *ἀνοιγμένως* of the MS compare xxv 7 ἠνοῦχθαι MS ἠνεῶχθαι Harnack: late Greek departed so commonly from the Attic forms of *ἀνοίγνυμι* that I should rather scruple to alter the MS readings. In the words *αὐτῷ προσφέρεται δόξα καὶ τιμὴ* allusion is I think meant to be made to Apoc. v 12, 13.

vii ll. 13-16 ὁ ταῦτα μαθὼν τὰ γράμματα, τὸ α φημί καὶ τὸ ω, οὐ τὰ αἰσθητὰ ἀλλ' ἄπερ γράφει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οἶδεν τὸν αὐτὸν ἀρχὴν τῶν ὄλων καὶ τέλος τῶν ἀπάντων κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν θεολόγον Ἰωάννην εἰπόντα κτλ.

The MS gives ὁ αὐτὸς ἀρχή for τὸν αὐτὸν 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 φημὶ καὶ τὸ ω, οὐ τὰ αἰσθητὰ ἀλλ' ἄπερ γράφει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οἶδεν. ὁ αὐτὸς ἀρχὴ τῶν ὄλων καὶ τέλος 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 ll. 2-5 *ἐπεὶ οὖν ἥλιος ἡμέραν καὶ οὐ νύκτα φωτίζει, τοῖς ἐν νυκτὶ διάγουσι χρεία λυχνίας οὐ φωτός. τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ κατὰ τὴν θείαν παιδείουσιν φωτίζον τοὺς ἀκούοντας. καὶ ἐπεὶ μὴ ἀλλαχοῦ αὐτὸ δεῖ ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησιαίς, λυχνίας τὰς ἐκκλησίας ὠνόμασεν.*

I do not understand how, on this reading, it is proposed to construe the sentence *τοῦτο . . . φωτίζον*, 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 λυχνια(ε)λου 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 *αὐτο(ῦ) δεῖ*. 'Because it is just in the churches that the candle-light is wanted, he called the churches candlesticks.'

- ix ll. 6, 7 *τῷ ζ' ἀριθμῷ, μυστικῷ ὄντι, διὸ ἅγιος καὶ εὐλογημένος ἐστίν.*

Compare Scholion xxviii l. 7 *εἰ οὖν . . . ἔχει λοιπὸν ἐπὶ τὰ κέρατα, ἁγίαν βασιλείαν καὶ εὐλογημένην ἔχει.* Seven in both cases is 'holy and blessed', because God 'blessed the seventh day and hallowed it', *εὐλόγησεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐβδόμην καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτήν*, Gen. ii 3 = Exod. xx 11. So also Schol. xxvii l. 7 *θειῷ ἀριθμῷ σφραγίδων.*

- ix l. 9 *ἵν' οὖν ὠφελήσῃ τοὺς δυναμένους ὁ τὸν λύχρον ἄψας.*

The biblical reference is rather to Luke, who alone uses the phrase *λύχρον ἄψας* (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 δεομένους*, cf. *δεῖ* in l. 5.

- [ix l. 10 *ἐπὶ τῷ προφορικῷ λόγῳ ὡς ἐπὶ λυχνίᾳ ἐτίθητο αὐτόν.*

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, *ς* and *ι* being often confused in the MS.—J. A. R.]

- ix ll. 14-16 *ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ λείπονται τούτου οἱ νυκτερινὴν κατάστασιν ἔχοντες, ἀλλ' οὖν φωτίζονται ὑπὸ λύχρον ἐκεῖθεν ἀφθέντος.*

The MS has *ἀλλ' οὐ*, for which Diobouniotis conjectures and Harnack accepts *ἀλλ' οὖν*. I believe they are quite right, though Wohlenberg wants to return to *ἄλλου*.

x ll. 1, 2 τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὸν κόπον καὶ τὴν ὑπομονήν, ἃ σὺν ἀγάπῃ κατορθοῦνται. ἀγάπη is perhaps a reference to Rom. v 3-5.

[x l. 4 εἰ καθάπαξ ἐνεκαλείτο ἀποβαλεῖν τὴν ἀγάπην.

Better perhaps εἰ καθάπαξ ἐνεκάλει τὸ ἀποβαλεῖν τὴν ἀ.—]. A. R.]

xi ll. 5, 6 ὡς μὴ ἀδικηθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τοῦ μὴ βλαβῆναι.

Typography should come to the assistance of the reader here: ὡς μὴ ἀδικηθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἀντὶ τοῦ 'μὴ βλαβῆναι'.

xi ll. 8, 9 ἰσοδυναμεί δὲ τοῦτο τῷ φθείρεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν ναὸν αὐτοῦ.

MS τοῦτο τό: I should prefer ἰσοδυναμεί δὲ τούτῳ τὸ φθείρεσθαι κτλ.

xi ll. 9-12 οὐκ ἀδικεῖται δὲ οὐδὲ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ δευτέρου θανάτου. οἰόμενός τις ἀδύνατα εἶναι περὶ ἀγγέλου ἐκλαβεῖν ἀπολυθῆσεται τοῦ περισπασμοῦ γνοῦς ὡς πᾶσα λογικὴ φύσις δεκτικὴ ἐστὶ τῶν ἀποδοθέντων σημασινομένων περὶ τοῦ θανάτου. ἴσως δὲ ὁ ταραπτόμενος τὸν κοινὸν θάνατον ἐν νῷ λαβῶν πέπονθεν ταραχήν.

Harnack, who notes 'usus insuetus' of the word *περισπασμοῦ*, supplies three parallels from Origen (p. 50); I can add two more, from Origen, *in Eph.* iv 15 (*J. T. S.* iii 415 ll. 91, 92) and (still closer) *in Rom.* vi 12 ἀπολύων ἡμᾶς περισπασμοῦ. I find more difficulty in seeing meaning or connexion in the text as it stands; and I suggest οὐκ ἀδικεῖται δὲ οὐδὲ ἐκ τούτου. τὸ(ν) δεῦτερο(ν) θάνατο(ν) οἰόμενός τις ἀδύνατα εἶναι περὶ ἀγγέλου ἐκλαβεῖν 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 τούτου, and only a colon after περὶ 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 ἴσως for the MS ἴσος: Wohlenberg thinks of Ἰησοῦς.

xiii l. 3 οὐκ ἀπεγνωστέον καὶ περὶ ἀσάρκων τινῶν ψευδομάντεων ταῦτα εἰρησθαι δι' ἀποκαλύψεως γὰρ ἐδείχθη τῷ ἀποστόλῳ.

Presumably the words should be οὐκ ἀπ(ο)γνωστέον, and the meaning 'we must not reject the idea that . . .' The ἀσαρκοὶ ψευδομάνται 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 ll. 4, 5 τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ μάννα τὸ κεκρυμμένον καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ψῆφον ὄνομα καινόν.

Full stop after *κεκρυμμένον*, and here the first part of the comment ends. The succeeding words are simply the *lemma* from Apoc. ii 17,

which the rest of this scholion expounds: see Dr Armitage Robinson p. 295.

xiv ll. 5, 6 ἐπειδὴ δὲ περὶ πνευματικῶν ὁ λόγος ἀνωτέρω, χωριστέον παντὸς αἰσθητοῦ δηλουμένου περὶ τῆς ψήφου.

‘Corrupta videntur’ Harnack. Wohlenberg restores text and sense by placing the comma after λόγος, and from the MS reading χωρειταιον deducing χωρητέον instead of χωριστέον. ‘We must rise above all material ideas.’

xiv ll. 9-15 ἐπεὶ γὰρ κατὰ πᾶσαν προκοπὴν οἰκείαν τῇ ἐκ τῆς προκοπῆς ποιότητι ἔχει τις προσηγορίαν, αἰεὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν προτέρων παρερχομένων, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν γραφόμενον ὄνομα τοῦ τελειωθέντος, οὐκ ἔχον ἕτερον μετὰ τοῦτο, αἰεὶ καινόν ἐστι κατὰ τὴν ἀδιάδοχον Καινὴν Διαθήκην καὶ ἔτι τοῦ κρυπτοῦ τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπου παραστατικόν. 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 ἀνθρώπου for τοῦ κρούστου(?) 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 καινόν and the comment on ὁ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν: place a full stop therefore after Καινὴν Διαθήκην. What follows ought to be easy enough: ἔτι is in the MS ἐπί, and αὐτῶν is αὐτω: read therefore καὶ ἐπ(ἐ) τοῦ κρυπτοῦ τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπου παραστατικὸν τοῦτο, οὐδεὶς αὐτ(ὸ) 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 (ει for ω is very easy). Read in that case τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν γραφόμενον ὄνομα τοῦ τελειωθέντος οὐκ ἔχ(ει) ἕτερον μετὰ τοῦτο, αἰεὶ καινόν 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 [Apoc. 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 ll. 8-12 ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ, καθ’ οὓς ἐπιπορεύεται τῷ παντὶ διαφορήσας, διὰ τοῦ χαλκολιβάνου παραβάλλονται—διὰ τὸ θεϊκὸν λίβανος, χαλκὸς διὰ τὸ τοῖς κτίσμασι συγκαταβαίνειν· εἶχον ποιεῖν ἐπιπορευόμενον διεγερτικὸν τῶν κοιμωμένων.

Harnack's text differs from the MS mainly by the correction of *ἐπιπορευόμενος* to *ἐπιπορευόμενον*: but he has rightly queried the word *εἶχον*, for which Wohlenberg and Stählin both make the simple but brilliant emendation *ἤχον*. 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 *ἐπιπορευόμενος*, and write *χαλκός διὰ τὸ τοῖς κτίσμασι συγκαταβαίν(ω)ν ἤχον ποιεῖν ἐπιπορευόμενος διεγερτικὸν τῶν κοιμωμένων*. The first part of the sentence might stand as it is, if *παραβάλλονται* 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' οὓς ἐπιπορεύεται τῷ παντὶ διαφοιτήσας δι' αὐ(ὸ)τοῦ, χαλκολιβάν(ω) παραβάλλονται*. This also has the advantage of echoing rather more closely the wording of the biblical text 'like to fine brass'.

xvi l. 1 *ἐπίστησον μὴ ἐφαρμόζη*.

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

xvi ll. 2-4 *διὰ τὸ τὰ ἔργα τῆς γνώμης ἐκείνης προσήφθαι τῇ Ἰεζάβελ εἰς πορνείαν κατασπασάσῃ καὶ χρήσιν εἰδωλοθύτων πευρωμένη*.

*χρήσιν* cannot be accusative after *πειρωμένη*. If the editors had understood that the definition at the end of the clause is attached to *τῆς γνώμης ἐκείνης* and not to *τῇ Ἰεζάβελ*, they would not have needlessly altered the readings of the MS *κατασπᾶν* 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 *idolothytia*'. [So too Stählin.]

xviii l. 3 *πρὸ ἀνατολῆς τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡλίον*.

Mal. iv 2 *ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν . . . ἥλιος δικαιοσύνης*.

xix l. 4 *ἀσυντρόχαστον*.

Not in L. S., who recognize only *ἀσύντροχος*: but see *συντροχάζω*.

Harnack notes that Origen uses *ἀσυντρόχαστον* in the *de oratione*.

xx l. 1 *ἄγιος, ἀληθινὸς ὁ μὴ μετουσίᾳ ἀλλ' οὐσίᾳ ὢν τοιοῦτος, αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς λόγος*.

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

xx ll. 8-10 *διὸ οὐδεὶς ἀνοίξει τὰ κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου, οὐκέτι ἐφεξῆς τὰ λοιπὰ φυλαχθῆναι χώραν ἔχοντα. ἀνοίγει μὲν τὰ δυνατὰ ἀνθρώποις νοῆσαι, κλείει δὲ ὅσα μὴ δύναται ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ γνῶναι*.

MS *ουκετι φυ υφεξεις τα λοιπα λαχθηναι*, and Dr Armitage Robinson

pointed out (*J. T. S. Jan.* p. 295) that the words *ὑφέξεις 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'. *ὑφέξεις 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 παροῦσα* reminds us of the Antiochene writers, and their favourite contrast between *ἡ παροῦσα κατάσταση* and *ἡ μέλλουσα κατάσταση*. But they did not accept the Apocalypse.

xxi ll. 5-7 *καὶ ἐπιμετεωρίζονται οὗτοι εὐσεβείας καὶ ἀρετῆς πτεροῖς. λέγεται περὶ αὐτῶν κτλ.*

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 ἐπ(ε)ὶ μετεωρίζονται οὗτοι εὐσεβείας καὶ ἀρετῆς πτεροῖς, λέγεται περὶ αὐτῶν κτλ.*

xxi ll. 11-12 *ἐρχόμενος γὰρ δι' ἐνεργειῶν ἀρετῆς πρὸς τὸν σωτήρα οὐκ ἐκβάλλεται ἕξω.*

Jo. vi 37 *τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς με οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἕξω.*

xxi l. 15 *καταβάσα παρὰ θεοῦ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.*

Not from Apoc. xxi 2 (as Harnack) but simply from the verse on which the Scholiast is commenting, iii 12.

xxii ll. 1-4 *ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς ὁ σωτήρ ὑπάρχει οὐ διὰ τὸ πίστεως καὶ ἀληθείας μετέχειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ βέβαιον κατ' οὐσίαν εἶναι ἀληθινὸς γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ ἀλήθειαν καὶ ἀληθινὸν εἶναι.*

From *βέβαιον* onwards in this sentence exactly half the words are given by the editors in a form different from the MS, which reads *δια το βεβαιος και ουσια ειναι αληθινος γαρ τον αυτον επ' αυτου το αληθεια και αληθινος ειναι*. Both Stählin and Wohlenberg make their proposals for improvement: the former writes *διὰ τὸ βέβαιον καὶ οὐσίαν εἶναι ἀληθ(ιν)ῶς γὰρ τὸ αὐτὸν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀλήθειαν καὶ ἀληθινὸν εἶναι*, the latter *διὰ τὸ βέβαιος καὶ οὐσία εἶναι ἀληθινὸς γὰρ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἀληθινὸς εἶναι*. I am sure that Wohlenberg is right against Harnack and Stählin in retaining the nominatives of the MS with *τὸ . . . εἶναι*. I think too that *οὐσία* of the MS is right, comparing *xx 1 ὁ μὴ μετουσία ἀλλ' οὐσία ὢν τοιοῦτος*. And lastly Wohlenberg's *ἀληθινὸς γὰρ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀλήθεια . . . 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 *ἀληθινός* into the first part of the sentence, so that the whole would read *διὰ τὸ βέβαιος καὶ οὐσία εἶναι ἀληθινός· (ἀληθινός) γὰρ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τ(ῷ) ἀλήθεια εἶναι*.



xxii ll. 14-18 τὸ αὐτὸ δ' ἐστὶν λέγειν μέλλω σε ἐμέσαι, καὶ τό· ἐγενήθητέ μοι εἰς πλησμονήν, οἶονεὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ πόλλ' ἔξετε [?] ἐν ἐμοί· ὅταν γὰρ τὴν περὶ τίνος μνήμην ἀποκαλεῖ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ὁ κύριος, τὸν τοιοῦτον ἤμεσεν, γενόμενον αὐτῷ εἰς πλησμονήν καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀπάτης καὶ κακίας παχύτητα μὴ χωροῦντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

For ἐπὶ πόλλ' ἔξετε—truly a counsel of despair—the MS gives *επιπολλεζεται*, and the true reading suggested itself independently to Stählin, Wohlenberg, and myself, *επιπολάζετε* '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 ὁ δὲ καὶ *κυβίαν ἀπεκάλεσεν ὁ ἀπόστολος*) and is out of place here, as Stählin too has seen. His suggestion is ἀπολεῖ, comparing Sap. iv 19 ἡ μνήμη αὐτῶν ἀπολείται: what had occurred to me is rather ἀπο(β)αλεῖ or ἀπο(β)άλ(η). For διὰ τὴν ἀπάτης καὶ κακίας παχύτητα the MS has διὰ τὴν ἀπάτης κακίας παχύτητα, from which Wohlenberg has rightly restored διὰ τὴν ἀπ(ὸ) τῆς κακίας παχύτητα.

xxiii ll. 4, 5 τὴν δὲ μεσότητα τὴν ἀπρακτον ἔχοντος καὶ τὸ χλιαρόν, ὅπερ δηλοῖ τὴν πρὸς πάντα βλάβαν μετὰ κλησιν.

An admirably simple and satisfactory emendation, *μετὰ κλησιν*, comes from Wohlenberg.

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: ὦ σου πάντως ἀκούειν ἐστὶν ἐπιστημονικὰ λέγοντος [cod λέγων] ὡς [cod ἦ] μόνου τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην ἠθισμένου [cod ἡθισμένου]· οὕτω σου πάντως ἐστὶν ἀκούειν τοῦ πνεύματος ὡς [cod ἦ] μόνου τοῦ πνευματικῶν [cod πνευματικοῦ] ἔχοντος [cod ἔχωντος] ὅτιον προστεθειμένον αὐτῷ [?] θεόθεν κατὰ τὸ λεχθέν· προσέθηκέ μοι ὅτιον τοῦ ἀκούειν [Is. 1 5] τὸ γὰρ τῆς αἰσθήσεως τῆς ἀκουστικῆς ὄργανον καὶ τὰ ἄλογα ἔχουσι, μόνων [cod μόνων] τῶν κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα σοφῶν ἐχόντων τὸ τῆς συνέσεως ὅτιον, περὶ οὗ ὁ σωτὴρ πληθυντικῶς εἶπεν· ὁ ἔχων ὄτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω [Matt. xi 15].

Robinson, Wohlenberg, and Stählin have each seen that we have here simply another scholion of Origen. On iii 22, ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, he writes according to their restored text ὡς οὐ παντός ἀκούειν ἐστὶν ἐπιστημονικῶν λόγων [ἐπιστημονικὰ λέγοντος Stählin] ἢ μόνου τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην εἰθισμένου· οὕτως αὐ παντός ἐστὶν ἀκούειν τοῦ πνεύματος ἢ μόνου τοῦ πνευματικοῦ κτλ. For ἐπιστημονικὰ λέγων of the MS I venture to suggest *ἐπιστημονικὰ λεγ(όντ)ων*.

xxv ll. 6-11 διὸ ὅταν λέγῃ θύραν ἠνεῶσθαι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, τὴν κατὰ σαφήνειαν διαίρεσιν τῶν νοητῶν ἐκλαμβάνωμεν, καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν ἀναβαίνων τις ἐκεῖ τῶν ἀγίων λέγῃ τὰς πιστώσεις, πιστώσεις δὲ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ γεγράφθαι.

ὡς ἕτερόν τινα ἀνάλαβε τὸν Ἰωάννην ὡσπερ τὸν Ἥλιαν· αὐτὸς γὰρ προσε-  
τάγη ἐκουσίῳ ὄρμῃ ἀναβῆναι.

The MS has in l. 8 ἀναβαίνειν for ἀναβαίνων: in l. 9 λέγει for λέγη, and πιστώσει δέ for πιστώσεις δέ; in l. 10 ἕτερός τι ἀνέλαβε for ἕτερόν τινα ἀνάλαβε. Stählin and Wohlenberg have of course seen that the full stop at γεγράφηται must disappear and ἀνέλαβε of the MS return into the text: 'Scripture does not say that John was taken up, like Elijah, by some force or being (ἕτερός τις Stählin, ἕτερόν 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 τὰς πιστώσεις πιστώσεις δέ can be right, though Harnack has found a parallel to the very rare word πίστωσις in Orig. *de exhortatione martyrii* 26 αἱ δι' ὄρκων πιστώσεις, and the verb πιστοῦται occurs in Schol. xxix 16. Whether the editorial note πιστώσει δέ 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 ἁγίων λέγη τὰς (MS ἀναβαίνειν and λέγει) I am much tempted to read ὅταν ἀναβαίνειν τις ἐκεῖ τῶν ἁγίων 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 ι and ς compare above vi 16, ix 3, and Dr Robinson's note on ix 10. The phrase takes up of course the λέγων Ἀνάβα ὧδε of Apoc. iv 1. For πιστώσεις or πιστώσει the sense might be best satisfied by πιστωθέντες, referring back to ἐκλαμβάνωμεν (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.

xxv ll. 13-15 σημαίνει δὲ τὸ οὕτω λεχθὲν τὴν τῆς ἐννοήσεως μεγαλοφωνίαν μετὰ σαφηνείας γενομένης πρὸς αὐτόν.

This makes good enough sense no doubt; but it departs a little widely from the MS tradition τῷ οὕτω λεχθὲν τὴν ἐννοήσιν μεγαλοφωνίαν. 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 οὕτω λεχθέντ(ι) ἢ ἐν(ε)νόησ(ε)ν μεγαλοφωνίαν.

xxvi l. 1 οὐ τοῦτο τὸ ὄν κτίζεται ἀλλὰ τὸ κτιζόμενόν ἐστι.

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 τοῦτο τὸ ὄν but τοῦτο ὄν; and

if, by a very small change, we read οὗ που τὸ ὄν κτίζεται ἀλλὰ τὸ κτιζόμενον ἔστι, 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.'

xxvi ll. 2-4 αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶπεν· φησὶν καὶ ἐγεννήθησαν, αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν.

Wohlenberg points out that this should be printed αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶπεν, φησὶν, καὶ ἐγεννήθησαν κτλ. 'He spake, says Scripture, and they were made.'

xxvi ll. 4-5 κτίζεται γὰρ τις ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, πρὸ τούτου ὢν θεοῦ ποίημα.

The whole point of the reference to Eph. ii 10 is that both words ποιέω and κτίζω occur there in conjunction; αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν ποίημα κτισθέντες κτλ. Consequently ποίημα at least ought also to be spaced.

xxvi ll. 5, 6 καὶ οὐκ αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ πατήρ ἐκτίσατό σε καὶ ἐποίησέν σε καὶ ἔπλασέν σε.

Reference to L. S. shewed that ἐκτίσατο could not have anything to do with κτίζω, so it was clear that we must read ἐκτίσαστο. 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 ἐκτίσαστό σε καὶ ἐποίησέ σε καὶ ἔκτισέ σε, he suggests, with great probability, that we ought to read the verse here with ἔκτισε instead of ἔπλασε. ἔπλασεν in fact is not read by any of the main authorities of the LXX text *ad loc.*: AF give ἔκτισεν, B omits the third verb altogether.

xxvii ll. 1-3 λέξει τις περὶ τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου, ὡς εἶη ὁ πᾶς λόγος τῆς προνοίας, καθ' ὃν ἡ κρίσις θεοῦ ἐπάγεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἡδέα τε καὶ ἀηδῆ.

The MS omits ἡ, and for the editors' ἡδέα τε καὶ ἀηδῆ has ηδεατε-  
καιηδη. I do not know how it is proposed to construe the printed text. I keep close to the MS and read καθ' ὃν κρίσις θεοῦ ἐπάγεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἡδε αἰτε καὶ ἡδη, '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.

xxvii l. 7 συσφίγγεται τὸ βιβλίον.

A beautiful emendation of Harnack's for *οὖν σφίγγεται* of the MS ; but he could have kept closer to the tradition by writing *συνσφίγγεται*.  
 xxvii l. 12 *οὐδεὶς γεννητὸς . . . ἄξιος εὕρηται*.

MS *γενητός*, 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 *γενητὸς γεννητὸς ἀγέννητος ἀγέννητος*, we must not begin by deserting MS authority.

xxvii l. 13 *τὸν τῆς προνοίας λόγον διακρίσεως καὶ διοικήσεως φανερώσαι*.

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

xxvii ll. 16-19 *οὗτος ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα λέων, ἡ ρίζα Δαβὶδ, τὸ ἀρνίον τὸ ἐσφαγμένον τυγχάνει περὶ τούτου τοῦ βιβλίου. καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν καὶ ἐν Ἡσαΐᾳ γέγραπται κτλ.*

All the critics, Robinson, Stählin, Wohlenberg, have seen that the new sentence must begin not at *καὶ Μωϋσῆς*, but four words earlier at *περὶ τούτου τοῦ βιβλίου*. The reference to Isaiah is I suppose to Is. xxix 11 *καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν τὰ ῥήματα πάντα ταῦτα ὡς οἱ λόγοι τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ ἐσφραγισμένου τούτου 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 ἴδὸν ταῦτα συνήκται παρ' ἐμοί, καὶ ἐσφράγισται ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς μου;*

xxvii l. 19 *ἐπεὶ πρώτης ἐπιδημίας κτλ.*

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

C. H. TURNER.