ORIGEN SCHOLIA IN APOCALYPSIN

XXVIII

(Metà tò égwnokénai mé, phs, òti hè máia Dávven, ó nikhíasas léow ék tís
phulís 'Ioudáa, éllhfen tò bibliaíon tò ti t(ó) lýsai tás sfragídas autòu) Eídon
ën mésw tòu (θ)rho(ó)nu kai tòn teosárron zhón kai tòn prebúterón ánmion
éstikós (ós) ésfagménoun. metà tìn anástasín kai anýlipsin oíðhein tò ámion
óukëtì ésfagménoun (álì' òás ésfagménoun) ófthé kai é(τ)ì éstós, toutéstín,5
óukëtì állloímpmenon.

(ei) ónd kátà kai(γ)ν ostaíun éxei lautón éptà k(ε)ratas, ágian basileían
kai éllhgménhin éxei, tautês yar símbolon tà (é)ptá.


XXVIII. 2. tò swrípsi: tò cod. I think the dative is more natural.
3. thronon Wohlenberg: sfranov cod  4. òs Diobouniotes: om cod
(lost between -oc and ec-), but it is not only part of the text of
Apoc. but is implied in Origen’s comment, if I have interpreted that
rightly.  5. ìllì òs ésfagménoun supplv: om cod. The text of the
comment as it stands in the MS contradicts the text of Apoc., as
Harnack rightly sees (p. 58): but when, instead of mistrusting the
comment as it stands, he says that Origen here develops a favourite
thought of his own ‘in opposition to the text’ ‘im Gegensatz zum Text’,
his explanation is surely quite impossible. Origen may allegorize his
text, and allegorize its plain meaning away: but he would never have
dreamed of contradicting his text. The suggestion of an omission by
homoeoteleuton seems to me to dispose of the difficulty.  5. éti ìstòs
swrípsi: épistostos cod, but this is a vox nihil. ìstòs is a variant and
more correct form for éstikós: ìti is a very simple correction of ìti,
though I admit that prósèti would be more natural, as the sense wanted
is ‘furthermore’.  6. állloímpmenon cod: if correct, this must mean
‘subject to change’; the sense is good enough, but it is not easy to
see why ‘standing’ should mean ‘no longer subject to change’.
7. ei H.: ò cod kátà kai(ν) H.: kátàkainov cod kérata H.:
kaíreta cod ágyan . . . kai éllhgménhn: Harnack has noted that the
same combination of epithets is found in Schol. ix, but he has not
apparently realised that Origen is referring us to the ‘blessing and
hallowing’ of the seventh day, that is, of the number seven.  8. éptá
In the light of what I have urged in the preceding note, I cannot doubt that not 'spirits' but 'seven' is the symbol of the kingdom that is 'blessed and hallowed'; and if, as I suspect, some abbreviation for "τριήμερον" is either in our MS or was in its ancestor, the change is not a serious one. I should prefer την καθημερινή φάντασην ἤ τὸ "Αξίως εἶ, ὥς δέσποτα σωτήρ, λαβείν τὸ βιβλίον καὶ τὰ ἔξθές; προφανῶς ἃς περὶ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἔστι ταῦτα, ἵσταντος ὡς ἀπόκαλυμμα εἰπώντος εἰκὼνι· ἐκ τῆς οὕτως γεναμένης σφαγῆς τὸ ἱερὸν αἰμα τυμήν δὲ δοθανὶ ἐπὶ τῶν σεσωσμένων.

καὶ ἐπειδὴ μὴ ὑπὲρ μέρους ἢ ἑνὸς ἔξον ἔξον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἑσταυρώθη, ἰὸ ἤγορασεν τὸ ἄιματι αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πάσης φυλῆς Ἰσραήλ καὶ διαλέκτων πάσης τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ἐτὶ μὴν καὶ λαοῦ καὶ θεοῦ διαφορὰν διαφορὰς ἐστὶ λαβείν

11. Zach. iv 10

XXIX. 1. Ps. cxl (cxli) 2. 2, 3. Apoc. v 8 5, 10, 11. ib. v 9. 7 Is. liii 7

scripsi: πνεῦματα cod. In the light of what I have urged in the preceding note, I cannot doubt that not 'spirits' but 'seven' is the symbol of the kingdom that is 'blessed and hallowed'; and if, as I suspect, some abbreviation for πνεῦματα is either in our MS or was in its ancestor, the change is not a serious one. I should prefer τῷ ἐπτά καὶ τῷ ἐπτά, but have not ventured to make the change. τὸ ἐπτά

Harnack (in the notes, but not in the text): ᾧ τὸ cod

XXIX. 5. κατὰ scripsi: μετά cod, but according to the text of Apoc. the 'new song' was the "Αξίως εἶ κτλ. If μετά is right, Origen must have read καὶ λέγουσιν instead of λέγουσι, and have treated what follows as something different from the 'new song'.

6. ῥὰ cod: possibly δὴ. 7. γεναμένης cod: γενομένης H. But there is no justification for altering what is a known form (Moulton Grammar of N. T. Greek, Prolegomena p. 51 n. 2, and vol. ii p. 213).

8. τιμή δέδοται scripsi: τιμοῦντος cod, τίμων δέδοτα H. Origen is expounding the words ἡγόρασαν εἰς τῷ αἱματι, and his meaning must surely be that the blood is the 'price given' for the purchase or redemption of the σεσωσμένων. If τίμων is really the MS reading, the scribe's thought may have been running on the τιμώ αἵματι ὡς ἀμονοι of 1 Pet. i 19.

10. διαλέκτων: substituted by Origen for the γλώσσας of Apoc. Was γλώσσα going out of use in the sense of 'language'? 11. ἐτὶ μὴν: I think that this phrase must introduce a new thought, and that therefore a full-stop must be placed before it. What the new thought is I think the words ἡ προτέρα ὑπόθεσις in l. 14 make clear: Origen has given alternative explanations of the contrast of λαὸς and ἔθνος, first the literal view that
λαὸς like φιλὴ refers to Israel, ἕθνος like γλῶσσα (διάλεκτος) to the Gentiles (l. 10), secondly the more remote idea that the λαὸς are the more advanced, the ἕθνος the more ordinary Christians. That being so, if the MS reads καὶ λαὸς καὶ ἕθνος καὶ λαὸς it is simpler to omit καὶ λαὸς once than with Diobouiotis and Harnack to add καὶ ἕθνος ἐστὶ. διαφοράν διαφόρος ἐστὶ λαβέω σcripsi (‘it is possible to interpret differently the difference between λαὸς and ἕθνος’): διαφοραν διαφοραν ὑπ' ὑπάρχων. There seems reason to suppose that at certain parts of the MS or its ancestor four or five letters were mutilated or illegible: cf. XXX I ἐγκαί τοῖς ἐνεργείαις? 12. φάσκοντα ὅτι σcripsi: φάσκοντα οἱ ὑπ' ἑαυτῶν σcripsi, τῶν φάσκοντα οἱ Η. The insertion of τῶν is unnecessary, once the drift of the sentence is grasped: ‘it is possible to interpret . . . if one says’, ‘by saying’. ὅτι seems to be essential: it may either replace οἱ, with which I think Origen’s style could dispense (if οἱ were right, one would expect οἱ μὲν), or be inserted before it 13. πιστοῦται Ἡ.: πιστοῦται ὑπ'. The word is a favourite of Origen’s: cf. Schol. xxv l. 9. 14. ὑπόθεσις Η.: ὑπόθεσις ὑπ'. The first of the two ‘hypotheses’ is that λαὸς and ἕθνος are the chosen race and the peoples of mankind: and this tallies with the number of 24 πρεσβύτεροι, since 24 suggests two groups of 12. And the πρεσβύτεροι must somehow represent humanity, since we are told that they were ‘redeemed from among men’, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (cf. l. 15). Aροκ, xiv 4 15. ὑμολογησαν ὑπ' 17. ἀναγνωσκοντες ὑπ'. Obviously ‘we who read’ must mean ‘we who study the scriptures’, not ‘we who read the scriptures to the congregation’. It is quite true that ἀναγινώσκεω means ‘to read aloud’: but it does not necessarily mean ‘read aloud to others’. If St Mark wrote (xiii 14) ‘when ye see the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not (let him that readeth detect what is meant) . . . ’, he was not thinking about the order of Readers. Even if the Gospel had been written for the purpose of being read in church, the evangelist certainly did not intend to suggest that the Reader should understand and the congregation should not. He wanted every one who read his Gospel to understand that at this point he meant something that he could not afford to say. Just as in Aροκ, xiii 18, the Roman power is referred to in veiled language, and νοεῖν νοεῖς is in each case the capacity to read between the lines, to solve the riddle.
of this passage follows from the recognition of its dependence on 1 Pet. ii 5; 'we who learn from Scripture that "incense" means the prayers of the saints, and "spiritual and acceptable sacrifices" mean good actions ... ' Harnack, failing to see this, has divided the words wrongly, and inserted an unnecessary ὅτι. 18. εὐπροσδέκτειν 20. προσευχαί τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ τενέματα θυσίας καὶ εὐπροσδέκτειν θεῶς αἵ ἁγαθαὶ πράξεις, ὥστε ἀπὸ τῆς Χριστοῦ ἐπιστημονίας ἐν πάντι τόπῳ θυμίαμα 20 προ(ἐ)γμαται τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου καὶ θυσίας καθαρσίας: μέγα γὰρ αὕτῳ τὸ ὄνομα ἐστιν καὶ τοῖς ἐθνεῖς, διὰ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδασκαλίαν, ὅσ φησιν ὁ προφήτης.

XXX

Ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν ἐστιν εὑρεν ὡς ὁσπέρ σώμα θεοῦ ἐνεργείᾳ εἰς τινὲς, ὅδεν αἵ ὑπηρετικαὶ χείρ(ες), καὶ ἑποτικαὶ ἀφθαρμοί, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν εἰδῶν θεαμάναι

19. Mal. i 11
XXX. 2. cf. Ps. cxviii (cxix) 73 cf. Ps. xxxiii (xxxiv) 16

of this passage follows from the recognition of its dependence on 1 Pet. ii 5; 'we who learn from Scripture that "incense" means the prayers of the saints, and "spiritual and acceptable sacrifices" mean good actions ... ' Harnack, failing to see this, has divided the words wrongly, and inserted an unnecessary ὅτι. 18. εὐπροσδέκτειν 20. προσευχαί τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ τενέματα θυσίας καὶ εὐπροσδέκτειν θεῶς αἵ ἁγαθαὶ πράξεις, ὥστε ἀπὸ τῆς Χριστοῦ ἐπιστημονίας ἐν πάντι τόπῳ θυμίαμα 20 προ(ἐ)γμαται τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου καὶ θυσίας καθαρσίας: μέγα γὰρ αὕτῳ τὸ ὄνομα ἐστιν καὶ τοῖς ἐθνεῖς, διὰ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδασκαλίαν, ὅσ φησιν ὁ προφήτης.

XXX. Harnack (p. 60) expresses doubt both as to the appropriateness and the intelligibility of this long comment, and would attribute it to some other commentary of Origen's. I do not share his doubts. The subject is the great judgement that brings to an end this present age. The comment comes in as an explanation of the 'great day of the wrath of God and the Lamb' (vi 17), and the point of the first part is to draw a sharp distinction between the 'wrath of God' elsewhere mentioned, and this 'great wrath'. The former is external and accidental: the latter is not. I do not indeed feel clear as to the connexion of the first sentence with what succeeds: but I think Origen means that, just as Scripture uses the material terms of the parts of a human body, hands, eyes, ears, feet, to express corresponding spiritual actions of God's providence, so terms of human emotion, like 'anger', may be used to express aspects of His nature. But here we must carefully distinguish between this ultimate judgement and the O. T. employment of the phrase 'the wrath of God' on particular occasions, where it is really equivalent to 'the devil'. 1. ὃς ὁσπέρ σώμα θεοῦ ἐνεργείᾳ εἰς τινὲς scripsi: ὁσπέρ σώμα θεοῦ ἀγιαὶ εἰς τινὲς cod; ὁσπέρ σώμα θεοῦ ἀγιον, ἀγιαὶ καὶ εἴσι ... τινὲς Ὦ. It is so clear that ἀγιαὶ is wrong, and that an abstract noun is wanted, that I make no apology for ἐνεργεία. Certain workings of God in relation to men are expressed anthropomorphically, in terms of a human body. If this is right, ὃς seems to be required before ὁσπέρ: it could easily have dropped out. 2. χείρ(ες) Ὦ.: χειρ(ες) cod. Note the numerous occasions on which sense can be restored to our text by assuming a confusion of ς and τ. I cannot profess to explain it palaeographically: but the fact is beyond dispute:
3. cf. Ps. cix (ex) 1? 4. Apoc. vi 17 9. 2 Reg. xxiv 1

cf. inf. l. 3 προνοια, προνοιας; l. 9 επεισε, επέσεσε: ix supra l. 3 λυχνιας ου, λυχνιαιον: ix 10 επι λυχνια, επι λυχνιας: xxxiii 2 αι, ας, etc. εποπτικαι . . . τεταγμεναι . . . απελαστικαι: H., not seeing that the feminine adjectives are in agreement not with the nouns that follow but with the abstract noun (ἐνεργαίαι or whatever word may be preferred), causelessly alters to masculine, neuter, masculine. 3. απελαστικαι προνοιας θεου σχιστι: επελαστικαι προνοια θεου cod. L.S. give no such word as ἔπελαστικός: for ἔπελαστικός see appended note on p. 15. And the purpose of 'feet' in this connexion must presumably be for pushing away: I conjecture therefore 'function of driving away from the providence of God', e.g. 'make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet'.

4. επει H.: επι cod ἐρείν, H.: αἴρειν cod οὗ τὸ optimum H.: οὖν cod. What is called the 'wrath of God' during the present dispensation is something non-essential to God and external to Him, but used by Him for the purpose of reclaiming sinners. 5. ὑπάρχων H.: ὑπαρχον cod 6. τοῖς δεομένοις: cf. Schol. ix supra l. 9 τοῖς δυναμένωσ, where in 1912 I conjectured (without I think any conscious knowledge of this passage) τοῖς δεομένως. ἀνάξιοι H.: ἀνάξιοις cod. Or we might invert the order of the words and read ὡς ἀνάξιοις θεοῦ, ω και παραδίδοται ίναι . . . 7. ποθήσωσι (suggested by H. though not placed in the text): ποθήσουσιν cod, which may perhaps stand.

8. ὅργην cod ἐν τῇ Diobouniotis: ἐνῷ cod 9. επέσεσε: ἐπεσει cod 11. The argument appears to be that ὅργη θεοῦ would have governed a feminine; and that as we have a masculine, we must understand that the wrath of God is personified in some one not God. One might say, why not in God? Origen answers that in plenty of places God is represented directly as speaking, no circumlocution being used: where a circumlocution is used, it is some one not God who speaks. Later on follows the real argument (ll. 13 ff), that what was suggested was sin, and God who punishes sin cannot conceivably suggest it.

13. η ταῦτα H.: ητα cod
14. pισθεντι ςόδ ειρηκια ςόδ 15-17. 'corupta sanare nequeo' H. But nothing was needed in the first part of the sentence than a note of interrogation after δικαιον. 'How can that anger whichpunishes, and justly punishes, men for sins incite them to sinning, so that after persuading them to sin it could justly punish them?' In the second part of the sentence we must restore (l. 17) κολάσης of the MS for Harnack's κολάζει, and I think we must omit the μη of the MS before ἡμαρτηκότα. 17. καθώς εἰρηται ςόδ: if this is right, we must refer back to l. 8, but the construction is imperfect, and I have suggested οἵμα as easily lost before εἰναι. If Origen were borrowing this exegesis from some earlier writer, we might write καλῶς εἰρηται ὁργήν θεον εἶναι κτλ. 18. τῷ ἀναπειθαν hæsitans scripsī: idem coniciit Diekamp: το ἀναπειθόν cod 19. ἡμαρτηκότα cod 22. τῇ (10): την cod τῇ δευτέρᾳ ... τῇ πρώτῃ scripsī: ἡ δευτέρα ... ἡ πρώτη cod. It is more natural in Origen's Greek to take ἔχρησατο as parallel with φησὶ (l. 20), in the sense of 'Scripture uses', than to put the names of the books in the nominative as we do. 23. τοῦ διαβόλου scripsī: praem τῆς cod. But the wrath of God in 2 Reg. is equivalent, not to the wrath of the devil, but to the devil in 1 Paral. 26. νομασθῃς cod 26-27. διὰ ... ὁργὴν κυρίον: 'sanare nequeo' Harnack. Besides the change that he himself has made, καθημαζευμένης (for which he produces, p. 59, an excellent parallel from Hom. in Ierem. xiv 3 το καθημαζευμένον και φερόμενον) in place of the MS κατεμαζευμένης, the only alteration to be made is τε for MS δὲ [so also, I see, Klostermann] in l. 26. Translate 'the devil is named on both occasions, whether by the ordinary name of "devil" or by the less familiar name of "wrath of God", for which compare the Song of Miriam etc.'
XXX b

"Ex.paused καὶ ἀγγέλους ἐφορώντας καὶ βοηθούντας ἦμιν εἰ πράττοντι, καὶ κράσις γίνεται καθολικῇ πρὸς τούτους πάντας, ωσ φησίν· ἀλάσαν γὰρ φησίν, κρίθην πρὸς τὰ ὅρη, καὶ ἀκούσατον ὁ βούη κοσμίς κογῆ· ἀκούσατο, βούη, τῆν κρίσιν τοῦ Κυρίου. καὶ δοκεῖ ἐν τούτους προστάσιος δοθήσεαι εἰς λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ κρίνεσθαι μετὰ τῶν ἑγκεκριμένων τὰ ἀνθρώποι· δυνάμεως, ἵνα δύνηται καὶ τὰς παραστήσεις (εἰ), διὰ τήν τινος ἀμέλειαν καὶ παράλειψιν τῶν ἐπιβαλλόντων

28. Exod. xv 7 33. 1 Cor. v 5, 1 Tim. i 20
XXX b. 2. Mic. vi 1, 2

28. καὶ supplet H.: om cod. Of course καὶ could easily enough have dropped out before κατὰ: otherwise I should have hesitated to insert it. αὐτοὺς (suggested by Harnack, but not put in his text): αὐτον cod. But αὐτοὺς is not only the reading of the passage in Exodus, it is implied by τοὺς Ἀγγελίους of 1. 30. 29. τὸτο cod: om H., but I will not venture to say that Origen could not have written it. 31. ἐδιδάσκαμεν: we should have expected ἐμάθωμεν or ἐδιδάχθημεν. 32, 33. παραδιδοσθαι bis cod 32. τὴν ὅργην cod

XXX b. The connexion of this second part of Schol. xxx with the first appears to lie in the thought that the great day of judgement includes in its scope all rational creation, angels as well as men. 2. ὡσ φησίν . . . φησί: φησί refers both times to the same quotation, so that the second is redundant. A double use of inquit is not uncommon in some of the Latin fathers in the case of Scriptural quotations. 4. προστασισθαι cod ὁ λόγος cod: τὸν λόγον H., but δοκεῖ can just as well be construed ‘the Word seems’ as ‘it seems that the Word’. 5. ἀνθρωπίνα cod δύναται H.: δυναται cod 6. διὰ τὴν τινος . . . γέγονεν (1. 7) cod: ‘corrupta sanare nequeo’ H., but all that is needful to make the sentence quite straightforward is to insert ei (better than δια, because it could so easily have been lost after παραστήσατο) before δια, and translate ‘in order that every one may have a chance of shewing whether it is owing to the neglect or omission by any of them [the
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angels] of duties on men's behalf that he [the man] has...'. The same result is reached in an even simpler way by Diekamp's emendation, γεγονέναι for γέγονεν. Or if we like to accent τίνος, we could do without any change at all: but that reading would imply that there was neglect on the part of some angel or another, which is exactly what Origen leaves open. 7. νοησομεν (suggested by Harnack, but not put in his text): νοησομεν cod 8. κρίσει λαοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἐπισκόπων: Harnack begs us to notice this particularly, and adds that Origen had often to make bitter complaints about bishops. By parity of reasoning, as Origen continues κρίσει υἱῶν μετὰ τοῦ πατρός, we ought to conclude that he had personal reasons for complaint against his father, the martyr Léonidas! Surely the point rather is that Origen is emphasizing the responsibility of the episcopal office: his relation to his people is that of a father to his sons. 11. παραστήσας scripsi [so too Diekamp]: παραστήσας cod, παραστήσας H., who, having thus put in an indicative verb, found it difficult to construe the sentence. παραστήσας introduces the dependent clause: 'by shewing that he himself has done his duty he will prove that it is the people who are guilty'. 12. μηδὲ scripsi: καὶ cod. We need a negative somewhere: the bishop shews that he has done all his part and has omitted nothing of the duty of a good ruler. 14, 17. ἀναστροφήν bis cod: ἀναστροφήν is of course a commoner word but I think that 'nurture', 'education' of the MS is right. 14. αἰτιομένων cod 17. παραλειπόντων scripsi: παραλειπόντων cod, but the reference is to their conduct in the past; cf. γεγονέας l. 15, γενομένων l. 18 18. ὡς supplevi: om cod, but the parallel in l. 16 ἀπολογουμένων ὡς shews that the word is natural before the second participle, though perhaps it is not absolutely indispensable.
XXXI

Σμηθροπῶν μελλόντων ἐπιφέρεσθαι, ὑπηρετῶν τις ἀγγέλοις θεοῦ φων(εί) πρὸς τοὺς ἐγκεκρισθέντας τὰ ἐπίπονα, τέως μὴ ἐπάγειν αὐτὰ ἐως σφραγί-

das ἐπὶ τῶν μετὰ(ω)πον λαβῆ(ω)σιν οἱ τοῦ θεοῦ δούλοι. ἑντέλλεται τούτῳ

αὐτῷ λέξειν ἐτέρας εἰς Ἰερεμία τῷ προφήτῃ Ἐκπετετε καὶ μὴ ϕ(ε)ίδεσθε τι, ἐφ' ὀσίς δὲ ἔστι τὸ σμηίων μὴ ἐτί(ε)χθε. μῆτοτε οὖν, ἐνεῖ οἱ κολαξιωμένοι διὰ 5

ἰδίας ἀμαρτίας τούτῳ πάσχοντα, τοὺς δικαίας χαρακτήρ τις σημαίνων τὴν

προσούσαν αὐτοῖς δικαιοσύνην τίθεται ἐπὶ τοῦ μετάπου, τοῦτεντε ἐπὶ τής

(ἐπ') ἀρετῆς παραφρασίας(ς) αὐτῶν, οἱ τοῦ προκειμένου τυχόντες σημείον χάριν

ὀμολογούντες τῷ δεδωκότι φασίν 'Εσμιεῖον εὑρ' ἰμάς τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου σοι

Κύριε, καὶ πάλιν Δέδωκας τοὺς φθογμένους σε σμηίωον τοῦ φίλεῖν ἀπὸ προ-

ώποις τόζογ(γ).

XXXI b

Ζητητέον εἰ (δυνα)τόν ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ σ(α)ρ(κ)α Ἰσραήλ, ἔτι ἐν (το)ῦ τῶ

Ἰωάννου τῷ βιόω περιόντ(ο)ς, ἀνδρῶν παρθένων τοσαῦτας εἶναι χιλιάδας.


XXXI b. 2. Apoc. vii 4, xiv 3, 4

XXXI. 1. ὑπηρετῶν: nominative participle, I suppose, 'a ministering

angel', 'an angel in waiting'. ἀνθοῦ φωνεῖ scripsi: τῇ θεόν φωνη cod.

But φωνη is, I do not doubt, a miswriting of φωνεῖ, and τῇ was

presumably then added to make the construction clear. 2. τὰ ἐπίπονα:

cf. Comm. in Jo. I 36 (ed. Brooke i 49. 18) ἐπιπάνω ... ἀγωγής 3.

μεταπόν κωδ λαβοντιν κωδ 4. φίδεθε κωδ 5. ἐγγυστή

cod 7. ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπὶ ἀρετῆς παραφρασίας scripsi: ἐπὶ τὴν συναρπήν παρ-

ρησία κωδ. Harnack remarks that he is unacquainted with the word

συναρπῆ, but suggests probatio as its meaning. συναρπήν, if genuine,

must be an adjective: but it is much more likely to be corrupt. I have

puzzled over the phrase, but can suggest nothing better than ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπὶ

ἀρετῆς παραφρασίας. A genitive seems wanted to carry out the parallelism

with ἐπὶ τῶν μετάπων: for παραφρασία = παραφρασία see on Schol. xxx i.

2. Both here and in l. 3 Harnack's punctuation is quite misleading:

παραφρασία(ς) must certainly go with what precedes, and I think that oì must

be relative, not article. 11. τοῦν κωδ, unless it is a misprint for τόξον.

XXXI b. 1. δυνατόν scripsi (similiter Diekamp, qui tamen retinet τῶν):

tον κωδ, τῶν Ἁ. I have noticed that losses of about four letters seem to

be especially frequent in our MS. σάρκα scripsi: σπέρμα κωδ. In the

admirable parallel adduced by Harnack (p. 6o) from the Comm. in Jo.

I i (i ppp. 2, 3 ed. Brooke) the phrase ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα Ἰσραήλ occurs twice.

ὁ κατὰ σπέρμα Ἰσραήλ is barely intelligible. ἐν τούτῳ Ἰωάννου τῷ βιῳ

περιόντος scripsi: ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἰ. τῷ βιῷ περιοντες κωδ, ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἰ. βιῳ

περιόντων Ἁ. I have made no change beyond writing τοῦν for τῷ τοῦ

and -ος for -ες, and though the order of the words is artificial (hardly too


XXXII

IIapaKaT<twv Aiyn TavTa> pp.8' XtAta8as '11'ap9lvous· Kat Eav A.ap.f3aV'<3> Παρακατων λέγει ταύτας μυ' δ' χιλιάδες παρθένους· καὶ εὰν λαμβάνῃς φυλάς ταύτας τὰς σωματικὰς τὰς λεγομένας ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, τοῦ παρθένο(ς),

5. cf. Io. i 47 10. i Cor. i 10 XXXII. i. Apro. xiv 4 artificial for cent. 3 A.D.) the sense is what we want. 3. ἀληθῆ δὲ δεῖ εἶναι τὰ ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ ἁγία ὁυσί αὐτῶν scripsi (δὲ δὲ Klosternann, ἁγία ὁυσί Diekamp): ἀληθῆ δὲ εἶναι τὰ ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ ἁγία ὁυσί σας cod, ἀληθῆ δὲ εἶναι τὰ ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ ἁγία, ἵσως (ἵσως is due to Diobouniotis) Ἡ. but ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ ἁγία is impossible. Text is the simplest way of making sense of the MS: it would also be possible, instead of inserting δεὶ, to take ἀνάγκης with what precedes and read ἐκλαμβάνωμεν for ἐκλαμβάνων.

6. τοῦτον ὅν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ scripsi: τοῦτον ἄνα τοῦ 'I. cod, τοῦτον ὅν τὸ 'I. Ἡ. εὰν τοσοῦτο λέγουμεν ēastesians scripsi: λέγουμεν cod, λέγουμε Diobouniotis, but τοσοῦτο or some such word seems to be required with πλῆθος, and if we insert that we may as well insert δεὶ, to take ἀνάγκης with what precedes and read ἐκλαμβάνωμεν for ἐκλαμβάνων. 7. Χριστοῦ scripsi: ἐν Χριστῷ cod, but προσέρχομαι implies a dative, as in the parallel from Comm. in Io. referred to on 1. i ēκ τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑθῶν τῷ θεῷ προσερχομένων λόγῳ προσελθήσωτε cod. 8. συμπληροῦσαι cod. 9. πολλὴ cod το. νοεῖ cod. II. ἵσως διαφέρεις αὐτοῦ ὑπόκειται scripsi: ἵσως διαφέρεσαι αὐτὸν ὑπόκειται cod, ἵσως διαφέρεσαι αὐτοῦ ὑπόκειται Ἡ. 144 is a square, and the true Hebrews correspond to it and to the number which is squared to make it, 12. With ὑπόκειται cf. Schol. ix 6 ὑποβάλλων αὐτῶς τῷ ζ ἄρθῳ tetrakionos cod. 12. ἴσακίς ἴσος σκελετικεῖς aulax copiæ: ἴσακίς ἴσος κυλισθῆς cod, ἴσακίς ἴσος κυλισθῆς Ἡ. But I do not know what 'rolling' could have to do with it. And though I cannot find ἴσοσκέλεζω 'to make isosceles' in the Lexicon, the formation is a natural one, and ἴσακίς ἴσοσκελεῖς might I suppose mean 'to square'. 13. tetrakionos cod

XXXII. 1. παρακατεων ὄν 2. φυλάς ταύτας τὰς σωματικὰς ὄν, recte: τὰς φυλάς ταύτας σωματικὰς Ἡ., to the detriment of the Greek:
If you understand these tribes to be the material ones', was what Origen wrote and meant. I am not quite satisfied, but have nothing better to offer. 3. pαρθενίας: no doubt the adjective, not (as in l. 4) the abstract noun. 4. εξηλομένην: οἵτινς: οἵτινς: as scripsi (cf. xxxii b l. 4) the following instead of with the preceding words, and has consequently made σὰν part of the quotation of Apoc. xiv 4.

XXXIII. 1. δῆλοιν: H., and this form of the contracted infinitive is defended for N.T. by Hort (Introduction § 410) though rejected by Moulton (Prolegomena p. 53): δῆλοιν H. 2. ἵσσερπης (cf. xxxii b l. 4) the following instead of with the preceding words, and has consequently made σὰν part of the quotation of Apoc. xiv 4.

XXXIII. 1. θλιψεως: cod. and this form of the contracted infinitive is defended for N.T. by Hort (Introduction § 410) though rejected by Moulton (Prolegomena p. 53): δῆλοιν H. 2. ἵσσερπης (cf. xxxii b l. 4) the following instead of with the preceding words, and has consequently made σὰν part of the quotation of Apoc. xiv 4.
5 ὃπως δὲ οἱ ἀνθρωποὶ νοησῶμεν τὸ ἀνάστατον τῆς θεραπείας αὐτῶν, (ὡ)νομάσθη ὁ παρ᾽ ἡμῖν χρόνος τεμνόμενος εἰς ἡμέραν καὶ νίκτα.

XXXIV

Ἐπίστησον εἰ αἱ πλουτεῖαι καὶ λευκανθεῖσαι στόλαὶ τῶν ἐκ μεγάλης θλιβετρῶν ἀναβεβηρῶν εἶναι δύναται τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν, ἢ δὴ προτεθωρημένα ὡς ἀν(α)στάντα ἀφθαρσα καὶ πνευματικα.

XXXV

Κράνας ὁ θεός πληγαῖς ὑποβάλλειν τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς, ἀπειράτους τῶν πληγῶν τούτων ἐνίοτε ἀνθρώπους ἐμεμνόντας ὡς εἰργάζοντο καὶ ὅσοι ἄγεντοι διὰ τῶν πληγῶν ἀπελείφθησαν, ἣν ἔχωσι μετανοίας τόπον, ὥστε μὴ προσκυνεῖν ἐτί τὰ δαίμονια τὰ χρύσα ἐκατὲρ καὶ τὰ ἐξ 5 ἐτέρας ὑλῆς κατεσκευασμένα ἀγάλματα. δηλοῦται ὡς προσκυνοῦσι τινες τὰ δαίμονα τὰ χρύσα καὶ τὰ ἀργύρα, χάλκι(ε)τε καὶ ξύλην· ὡς δαίμονα νοὴ(α) τὰ ἐφεδρεύοντα πνεύματα τῶν ἀφύσιοι μορφώμεσα. χρύσ(ε)τέ καὶ τὰ λοιπά, μὴ αἰσθανόμενα δι᾽ ὅψεως καὶ ἀκοῆς μηδὲ βαδίζουν, τὰ αἰσθητὰ ἀγάλματα. Στόμα γὰρ ἔχουσιν καὶ οὗτοι οὐκ οὐκέτι καὶ τὰ ἐξής, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν 10 τοῖς ψαλμοῖς.

6. Ἀποκ. vii 15.  
XXXIV. 1. Ἀποκ. vii 14  
XXXV. 2. Ἀποκ. ix 20  
9. Πες. cxxxiv (cxxxv) 16

5. οἱ ἀνθρωποὶ, i.e. we men on earth who use the chronology of day and night. Harnack needlessly suggests omission.

XXXIV. 2. θλήψεως cod δύναται cod: attracted into the singular number by σώματα immediately following. 3. ἀναστάντα σcritpi: ἀναστάντα cod. I make the change with hesitation: but the present ἀναστάντα ought to be causal, not intransitive.

XXXV. 1. θεός: θοῦ cod 2. ἱασεν cod 3. ὅσοι Η.: ὅσον cod διὲ τῶν ἡσίτανς scripsi: διετῶν cod, δι’ ἐτῶν Η. My suggestion involves only a very small change (c for e), and I think it may be justified as a reference to the plagues that accompanied the sounding of the fifth and sixth trumpets respectively. But I propose it faute de mieux 4. χρυσαία cod 5. δηλοῦται ὡς scripsi: δηλωῦτα ὡς cod τὰ δαίμονα τὰ χρυσά cod: neither here nor in l. 4 nor in l. 7 is there any trace of the words καὶ τὰ ἔδωλα before τὰ χρύσα. Origen’s text must have been without them, and that fact accounts for his exegesis in this sentence. 6. χαλκαία cod 7. νοῦται scripsi [so too Klostermann]: νοεῖται (omitting ἢν as dittography after ξύλων) Diekamp χρυσαία cod. The meaning of the sentence, which baffles Harnack, seems to be that ‘these things of gold, which neither see nor hear nor walk (Ἀποκ. ix 20), are the material images’. It is correct punctuation which helps in a case of this sort.
XXXVI

Omi o megáloi logoi sapfhnizémenoi brountai eisai tois dikaious kai o pro-
phitei ta xára mén dhnai fáskein fwni tis brontís (e)c éi tó trokhn: ζητίseis
yápr ékete troxón, kai kukloúmenon tóv troxón idvón ápse ékete brontím.

XXXVI b

*tíkous yápr (phsí) brountón éptá, kai õsa élalhisan aí éptá brountai
énellos gráfnein kai éléthei moi fíga gráfphs õsa élalhisan aí éptá brountai,
ára noeis épi toúton õti aí toúntai brountai élalhisan lágonous duvaméno
gráfsehain kai fíga gráfsehain kai õti tíkousen énábrhon fwnhys diá tis toua-
tics fwnhys õ leirós 'Iványnn. álla múptote aí éptá brountai aí élalhikía 5
tó 'Iványnn, éan pro(s)ychtís tís gráfph, eúrfshes tincn eisín múa brountí
cosía álalh brountí kúneic týtís brountí boulí̂: tetarí̂ brountí icýc-

XXXVI. 5. ìálh múptote cod: ìálh (om múptote) H. The omission
muóptote is wrong: it is a quite common locution with the indicative
in Origen's exegetical language—fully expressed it would be rendered
'see whether it is not the case that': it is 'perhaps', with a balance in
favour of the idea suggested.

XXXVI b. 5. ìálh múptote cod: ìálh (om múptote) H.,
but I do not venture to desert the MS where an irregular form could so
easily arise from the desire to avoid the three successive lambdas.

6. pro(s)ychtís H.: pro(s)ychtis cod 8. exébeia Diobouniotis, followed
by H.: svnncis cod, which word has however already been used for the
second thunder, l. 7.
Λαλουσών ἀκούσω τῶν βροντῶν, (οὐ) δύναμαι γράφειν, οἷδέ γάρ ἁγίων τῶν
κόσμων χαρῆται τὰ γραφώματα Βιβλία: ἀπὸ φωνῆς τῶν ἁγίων (β)ροντῶν τῶν
·λαλουσῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὥς ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἄμην.

XXXVII

Καὶ ἤλθεν καὶ ἐργὴ σου καὶ τὸ καίρος τῶν νεκρῶν κατὰ τὸν τῆς συντελείας
καίρον, φανερωθέντων πάντων τῷ Βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ ἱλαστήριῳ ἐκατὸ
ἐπαξίως τῶν βεβαιωμένων. ἡ ἐργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ συνίσταται, ἢν ἐκατόστοι ἐθνελγίσεν
ἐν τῇ ὁμορφίᾳ τῆς ἁπαλῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως Δικαιόφροσύνης τοῦ θεοῦ. ἐν ὧς}
καὶ ἁγίῳ καὶ ὁ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ ἁγίων (καὶ) φοβομένων τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ}
μισθὸς ἀποδοθήσεται. τῶν ὧν μισθὸς λαμψάνει τρία τάγματα δηλοῦνται, προφητῶν
καὶ ἁγίων (καὶ) ἐτέρων φοβομένων τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ὥστε (εἰ)
οἱ εἰσαγόμενοι εἰς εὐλαβείαν συμμαντοῦντο τῷ φοβεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ, οἱ ὧν}
καὶ μη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐτε φοβοῦσί σου τῷ τῶν ἁγίων προσγραφήσει:

9. 10. xxi 25

XXXVII. 1-5. Ἀποκ. xi 18 2. 2 Cor. v 10 3. Rom. ii 5, 6 10. Ps.

9. ὡς supplevi: om cod. The negative seems to me to be necessary
for the sense, and to be implied by the oȟδε that follows. 10. βροντῶν
H.: ἐροντῶν cod.

XXXVII. 2. τῷ scripsi: to cod 3. ἀνανέωταται: I suppose this
is equivalent to the late Latin constitutus est: ‘it is that wrath of
God, which . . .’ 5, 7. καὶ . . . καὶ H.: om bis cod. The insertions
appear necessary to the sense, for Origen speaks definitely of τρία
tάγματα. 7. εἰ supplevi: om cod. I do not think it is like Origen’s
style to say ‘And see, immature Christians are signified by . . .’: he
would say ‘consider whether immature Christians are meant by . . .’ or
as we phrase it ‘are not meant by . . .’ And εἰ would easily drop out
before ὡς. 11. καὶ εἰκός supplevi: om cod. Some such insertion
seems wanted before ὡς. I do not of course suggest that these are
necessarily the actual words. 12. προφήτου ὁ ἁγιὸς cod: προφήτης
τοῦ ἁγίων H., but the MS is right. ‘The term “saint” is a wider one
than “prophet”: for all prophets must be saints, but not all saints do
in fact prophesy.’ Possibly ἐπιπλεῖον should be printed as one word.
XXXVIII

Or(a) μὴ ὁ δράκων πολεμήσας μετά τῶν ἄγγελων καὶ θλι(π)eis, βληθείς κάτω ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐσωρεύν πίπτων τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων, ἀπερ ἄστρα θείας δύναμι(ε)ις οὐσίας (εἰκός) συναπτ(ε)στατηκέναι αὐτῷ καὶ συγκατενεχθήναι τῷ δράκοντι ὡς Ἡσαΐας φησίν πῶς εξεπεκεν ὁ ἐσωφόρος εὗ οὐρανοῦ;

XXXVIII. 1, 2. Apoc. xii 7, 9, 4  4. Is. xiv 12

XXXVIII. 1. ὅρα μὴ scripsi: ὅρμη cod, ὅρμη H. Origen asks us to consider whether, when we are told (Apoc. xii 4) that the dragon's tail draws the third part of the stars of heaven and has thrown them to the ground, we are not to understand that these stars were spiritual beings who rebelled with the dragon and were cast down from heaven with him; and so Isaiah speaks of the star of the morning as having fallen from heaven. θλιθείς H.: θληθεῖς cod  3. δύναμεις H.: δυνάμις cod εἰκός supplevi: om cod. As before, it seems imperative to supply a word to govern the infinitives. συναπεστατηκέναι H.: συναποστατηκέναι cod

Introduction

Ten years ago I published (J. T. S. xiii 386-397, April 1912) critical notes on the first half of the then newly known Scholia of Origen on the Apocalypse. Now I complete the task, but in order to make the notes more intelligible I print above the notes my revised text of the Scholia, xxviii—xxxviii, on which I am commenting.

The material is as follows: the editio princeps by Harnack and Diobouniotis Der Scholieng-Kommentar des Origenes zur Apokalypse Johannis in Texte und Untersuchungen vol. xxxviii part 3 (1911): early published notes included contributions by Dr Armitage Robinson in J. T. S. Jan. 1912 pp. 295-298; Dr G. Wohlenberg in Theologisches Literaturblatt Jan. 19, Feb. 2, May 10, 1912; Dr O. Stählin in Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift Feb. 3, 1912; Dr E. Klostermann in Theologische Literaturzeitung, Feb. 3, 1912; Dr Fr. Diekamp in Theologische Revue, Feb. 12, 1912.

My own notes to the text will I think sufficiently explain themselves. But I append two further notes: one on the word ἀπελαστικός which I have conjecturally restored in Schol. xxx l. 3, the other on the text of Origen's Biblical citations.

a. ἀπελαστικός

ἀπελαστικός, driving away, Eus. praep. ev. iv 1 πολλὰ εἶδοι ῥίζων . . .

1 Kindly contributed by Dr Darwell Stone, being his article on the word for the Lexicon of Patristic Greek.

\textit{b. Biblical text}

\textit{Old Testament}

2 Reg. xxiv 1 ὁργὴ Κυρίου with B²A: ὁργὴ Κύριος B* ἐπὶ Origen: ἐν AB καὶ (ante ἀριθμησον) Origen: om AB 'Ἰουδαίοι with AB²: 'Ἰουδαίο B

Paral. xxii 1 δίδακτος Origen: om δ AB

Ps. xxxiii (xxxiv) 10 οἱ ἄγιοι with N*U: ἧπειρον πάντες N²AB R

lix (lx) 6 δίδακτον Origen: δίδακτος NBR T

cxxxiv (cxxxv) 16 ἀλάχθονσι with ART: ἀλάχθοσιν B

Mic. vi 1, 2 ἀνάσταθι (I can find no authority for this form) Origen: ἀνάστηθι ABQ κρίθητι with B: καὶ κρίθητι A Q' Boulot with A Q*: λαοὶ B

Zach. iv 10 κυρίου with N Q (A): om B

Isa. xi 2 σύνησις (ἐν) Origen: ἑσύνησιν NABQ

Ezech. ix 5, 6 φείδοντε with B Q: φείδοσθε A τι Origen: om ABQ ἐφ' ὦς Origen: ἐφ' ὦς ABQ

\textit{New Testament}

Mc. iii 17 Βοανγέλια with later MSS: Βοανγέλια NABC etc. Our MS doubtless misrepresents Origen

Io. xxi 25 χαρῆσαι with A etc.: χαρῆσειν N BC*

Rom. ii 5 ἀποσκολύβες διαποκρίσισι with N*ABD*²: ἀ. καὶ  baiser MSS

\textit{Apocalypse}

v 5 ὁ ναήσας λέων ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς with N: ὁ ν. λ. ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς cett

v 6 ἐλθὼν with N: ἐλθὼν Α

καὶ τῶν πρεσβύτερων Origen: καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν π. cett ἄστηκός with A etc.: ἄστηκός N

ix 20 τὰ δαμόνα τὰ χρύσα Origen (see note on Schol. xxxv 1. 5): τὰ δαμόνα καὶ τὰ ἐιδώλα τὰ χρύσα cett

x 4 ὅσα ἐλάλησαν with N: ὅτε ἐλάλησαν Α etc.

xiv 4 οὕτω εἶσον (τε) with N etc.: om A

The material is not on a large scale: but the persistent tendency of N Origen to be found together—about which I hope some day to write something in the \textit{JOURNAL}—is once more in evidence.

\textit{C. H. Turner.}