

THE TEXT OF ROMANS, SECOND CORINTHIANS, AND  
GALATIANS IN THE WRITINGS OF ORIGEN OF  
ALEXANDRIA

by

MATTHEW RICHARD STEINFELD

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the  
degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

School of Philosophy, Theology, and Religion  
College of Arts and Law  
University of Birmingham  
September 2015

UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM

**University of Birmingham Research Archive**

**e-theses repository**

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

## ABSTRACT

This thesis gathers and analyzes Origen of Alexandria's citations of Romans, 2 Corinthians and Galatians in order to gain a better understanding of the nature of the New Testament text in the second and third centuries. Throughout the transmission process of Origen's writings, it is possible that the wording of his citations has undergone alteration that relates to changes in the New Testament transmission. Origen's citations are analyzed to determine whether his citations, as they are found today, first transmit the text quoted by the author, and, second, are likely to be a reflection of his biblical manuscripts. If Origen's authorial citations can be demonstrated to be from his biblical exemplars, it is only then that his citational text can be compared with New Testament manuscripts for the purposes of establishing textual affinity. If Origen's citations cannot be used to establish his biblical text, then his use as a witness to specific text-forms should be reconsidered. However, his citations still reveal the transmission history of his writings, specifically how they have undergone alteration in light of the historical and theological environments of his editors. The thesis concludes that Origen, despite often corresponding to the Initial text and Byzantine text agreements, cited freely with little extant manuscript support. This suggests that his authorial citations have been accommodated to a text form similar to that of the Initial text and then the Byzantine text through subsequent transmission.

*To Julie and Paul Coley, my dear friends*

*The research leading to these results has received funding in part from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement no. 283302 (COMPAUL: The Earliest Commentaries on Paul as Sources for the Biblical Text).*

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
List of Tables	3
General Abbreviations	5
Abbreviations of Primary Sources for Origen’s Citations	6
Abbreviation of Secondary Sources for Origen’s Citations	8
CHAPTER ONE	11
1.1 Introduction	11
1.2 A Working Definition of “Patristic Citation”	17
1.3 Historical Definitions of Patristic Citations	18
1.4 The Goals of NT Textual Criticism and Original Text	22
1.5 Citational Text vs. Biblical Text	27
1.6 Searching for Origen’s Citational Text	31
1.7 Verifying <i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i> with <i>Biblia Patristica</i>	34
1.8 Sources for Citational Text	38
1.9 Presentation of Origen’s Citational Text	43
1.10 Potential Shortcomigns of Procedures and Findings	46
1.11 Toward a Commentary on Origen’s New Testament Text	49
CHAPTER TWO	54
2.1 Secondary Sources for Origen’s Citations of Romans	54
2.2 Origen’s Primary Works as Sources for Citations of Romans	58
2.3 Verses of Romans Origen Does Not Cite	59
2.4 Markings and Introductory Material	60
2.5 Secondary Sources in Order of their Citational Frequency	61
2.6 Origen’s Primary Works in Order of their Citational Frequency	67
2.7 Textual Commentary on Origen’s Citations of Romans	74
2.8 Summary of Origen’s citations of Romans	137
CHAPTER THREE	139
3.1 Secondary Sources for Origen’s Citations of 2 Corinthians	139
3.2 Origen’s Primary Sources for Citations of 2 Corinthians	140
3.3 2 Corinthians Verses Origen Does Not Cite	142
3.4 Markings and Introductory Material	143
3.5 Secondary Sources in Order of their Citational Frequency	144
3.6 Primary Works in Order of their Citational Frequency	149
3.7 Textual Commentary on Origen’s Citations of Romans	159
3.8 Summary of Origen’s Citations of 2 Corinthians	203
CHAPTER FOUR	205
4.1 Secondary Sources for Origen’s Citations of Galatians	205
4.2 Origen’s Primary Works as Sources for Citations of Galatians	206

4.3 Verses of Galatians Origen Does Not Cite	208
4.4 Markings and Introductory Material	208
4.5 Secondary Sources in Order of their Citational Frequency	209
4.6 Origen's Primary Works in the Order of their Citational Frequency	213
4.7 Textual Commentary on Origen's Citations of Galatians	218
4.8 Summary of Origen's Citations of Galatians	243
CHAPTER FIVE	245
5.1 Secondary and Primary Sources of Origen and the Citations They Contain	245
5.1.1. Secondary Sources That Cite All Three Epistles	246
5.1.2. Primary Sources That Cite All Three Epistles	251
5.1.3. Secondary Sources That Cite Romans and 2 Corinthians	257
5.1.4. Primary Sources That Cite Romans and 2 Corinthians	258
5.1.5. Secondary Sources That Cite Romans and Galatians	260
5.1.6. Secondary Sources That 2 Corinthians and Galatians	260
5.1.7. Primary Sources That Cite 2 Corinthians and Galatians	261
5.1.8. Summary of Sources and Their Citations	261
5.2. Overall Textual Affinity of Citations from Individual Epistles	263
5.2.1 The Overall Textual Affinity of Romans Citations	265
5.2.2 The Overall Textual Affinity of 2 Corinthians Citations	267
5.2.3. The Overall Textual Affinity of Galatians Citations	269
5.2.4 Summary of Overall Textual Affinity	271
5.3. A Presentation of Significant Readings	273
5.3.1. Origen's Citations of Mixed Affinity	273
5.3.2 Origen's Readings Against the Initial Text and Byzantine Text	277
5.3.3 Mixture in the Early Sources for the Greek New Testament	289
5.3.4 Different Readings Between Origen's Works	293
5.4. Origen's Citational and Biblical Text	295
5.5. Implications Relevant to the Research Questions in Chapter 1	302
5.5.1 Goals of New Testament Textual Criticism and the Church Fathers	302
5.5.2 Reconstructions and Memory in Relation to Patristic Citations	303
5.5.3 What is a citation?	306
5.6. The Future of Patristic Citations	309
5.7. Recommendations for Future Research	313
BIBLIOGRAPHY	315
APPENDIX 1 — ORIGEN'S CITATIONS OF ROMANS	334
APPENDIX 2 — ORIGEN'S CITATIONS OF 2 CORINTHIANS	395
APPENDIX 3 — ORIGEN'S CITATIONS OF GALATIANS	413

## List of Tables

1. Variant Readings of Romans in Secondary Sources	55
2. Affinity of Romans Readings in Secondary Sources	56
3. Secondary Readings Excluding <i>Rom.Frag A &amp; D</i>	57
4. Variant Readings of Romans in Primary Sources	58
5. Weighted Readings of Romans in Origen's Works	58
6. Variant Readings of 2 Corinthians in Secondary Sources	139
7. Weighted Readings of 2 Corinthians in Secondary Sources	140
8. Variant Readings of 2 Corinthians in Primary Works	141
9. Weighted Readings of 2 Corinthians in Primary Works	141
10. Variant Readings of Galatians in Secondary Sources	205
11. Weighted Readings of Galatians in Secondary Sources	206
12. Variant Readings of Galatians in Primary Works	207
13. Weighted Readings of Galatians in Primary Works	207
14. <i>1Cor.Com</i> Readings	246
15. <i>Basil.Phil A</i> Readings	247
16. <i>Eph.Com</i> Readings	247
17. <i>Jer.Frag B</i> Readings	248
18. <i>John.Frag</i> Readings	248
19. <i>Ps.Exc</i> Readings	248
20. <i>Ps.Sel</i> Readings	249
21. <i>Rom.Frag A</i> Readings	249
22. <i>Cels</i> Readings	251
23. <i>Euches</i> Readings	251
24. <i>Jer.Hom A</i> Readings	252
25. <i>Jer.Hom B</i> Readings	252
26. <i>John.Com A</i> Readings	252
27. <i>John.Com B</i> Readings	253
28. <i>Mart</i> Readings	253
29. <i>Matt.Com A</i> Readings	254
30. <i>Matt.Com B</i> Readings	254
31. <i>Matt.Com C</i> Readings	254
32. <i>Pass</i> Readings	255
33. <i>Princ</i> Readings	255
34. <i>Ps.Frag</i> Readings	256
35. <i>Lam.Frag</i> Readings	257
36. <i>Prov.Exp</i> Readings	257
37. <i>Rom.Frag B</i> Readings	257
38. <i>Ex.Com</i> Readings	258
39. <i>Gen.Com</i> Readings	258
40. <i>Gen.Sel</i> Readings	258
41. <i>Hera.Dial</i> Readings	259
42. <i>Rom.Frag B</i> Readings	259



43. <i>Eze.Frag</i> Readings	260
44. <i>Luke.Frag</i> Readings	260
45. <i>Cant.Sch</i> Readings	261
46. <i>Rom.Frag C</i>	261
47. Textual Affinity of Romans Readings	265
48. Textual Affinity of 2 Corinthians Readings	267
49. Textual Affinity of Galatians Readings	269
50. Overall Affinity of Secondary and Primary Sources	273

## General Abbreviations

BP	Biblia Patristica
CPG	Clavis Patrum Graecorum
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
LXX	Rahlfs-Hanhart Septuagint, Editio altera
NA	Nestle-Aland 28 <sup>th</sup> edition
NTGF	The New Testament in the Greek Fathers
PG	Patrologia Graeca
RP	Robinson-Pierpont, The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform, second edition, 2005.
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
TLG	Thesaurus Linguae Graecae
VS	Hermann Freiherr Von Soden, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments (1913)

## Abbreviations of Primary Sources for Origen's Citations

<i>Apoc.Sch</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1468, <i>TLG</i> 2042.042, Scholia in Apocalypsem (scholia 1, 3-39), C.I. Dyobouniotes and A. von Harnack, Der Scholien-Kommentar des Origenes zur Apokalypse Johannis. Texte und Untersuchungen 38.3. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911. 21-44.
<i>Cant.Frag</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1433, <i>TLG</i> 2042.026 Libri x in Canticum canticorum (frag), W.A. Baehrens, Origenes Werke VIII. GCS 33.
<i>Cant.Sch</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1433, <i>TLG</i> 2042.076 Scholia in Canticum canticorum. PG 17.
<i>Cels</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1476, <i>TLG</i> 2042.001. Origène. Contre Celse. M. Borret, SC 132.
<i>Engas</i>	<i>TLG</i> 2042.013, De engastrimytho or Homilia in i Reg. [i Sam.] 28.3-25, Klostermann, Origenes Werke, vol. 3, GCS 6, 283-294.
<i>Euches</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1477, <i>TLG</i> 2042.008, De oratione, P. Koetschau, Origenes Werke, vol. 2 GCS 3. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1899: 297-403.
<i>Ex.Com</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1413, <i>TLG</i> 2042.049, Fragmenta ex commentariis in Exodum, PG 12. 1857-1866: 264-281.
<i>Ex.Hom</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1414, <i>TLG</i> 2042.023, Homiliae in Exodum, W.A. Baehrens, Origenes Werke VI, GCS 29.
<i>Eze.Hom</i>	<i>TLG</i> 2042.027, Homiliae in Ezechielem, W.A. Baehrens, Origenes Werke, vol. 8 GCS 33. Leipzig: Teubner, 1925]: 319-320, 323, 327-329, 336-337, 340, 354-355, 378, 390, 396, 426-427, 434-435, 450-452.
<i>Gen.Com</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1410, <i>TLG</i> 2042.047, Commentarii in Genesim (fragmenta), PG 12, 1857-1866: 45-92.
<i>Gen.Hom</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1411, <i>TLG</i> 2042.022, Homiliae in Genesim (in catenis), W.A. Baehrens, Origenes Werke VI, GCS 29
<i>Gen.Sel</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1410, <i>TLG</i> 2042.048, Selecta in Genesim (fragmenta e catenis), PG 12, 1857-1866: 92-145.
<i>Hera.Dial</i>	<i>TLG</i> 2042.018, Dialogus cum Heraclide, J. Scherer, Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide SC 67, 1960 52-110.

- Jer.Hom A* CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009, In Jeremiam (1-11), P. Nautin, Origène. Homélie sur Jérémie, vol. 1 SC 232. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976.
- Jer.Hom B* CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021, In Jeremiam Homiliae 12-20. P. Nautin & P. Husson, Origène. Homélie sur Jérémie, vol. 2 SC 238 (this edition superceded E. Klostermann, Origenes Werke, vol. 3, GCS 6. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901: 85-194).
- Job.Hom A* CPG 1424, TLG 2042.086, Homiliae in Job, J.B. Pitra, Analecta Sacra II.
- John.Com A* CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005, Commentarii in evangelium Joannis (lib. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13, C. Blanc, Origène. Commentaire sur saint Jean, 5 vols. SC 120, 157, 222, 290, 385. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1:1966; 2:1970; 3:1975; 4:1982; 5:1992]: 1:56-390; 2:128-580; 3:34-282; 4:44-360; 5:58-360.
- John.Com B* CPG 1453, TLG 2042.079, Commentarii in evangelium Joannis (lib. 19, 20, 28, 32) E. Preuschen, Origenes Werke IV, GCS 10
- Lev.Hom* TLG 2042.024, Homiliae in Leviticum, W.A. Baehrens, Origenes Werke VI GCS 29.
- Luc.Schol* TLG 2042.078, Scholia in Lucam (fragmenta e cod. Venet. 28), PG 17.
- Luke.Hom* CPG 1451, TLG 2042.016, Homiliae in Lucam, M. Rauer, Origenes Werke IX, 2d ed, GCS 49.
- Mart* CPG 1475, TLG 2042.007, Exhortatio ad martyrium, P. Koetschau, Origenes Werke, vol. 1 GCS 2. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1899: 3-47.
- Matt.Com A* CPG 1450, TLG 2042.028, Commentariorum series in evangelium Matthaei (Mt. 22.34-27.63), E. Klostermann, Origenes Werke, vol. 11, GCS 38.2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1933]: 4, 21-22, 42-43, 54, 83-84, 86, 93-101, 103, 108, 110, 112-114, 118-128, 130-138, 140, 144-151, 156-157, 159-163, 166, 171, 178, 180, 189, 191-192, 206, 219-220, 222, 227, 229-230, 233, 236-242, 244-248, 250-255, 257-266, 270-278, 283-284, 287, 293-295.
- Matt.Com B* CPG 1450, TLG 2042.029, Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei (lib. 10-11), R. Girod, Origène. Commentaire sur l'évangile selon Matthieu, vol. 1 SC 162. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970: 140-386.

<i>Matt.Com C</i>	<i>CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030, Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei (lib. 12-17), E. Klostermann, Origenes Werke, vol. 10.1-10.2 GCS 40.1-40.2. Leipzig: Teubner, 10.1:1935; 10.2:1937: 10.1:69-304; 10.2:305-703.</i>
<i>Nave</i>	<i>TLG 2042.054, Parts of Jesu Nave [Joshua] (frag catenis), PG 12, 820-824.</i>
<i>Osee</i>	<i>TLG 2042.063, Osee Commentary (frag), PG 13, 825-828.</i>
<i>Pass</i>	<i>CPG 1480, TLG 2042.118, De pascha, B. Witte, Die Schrift des Origenes "Über das Passa" [Arbeiten zum spätantiken und koptischen Ägypten 4. Altenberge: Oros, 1993]: 88-148.</i>
<i>Princ</i>	<i>CPG 1482, TLG 2042.002, De principiis, H. Görgemanns and H. Karpp, Origenes vier Bücher von den Prinzipien. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976:</i>
<i>Ps.Frag</i>	<i>CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044, Fragmenta in Psalmos 1-150, J.B. Pitra, Analecta sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata, vols. 2 and 3. Paris: Tusculum, 2:1884; 3:1883: 2.444-483; 3.1-236, 242-245, 248-364.</i>
<i>Rom.Frag C</i>	<i>CPG 1457, TLG 2042.038, Commentarii in Romanos (III.5-V.7) (Papyrus Cairo Journal d'Entrée (Cairo Museum) 88748 + cod. Vatican. gr. 762), J. Scherer, Le commentaire d'Origène sur Rom. III.5-V.7. Cairo: L'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1957: 124-232.</i>

#### Abbreviations of Secondary Sources for Origen's Citations

<i>1Cor.Com</i>	<i>CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034 Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam i ad Corinthios (in catenis) C. Jenkins, "Documents: Origen on I Corinthians," Journal of Theological Studies 9 &amp; 10 (1908): 9:232-247, 353-372, 500-514; 10:29-51.</i>
<i>Basil.Phil A</i>	<i>CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019, Philocalia sive Ecloga de operibus Origenis a Basilio et Gregorio Nazianzeno facta. J.A. Robinson, The Philocalia of Origen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893.</i>
<i>Basil.Phil B</i>	<i>CPG 1502, TLG 2042.020, Philocalia sive Ecloga de operibus Origenis a Basilio et Gregorio Nazianzeno facta. E. Junod, SC 226</i>

<i>Deut.Adnot</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1419, <i>TLG</i> 2042.070] Adnotationes in Deuteronomium (fragmenta e catenis), PG 17
<i>Deut.Sel</i>	<i>TLG</i> 2042.053, Selecta in Deuteronomium (fragmenta e catenis), PG 12. 1857-1866: 805-817.
<i>Eph.Com</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1460, <i>TLG</i> 2042.035, Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam ad Ephesios (in catenis) J.A.F. Gregg. "Documents: The commentary of Origen upon the epistle to the Ephesians." <i>JTS</i> 3 1902.
<i>Ex.Sel</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1413, <i>TLG</i> 2042.050, Selecta in Exodum (fragmenta e catenis), PG 12.
<i>Eze.Frag</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1442, <i>TLG</i> 2042.062, Selecta in Ezechielem (fragmenta e catenis), PG 13, 1857-1866: 768-825.
<i>Jer.Frag A</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1438, <i>TLG</i> 2042.084, Fragmenta in Jeremiam (e Philocalia) E. Klostermann, Origenes Werke III GCS 6
<i>Jer.Frag B</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1438, <i>TLG</i> 2042.010, Fragmenta in Jeremiam (in catenis), E. E. Klostermann, Origenes Werke, vol. 3 GCS 6. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901: 199-232.
<i>Job.Hom B</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1424, <i>TLG</i> 2042.057, Homiliae in Job, PG 12.
<i>Job.Hom C</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1521, <i>TLG</i> 2042.073, Homiliae in Job (fragmenta in catenis, typus II) from cod. Marc. gr. 21, 538, PG 17.
<i>John.Frag</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1453, <i>TLG</i> 2042.006, Fragmenta in evangelium Joannis (in catenis), E. Preuschen, Origenes Werke, vol. 4 GCS 10. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903: 483-574.
<i>Lam.Frag</i>	<i>TLG</i> 2042.011, Fragmenta in Lamentationes (in catenis), E. Klostermann, Origenes Werke III, GCS 6.
<i>Luke.Frag</i>	<i>CPG</i> 1451, <i>TLG</i> 2042.017, Fragmenta in Lucam (in catenis), M. Rauer, Origenes Werke, IX, 2nd edn. GCS 49 (35)
<i>Prov.Exp</i>	<i>TLG</i> 2042.075, Expositio in Proverbia (fragmenta e catenis), PG 17, Paris: 1857-1866: 161-252.
<i>Ps.Exc</i>	<i>TLG</i> 2042.074, Excerpta in Psalmos [Dub.], PG 17.

- Ps.Sel* CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058, *Selecta in Psalmos* [Dub.] PG 12, Paris: Migne, 1857-1866: 1053-1320, 1368-1369, 1388-1389, 1409-1685.
- Rom.Frag A* CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036, *Commentarii in epistulam ad Romanos* (I.1-XII.21) (cat), A. Ramsbotham, "Documents: The commentary of Origen on the epistle to the Romans," *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 & 14 (1912): 13:210-224, 357-368; 14:10-22.
- Rom.Frag B* CPG 1457, TLG 2042.037, *Commentarii in epistulam ad Romanos* (from Codex Vindobonensis Greek 166) K. Staab, "Neue Fragmente aus dem Kommentar des Origenes zum Römerbrief," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 18 (1928): 74-82.
- Rom.Frag D* CPG 1457, TLG 2042.039 *Commentarii in Romanos* (cod. Athon. Laura 184 B64), O. Bauernfeind, *Der Römerbrieftext des Origenes nach dem codex von der Goltz, Texte und Untersuchungen* 44.3. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1923]: 91-119.

## CHAPTER ONE

### 1.1 Introduction

Origen of Alexandria (184-254 AD) was one of the most prolific writers and influential theologians of the early Church. Considering that his literary career predates all extant Greek manuscripts of the Pauline Epistles, copies of his writings could provide access to the earliest periods of the Greek New Testament text (Papyrus 46, the earliest surviving manuscript of Paul's epistles is consistently dated to the mid- to late third-century)<sup>1</sup>. If it is the case that the earliest attestations of the New Testament are contained in the writings of the Church Fathers, these patristic citations must be established genuinely to reproduce the text of biblical manuscripts known to their authors before they are used in the field of New Testament textual criticism. The significance of this thesis is that it will demonstrate that an exhaustive examination of Origen's citations of Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians is inconclusive in establishing the extent to which the biblical text transmitted in these writings goes back to Origen and whether it derives from biblical manuscripts known to him.

The inability to establish the exact source for Origen's citations is often a reflection of the oral and memory-based culture of his time. This is seen in the widespread illiteracy of the Roman Empire, as well as in the high view of memory in direct opposition to textual precision.<sup>2</sup> The earliest Christian movements grew out of Jewish oral culture and employed memory-based learning methods. The high cost of

---

<sup>1</sup> See further Edgar B. Ebojo, *A Scribe and His Manuscript: An Investigation into Scribal Habits of Papyrus 46* (P. Chester Beatty II – P. Mich. Inv. 6238), unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 2014, p. 148.

<sup>2</sup> William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, Harvard University Press, 1991), 324-325; in regard to Ancient and Koine Greek perspectives of memory over text cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 274 and Papias, *Fragments* 1.



manuscript production also restricted personal access to these documents and limited scriptural knowledge to liturgical reading. Though Origen possessed a library of manuscripts, the influence of orality and memory is apparent in his own citations where he sometimes cites the same passage in different ways, with both an awareness of differing readings in available manuscripts and also flexibility in his varying interpretations. This free nature, often in contrast to other citations that correspond to the text of modern critical editions of the Greek New Testament, suggests that many of Origen's citations have been accommodated during the course of their transmission to the text-forms known to his copyists. As none of the authorial copies of Origen's writings exist, one must address the problems of accommodation through the extant copies, all of which were copied hundreds of years after the life of Origen and represent the ongoing transition from an oral to textual tradition.

In 1941, a trove of manuscripts was discovered in Tura, Egypt, just south of Cairo. Among these documents were works by Didymus the Blind and Origen. Of Origen, the following works were found: Dialogue with Heraclides, a discourse on Easter, Commentary on Romans (extracts of books 5 & 6), a homily on 1 Kings, a sermon on the Witch of Endor, and Contra Celsum. Among the manuscripts found, Papyrus Cairo 88748 is the earliest document for a work of Origen. It has been palaeographically dated to the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> century. The Dialogue with Heraclides was found for the first time in Tura, though the copies of Contra Celsum found proved to resemble forms previously known to scholars. Despite being the earliest extant documents of Origen's writings, they are hundreds of years later than his authorial writings.

Patristic citations as attestations to the early biblical text are often considered a third line of evidence.<sup>3</sup> That is, they come behind continuous-text manuscripts and versions. On the other hand, Fee suggests “when properly evaluated, patristic evidence is of *primary* importance, for both of the major tasks of New Testament textual criticism: In contrast to the early Greek manuscripts, the Church Fathers have the potential of offering datable and geographically certain evidence.”<sup>4</sup> This dual demonstration could provide a fuller picture into the biblical text, especially since New Testament manuscripts rarely indicate such characteristics. Patristic citations could provide supplementary evidence for periods of time from which there is no manuscript evidence, namely the first two centuries AD.

Fee offers caveats about what keeps the patristic writings from being a most significant witness, that is, proper evaluation. The potential issues Fee speaks about include but are not limited to: (1) determining whether a Church Father has cited from a copy of his biblical text or “from memory”, (2) establishing the “citing techniques” or practices of a Church Father, (3) assessing the “character/type of work involved” i.e. genre, and (4) whether a “number of Bibles used by the Father” is the reason for varying citations of the text.<sup>5</sup> Fee then states that there are three broader problems: “reflecting

---

<sup>3</sup> F. J. A. Hort, *Two Dissertations* (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1876) 1-72, esp. 30-42; *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Introduction and Appendix (London: Macmillan, 1896), 107-115; B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1924), ch. 4; M. J. Suggs, “The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text,” *NTS* 4 (1957/1958): 139-147 who calls the Church Fathers as “supplemental”; B. M. Metzger, “Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament,” *NTS* 17 (1971/1972): 379-400, who speaks of them as “indirect”; B. M. Metzger and B. D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 126-134; D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) 108-118.

<sup>4</sup> Fee and Mullen, “The Use of the Greek Fathers,” 351.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, 344.

in turn the Father himself, the transmission of his evidence, and our own need to discriminate carefully what is truly primary and what is not."<sup>6</sup> The proper evaluation of Patristic citations will be a prevalent theme throughout this thesis.

Ehrman shares Fee's optimism of what carefully handled patristic citations could yield, though he too, shows skepticism as when he warns "the quotations of Scripture in them [the Church Fathers] are spotty, often periphrastic, and likewise subject to the vagaries of textual transmission."<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, he says "even though they must be used with caution, the Church Fathers can play an invaluable service for those interested in establishing the original text of the New Testament. No longer can we continue to ignore them."<sup>8</sup> The use of patristic citations for establishing the "original text" will, likewise, be a prevalent theme throughout this thesis.

The potential gains that could come from the Church Fathers in the form of elusive early Christian textual data are often held back by the potential problems that have been mentioned above.<sup>9</sup> As possible indirect witnesses to biblical manuscripts, the task required in order to responsibly use the patristic citations as witnesses to the New Testament manuscripts first requires that the textual problems of the Church Fathers citations are resolved.<sup>10</sup> This demands that the textual study of the Church Fathers is a

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Bart D. Ehrman, "Patristic Evidence and Textual Criticism" in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 249.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> "It is true of New Testament quotations in the Church Fathers as it is of the versions that they are often misjudged and consequently misused. The route from a modern edition of the Church Fathers work back to the text which he read in his New Testament may be long and tortuous." Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1987), 166.

<sup>10</sup> "All the scribal questions asked of the NT MSS themselves must also be applied to the Fathers texts, and especially to that portion of their text where they cite Scripture. It has long been recognised that he

pre-requisite before citations can be applied to the overall discipline of Greek New Testament textual criticism. This task for the patristic textual scholar often results in “extreme caution” which leads to “total neglect” or the exact opposite, citations elevated “as primary evidence...due to lack of proper caution.”<sup>11</sup> These attestations are not quick fixes for the unexplainable problems in the biblical documents, and previous scholars who have suggested their immediate application have demonstrated this misstep.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, the opportunity and difficulty the citations afford are equally powerful.<sup>13</sup>

The value of patristic Citations of the New Testament is not something that has been previously ignored. Francis Lucas of Brugge first investigated patristic writings for the purpose of textual criticism in the sixteenth century; Erasmus, in his 1516 edition of the Greek New Testament likewise cites several Church Fathers: Ambrosius, Athanasius, Augustine, Cyprian, Gregory of Nazianzus, Origen, and Theodoret.<sup>14</sup> Griesbach also carried out investigations of patristic citations in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>15</sup>

---

monks of the Middle Ages, to whom we are indebted for many of the extant copies of the Fathers, sometimes tended to conform biblical passages to a more contemporary text—although as Suggs has pointed out, this problem can be overstated, since there is also good evidence that the trained copyist normally aimed at verbal accuracy.” Fee and Mullen, “The Use of Greek Patristic Citations,” 345.

<sup>11</sup> Gordon D. Fee, “The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations” from *Biblica* 52 (1971), 301.

<sup>12</sup> For example, M.-E. Boismard, in a series of articles in *Revue Biblique* (1948, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1957).

<sup>13</sup> “And yet there are today more problems connected with the New Testament quotations, even in the works of outstanding editors, that would be imagined.” Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 167.

<sup>14</sup> On Brugge: Eberhard Nestle, William Edie, and Allan Menzies, *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1901), 146; Desiderius Erasmus, *Novum Instrumentum omne* (Basel: Johann Froben, 1516).

<sup>15</sup> Johann Jacob Griesbach, *Dissertatio Critica De codicibus quatuor evangeliorum Origenianis* (Halle: Litteris Hendelianis, 1771); repr., J. J. Griesbach, *Opuscula Academica* (ed. J. P. Gabler, vol. I, Hena, 1824), 226-317; *Commentarius Criticus in Textum Graecum Novi Testamenti* (2 vols; Jena: Goepferdt, 1798, 1811); *Symbolae Criticae Ad Supplendas Et Corrigendas Variarum N.T. Lectionum Collectiones* (2 vols.; Halle, 1785, 1793).

It looks as if this is a growing field of study as many relatively recent inquiries have been made concerning the citations of the Church Fathers<sup>16</sup> in general and in regard to Origen's text, specifically.<sup>17</sup> A recent wave of PhD and Master's theses on the subject has also brought new investigations into the conversation.<sup>18</sup> Historically, investigations on Origen's text are generally limited to the Gospels.<sup>19</sup> In fact, there are no modern investigations of Origen's citations of any Pauline letter other than 1 Corinthians, which was undertaken by Darrell Hannah, published in the Society of Biblical Literature's *New Testament in the Greek Fathers (NTGF) series*.<sup>20</sup> The scope of this thesis is a response in content and methodology with regard to the remaining task

---

<sup>16</sup> A list of the most recent projects known by the International Greek New Testament Project is given at <http://www.igntp.org/patristic.html>.

<sup>17</sup> A thorough list up to the year 1982 of those who have contributed to the study of Origen has been put together by Henri Crouzel in his "Bibliographie critique d'Origène," in *Instrumenta Patristica VIII* (Steenbrugge: Abbey of St Peter, 1971, and its supplement in 1982).

<sup>18</sup> See Jared Anderson, "An Analysis of the Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen," MA diss., University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, 2008; James Jeffrey Cate, "The Text of the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation in the Writings of Origen," PhD thesis, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1997; Amy M. Donaldson, "Explicit References to New Testament Variant Readings Among Greek and Latin Church Fathers," PhD thesis, University of Notre Dame, 2009; F. Pack, "The Methodology of Origen as a Textual Critic in Arriving at the Text of the New Testament," PhD thesis, University of Southern California, 1948; Raquel, Sylvie Taconnet "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen," PhD thesis, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002.

<sup>19</sup> See F. C. Burkitt, "W and Θ: Studies in the Western Text of St. Mark," *JTS* 17 (1916), 20; Ernst Hautsch, *Die Evangelienzitate des Origenes*, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1909; Kwang-Won Kim, "Origen's Text of John in His On Prayer, Commentary on Matthew, and Against Celsus." *JTS* (1950), 83; Kirsopp Lake, Robert Blake, and Silva New, "The Caesarean Text of Mark," *HTR* 21 (1928): 207-404; Streeter, *The Four Gospels*; Sylvie Taconnet Raquel, "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen." (Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002).

<sup>20</sup> Darrell Hannah, *The Text of I Corinthians in the Writings of Origen* (NTGF 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997). Over the past 30 years, this series has published several volumes on patristic citations. This series has been published by the Society of Biblical Literature from 1986-2008. Bart D. Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels* (NTGF 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986). To date, there are 7 volumes of this series. Volumes 2-7 are: James A. Brooks, *The New Testament Text of Gregory of Nyssa* (NTGF 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991); B. D. Ehrman, G. D. Fee, and M. W. Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen* (NTGF 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); Jean-François Racine, *The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea* (NTGF 5; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2004); Carroll Osburn, *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis* (NTGF 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2004); and Roderic Mullen, *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem* (NTGF 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997). Independent of this series is a very recent dissertation accepted on Origen's text of Acts, Stanley N. Helton, "The Text of Acts of the Apostles in the Writings of Origen," Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014.

of investigating Origen's citations of the Pauline epistles. The epistles chosen in this thesis simply consist of the three remaining Pauline *Hauptbriefe* yet to be considered by patristic textual critics. Nevertheless, the appeal of the Church Fathers as witnesses to the Greek New Testament has encouraged investigations of their citations for centuries and will hopefully continue to do so.

## **1.2 A Working Definition of "Patristic Citation"**

A preliminary issue affecting any project on patristic citations is defining what is meant by "patristic citation". How scholars define this term is often telling in regard to how citations will then be used in textual criticism (discussed below). Considering the varying perspectives, it was important that this thesis first defines what is meant by "citation" in order that there be no confusion as the discussion proceeds. Therefore, in this thesis, a Greek New Testament citation is recognizable New Testament content reproduced in the writings of Origen. This definition of "citation" is rather broad considering the more nuanced categories commonly used in publications on patristic citations discussed below. This means that any New Testament content in the writings of Origen will be considered his "citational text". These definitions will be helpful later as Origen's writings contain multiple citations of the same sections of biblical text, many of which are different from each other. This means that the citational text may be different from one citation to the next even if the citations are of the same text (i.e. Romans 5:7) or in the same work of Origen (i.e. *Cels*). Also, the term "biblical text" (in reference to Origen) will refer to his personal exemplars or Greek New Testament documents that he may have used directly to quote New Testament content. Lastly, one way this thesis

distinguishes between works that are truly Origen's versus works that are attributed to him is through the terms "primary" and "secondary" sources. For example, works that are known to be Origen's such as *Contra Celsum* or *On First Principles* are considered primary. On the other hand, text from a catena or a margin believed or even noted to be from Origen will be considered secondary.

### 1.3 Historical Definitions of Patristic Citations

One of the major contributors in this area of understanding patristic use of the New Testament is Gordon Fee. He emphasized the "need to devise a set of criteria, or guidelines, by which to assess the degrees of certainty or doubt with regard to any patristic citation."<sup>21</sup> By nature, this suggests that not all biblical content in the Church Fathers' writings is considered a patristic citation as understood in section 1.2 above.<sup>22</sup> Fee defined his own criteria in the following way:<sup>23</sup>

"Allusion: A reference to the content of a biblical passage in which *verbal correspondence to the NT Greek text* is so remote as to offer no value for the reconstruction of that text." [emphasis mine]

"Adaptation: A reference to a biblical passage, which exhibits *verbal correspondence to the Greek NT*, but which has been

---

<sup>21</sup> Fee and Mullen, "The Use of the Greek Fathers," 191-207.

<sup>22</sup> The perspective that patristic citations must be vetted as citations is common. "Patristic citations are not citations unless they have been adequately analyzed." Robert M. Grant, "The Citation of Patristic Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus," *New Testament Manuscript Studies*, eds. M. M. Parvis and A. Wikgren; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), 124; Dimant defines patristic citations as "biblical phrases of at least three words, more or less accurately reproduced, and introduced by special terms and explicit references to the source." Devorah Dimant, "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apokrypha and Pseudepigrapha," *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, eds. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling; CRINT 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990) 379-419; Fee and Mullen, "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations"; Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel*; This approach is also followed by Mullen, *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*.

<sup>23</sup> Fee, "Text of John in Origen and Cyril," 362.

adapted to fit the Fathers discussion and/or syntax.” [emphasis mine]

“Citation: Those places where a Father is *consciously trying to cite*, either from memory or by copying, the *very words of the Biblical text*, although citations may be either ‘genuine’ or ‘loose’.” [emphasis mine]

Though these definitions were introduced in his 1971 publication, these categories still reflect the same methodological stance used decades later in his work on Origen’s text of John.<sup>24</sup> Indeed, many other scholars have adopted this categorization over the last 40 years.<sup>25</sup> The need to set out a working definition of “citation,” “citational text,” and “biblical text” (§1.2) should start to become clear in view of Fee’s definitions and their widespread use among the various investigations of the Church Fathers.

Fee’s “criteria, or guidelines” for determining what is a patristic citation are clearly based on “verbal correspondence” to extant Greek New Testament manuscripts and his own judgment where “a Father is consciously trying to cite.”

The level of correspondence to the Greek New Testament determines his category of “allusion”. This means that whatever Greek New Testament text Fee chooses as a benchmark to collate a particular citation determines the accuracy of a citation that was written at a point in time, where there are now are no manuscripts extant for the Pauline epistles. His definition of “adaptation” requires either an awareness of the Church Father’s exemplar to be able to determine he is adapting the biblical text, or a New Testament text, which is assumed and is imposed upon the

---

<sup>24</sup> Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel*, 22.

<sup>25</sup> All of the works found in note 21 (page 12) have adopted this categorization. Many of the Master’s theses and Ph.D dissertations on Origen’s text, likewise, use this terminology c.f. note 19 (page 12.)



Church Father. The last definition, of “citation”, consist of those reproductions of text in the writings of the Church Fathers where (1) the intentions of the Church Fathers are known (“consciously trying”), and (2) it can be determined that the Church Father is either citing from memory or an exemplar. It appears that in the process of using patristic evidence to determine the earliest possible text and transmission history of the New Testament, the citations of the Church Fathers are assessed according to extant manuscripts and their departure from known readings of the New Testament. Yet Fee continuously raises the shortcomings of erroneous methodologies.<sup>26</sup>

His awareness that most citations are “either incomplete, ambiguous, or unreliable” has caused him to base citations’ value on their correspondence to known New Testament manuscripts.<sup>27</sup> Fee’s definitions have been created to determine citational accuracy, which is determined by a comparison of critical editions of the Church Fathers and a benchmark Greek New Testament critical text. Perhaps determining the intentions or the possible agreements between hypothetical exemplars of the second or third century and extant manuscripts is not the best “first step” of working with patristic citations.

If the patristic witnesses are to address the “original text” (as Fee states), then such categorizing definitions of what the Church Fathers cite undercuts the value of those readings that are demoted to Fee’s lesser forms of attestations. After all, if a second or third century exemplar (now lost) was being used by a Church Father in his

---

<sup>26</sup> "The problem here rests with the judgment, or lack thereof, exercised by those who use these data. This is often true of individual scholars, whose use of patristic evidence sometimes belies a failure to have worked carefully with a Church Father’s citation in context." Fee and Mullen, "The Use of the Greek Fathers," 355.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 353.

works, according to Fee's definitions, it would be considered "from memory" or "loose". If the extant manuscripts are the benchmark, then the earliest text that the Church Fathers are being used to establish will only end up establishing whichever benchmark hand-edition they are compared to. To state Westcott and Hort's maxim, "Knowledge of documents should precede final judgment upon readings".<sup>28</sup> The process of defining a citation's category as a *preliminary* step is the reversal of this maxim.

The attempt to distinguish citations from allusions can be seen as early as Griesbach, though he also stressed the importance of including all citations for data despite their lack of reflection of a known manuscript.<sup>29</sup> This seems to be the best way forward, as it is only once citations are compared to each other that an understanding can be formed of how the individual Church Fathers cite the New Testament, which then informs the scholar of which citations appear to be authorial patristic citations. It is only after citations can be deemed authorial that they could ever address the biblical exemplars of the Church Fathers.

Ironically, Fee himself stated that much of the uncertainty of using patristic citations "is due, not only to the use of uncritical editions but to the uncritical evaluation of the Father's habits of citation."<sup>30</sup> However, to pre-determine a Father's citation goes against his own warnings of "critical evaluation". Fee's assumption that "verbal correspondence" and observable intentions of citation can then demonstrate not just authorial citations, but the text of biblical exemplars is a large leap. This will be apparent

---

<sup>28</sup> B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction and Appendix* (Second edition. London: Macmillan, 1896), 31.

<sup>29</sup> J. J. Griesbach, *Curae in historiam textus Graeci epistolarum Paulinarum* (Ienae: Fickelscherr, 1777) 25-28.

<sup>30</sup> Fee, "Text of John in Origen and Cyril," 361.

in the next three chapters when Origen is listed as support for multiple readings in the same unit of variation in the Greek New Testament.<sup>31</sup>

The way in which terms are defined in the study of patristic witnesses has much impact on which citations will be included or excluded, how they will be used as evidence, and ultimately what implications can be made about furthering an understanding about the earliest Greek New Testament text.

#### **1.4 The Goals of NT Textual Criticism and Original Text**

Historically, the goal of textual criticism of the Greek New Testament has been the recovery or reconstruction of the “original text”. Epp claims “virtually all textual critics from the outset of the discipline have assumed that their goal is to discover and to restore the original text of the New Testament.”<sup>32</sup> As reflected in the statement by Aland and Aland that “only one reading can be original,” the idea of a single, authorial, text for each New Testament book has guided the practice for centuries.<sup>33</sup> In relation to the previous centuries of the discipline, the last few decades have gradually moved away from this concept, at least in the Gospels. Parker suggests that multiple forms of the text

---

<sup>31</sup> “...“a Church Father not infrequently quotes the same passage in more than one form, often from memory rather than by consulting a manuscript, and may therefore appear in support of differing readings.” Kurt, Aland, and Eberhard Nestle, *The Greek New Testament* (New York: American Bible Society, 1966), xxx; Suggs, “The Use of Patristic Evidence,” 139- 47; Osburn, *The Text of the Apostolos*,” 34: “Fee draws attention to instances in which a Father presents quotations reflecting two or more text forms, and suggests the following guidelines: 1. At times, careful analysis indicates that the Father knew and used only one text form, and that the second quotation reflects either (a) faulty memory, or (b) inconsequential omissions or adaptations to the new context. In most cases, Fee suggests, the long form reflects the Fathers text and the short form is a Fathers abbreviated version. 2. At other times, it appears that the Father knew and used two or more different forms of the text, e.g., Origen’s citations of Mark in his “Commentary on John.” 3. When one cannot decide in this regard, Fee suggests that it is less likely that a Father knew and used two different texts than either that he is careless or that an error has made its way into his own textual tradition. This being the case, one cannot know the reading of the Fathers text.” (from Fee, “Greek Patristic Citations,” 260).

<sup>32</sup> Eldon J. Epp, *Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism*, 67.

<sup>33</sup> Aland and Aland, *Text of the New Testament*, 280.

existed early on "as a free, or perhaps, as a living, text" in that the origins of the Gospel tradition were spread orally, undercutting the claims of a four-fold unmixed recoverable original text.<sup>34</sup> Parker questions whether there actually was an original text of the Gospels, while others, such as Epp, question the possibility of recovering it, if such existed, when he suggests that we should "no longer think so simplistically or so confidently about recovering the New Testament in the Original Greek."<sup>35</sup>

As these concepts have gained traction, there have been attempts to create a uniform vocabulary of how to speak of the earliest New Testament. These are still various, despite the move away from the previous goal of establishing an original text. Mink, in his study of textual contamination, introduced the term "*Ausgangstext*," or Initial Text, to designate readings selected in the *Editio Critica Maior*.<sup>36</sup> This hypothetical reconstruction represents the earliest readings of the extant New Testament manuscripts. This need not be an "archetype" or a representation of a lost manuscript "from which all extant manuscripts descend."<sup>37</sup> This means that the Initial Text is somewhere chronologically after an original text and before an archetype of all extant manuscripts.<sup>38</sup> Trobisch suggests that critical hand-editions of the New Testament should aim to reconstruct the first edition of the New Testament (the extant tradition's

---

<sup>34</sup> Parker, *The Living Text*, 200.

<sup>35</sup> Epp, "A Continuing Interlude, 176.

<sup>36</sup> Gerd Mink, "Problems of a Highly Contaminated Tradition," 25. NA28, *Introduction*, 52\*.

<sup>37</sup> Klaus Wachtel, "*The Textual History of the Greek New Testament*," 6.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 6. Wachtel goes on, "It is clear that there is not evidence that could prove that the resulting 'initial' text ever existed in exactly the reconstructed form. The reconstruction remains hypothetical, although it claims to get closer to the authorial text than the archetype." *Ibid.*, 7.

archetype), which is more around the time of Origen, namely, the late second or early third century.<sup>39</sup>

Despite the differing goals for the earliest text, textual scholars of differing perspectives can all agree that, based on the manuscripts that exist today, a great majority of the Greek New Testament is undisputed.<sup>40</sup> That is, what can be known about the earliest extant manuscripts, only takes us so far, namely, the third century when the manuscript evidence stops, or before in the form of hypothetical reconstructions. Kurt Aland notes this lack of confidence to go when he refers to the “naïveté” and “fundamental error” of the scholar who still thinks that the transmission history can lead back to an original text.<sup>41</sup>

The *Editio Critica Maior* (ECM), which has been adopted in the Nestle-Aland 28<sup>th</sup> edition, has only so far produced the Initial Text for the Catholic Epistles. Work is currently in progress on the Gospel of John and the Acts of the Apostles. This thesis has anticipated the production of the ECM for the rest of the New Testament and

---

<sup>39</sup> Trobisch, *The First Edition of the New Testament*, 6.

<sup>40</sup> "Most manuscripts included in the ECM apparatus agree at more than 85%, Wachtel, *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament*, 221; "...it is all too easy to overlook the fact that the Byzantine Imperial text and the Alexandrian Egyptian text, to take two examples that in theory are diametrically opposed to each other, actually exhibit a remarkable degree of agreement, perhaps as much as 80 percent!" Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 28; "The Byzantine and Alexandrian text have been estimated to agree as much as 90 percent," Maurice A. Robinson and William G. Pierpont, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform*, 2005 (Southborough, MA: Chilton, 2005), 584; "The stability of the New Testament text under consideration, from the early papyri to the Byzantine text, achieves an average of 92.6 percent." K. Martin Heide, "Assessing the Stability of the Transmitted Texts of the New Testament and the *Shepherd of Hermas*," in *The Reliability of the New Testament: Bart D. Ehrman and Daniel B. Wallace in Dialogue*, ed. Robert B. Stewart (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011), 138.

<sup>41</sup> Kurt Aland, "The Twentieth-Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism," in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*, eds. Ernest Best, R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 11.

adopted the text of NA28 as the Initial Text.<sup>42</sup> The justification for this is the small number of changes to the text of the Catholic Epistles between NA27 (not dependent on the ECM) and NA28.

The Robinson-Pierpont edition will serve as the representation of the Byzantine form of the biblical text in order to provide a rough guide to the affiliation of the biblical quotations. It is important to note the issue of the Byzantine Text and its effect on earlier forms of the Greek New Testament. Fee notes that the Byzantine “editors and textual workers” were influential in “shaping the stylized Byzantine text.”<sup>43</sup> Pack adds, “The process that ended with the Byzantine text-type finds its beginnings in Origen's methodology, for it was a process of “correction” of the knowledge, use and conflation of different textual traditions...”<sup>44</sup> In terms of patristic citations, Ehrman suggests that in units of variation in the citations of the Church Fathers it is best to choose the reading that disagrees with the “later ecclesiastical text.”<sup>45</sup> Considering these comments as representation of a wide acceptance that the Byzantine Text was later and secondary, this thesis will proceed with this at the forefront of its explanation of the textual transmission of Origen.

It is often assumed that the recovery of an original text would result in an end-all explanation for the history of the New Testament, that it would reflect the exact text and

---

<sup>42</sup> Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Holger Strutwolf. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012. For TLG, see <http://www.tlg.uci.edu/>.

<sup>43</sup> Gordon D. Fee, "P75, P66, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria" from *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974) 19-45.

<sup>44</sup> Frank Pack, "The Methodology of Origen as a Textual Critic in Arriving at the Text of the New Testament." Unpublished Dissertation. University of Southern California, 1948, 346-47

<sup>45</sup> Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 127.

the author-preferred reading. Aland's assessment seems appropriate considering the issues of original text in other disciplines such as English literature. Such issues are seen in the publication history behind the novel *Frankenstein, The Modern Prometheus* by Mary Shelley. Shelley and her husband (Percy B. Shelley), originally published as a three-volume edition in 1818 and a second two-volume edition in 1822. There has now been a publication of Mary Shelley's original draft that has been separated from Percy Shelley's amendments which proves to be a significantly different text than the original publication by the two.<sup>46</sup> Another famous example would include the famous original manuscript of *Great Expectations* by Charles Dickens, which displays the complexities of the editorial process and no clear indication of what is the original text or the author's intentions amongst the multiple, barely legible notes.<sup>47</sup>

Indeed, the failure of the historical goal of the New Testament textual criticism discipline created the realization that we must settle for the earliest possible text instead. Moreover, it has caused a change of focus in the explanation of the transmission history of the New Testament.<sup>48</sup>

As the focus of textual criticism of the New Testament has moved toward explaining the transmission history of extant manuscripts instead of recovering an original text, hopefully, the discipline of patristic citations will follow suit. Variant readings

---

<sup>46</sup> Mary Shelley, Percy B. Shelley, *The Original Frankenstein*, ed by Charles Robinson, (New York: Vintage Book, 2009); Charles E. Robinson, *The Frankenstein Notebooks: A Facsimile Edition of Mary Shelley's Novel, 1816-17 (Parts One and Two)*; *The Manuscripts of the Younger Romantics, Volume IX*, General Ed., Donald H. Reiman. Garland Publishing, 1996.

<sup>47</sup> Charles Dickens, *The Manuscript of Great Expectations*, from the Townshend Collection, Wisbech (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

<sup>48</sup> "It must be recognized that every significant variant records a religious experience which brought it into being. This means that there are no "spurious readings"; the various forms of the text are sources for the study of the history of Christianity." D. W. Riddle, "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline," *ATHR* 18 (1936), 221.

in the New Testament manuscript tradition have led to the use of secondary evidence such as patristic citations and versions to help explain the periods of time before extant manuscripts, namely the first few centuries of the Greek New Testament. To combat the trend, this thesis will investigate all of Origen's citations on their terms. It will attempt to explain the textual evidence of the New Testament in Origen, to develop a story of how Origen's citations have become what they are, and to show that they indeed have been changed throughout their transmission history. This insight will be applied to textual studies of the wider Greek New Testament tradition. Just as the original text of the New Testament manuscripts is an unlikely destination, so too the authorial citations of Origen are often unattainable. However, even if they are recoverable, it must still be determined if such citations represent his biblical manuscripts. Considering this, when dealing with patristic citations, it is important that not only the citations of the Church Fathers be confirmed as from the actual author, but also that such citations are a reflection of that particular Church Father's biblical manuscripts. This is especially important in Origen's writings, as his citations are often clearly authorial, yet show no attempt to cite a specific manuscript reading.

### **1.5 Citational Text vs. Biblical Text**

Only fragments of manuscripts exist from the first few centuries of the Greek New Testament. It is unknown which manuscripts Origen had in his possession. Most of his writings have been lost, and the works that are extant are only in copies made hundreds of years after his lifetime. To add to these problems, it still remains to be seen whether Origen's citations as they stand actually reflect his authorial citation. And lastly, if his



citations are authorial, do they demonstrate the wording of whatever manuscripts he had or knew?<sup>49</sup> These are serious issues that must be addressed with a methodology that accounts for such uncertainties. To anticipate such problems, there must be a distinction between Origen's citational and biblical text. Therefore, the task of the patristic textual scholar is to assess his citational text (citations) in order to establish his authorial citations. Through the process of understanding his authorial citations, only then can his readings be compared to the New Testament manuscript evidence in order to determine Origen's agreement or disagreement to known text-forms. If the textual tradition of the New Testament is first compared to Origen's citations before Origen's citations are considered to be authorial, the results could misrepresent Origen's textual nature considering some of his citations have been changed over time and are therefore not a reflection of Origen's biblical text.

If there is inconsistency in his citations, this could be caused by several scenarios: (1) citations are a reflection of multiple biblical manuscripts verbatim,<sup>50</sup> (2) biblical text was cited freely from memory,<sup>51</sup> (3) or subject to alteration in the subsequent copying process. Given the nature of the transmission and copying process

---

<sup>49</sup> "Purely quantitative methods are not applicable (because the transmission of data is random, rather than regular." Michael W. Holmes, "Working with an Open Textual Tradition: Challenges in Theory and Practice," 74. In other words, the citational texts of Origen cannot simply be compared to New Testament manuscripts without rendering erroneous results; Eldon J. Epp, "The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission" in *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism Collected Essays, 1962-2004* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 291.

<sup>50</sup> "...perhaps it is folly even to assume he had only one Bible at any given time." Gordon D. Fee, "The Text of John in *The Jerusalem Bible: A Critique of the Use of Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism*" from *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971) 163-73.

<sup>51</sup> If, as was usual, it was from memory, can this memory be trusted to reproduce the copy of Scripture he must have possessed? Ibid; "...a Church Father not infrequently quotes the same passage in more than one form, often from memory rather than consulting a manuscript, and may therefore appear in support of different readings." K. Aland, *The Greek New Testament*, xxx.

in the early Church, all three factors are likely to be involved in most patristic citations.<sup>52</sup>

On the other hand, if Origen's citational text is consistent, there may also be several factors for this scenario: He (1) may have cited the same biblical text as found in his manuscript(s) for all places that citation is found, or (2) in the copying process of the patristic works, the patristic citations were accommodated to a secondary biblical text, giving the false impression of unity in the citational text.

If a Church Father's citational text is inconsistent, the problems abound and the textual critic must best assess the reasons for inconsistency (or mixture) based on the available evidence.<sup>53</sup> Likewise, if patristic citations are consistent, even then the citational text must not be assumed to be the biblical text of the Church Father for the last reason stated above. A Church Father may very well be consistent and the subsequent copies of his writings may reflect this. However, this must be shown to be due to the Church Father citing technique not the work of later hands and not subsequent copyists.

When patristic citations of the same passage are consistent and are deemed to be the authorial citational text of the Church Father, it is here that the citational text can be compared to the wider evidence of the Greek New Testament manuscripts. To reach an authorial citational text that is likely to be that of the Church Father is the goal of the patristic textual scholar. This goal is also possible. If multiple attestations to the same

---

<sup>52</sup> "When the manuscripts of a father differ in a given passage, it is usually safest to adopt the one that diverges from the later ecclesiastical text (the Byzantine Text or the Vulgate)." Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 127.

<sup>53</sup> On mixture see Fee and Mullen, "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations," 359; Evert Wattel and Margot van Mulken, "Shock Waves in Text Traditions," in *Studies in Stemmatics* (ed. Pieter van Reenen and Margot van Mulken; Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996), 106; Holmes, "Working with an Open Textual Tradition," 68.

section of biblical text are the same in the various writings of a Church Father, it is possible that such repetition is an indication of an authorial reading, especially if it is different from known text forms of the New Testament. However, just because a citation might be authorial does not demand that such a citation is a reflection of a Church Father's manuscript text. This means if Origen's free citations are clearly authorial, it would be detrimental to understanding Origen's manuscripts if one were to conclude that his manuscripts contained such readings.

In summary, if there is evidence that suggests Origen's citational text is authorial, and consistent with other readings of the same biblical passage in his different works, this could represent a biblical text reading. Such examples are especially helpful in places where certain text forms such as the Initial Text (NA in this thesis) and the Byzantine text (RP in this thesis) are identical. On the other hand, the units where these text-forms disagree indicate where to assess Origen's citations. If Origen's citations agree with RP against NA, it is most likely that his citations have been changed by his readers or copyists that were most familiar with the Byzantine text.<sup>54</sup> Likewise, if his citations are identical to these hand-editions in some places and are free in other places,, it could mean that Origen's free citations have been partially accommodated to a more widely known text-form.

---

<sup>54</sup> Gordon D. Fee, Revised by Roderic Mullen, "The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis Second Edition*, ed Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 354; Frank Pack, "The Methodology of Origen as a Textual Critic in Arriving at the Text fo the New Testament." Unpublished Dissertation. Univeristy of Southern California, 1948), 257; Suggs, "Use," 140;

## 1.6 Searching for Origen's Citational Text

In order to carry out an investigation of Origen's citations two main types of resources are available: (1) lists indicating where and what Origen cites, and (2) a searchable text database for all of Origen's works. *Biblia Patristica* could serve as a starting place for the former.<sup>55</sup> Indeed, it lists all citations and allusions in their biblical order, yet the authors' parameters for "citation" or "allusion" appear to follow Fee's categories, which proves problematic.<sup>56</sup> For the latter, TLG is used as the source for finding the citations within Origen's works.<sup>57</sup>

Continuing with the premise that "a patristic citation occurs when there is recognisable biblical content reproduced in the writing of the Church Fathers", the search for Origen's citations began with a selection of both a search text and a database: the NA28 and the TLG<sup>58</sup>. The result of searches within TLG relies entirely on the text that is searched. To find all of Origen's citations in the database requires flexibility in the search text. This flexibility allows alternative forms besides the exact search text to be found. The NA benefits electronic searches in two ways: (1) the critical

---

<sup>55</sup> *Biblia Patristica* is a 5-volume set that catalogues patristic citations of the Old and New Testaments. It has been as a platform for research in this field in that it serves not only as a starting place for finding citations, but it can also help comparatively when assessing the extent of a search already undertaken. The third volume is dedicated to Origen alone. J. Allenbach, *Biblia Patristica: index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique* (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975). The use of *Biblia Patristica* in the current thesis is described in the next section §1.7. BP can now be found in its entirety online at <http://www.bibliindex.mom.fr>.

<sup>56</sup> See Fee's guidelines in §1.3.

<sup>57</sup> See <http://www.tlg.uci.edu/about/>, "The *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* is a Special Research Project at the University of California, Irvine. It is administered by a Director who reports to the UCI Vice Chancellor for Research. Founded in 1972 the TLG represents the first effort in the Humanities to produce a large digital corpus of literary texts. Since its inception the project has collected and digitised most texts written in Greek from Homer (8 c. B.C.) to the fall of Byzantium in AD 1453 and beyond. Its goal is to create a comprehensive digital library of Greek literature from antiquity to the present era. TLG research activities combine the traditional methodologies of philological and literary study with the most advanced features of information technology."

<sup>58</sup>

apparatus provides alternative readings to the main text that can be searched, (2) an eclectic text of the New Testament allows for more diversity in the search results than using a specific manuscript or an edition based on a limited range of manuscripts (e.g. the Byzantine Text).

The search strings used in the present study to identify Origen's citations consist of 3 consecutive words of the NA text with results in any order with a maximum of 7 words between the first and second word, and the first and third word. In other words, if two consecutive words in the biblical text are searched, it only produces results where these words are within 7 words of each other in Origen's text. Each subsequent search will take the second word of the previous search as its first word and so on. All variants in the critical apparatus will be searched as if they were substituted in the base text of NA.

Since the vocabulary of the biblical text is often expressed in various forms, searching for lexical roots offers one way of maximising the results, which allows for the possibility that Origen's citations might contain stylistic variations or alternate readings. This is easily done with TLG by using the wildcard feature. One can trim any word as much as desired by replacing the trimmed parts with a hyphen. For example, for an advanced search of Galatians 1:2 in Origen's corpus one could search "αδελφ-" + "εκκλησι-" + "Γαλατ-". The word separation limit was set at seven to allow for the possibility that Origen's citations were stylistically inconsistent. This decision concerning separation was made simply to allow for any possible citations to be recovered from the database. Instead of selecting Origen's citations and assessing them independently as

to their likelihood of reflecting his biblical text, all citations of Origen are gathered in order to assess them in relation to each other.

To illustrate this, an example from Galatians 2:1 will be demonstrated. The first four words of the verse read "Ἐπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν. The first search will consist of the words 1-3: ""Ἐπειτ-" + "διὰ" + "δεκατεσ-" (all within a 7 word span, in any order). The following search will consist of "διὰ" + "δεκατεσ-" + "ἐτῶν" (i.e. words 2-4, same criteria). The entire text of each of Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Romans was inputted through TLG in thousands of individual 3 word searches from beginning to end. This process included the base text of NA but also all variant readings found in the NA critical apparatus substituted for the base-text where NA indicates variation. The search feature did not require that the words be in sequential order. This means that issues of transposition in Origen's citations would not affect the results from searches. However, issues of substitution had some impact on the search results.

This methodology served as a catchall for all readings listed in the NA apparatus and base-text. The parameters of the search were very wide considering that it was for the purpose of gathering every possible indication of these three epistles in Origen's corpus. The inclusivity of the seven-word formula helped to alleviate the pressure of having to define the various categories of "citation" found in the various literature. Simply put, if it met the criteria, it was then assessed.

The major units of Greek grammar make up the structure of any patristic citation.<sup>59</sup> Conversely, many commonly used words in sentences are not helpful in a

---

<sup>59</sup> "While the wording of the primary text is often reproduced verbatim, it is not uncommon for a citation to be adapted to the patristic context and/or sentence structure, yet retain much of the lexical and syntactical

textual search, such as (some) conjunctions, articles, particles, and high-context Christian terms (i.e. “word of God”, etc).<sup>60</sup> In the case of the last example, a search that finds the exact words searched for, but from a different biblical text, such as a New Testament book citing a Septuagint passage, such results are removed from the citation list for the three epistles at hand. Searching in a way that only covers the “structure” of a verse ensures that unique and important words are incorporated into the search, while skipping recurrent words that may disrupt search results. One key aspect of TLG is the ability to circumvent such recurrences.

In order to assess how my search was going, a test was created to compare my results using TLG with the list in BP. The results of this test will be discussed next.

### **1.7 Verifying *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* with *Biblia Patristica***

The citation list in BP was compared to my own findings in TLG for one work found in two volumes, *Jer.Hom A* and *Jer.Hom B* (SC 232, 238). This originally came about to check whether any citations were overlooked, as well as a way to test whether I would use BP. The results were telling and will be discussed below. BP lists 71 citations of Romans from Origen's Homilies on Jeremiah, all of which are extant in Greek, taken from the following critical editions<sup>61</sup>:

Homélies Sur Jérémie 1 (I-XI), Sources Chrétiennes 232

---

structure of the text. The choice to cite accurately or to adapt appears to be based primarily on how well the language of the text coincided with the patristic point being made.” Osburn, “Methodology in Identifying,” 330.

<sup>60</sup> Fee and Mullen, “The Use of the Greek Fathers,” 358.

<sup>61</sup> P. Nautin, Origène. *Homélies sur Jérémie*, vol. 1, I-XI, Sources chrétiennes 232, (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976): 196-430; P. Nautin & P. Husson, Origène. *Homélies sur Jérémie*, vol. 2, XII-XX, Sources chrétiennes 238, (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976).

## Homelies Sur Jérémie 2 (XII-XX), Sources Chrétiennes 238

Out of a total of 71 citations, only 16 were also identified using TLG and the method described in §1.6 above. Of the 71 citations, 9 are not listed in the critical edition's scriptural index (located in the appendix of SC 232, 238), and 2 citations I had overlooked. That means the remaining citations, were free, loose enough to not even be picked up by the triple word formula, which means the majority of the citations listed in BP do not even meet the inclusive requirements to be used as a "citation".

The critical edition itself, a two-volume set, identified what the editors deemed to be references or citations within footnotes and appendices. These are marked in the text body with quotation marks to indicate material from the Greek New Testament. Since only nine are not listed by the critical edition, which are included in BP, the majority of BP's citations are located within the indices of the critical edition. This originally caused concern in that it appeared that BP adopted the citations listed in the Scripture Index of the critical edition for Origen's homilies on Jeremiah for its own list of citations.

Six citations listed for Romans either did not exist or were typographical errors. They are as follows with the biblical verse, homily, section page and line listed respectively: 1:13 14,3 (70,20); 9:33 39,1 (372,5); 8:7 3,2 (316,85); 10:13 20,7 (280,5); 11:3 4,16 (102,6); 11:1 5,1 (280, 38).

Of those listed, one citation is at the end of the page and carried over to the next. As a result it is counted twice. Another citation is labelled "Homily 39, section 1" which does not exist considering there are only 20 homilies on Jeremiah. Another is an OT



citation of Joel. Though, it is cited by Paul in Romans, it cannot be distinguished between Joel or a Romans citation of Joel. Another is labelled as "Homily 4, section 16" yet Homily 4 only has 6 sections making this impossible. Two are examples of places that were listed in the index yet either had no text in agreement with Romans or even a citation where indicated.

The main issue with BP is not the previously mentioned errata or its practical functionality. The largest problem I encountered using BP in relation to my research was the excessive inclusivity of their list. The following is a review of several Romans citations listed in BP for Origen's Homilies on Jeremiah.

(1) Homily 14,3 contains the reading *ωφεληθεί ἂν τῷ ἐκεῖνος καρπούς ἐν αὐτοῖς* which is listed as a citation for 1:13 which reads in the NA, *οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν.*

(2) Homily 12,13 contains the reading *Ὁ δὲ ἀκούων τῆς περιτομῆς κεκρυμμένως ἐν κρύπτῳ περιτομηθήσεται,* which is noted as related to 2:29 which reads in the NA, *ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι, οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ.* Again, there is vocabulary overlap, but not enough to warrant including it.

(3) A reading in Homily 12,13 has *προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἰλασμόν περὶ τῶν αμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.* Despite the overlap of *προέθετο ὁ θεός* which is in Romans 3:25, the nouns *ἰλασμόν περὶ τῶν αμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν* hints at 1 Jn 2:2, 4:10. Despite some overlap in content, it matched more with non-Pauline works, which warranted its removal from the citation list.

(4) Homily 14,11 contains the reading *ἔτι ὄντων αμαρτωλῶν ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν* which is footnoted in BP as Romans 5:6.

(5) Homily 7,3 contains the reading *τό σῶμα τό τῆς ἀμαρτίας* which is contained in Romans 6:6. However, despite meeting the inclusivity formula, the commonly used word makes the citations inconclusive.

(6) Homily 20,7 contains a reading which includes the word ταλαίπωρος, found in Romans 7:24. The context of this citation is in agreement with the epistles investigated in this study. However, only one word is in agreement to the text of Romans 7:24.

(7) Homily 7,3 contains the reading ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκος ἁμαρτίας which is a phrase that appears in Romans 8:3. This should be considered a citation, as there is exact wording and there are no variants for this passage in the Greek New Testament hand-editions.

(8) Homily 13,1 contains more of a reference than a citation in the reading τῷ γὰρ ἐκείνων παραπτώματι ἡ σωτήρια ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς το παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς in relation to Romans 11:11. There are several nouns and verbs related to the biblical passage yet it does not maintain several grammatical characteristics such as a direct object and verbal forms.

(9) Homily 4,5 contains the reading εἰ ὁ θεός τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο ποσό πλέον ἡμῶν οὐ φείσεται. It resembles Romans 11:21 in that there are several vocabulary agreements, yet there is a high level of stylistic freedom. This is a clear reference but not a citation.

(10) Homily 12,8 contains the phrase διὰ τα τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα which is related to Romans 15:19 but is probably a reference different in noun case and word order.

The examples that have been briefly discussed above all meet the following description: (1) they are marked in the indices of the critical edition for Homilies on Jeremiah, (2) they are listed in BP, and (3) they are not be considered as intentions to cite biblical text. For those listed in the critical edition and found in BP, the issues with the above examples were very common. Many were not included upon the grounds of a general lack of connection to Romans, vagueness, or, sometimes as a LXX reference. Both the indices in the Origen critical edition and BP included readings that do not meet my inclusivity formula. Of those briefly mentioned, being generous, only a few could be considered citations. Those that were not mentioned are even less related to a biblical manuscript reading.

Considering the issues at hand, when working with patristic citations it is imperative to set parameters for inclusion. BP should not be considered as a *de facto* starting point for searching for patristic citations, which was helpful to discover early on through comparison to my original search with TLG. The main reason is that most entries in its volumes, despite being citations, are not conclusively related to the particular biblical verses they are listed under. This problem is magnified when editors of a list such as BP accept the decisions of an individual editor for each of the works used. If a critical edition notes a section of text as a citation, it should not warrant that a reference tool such as BP include such information unless it is clearly indicated in the terms of inclusivity in the introduction.

Due to the issues that arose from using BP as a tool to compile an exhaustive list of Origen's citations, the TLG became the starting point for an independent search for Origen's citations. In the end, if one is primarily concerned with compiling a complete list of patristic attempts to cite biblical text, it requires just as much time to use a volume such as BP and confirm its findings as it would be to conduct an original independent search that has generous parameters for inclusion.

### **1.8 Sources for Citational Text**

The manuscript tradition of Origen's works is vast and critical editions serve the textual scholar as the source for citations, not simply for convenience, but for the best possible readings.<sup>62</sup> However, critical editions are reconstructions based on the various extant manuscripts. On some level, critical editions are hypothetical and might not

---

<sup>62</sup> Fee, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril," 359.

represent the authorial writings of the patristic authors. Considering that Origen's earliest manuscripts are from the 7<sup>th</sup> century, even the best critical edition could be a depiction of what Origen's works (and therefore citations) have become, not what they were.

Though critical editions free researchers from the task of assessing all manuscripts of Origen, it is possible that Origen's authorial citational text is lost in the editing process of the edition, and with it, his possible biblical text. Therefore, any project short of a collation of all Origen manuscripts must leave room that they could portray a text that Origen never knew. This confirms the decision that the search for citations be wide and inclusive in order to get the most data for internal comparison. Despite the inevitable varying quality of the dozens of critical editions used as sources, the process of comparing citations of the same content through the Origen corpus will hopefully weed out readings unlikely to be Origen's.

Ideally, all the works of a Church Father are to be consulted when searching for citations of the New Testament. A search for Origen's citations relies on critical editions as they "increase our access to the Fathers' New Testament texts" and these are the texts that make up the searchable texts of databases like TLG.<sup>63</sup> This search also relied heavily on *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (CPG),<sup>64</sup> a multi-volume series, to identify the

---

<sup>63</sup> Fee and Mullen, "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations," 246; Suggs, "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text" *NTS* 4 1957, 147.

<sup>64</sup> Maurice Geerard, *Clavis patrum graecorum: qua optima quaeque scriptorum patrum graecorum recensione a primaevis saeculis usque ad octavum commode recluduntur*, Turnhout, 1974–2003; vol. 1 : *Patres antenicaeni, schedulis usi quibus rem paravit*, F. Winkelmann, 1983 ; nos 1000 to 1925; vol. 2 : *Ab Athanasio ad Chrysostomum*, 1974; nos 2000 to 5197; vol. 3 : *A Cyrillo Alexandrino ad Iohannem Damascenum*, 1979; nos 5200 to 8240; vol. 3 A : *A Cyrillo Alexandrino ad Iohannem Damascenum : addenda volumini III, a Jacques Noret Parata*, 2003; vol. 4 : *Concilia : catenae*, 1980; nos starting at

most recent publication of critical editions for Origen's works. Once the citations were found and listed according to verse, it was verified that the most up-to-date critical edition was used for all works in TLG. For example, the search text for several works in TLG is based on superseded GCS volumes. The *Clavis* helped identify subsequent volumes, such as those by SC, which were then manually looked through to verify that the same citations existed in the places indicated in the previous editions by TLG versus the updated sources listed in CPG.<sup>65</sup>

Once the works of Origen and their citations were updated to the most recent editions, they were stacked and spatially aligned to discern textual differences. The comparative nature of this thesis in relation to Origen and his citations with his other citations alleviates the need to reconstruct a definitive biblical text for each verse of the three epistles investigated. Instead, using what readings are extant, it will attempt to determine whether each individual reading is likely to be authorial. Or rather, instead of establishing a single representative text, each citation will be considered as a possible authorial reading. This allows for multiple authorial readings of Origen in the same place and does not assume just one biblical text behind his citational texts, alleviating any assumption Origen had a definitive text for each epistle. Also, due to the fact that all citational evidence has been taken from critical editions of Origen, any reconstruction on my part would be a creation of a critical edition of Origen using other critical editions, which may not represent some of the manuscript readings of Origen's works.

---

9000; vol. 5: *Indices, initia, concordantiae, cura et studio M. Geerard et F. Glorie*, 1987; vol. 6: *Supplementum cura et studio M. Geerard et J. Noret*, 1998.

<sup>65</sup> As citations were found in the SC volumes, it was required that verse and line number of SC replace the numbers from GCS as there were frequently divergent numbering systems of text-line, sections, and chapters as a result of the differing ways the editions were structured.

Fee suggests that the “reconstructions of the biblical text of the early Greek Fathers, are currently the most urgent need for the study of patristic citations in NT textual criticism.<sup>66</sup> Again, this is Fee’s most urgent need because, despite his warnings to the contrary, his work and the work of the series of which his treatment of Origen is a part is primarily concerned with comparing citational text to manuscripts as if the citational text of the Church Fathers was their reconstructed biblical text.<sup>67</sup> Instead, the texts of NA and RP for each verse will be compared with each of Origen’s citations from all his works for each individual verse. This comparison will not be to determine affinity, but rather to measure all of Origen’s citations and their various agreement with the NA and RP text.

From a methodological standpoint, attempting to reconstruct a definitive biblical text of Origen’s should be avoided. The reason is that reconstructions (or a single established text of Origen) have been used primarily for comparative studies in regard to the Greek New Testament manuscripts. Such models often do so with the goal of placing the Church Fathers in a definitive textual affinity. However, from the outset of finding citations independently through TLG, it was apparent that several forms of the same verses co-existed in Origen’s citations. For these reasons, to attempt to reconstruct a definitive citation for each of the verses would be to ignore the various forms of Origen’s authorial citations as a free-citer. Despite, the possibility of identifying one authorial citation and the others as transmissional, a reconstruction would still presume one specific biblical text behind that one authorial citation.

---

<sup>66</sup> Fee, "Text of John in Origen and Cyril," 358.

<sup>67</sup> Fee and Mullen, "The Use of the Greek Fathers," 353.

Each reading that met the inclusive requirements noted above was collated to both the NA and RP texts. All of the units of variation were then searched for within the critical apparatus of the editions of Nestle-Aland 28, Tischendorf's editio octava maior, Tregelles, and Von Soden's editions.<sup>68</sup> While many of these units of variation found in Origen's citations were not in the NA critical apparatus, some were found in the other three as will be discussed in Chapters 2, 3, and 4. It was the combination of these four critical apparatus' that provided the external evidence for Origen's readings in this thesis. The shortcomings related to the decision to use the four critical editions are to be discussed later in Chapter 5 (§5.7).

It was a mixture of external evidence that supported the readings of Origen in relation to NA and RP, as well as the manuscript support of his various forms of the same verses that led to a list of conclusions of how (a) Origen might have originally cited in each individual place, and (b) how Origen's text might have changed over the transmission history of his individual works.

In regard to preliminary inquiry, the collation of Origen's citations, as they are found in critical editions, reveals the ways Origen cited biblical text among his various works. The editors, however, have chosen the readings. Origen's citations are edited selections taken from critical editions in lieu of an exhaustive presentation of extant manuscripts of Origen's works. Despite not having transcribed and listed what Origen's manuscripts read, if critical editions have chosen the best readings for each of Origen's

---

<sup>68</sup> Constantine von Tischendorf, Caspar René Gregory, *Novum Testamentum Graece: ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit*. Lipsiae: J.C. Hinrichs, 1872; Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, *The Greek New Testament* (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1813-1875); Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt* (3 vols; Berlin: A. Glaue, 1902-10).

works, then a collation among all of Origen's works even from an edition should still result in a wealth of units of variation. In places where Origen cites particular verses multiple times, the impact of the editorial process in the making of critical editions of Origen's works is much less. These units will reveal the places in which the manuscripts of the Greek New Testament can then be examined as support for specific Origen readings.

The second aim is to help better understand the history of how Origen's citations of the Greek New Testament have undergone change, but also why, if they have indeed changed. From its inception, the New Testament has undergone change. Therefore, this should be apparent in Origen's citations. Once patristic citations can be determined confidently, then they can stand as representations of that particular Church Father's time and location in the transmission history of the Greek New Testament.

### **1.9 Presentation of Origen's Citational Text**

Within the textual commentaries, each of Origen's citations is labeled with the siglum Or and a corresponding letter (a-z) within parentheses (i.e. Or(e)). Though each of Origen's works have a *Clavis* and TLG number, each work is placed in a new referencing system which brings elements of both systems in a unified catalogue. Typically, the new abbreviations for Origen's work in this thesis contain a word (2 letters or longer) of the name of the work (i.e. *Orat* or *1Cor*) and another word (3 letters or longer) describing the type of material/document (*Ps.Frag* for the fragmentary Psalms commentary). This might include a subsequent letter if there are multiple sources within the same work and material (i.e. *Rom.Com B* for Romans Commentary #2). The format



of this abbreviation system is an adaption of the system used in BP, but, since it includes both Greek and Latin sources, a wholesale adoption of BP's system was avoided.

The full list of citations in the Appendix will consist of the following elements: (1) identifier in parentheses, (2) the citation text, and (3) source.<sup>69</sup> The apparatus presents manuscript witnesses cited in the Greek New Testament critical editions of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Von Soden, and NA. Witnesses will be presented in my apparatus in the following order: Origen, NA text, RP text, papyri, majuscules, minuscules, and lectionaries. Versions and other Church Fathers will not be included in my apparatus. Versions are omitted because only Greek sources are consulted. Other patristic citations are not listed on the grounds mentioned later in Chapter 5. However, one main reason for not including other patristic citations is that Origen is early and citations from others might be reproductions of Origen.

In order to display the transmission history of Origen's citations, a positive apparatus would be required to indicate all variant readings for all units of variation in all biblical manuscripts for the verses Origen cites. Such an apparatus would indicate how the various manuscripts of the Greek New Testament relate to Origen's readings and relevant units of variation. To create such a tool would be an enormous endeavour. Considering the limits of a doctoral thesis, it seemed more compelling to focus on places of disagreement between the NA and RP texts and Origen to characterise Origen's affinity as well as major manuscripts of the New Testament relative to Origen. One thing a comparison between major critical editions of the New Testament does is

---

<sup>69</sup> These abbreviations can be found in the List of Abbreviations on page 1.

reveals the number of instances where they all agree with Origen. The majority of the Greek New Testament consists of these unified agreements. This process will filter out the units of variation where there is full agreement between NA, RP, and Origen allowing the conflicting units of variation to be located and discussed. Units of variation that will be discussed in the subsequent three chapters of this thesis are determined by the relationship between Origen, NA, and RP. These chapters will specifically address Origen's citing style, consistency, and the likelihood of alteration. If a citation only covers part of a verse, it is omitted from the apparatus for other variation units. When a citation leaves out an expected part of the beginning or the end of a text it is not counted as an omission, rather what is present in a citation will be considered where available.

On the other hand, some single citations contain sections of biblical text that have multiple units of variation. Among these units of variation within a single citation, some citations reflect opposing mixtures of affinity, as the citation reflected multiple text forms. The location where citations have a mixture of different text forms indicates that Origen's text has undergone accommodation. For example, Princ 3:1:21:3 in a citation of Romans 9:19 reads ἐρεῖς μοι οὖν with NA against RP's ἐρεῖς οὖν μοι, yet then omits οὖν in the following unit of variation against NA with RP. Agreement or disagreement with various text forms or biblical manuscripts is not enough to assess Origen's citations. However, looking at how Origen's citations agree with each other, and in places where there are units of variation between NA and RP can provide examples of how Origen's citations have changed.

## 1.10 Potential Shortcomings of Procedures and Findings

Considering the vast amount of writings Origen produced, limitations were required concerning which data were to be considered. Either the scope of Origen's works was to be limited, or the amount of works for investigation. It was eventually decided that a wider scope of a select few epistles would help explain Origen's citing of the Greek New Testament better. Considering that this thesis is calling into question general ideas about how patristic citations are used as evidence for the wider discipline of Greek New Testament textual criticism, a consideration of all of Origen's works for a few epistles seemed best. However, even limitations on which parts of the New Testament to consider still leaves substantial shortcomings in a comprehensive explanation of Origen's citations of the Greek New Testament.

Each work of Origen has its own manuscript lineage. The best witness of *Contra Celsum*, for example, is the 13<sup>th</sup> century *Codex Vaticanus Graecus 386*, which has a fairly straightforward genealogy of its descendants.<sup>70</sup> This is an exception, considering many of the witnesses to Origen's works are fragmentary: even though there are 72 extant works of Origen with Pauline citations out of the 82 works listed on TLG, hundreds of documents are available for the study of his textual nature.<sup>71</sup> To compare all units of variation in his citations in all the extant documents is simply beyond the possibilities of this thesis. That is why in order to have a limited project covering

---

<sup>70</sup> *Parisinus Graecus 616*, Membranaceus, 12<sup>th</sup> century, fol. 20r-344v; *Venetus Marcianus 45*, Chartaceus, 14<sup>th</sup> century, fol. 338; *Codex Bessarionis* fol. 6r-311r; *Venetus Marcianus 44*, Chartaceus, fol. 224, 15<sup>th</sup> century; *Codex Bessarionis*, fol. 14r-234v; *Parisinus Graecus 945 Regius*, Chartaceus, fol. 326, 14<sup>th</sup> century, fol. 48r-314v; *Basileensis A III 9*, Chartaceus, fol. 472, 16<sup>th</sup> century, fol. 144r-452r; *Parisinus Graecus 293* (Iolianus = belonging to Claude Joly in 1666), Chartaceus, 16<sup>th</sup> century, fol. 1r-304r.

<sup>71</sup> <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>, where searches can be made further for individual authors.

Origen's text of three biblical letters, it was decided that the best available critical edition would be selected to represent each of Origen's works, from which a comparison of the readings in the individual critical editions could be made with the selected critical editions of the Greek New Testament, the NA and RP representing the Initial Text and Byzantine text respectively.

It is through this comparison that general trends began to appear. If a critical edition of one of Origen's works was inconsistent in the way Origen's citations of a specific verse appeared, then it provided a location of conflict that either revealed the inconsistency of the edition or reflects the alterations which arose in the manuscripts that were used for the edition. This reliance upon critical editions for this thesis in regards to both Origen and the Greek New Testament proves to be a shortcoming in that the apparatus of the GNT editions, which were used to find units of variation, contained very few of the variant units in Origen's writings. The collation of Origen's manuscript readings with those of the Greek New Testament manuscripts, especially where Origen is against NA and RP would be an enormous undertaking. Even with enough people and funding, to do this would undercut all critical editions for Origen, which is not the purpose of this project.

Test passages could have been used as a sample of the whole, yet at the outset of the thesis, there was the desire to note and describe all of Origen's citations for whatever epistles were selected for study, which no doubt yields a better assessment than any selection of test passages from the epistles. The work that is yet to be done concerning the assessment of the citations within the manuscripts of Origen against the

greater New Testament transmission is hopefully the work of many future theses and international projects. Considering that several theses have emerged over the past ten years on Origen's text, hopefully this is an indication of more in the future.<sup>72</sup>

Another shortcoming is the lack of overlap of the units of variation that are discussed in the editions of Nestle-Aland, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Von Soden with those that are among Origen's citations. While it is essential to use critical editions, it is limited when the units of variation that pertain to the Greek New Testament are not the same as the units of variation which appear in Origen's citations. Therefore, the critical apparatus is often not much help in finding variant readings in patristic citations. If, for example, certain readings are only extant in Origen, the use of a critical apparatus that only lists variant readings in extant manuscripts is not going to be of much use. In the same way NA cannot include every variant reading of the Church Fathers in its apparatus, I could not consult extensive amounts of manuscripts for Origen's citations.

Ultimately, the shortcomings are a result of scope and purpose. In order to address certain aspects of Origen's citations, the choices made to reach such a goal requires that certain things not be included, and certain tools used. To list some of the shortcomings and limitations of this thesis is important for anyone undertaking future projects that include Origen's citations, at least for help in understanding that comprehensive projects without such limitations are reserved for teams or a single

---

<sup>72</sup> Jared Anderson, "An Analysis of the Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen (MA diss., University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, 2008); James Jeffrey Cate, "The Text of the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation in the Writings of Origen" (PhD thesis., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1997). Donaldson, "Explicit References," 2009; Stanley N. Helton, "The Text of Acts of the Apostles in the Writings of Origen" (PhD diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014); Sylvie Taconnet Raquel "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen" (PhD diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002).

lifetime.

### **1.11 Toward a Commentary on Origen's New Testament Text**

The main purpose of the commentary is to discern how Origen's citations relate to each other in order to detect changes in his citations during the transmission of his works. It also will discuss citational patterns, habits, and techniques, and whether his authorial wording can be established. Next, the commentary will discuss all pertinent units of variation of the citations in relation to NA and RP. Citations that disagree with both NA and RP will then be compared to the wider Greek New Testament evidence for support.

Manuscripts and their relationship to Origen when he disagrees with NA and RP will provide a helpful indication of what type of text Origen's citations have been accommodated to. Where Origen departs from these texts might reveal readings that are no longer extant in New Testament manuscripts. Citations that agree only with the NA text will provide evidence of readings that have not been accommodated to the Byzantine text and preserve early readings. However, if Origen's citations show a mixture of NA-like readings and those of a free nature, it could be an indication that Origen's citations were accommodated to this type of text-form. If Origen often cites freely, his readers could have made his free citations more like their own Greek New Testament. If this were the case, then again, like the later adjustments to the Byzantine text, so too, Origen's citations could have been changed from a free authorial nature.

Another element to be discussed in the commentary, as well as a good place for insight into the authorial practices of Origen, is in regard to citation chains. These are

unbroken sequences of biblical passages in one citation. Some of Origen's citations extend over several modern verses. As individual or isolated citations can often be adapted to surrounding context and syntax, the continuous sequences of modern verses could provide evidence of unaltered biblical text. While short citations could be more easily reproduced from memory, stretches of sequential text are thought to be evidence of reliance on a biblical manuscript and an indication of the author's biblical text.<sup>73</sup>

However, citation chains do not always contain a verbatim reproduction of a biblical text.<sup>74</sup> Long chains of citations are often non-sequential and represent more of a cluster of short citations that might not be from the same context. Regardless, stretches of uninterrupted text might not feature the grammatical, syntactical, and contextual peripherals that often affect the beginnings and ends of citations, at least for the verses in the middle of such chains. Such stretches of text can be a helpful place to glean authorial citations, and possibly a patristic biblical text. Another important instance is the repetition of phrasing or sections of previously cited text. This occurs when there are lemmata, and subsequent text that repeats the previous heading, which is normally

---

<sup>73</sup> Fee, "Greek Patristic Citations," 260; Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 86-87; Carroll D. Osburn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism," *NovT* 47.4 (2005), 318.

<sup>74</sup> Harry Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 40; J. Harold Greenlee, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (rev. ed.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 47; Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 69; Tübingen: Mohr, 1986), 11-15; Walter C. Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985), 6; Christopher Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 275-91, 334-6; John Whittaker, "The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts, or the Art of Misquotation," *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (ed. J. M. Grant; New York: AMS, 1989), 63-95.

found in commentaries.<sup>75</sup> Repetition would likely indicate consistency in the citing techniques of a Church Father, but may be evidence of later accommodation.

Previous work has taken repetition, long sequences of citational text, commentary matching lemma, and agreement with the NA text to be signs not only of authorial citations, but also of patristic New Testament exemplars.<sup>76</sup> Instead of being places to investigate further, they have been used as *de facto* proof for the early presence of the Initial Text in the early Church writings. However, if Origen's citations of these epistles can be determined to be authorial, then any subsequent changes will reveal how readings of the New Testament have changed over the years. This might not result in an earlier, more accurate reconstruction in the modern hand-editions, but it might indicate better explanations of how the Greek New Testament has undergone change, and a fuller explanation for its transmission history since the time of Origen.

The catenae and other secondary sources will still be considered despite their minimal contribution.<sup>77</sup> This categorization of secondary sources is simply based on the fact that they are not copies of Origen's works, but rather extracts of material from Origen's works. This is important because most citations attributed to Origen might not actually be from primary sources of Origen. For example, the source *Rom.Frag D*

---

<sup>75</sup> "One would expect the lemmata, rather than the citations within the exegetical part, to suffer correction in the direction of the standard text." F. T. Gignac, "The Text of Acts in Chrysostom's Homilies," *Traditio* 26 (1970), 308-15; Osburn, "Methodology in Identifying," 342.

<sup>76</sup> Fee and Mullen indicate a Father's [biblical] text is observable when, (1) it shows clear affinities with a Fathers otherwise well-established textual relationships, e.g., Origen's many single citations of John that agree with P75 and 03, and (2) when the Fathers habits of citation reflect a rather high degree of accuracy...although this must be used with some degree of caution" in "Greek Patristic Citations," 258.

<sup>77</sup> "...they are practically useless." A. E. Brooke *The Commentary of Origen on S. John's Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896: 1.xxv; Gordon Fee, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations," in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, Eldon J. Epp, and Gordon D. Fee, eds (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1993) 301; repr. from *Biblica* 52 (1971), 357-394.



consists of commentary on the text of Romans taken from the margins of the von der Goltz manuscript (GA1739). These commentary notes have been used to reconstruct what is believed to be Origen's text of the epistle.<sup>78</sup> Or Rom.Frag is also in the margin of a 13<sup>th</sup> century commentary manuscript, GA1953. Such evidence is not a continuous text witness for Romans, but rather a compilation of various readings scattered throughout the margins of 1739 and 1953.

It is because of this lack of verification that secondary sources will be treated separately. Other citations attributed to Origen can be found in catena manuscripts, which are compilations of various comments often by many Church Fathers. The questioning of the validity of catena manuscripts is well documented, and therefore, any citations from these witnesses will also be considered separately from the primary sources of Origen.<sup>79</sup>

Despite being secondary sources, these sources are still valuable. It is clear that such citations can be used to determine Origen's biblical text (as their authors are uncertain). However, the catena citations provide evidence of how citations have been

---

<sup>78</sup> "...the text of Romans in Codex 1739 is that which Origen used." Kim, K. W. "Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (1950): 167; "For the Pauline epistles the manuscript which Ephraim himself followed was a very ancient codex which the compiler recognized, by comparing it with the writings of Origen, as containing an Origenian context. For the epistle to the Romans, however, though he consulted his ancient codex, he actually provides a text which he constituted from the lemmata in Origen's commentary...With little doubt the text of Romans in Codex 1739 is that which Origen used, while the text of the other epistles is based on an ancient copy which the compiler of the archetypal text, who seems to have had an intelligent and accurate interest in textual questions, identified as agreeing with the text used by Origen in his commentaries." p144-145 there is a footnote that readings "There would be no question at all if it were not for the bare possibility that in the copy of Origen's commentary which the compiler used the lemmata had already been assimilated to some other textual fashion." *Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts*, eds Kirsopp Lake and Silva New, *Harvard Theological Studies XVII* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), 143-44.

<sup>79</sup> Gordon D. Fee, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations" from *Biblica* 52 (1971), 305; Ronald Heine, "Can the Catena Fragments of Origen's Commentary on John Be Trusted?" *Vigiliae Christianae* 40 (1986): 118-34.

accommodated to different forms of the text over their transmission history. It is the evidence of such changes that can address how Origen's works, and works attributed to Origen have changed. At this time, there is little reason to think that Origen's primary sources are unsusceptible to having undergone the same accommodation as the catena manuscripts.

The next three chapters will be a presentation of the citations for Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians, respectively.

## CHAPTER TWO

There are 980 citations of the epistle to the Romans in sources attributed to Origen of Alexandria. In his primary sources there are 371 citations from a total of 24 works. Most readings are either identical to the editorially reconstructed texts of NA and RP, or differ from both. There are 16 secondary sources. These sources contain 609 citations, almost twice as much as the primary sources.<sup>80</sup> Roughly, both the secondary sources and the primary sources have a small number of readings that agree with only NA or RP, and these are equally balanced in both sources.

This chapter will discuss individually the secondary sources, the primary sources of Origen, and contains a textual commentary for Origen's citations of Romans.

### **2.1 Secondary Sources for Origen's Citations of Romans**

There are 609 citations from secondary sources. The majority of these citations have no variation between Origen, the NA, and RP (436). In citations where there are units of variation, their readings will be listed in tables in order to understand their relationship to NA and RP. The number of "readings" does not correspond to full citations, but rather individual units where Origen is present. Therefore, a single citation might have multiple units of variation. Below is a table that demonstrates Origen's affinity in relation to NA and RP.

---

<sup>80</sup> This is due in large by the high number of citations from *Rom.Frag D*; see page 46 for a description of *Rom.Frag D*.

Table 1

Variant Readings of Romans in Secondary Sources		
Against Both	123	53.25 %
With NA against, RP	57	24.67%
With RP, against NA	51	22.08%
Total	231	100%

Where there are variant readings, Origen's citations in catenae are mainly against both NA and RP, and are nearly equally balanced between agreeing with only NA and RP.

So far, the percentages only address Origen's text in places of variation. These represent a percentage of Origen's writings. The places where Origen's readings are identical to both NA and RP are not included above. However, to speak of Origen's citational affinity as whole, Origen's citations that are identical must be quantified somehow, since it is impossible to speak of them in relation to units of variation if they contain none. The citations that are identical to NA and RP can be weighted in relation to the places where there is variation. So, if Origen's citations of Romans contain 231 readings in 172 variant citations, there is a ratio of 1.34 readings-to-variant citations, or, rather, 1.34 units of variation in every citation that contains variation. The number 1.34 (the readings per citation) can be applied to the identical citations in order to quantify a weighted number of readings identical to NA and RP. The following table reflects these numbers for the secondary sources:

Table 2

Affinity of Romans Readings in Secondary Sources		
Identical to NA/RP <sup>81</sup>	586	71.73%
Against Both	123	15.06%
With NA against, RP	57	6.97%
With RP, against NA	51	6.24%
Total	817	100%

Where there is variance, Origen's citations in the catenae are against both NA and RP editions of the Greek New Testament. Also, Origen's readings (as they stand in his critical editions) are nearly equally balanced between agreeing only with the NA text and the RP Text. The overall statistics for catenae reflect a consistent textual reading that is predominantly identical with a fairly even agreement between NA and RP, with few unique readings. However, these numbers are strongly influenced by *Rom.Frag A* and *Rom.Frag D*. Out of the 57 readings in agreement with NA, *Rom.Frag D* contains 47 of them. Conversely, *Rom.Frag A* represents half of the RP readings for Romans. The overall percentages are affected by the volume of both compared to the other sources which all have less than 10 readings. This would be problematic if one were to base the affinity of Origen's biblical text on these overall percentages of affinity.

As can be seen in Table 3, the secondary readings in all sources apart from *Rom.Frag A* and *Rom.Frag D* are more likely to be against both NA and RP:

---

<sup>81</sup> The number of "identical readings" is determined by multiplying the number of identical citations (436) by the average number of readings per variant citation (1.34).

Table 3

Secondary Readings Excluding <i>Rom.Frag A &amp; D</i>		
Identical to NA/RP <sup>82</sup>	121	59.31%
Against Both	66	32.35 %
With NA against, RP	7	3.43%
With RP, against NA	10	4.90%
Total	204	99.99%

When the high volume of citations from *Rom.Frag A* and *Rom.Frag D* are removed from the totals, the percentages demonstrate that Origen's citations, as they are reflected in the critical editions, are more likely to be against both NA and RP. If it is understood that *Rom.Frag A* has a high number of readings that correspond to RP, the amount of readings this source contains sways the averages, The remaining secondary sources reflect numbers that look more like the primary sources, i.e. an NA-like text. It is significant that *Rom.Frag A* shows strong signs of accommodation to the Byzantine Text, while *Rom.Frag D* shows an earlier text that is unaffected by such accommodation. The fact that the catena readings of Origen's citations are largely against both NA and RP could mean that despite their categorization in this thesis as "secondary," they could in fact reflect Origen's authorial citations, considering that citations of the New Testament supported by biblical manuscripts are not likely to be changed to unknown or unsupported readings. However, the presence of free or unknown readings in catenae does not require them to be the actual text of the author

---

<sup>82</sup> The number of "identical readings" for this table was determined by multiplying the number of identical citations (83) by the average of readings per variant citation (1.46). These two numbers are the difference of total numbers for these two sources, from the total numbers from the secondary sources: 615 citations - (142 + 333) = 140 citations. The difference of the total of identical citations and those of *Rom.Frag A* and *D* is 437 - (109 + 245) = 83 identical citations. Remaining are 57 citations with units of variation, which contain 83 units. Therefore  $83 / 57 = 1.46$  units per citation.

they are attributed to. Free citations in a catena could reflect the catenist’s own textual freedom in compilation.

## 2.2 Origen’s Primary Sources as Sources for Citations of Romans

There are a total of 371 citations of Romans from Origen’s primary sources. Most of these citations contain no units of variation (214). Below is a table that demonstrates Origen’s affinity in relation to NA and RP in citations that contains units of variation.

Table 4

Variant Readings of Romans in Primary Sources		
Against Both	160	82.47%
With NA against, RP	25	12.89%
With RP, against NA	9	4.64%
Total	194	100%

Where there is variance, Origen’s citations from his works are mainly against both of the Greek New Testament, and Origen’s readings (as they stand in his critical editions) are twice as likely to correspond to the text of NA than RP. The overall weighted assessment is shown below.

Table 5

Weighted Readings of Romans in Origen’s Works		
Identical to NA/RP <sup>83</sup>	262	57.46%
Against Both	160	35.09 %
With NA, against RP	25	5.48%
With RP, against NA	9	1.97 %
Total	456	100%

---

<sup>83</sup> The “identical readings” are determined by multiplying the number of identical citations (436) by the average of readings per variant citation (1.23).

The main difference between the citations found in catenae and those from Origen's works is the amount of citations that are identical (71.73% in catenae vs 57.46% in his works). The second difference concerns the amount of readings against both NA and RP (15.06% in catenae versus 35.09% in his works). These two differences are more than likely directly related to the overwhelming presence of *Rom.Frag A* and *Rom.Frag D*'s citations, which mainly share the same readings as the RP and NA text. Instead of what appears to be adjustment on the part of the catenist, the readings reflect a reading more like the works of Origen: approximately 60% identical, 30% unique, and 10% split between NA and RP.

### **2.3 Verses of Romans Origen Does Not Cite**

From the extant citations of Origen, there are only 13 verses in Romans he does not cite (9:10, 9:11, 9:15, 9:24-33). This number is significantly higher if one does not count the citations from *Rom.Frag D*, considering there are 130 verses where it is the only witness (1:29-32; 2:2-3, 17-20, 26-27; 3:6, 8, 26; 5:2, 11, 18-21; 6:1, 3, 6, 7, 15-17; 7:5, 16-21; 8:1-2, 5, 10, 12, 17, 18, 22, 23, 34; 10:1-3, 5, 9, 12, 14-21; 11:1-4, 8, 9, 13-20, 23, 24, 29-32; 12:2-7, 9-13, 15; 14:11-14, 16-20, 22; 15:1-9, 13-18, 21-33; 16:27). Further, there are 49 verses that contain OT citations that affect a study such as this that only focuses on the New Testament text (10:11, 13; 11:10, 27, 33-36; 12:17, 18; 13:3-6, 10-11, 14; 14:3-8; 15:10-12; 16:1-19, 21-24).



## 2.4 Markings and Introductory Material

Origen's citations are often marked with an introductory formula or a marker following the citation. These can be as specific as Φησὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ πρὸς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ ὁ Παῦλος “for Paul said in the epistle to the Romans” (Romans 16:25, John.Com A 6:4:25:3) or more vague, such as φησὶν ὁ Ἀπόστολος “the Apostle said” (Romans 1:11, Ps.Sel 12:1317:28). Out of the 347 identical citations of Romans, only 90 have markers (25.93%). Of the remaining citations (633), which either agree with NA alone, RP alone, or against both, there are 41 markers (6.47%; altogether 388 markers). Therefore, it should not be expected that any specific information provided by Origen concerning the citations would make it more likely to be his biblical text or an indication that he is attempting to cite his exemplars.

Although it is helpful to know that Origen's markers are not an indication of his citing consistency, even if a Church Father indicated somehow through a marker or phrase that he was attempting to cite an exemplar, the marker does not guarantee he is citing an exemplar. If a text has undergone adjustment throughout its transmission, the likelihood that a copyist is going to keep such markers in the context is almost certain. This means that any such markers are only important if it can be established that a Church Father uses such devices consistently and that a Church Father's citational text can be established as his biblical exemplar. Consequently, markers of any kind cannot be relied upon to determine the biblical text of Origen.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> Matthew R. Steinfeld, "Preliminary Investigations of Origen's Text of Galatians," H.A.G. Houghton (ed.), *Early Readers, Scholars and Editors of the New Testament (Texts and Studies 3.11)* Piscataway NJ: Gorgias Press, 2014, pp. 107-118.

## 2.5 Secondary Sources in Order of their Citational Frequency

The following section is a list of secondary sources and the citations of Romans they contain. Each work is presented indicating the name of the work, the verses it cites, and the number of total citations of Romans in the work.

*Rom.Frag D*, 1:1-32; 2:1-29; 3:1-31; 4:2-25; 5:1-6, 8-21; 6:1-23; 7:1-25; 8:1-39; 10:1-10,12, 14-21; 11:1-9, 11-26, 28-32; 12:1-15; 14:10-23; 15:1-9, 13-33; 16:25-27

There are 29 citations that differ from NA and RP in *Rom.Frag D* (1:27, 2:17, 3:2, 3:3, 3:8, 3:9, 3:12, 3:25, 4:11, 5:11, 5:14, 5:15, 5:17, 6:16, 7:25, 8:1, 8:11, 8:28, 8:34, 10:3, 10:5, 11:21, 12:3, 12:14, 14:10, 14:12, 15:3, 15:7, 15:15). Two citations contain units of variation that are conflation of the differences of NA and RP (1:19, 8:24).

Where NA and RP disagree, *Rom.Frag D* corresponds with NA significantly more often with 46 citations (1:16, 1:24, 1:29, 1:31, 2:8, 2:13, 2:14, 3:22, 3:26, 3:28, 3:29, 3:30, 4:2, 4:8, 4:12, 4:19, 6:11, 6:12, 7:9, 8:14, 8:23, 8:26, 8:38, 10:1, 10:15, 10:17, 10:19, 11:3, 11:22, 11:23, 11:26, 11:28, 11:30, 11:32, 12:2, 12:15, 15:4, 15:8, 15:14, 15:16, 15:18, 15:24, 15:28, 15:29, 15:31, 15:32). Alternatively, when the Greek New Testament editions disagree, *Rom.Frag D* corresponds with RP against NA 12 times (2:5, 2:16, 5:6, 7:23, 10:20, 11:13, 11:17, 11:31, 12:4, 14:22, 15:17, 15:27).

If 1739 is a reflection of Origen's citational text, it is a demonstration of a textual reading of the New Testament in the second or third century that is very close to the text of NA, with minimal accommodation to the RP text. However, where there is agreement between *Rom.Frag D* and only one hand-edition, 25% of these readings are with the RP text. This indicates that despite the presence of NA-like readings, there are substantial accommodations to the Byzantine text.

*Rom.Frag A*, 1:1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18; 2:5, 7-14(2x), 15(2x), 16, 21-25; 3:1, 3, 4, 9-21(2x), 22-24, 27-31; 4:2, 3, 4(2x), 5-12, 14-24, 25; 5:3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13; 6:5, 8-10(2x), 11(2x), 12-14, 18-23; 7:1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 22-25; 8:3, 4, 6, 7(2x), 8, 24-26, 28(3x), 29(3x), 30-39; 12:20

*Rom.Frag A* has 142 citations of Romans. These citations were taken from Ramsbottom's critical edition, which utilised MS Vatican. gr. 762 (10th century), Bodleian MS. Auct. E. 2. 20 (16th century), and Cramer's critical edition in vol. IV of his *Catena*. The last four chapters of Romans are missing from this commentary.

Therefore, there are no citations in this work past 12:21. *Rom.Frag A* shows the most adjustment to the Byzantine text, as seen in 24 units of variation in 19 citations (1:1, 2:8, 2:13, 2:14, 2:16, 3:12, 3:22, 3:28, 3:29, 4:2, 4:8, 4:12, 5:6, 6:11, 6:12, 6:13, 7:23, 8:24, 8:38). There are 3 units of variation where *Rom.Frag A* corresponds to the NA text against RP, and 15 units of variations against both NA and RP. A total of 109 citations are identical to the mutual text of NA and RP.

Despite a very strong correspondence to the RP readings, there are still agreements with an NA-like text alone. For the most part, namely where the text is clearly accommodated namely in the 24 units that agree with RP only, this source is not a good indication for Origen's citational text, which makes no contribution at all for his biblical text. However, it does demonstrate the effect of the Byzantine text on Origen's writings over time.

*Basil.Phil A*, 1:1, 14, 18, 19(2x), 20(3x), 21(3x), 22(2x), 23(2x), 24; 2:4(3x), 5(3x), 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 28, 29; 3:21; 5:3, 13; 7:14, 8:28(3x), 29(5x), 30; 9:6, 8(2x); 9:16(2x), 17, 18, 19, 20, 21(2x), 22; 16:25(2x), 26

There are 59 citations of Romans in *Basil.Phil A*. As this source is a compilation of other Origenian writings, the citations in *Basil.Phil A* are clearly seen in other sources. Where there is a citation in *Basil.Phil A* there is another citation in a different work from which it came. It normally reflects the text of *Rom.Frag A* (1:1, 5:3, 5:13, 8:28, 29), *Cels* (1:14, 19, 21, 22; 2:8, 8:14), and *Princ* (2:4, 2:5, 9:6, 19, 9:21). Most of the citations are in agreement with both NA and RP as 36 of the 59 citations are variant-free. When the readings of NA and RP disagree, *Basil.Phil A* corresponds to NA against RP in 6 units of variation from 1:19(2x), 2:8, and 2:14). There are 5 units of variation in 3 verses in agreement with RP against NA (1:1, 2:5(2x)). There are 26 units of variation where Origen has unique differences from both in 13 verses (1:14, 1:18, 1:20(2x), 5:3, 5:13, 8:14, 8:29(2x), 9:8(2x), 9:19, 9:21). When *Basil.Phil A* disagrees with both, it is mainly in regard to the presence of a post-positive. As it is with *Rom.Frag A*, there is indication that the text has undergone accommodation to the Byzantine text; it is most likely not Origen's authorial citation.

*Basil.Phil B*, 8:28(3x), 29; 9:16, 17, 18, 19, 22

*Basil.Phil B* has 9 citations of Romans. These citations are only from chapters 8 and 9 of the Epistle. There are 8 citations that are identical to NA and RP. There is one unit of variation (9:16) that is against both NA and RP with a mid-sentence addition of εἶναί. There is one citation that corresponds to RP against the text of NA in 9:19. This source shows some accommodation to the Byzantine text, but otherwise, citations are identical to a unified NA and RP reading.

*Lam.Frag*, 6:2; 8:7, 8, 32; 11:11, 25(2x)

*Lam.Frag* has 7 citations of Romans. One reading (6:2) is against both NA and RP. None of these citations are of verses where there is any variance between NA and RP other than 11:26, but here, *Lam.Frag* is lacunose. There is no evidence in *Lam.Frag* of accommodation from the minimal citations available, though there is evidence of a free authorial citational text that is possibly Origen's.

*Prov.Exp*, 2:5, 13; 5:10(2x); 6:22; 12:8

*Prov.Exp* has 6 citations of Romans. Two verses are identical to NA and RP. There is one unit of variation where *Prov.Exp* corresponds with RP against NA (2:13). There are three units of variation in two verses where Origen is against the reading of both NA and RP (5:10, 6:22). This source shows signs of accommodation to the Byzantine text, with free citations as well.

*1Cor.Com*, 1:14; 9:3; 14:23; 15:19, 20

*1Cor.Com* has 5 citations of Romans. Two citations are identical to the reading of NA and RP. Two units of variation in two verses (14:23, 15:19) are different from the unified NA/RP reading. Two units of variation correspond to RP against NA (2:13). This source demonstrates free citing and accommodation.

*Jer.Frag B*, 2:4, 5; 9:22, 23

*Jer.Frag B* has 4 citations of Romans. Three citations are identical to NA and RP. There is only one citation that is different from the reading of NA and RP (2:4). This

issue here is not variant readings but segments of biblical text mixed in with commentary. There is no evidence of Byzantine accommodation in *Jer.Frag B*.

*Job.Hom C*, 12:21; 16:20

*Job.Hom C* has two citations of Romans. One citation (16:20) omits a phrase in NA and RP. The other is identical to the reading of NA and RP. There is no evidence of accommodation in *Job.Hom C*.

*Deut.Sel*, 8:32

*Deut.Sel* has 1 citation of Romans that is identical to NA/RP and no evidence of accommodation.

*Eph.Com*, 11:6

*Eph.Com* has one citation of Romans that has an added ἔστιν which is against both NA or RP. There is no evidence of later accommodation.

*Eze.Frag*, 2:1

*Eze.Frag* has one citation of Romans, which adds κριματι against both NA and RP. There is no evidence of later accommodation.

*Job.Hom B*, 16:20

*Job.Hom B* has one citation of Romans, which omits τῆς ειρήνης against NA/RP. There is no evidence of later accommodation.

*Ps.Exc*, 8:8

*Ps.Exc* has one citation of Romans, which is against the reading of NA and RP in that it substitutes the initial δέ with γάρ. There is no evidence of later accommodation.

*Ps.Sel*, 1:11, 16, 17, 23, 26; 2:13; 3:2; 5:3(3x), 4(2x); 6:4, 18, 2; 7:24(3x); 8:7, 28, 29, 36; 9:2, 16; 10:8, 10; 12:8, 14; 13:12, 13(2x); 16:25

*Ps.Sel* has 32 citations of Romans. In seventeen of these, Origen, NA, and RP are identical. There is one unit of variation where *Ps.Sel* corresponds to NA against RP. *Ps.Sel* is unique compared to NA and RP in 18 units of variation within 12 verses (1:11, 1:23, 2:13, 3:2, 6:18, 6:22, 8:7, 8:28, 8:29, 10:8, 10:10, 13:13). There is no evidence of Byzantine accommodation. The free citations of Origen demonstrate that they have not been accommodated to known text forms of the New Testament, indicating that they are his authorial citations.

Overall, the secondary sources are fairly consistent in their representation of Origen's citations in Romans. Most readings are of places where NA/RP agree and Origen's citations agree with both. Alternatively, Origen has a high number of free readings. This indicates places where NA and RP disagree and Origen is unique, or demonstrates a tendency of Origen to not cite manuscripts verbatim. Some sources such as *Rom.Frag A* and *Basil.Phil A* show considerable agreement with the RP text. This demonstrates that Origen's citational text in these works reflect a text different from the text Origen normally cites in his other sources, which is likely to be a result of later changes. However, some citations also depart from the later Byzantine text, which these two sources reflect most often, which indicates Origen's free citations.

## 2.6 Origen's Primary Sources in Order of their Citational Frequency

The following section will be a list of Origen's primary sources and the citations of Romans they contain. Each work will be presented indicating the name of the work, the verses, which it cites, and the number of total citations of Romans in the work.

*Cels*, 1:14(2x), 18, 19(3x), 20(6x), 21(5x), 22(5x), 23(4x), 24(2x), 25; 2, 4, 5, 23(2x); 5:8; 6:4, 9, 10; 7:9, 10, 12, 14, 24(2x); 8:8, 9, 13, 14(2x), 8:15, 19(3x), 20(4x), 21(3x), 28(3x), 30, 35, 36, 37(2x), 38(2x), 39; 11:11, 12, 25; 12:14; 13:1, 2; 14:1, 9, 15, 21; 15:19, 20; 16:25(2x), 26(2x)

Of Origen's works, *Cels* is second in total number of citations with 87. The majority of these citations reflect a common text with NA and RP, as 52 of these citations have an identical reading with NA and RP. Where *Cels* is different from both, there is often additional wording, in between phrases of Romans text (1:14(2x), 1:18, 1:20(3x), 2:23, 5:8, 6:9, 8:8, 8:9, 8:13, 8:14, 8:19(2x), 8:20, 8:21, 8:39, 13:2, 14:9, 15:19, 16:26). The citations in *Cels* agree with NA every time there is a difference between NA and RP. This occurs 7 times (1:19(2x), 2:5, 7:9, 8:14, 8:38, 13:1). There are 32 units of variation where *Cels* has unique differences from both NA and RP.

*Cels* shows no agreement with the RP text alone. It is in agreement with the NA except for places where he is against both NA and RP. This means this source is a strong candidate for finding Origen's authorial citational text considering the presence of free citations.

*John.Com A*, 1:1, 2, 3(2x), 4, 5(2x); 3:25(2x), 30, 31; 5:3, 4, 13; 6:9, 10(2x); 7:1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 15; 8:8(2x), 9, 19, 20(2x), 21; 9:11, 12, 13, 14; 10:6, 7(2x), 8(2x), 11:25; 14:2, 9; 15:19; 16:25(2x), 26(3x)



There are 50 citations of Romans in *John.Com A*. There are 30 citations where Origen, NA, and RP are identical in their reading. Elsewhere, *John.Com A* corresponds in three units of variation with NA against RP (1:1, 9:11), and once with RP against NA. There are 22 units of variation where *John.Com A* is different to both NA and RP (3:25(2x), 3:30, 3:31, 5:13, 6:9, 6:10, 7:8, 7:9, 8:8(2x), 8:20(2x), 9:12, 10:8(2x), 14:9, 16:26(2x)), and three unique citations that demonstrate Origen's independence in citing Romans. There is evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Rom.Frag C*, 1:3, 14(2x); 3:4, 5(2x), 7, 10-12, 14-19, 21(2x), 23-25, 28, 29, 31(2x); 4:1, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25; 5:1, 3, 13, 10; 6:23; 7:7, 11, 24, 25; 11:11, 25, 26; 12:21

*Rom.Frag C* has 50 citations of Romans. Sixteen of these citations are identical from the text of NA and RP. *Rom.Frag C* agrees with NA against RP in six units of variation in verses 3:28, 3:29, 4:1, 4:13, and with RP against NA in one unit (3:12).

*Rom.Frag C* is unique in 25 units of variation against both NA and RP (2:14(2x), 3:4, 3:5, 3:7, 3:21(2x), 3:23, 3:25, 3:31, 4:9, 4:11, 4:16, 4:19, 4:25, 6:23, 7:11, 8:24).

*Rom.Frag C* has one unit of accommodation to the Byzantine text. The free readings demonstrate the likelihood that most of these citations are authorial.

*Euches*, 1:22, 23(2x), 24(4x), 26, 27, 28; 6:12(2x); 8:15, 8:26, 27(2x), 28, 29, 30, 37; 9:11, 12; 10:8; 13:7, 8; 14:2, 10

*Euches* has 27 citations of Romans. Thirteen citations are identical from NA and RP. Two units of variation (6:12, 13:8) agree with NA against RP. There is one unit of variation against NA in favor of the reading of RP. There are 14 units of variation where *Euches* differs from both NA and RP (1:23, 1:24(2x), 8:15, 8:26, 8:28, 8:29, 9:11, 9:12,

13:7, 14:10). One reading appears to have been accommodated to the Byzantine text. However, there is agreement with NA-only readings, most readings show an authorial citational text considering the free readings.

*Princ*, 2:4(2x), 5(2x), 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 28, 29; 9:6, 8(2x); 9:16(5x), 18, 19, 20, 21(2x); 16:25-26

*Princ* has 26 citations of Romans. Seventeen citations are identical to NA and RP. Eight units of variation are against both NA and RP (2:5, 9:8(2x), 9:21). Only two units of variation agree with NA alone (2:8), and with RP alone in five units of variation (2:5(2x), 9:20).

The citations of Romans in *Princ* show accommodation to the Byzantine text as RP-only readings outnumber NA-only readings 5 to 2. There is also a lower number of free readings which demonstrates a result of accommodation away from Origen's authorial citational text.

*John.Com B*, 1:1, 2, 3(2x), 3, 6, 7; 3:23; 5:12(2x), 13, 14(2x), 15, 16, 17; 7:24(2x); 8:28; 9:1; 10:6, 7; 11:11; 14:9

*John.Com B* has 24 citations of Romans. There are 16 citations that are identical to the reading of NA and RP. There are two units of variation in one verse where *John.Com B* corresponds to NA against RP. There are 10 unit of variation where Origen has unique differences from NA and RP (5:13, 5:14, 5:16, 5:17, 9:1, 11:11, 14:9). There is no accommodation to the Byzantine text and there are several readings that are free. This is likely to contain authorial citations of Origen.

*Matt.Com C*, 1:8, 14; 2:4, 5, 14, 15; 3:25; 6:9, 12; 7:1, 2, 3(2x), 24; 8:8, 9, 16, 32(2x), 11:25, 26; 12:16; 13:9; 14:2

*Matt.Com C* has 24 citations of Romans. There are 12 citations that are identical to NA and RP. There are three units of variation (all in 3:25) that correspond to NA against RP. There are 12 units of variation in 9 citations (2:5, 2:14, 6:9, 6:12, 11:26, 12:16, 13:9(2x), 14:2) where Origen has unique differences from both NA and RP. The free readings of Origen and the absence of RP-only readings demonstrate an authorial citational text.

*Ps.Frag*, 1:17(2x); 2:4, 12; 3:2(2x); 5:3(2x), 4; 6:21, 22; 7:24; 8:8, 37; 9:4, 5; 10:10; 12:1, 19; 14:1

*Ps.Frag* has 20 citations of Romans. There are 11 citations where Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Although there are 11 units of variation in the other 9 citations where Origen disagrees with a common NA and RP reading (2:12, 3:2(2x), 6:22, 8:8, 9:4, 10:10(2x), 12:1, 14:1). The most common difference is an added conjunction at the beginning of the verse. Considering these differences, *Ps.Frag* is very consistent. Origen's citations in *Ps.Frag* are mainly free and represent a text unaccommodated to the Byzantine text.

*Jer.Hom B*, 2:4, 5, 15, 23, 28; 3:2; 5:8; 7:24; 10:7, 8; 11:11, 22; 13:7

*Jer.Hom. B* has 13 citations of Romans. Six of these citations are identical to NA and RP. There are 5 units of variation that are unique to a common NA/RP reading (2:4, 5:8, 10:8, 11:22, 13:7). Two units of variation (2:5, 11:22) correspond to RP when it is

different from NA. There is agreement with the RP text in *Jer.Hom B*. Readings against both hand-editions demonstrate a free text.

*Mart*, 1:3; 5:3, 4; 7:24, 8:21(2x), 36; 9:8; 10:10

*Mart* has 9 citations of Romans. There are no units of variation between Origen, NA, and RP in eight of these citations. There is one unit of variation that is against both NA and RP. The citations in *Mart* are all located in sections where NA and RP agree.

*Jer.Hom A*, 2:23; 6:12; 11:5, 11, 21, 22, 25, 26

*Jer.Hom A* has 8 citations of Romans. There are seven citations, which are identical to the reading of NA and RP. Of these, only one unit of variation (11:21) is unique compared to NA and RP. Origen's citations are the same as the combined NA/RP readings with no clear evidence of later accommodation.

*Matt.Com B*, 1:20; 2:23; 3:29; 7:12, 14, 13:12; 14:23

*Matt.Com B* has cites Romans 7 times. Four of these citations are identical to the text of NA and RP. Three units of variation are against both NA and RP in verses 7:12 and 14:23. There is no evidence here of accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Ex.Com*, 2:4, 5, 6; 9:18, 19, 22

*Ex.Com* has 6 citations of Romans. There are five units of variation where Origen is identical to the readings of NA and RP. There are two units of variation in 2:5 and 9:19 where *Ex.Com* corresponds to RP against NA. No readings correspond to NA alone. *Ex.Com* demonstrates evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text.

[The following sources show no accommodation to the Byzantine text, and are probably therefore a representation of Origen's authorial citational text for their respective verses of Scripture.]

*Rom.Frag B*, 1:1, 5, 10, 13, 14; 2:5

*Rom.Frag B* has 6 citations of Romans. One citation is different from both NA and RP (1:10). Another citation (1:1) has two units of variation, one corresponding to RP and another different from both NA and RP. The citations of 1:13 and 2:5 are identical to both NA/RP. *Rom.Frag B* shows mixture at the citations level where two units within the same verse are opposed to each other textually.

*Gen.Sel*, 2:14(2x); 8:7, 8

*Gen.Sel* has 4 citations of Romans. Two citations are identical to NA and RP. Three citations (2:14, 8:7, 8:8) are unique to both NA and RP. One citation corresponds to NA where it is different from RP (2:14).

*John.Frag B*, 2:5; 6:4; 10:4

*John.Frag* has three citations of Romans. There is one unit of variation where *John.Frag* is against NA and RP (10:4), where there is an omission of the post-positive γάρ.

*Hera.Dial*, 6:9; 7:22

*Hera.Dial* has two citations of Romans. One citation adds a γάρ at the beginning of the citation (6:9), while one removes γάρ (7:22). Both readings are different from the text of NA and RP.

*Apoc.Sch*, 13:12

*Apoc.Sch* has one citation of Romans that is identical to NA/RP.

*Eze.Hom*, 8:13

*Eze.Hom* has one citation of Romans that is identical to NA/RP.

*Gen.Com*, 9:17

*Gen.Com* has one citation of Romans that is identical to NA/RP.

*Lev.Hom*, 1:20

*Lev.Hom* has one citation of Romans, which is different from the text of NA and RP in that it omits γάρ and adds the article τοῦ after ἄόρατα.

*Luc.Schol*, 8:32

*Luc.Schol* has one citation of Romans, which is identical to NA/RP.

*Matt.Com A*, 13:12

*Matt.Com A* has one citation of Romans, which is identical to NA/RP.

*Matt.Schol*, 11:25

*Matt.Schol* has one citation of Romans, which is identical to NA and RP.

*Pass*, 13:12

*Pass* has one citation of Romans that is identical to NA and RP.

For Romans, Origen's primary sources are much more likely to have free citations and NA-only readings. This suggests that his primary sources are less likely to

be accommodated to later readings. However, this does not demand that his readings did not undergo accommodation to an NA-like reading. The presence of so many free readings and NA-only readings could be a result of accommodation to a text-form like the NA text. On the other hand, it could suggest that Origen for the most part cited a text in agreement with the NA consistently and often cited freely and both occurred naturally.

## 2.7 Textual Commentary on Origen's Citations of Romans<sup>85</sup>

Chapter One

Romans 1:1

Παῦλος δούλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ κλητὸς ἀπόστολος ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ

-----  
Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ Or(af) NA P10 03 81. ] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Or(bcd) RP P26 01 02 08 012  
018 020 025 044 33. 69. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 1739. 1881. 1908. 2464.  
I249

Or(a) has an introductory marker “to the Romans,” “Paul,” and a post-positive interjection (φησί). Or(d) likewise has an introductory marker. Or(f) has introduction material as well which reads “from the apostle’s letter to the Romans” in reference to Paul and is also near other Romans citations. Or(a) is found within a group of Romans citations that includes content from Romans 1:1-5. Or(f) is also found within a citation grouping of Romans content from 1:1-7. The readings for this unit of variation are Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (NA) or Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (RP). This transposition is present in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, and Treg. Paul's introductions in his letters typically adhere to the order found here in Or(af). His introductions in 2 Co 1:1, Phil 1:1, Col 1:1, 1Tim 1:1, 2 Tim 1:1 Phlm 1 are identical with the reading Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. The alternative reading in Or(bcd) is from fragmentary evidence or extracted from catenae

---

<sup>85</sup> The NA text will serve as the commentary's base text.

(Basil.Phil A). Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ occurs more often in Origen than Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, and it is therefore probable that this reading reflects subsequent adjustments to Origen's writings.

Romans 1:2-9  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 1:10  
πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν πρόσευχῶν μου, δεόμενος εἴ πως ἤδη ποτέ εὐοδωθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς

-----  
ἤδη ποτέ Or(a) NA RP 020 5. 38. 61. 71. 93. 1739 ] omit Or(c)

Or(a) is in proximity to other citations of Romans. This unit is mentioned in the apparatus of Tisch, though it is not in NA. Or(c) omits ἤδη ποτέ which is found in both NA and RP. This is the only instance of this reading in Origen's writings. The lack of variants in the fuller citation Or(a) shows that the abbreviated citation Or(c) with its omissions, is not significant.

Romans 1:11  
ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἵνα τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν πνευματικὸν εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς

-----  
χάρισμα ὑμῖν Or(ab) NA RP ] ὑμῖν χάρισμα Or(c) 33. 69. 73.

Or(c) is the only citation that reads ὑμῖν χάρισμα. The citation also omits τι before μεταδῶ. Both of these omissions in opposition to Or(ab) show an abbreviated citational text and an accommodation to context. Or(a) is near other citations of Romans. Only Or(c) has an introductory marker. This unit of variation is not in the critical edition of NA.



Romans 1:12

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Or(a) is in proximity to other Romans citations.

Romans 1:13

οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν.

-----

καὶ ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο Or(ab) NA RP ] omit Or(c)

Or(c) omits the phrase καὶ ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο and is prefaced with an introductory marker. Or(a) is within proximity of other Romans citations. The omission is not an example of an alternate form of the biblical text, but rather due to Origen's citing technique.

Romans 1:14

Ἑλλησίν τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί

-----

Or(abc) remove the particle τε in two places within the same verse. This reading does not correspond to the text of NA or RP, and is not in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Though there are three readings that omit τε, there are four other readings of Origen's where they are present. Or(c) is derived from *Ce/s*. There are other citations of Romans within proximity of Or(fg). Or(defgh) are identical and are only different from (abc) in regard to τε. The omission could actually be Origen's authorial citation text, considering that Or(defgh) might have been accommodated to the common NA/RP reading. *Ce/s* has been demonstrated to have no accommodation to the Byzantine text. This reading is authorial but might not be an attempt to cite a biblical manuscript.

Romans 1:15

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Or(b) is within proximity of other citations of Romans.

Romans 1:16

Οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον \* δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι

-----  
\* τοῦ Χριστοῦ RP 06c 018 020 025 044 69. 1908 ] omit Or(a) NA P26 01 02 03 04 06 012 33. 81. 1505. 1506. 1739. 1881.

Or(b) attests to the NA reading against RP. It has an introductory marker before the citation. The witnesses for these two readings show that τοῦ Χριστοῦ was a secondary development and that Origen's citations have not undergone accommodation to the later text.

Romans 1:17

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Or(b) is within proximity of other citations of Romans.

Romans 1:18

Ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων

-----  
γὰρ Or(cd) NA RP ] omit Or(ab)

The omission of γὰρ in Or(ab) is not in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Or(ab) both have introductory markers, with Or(b) citing Or(a). Both citations also have other Romans citations near. Only the omission of γὰρ in Or(a) appears to be an accommodation to context which Or(b) reproduces.

Romans 1:19

διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφάνερωσεν

-----  
θεὸς γὰρ Or(abcdef) NA 01 02 03 04 06 08 012 ] γὰρ θεός RP 06c 018 020 025 1739

The reading of NA is the most frequent in Origen's citations in Or(acdf). No citations of Origen reflect the text of RP. Or(b) has γάρ, being an abbreviated reading, though it is located in a work that has the NA reading in an earlier section. Or(abc) have other Romans citations near. Or(ac) have introductory markers. Or(df) are taken from *Cels*, with introductory markers and other Romans citations near. This unit of variation is not found in the apparatus of NA, though it is found in Tisch and Treg. The earliest manuscript witnesses favor the θεος γάρ reading.

Romans 1:20

τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἢ τε αἶδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους

-----

omit Or(aegijk) ] γάρ Or(bdfhl) NA RP  
 τοῦ θεοῦ Or(aefgij) ] αὐτοῦ Or(bdhkl) NA RP

Or(aegijk) all omit the post-positive γάρ as it appears in NA and RP. Or(a) is the only citation that omits the word that has Romans citations nearby and an introductory marker. Or(aefgjk) read τοῦ θεοῦ instead of αὐτοῦ . This unit of variation is not located in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Or(ai) has an introductory marker. Or(ai) has nearby Romans citations. Again, the *Philocalia* readings of Or(ghi) share the same reading as *Cels* [Or(abcdef)]. The Leviticus homily could be where the reading ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ originated, which was later used in later copies of *Cels* and *Basil.Phil A*.

Romans 1:21

διότι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν, ἀλλ' ἐμταιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία.

-----

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. The readings of the *Philocalia* [Or(fgh)] again follow the readings of [Or(abcde)] including the surrounding citations of Romans and their introduction markers.

Romans 1:22

φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν  
-----

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Or(abcde) all have surrounding citations of Romans. Or(c) has an introductory marker. Or(g) has the same citation, introductory marker, and surrounding Romans which indicates it was taken from Or(c).

Romans 1:23

καὶ ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνοσ φθαρτοῦ  
ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἔρπετῶν  
-----

ἤλλαξαν Or(abceghij) NA RP ] ἤλλαξαντο Or(d) 018 6. 630., αλλαφαντες Or(f)  
θεοῦ τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Or(f) ] ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ Or(abcdeghij) NA RP  
omit Or(j) ] εἰκόνοσ Or(abcdefghi) NA RP

Or(df) have participial forms of the verb for ἤλλαξαν (the reading of NA/RP). There are no variant readings noted in the NA critical apparatus or this section of text. Only Or(f) reads θεοῦ τοῦ ἀφθάρτου instead of ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ. It has other citations of Romans nearby, although there are not variant readings indicated in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Or(abcd) have surrounding citations of Paul. Or(ac) have introductory markers. Or(ef) both have nearby citations with Or(e) having an introductory marker. Or(gh) both have introductory markers and other citations nearby. Or(j) omits εἰκόνοσ. This unit of variation is not found in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The citations are consistent presentations of the full verse, despite the

minor changes to context. The common reading among Origen's readings should be considered his authorial citation text.

#### Romans 1:24

Διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς

-----

καὶ RP ] omit Or(ch) NA

Or(c) omits the conjunction καὶ in correspondence with RP, though it is the only citation that has this part of the verse. Or(d) has the phrase προημαρτηκότας τι. This is unique in his citations though there is another citation in the same work, which is consistent in other citations. The variant is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Other than this unit of variation, Origen's citations for Romans 1:24 are consistent, despite their intermittent presence throughout the verse. The abbreviated citations of *Cels* Or(ab) are reflected in the abbreviated citations of *Philocalia* Or(g) and *Euches* Or(f). There are three other citations from *Euches* Or(cde) which are the longest of Origen's citations. Or(cd) have introductory markers and nearby citation.

#### Romans 1:25

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

#### Romans 1:26

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Or(c) has φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος as an introductory marker. Origen is consistent in his citations with NA and RP.

#### Romans 1:27

ὁμοίως τε καὶ οἱ ἄρσενες ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας ἐξεκαύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσιν τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ἣν ἔδει τῆς πλάνης αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀπολαμβάνοντες

-----  
δὲ 02 06 012 025 044 33. 104. 630. 1505. 1739. 1881. ] τε NA RP 01 03 06c 018 020  
81. 365. 1175. 1241. 2464. ] omit Or(a)

Or(a) omits τε. The support for this reading is the manuscript 04. This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of NA and Treg.

Romans 1:28

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Or(a) has an introductory marker as well as other citations near.

Romans 1:29-32

There is no variation between Origen, NA, and RP

Chapter Two

Romans 2:1

Διὸ ἀναπολόγητος εἶ, ᾧ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις, τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσεις ὁ κρίνων

-----  
κρίματι Or(b) 04 104 ] omit Or(a) NA RP

Or(b) adds κρίματι before κρίνεις. This reading disagrees with NA and RP, which lack κρίματι. This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of NA and Treg. The abbreviated citation added the extra word to accommodate the shortened form. This is an example of Origen's adjustment of the text to fit his context.

Romans 2:2-3

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 2:4

ἢ τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει;

-----  
τοῦ θεοῦ Or(dh) ] αὐτοῦ Or(abcefgijkl) NA RP

Or(dh) both read τοῦ θεοῦ , which disagrees with the reading found in NA and RP (αὐτοῦ). This unit of variation is not found in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or

Treg. The reading of Or(dh) is short and omits a good deal of content from the verse.

Origen cites Romans 2:4 eleven times in correspondence to the NA/RP reading which is a good indication of Origen's consistency. Or(abcefgi) are near other citations and Or(bcgl) have introductory markers.

Romans 2:5

κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά \*σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον \*\* καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ

-----  
δέ Or(abcdefgln) NA RP ] omit Or(hjk)

\*σου Or(abcdefgklmno) NA RP ] omit Or(hi)

\*\*σου Or(o), αὐτοῦ Or(ch) ] omit Or(abdfgijklmn) NA RP

καί Or(bcfghimno) RP 01c 06c 018 020 025 044 33. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. ] omit Or(a) NA 01 02 03 06 012 81. 1506.

Or(hjk) lack the post-positive δέ in this unit of variation. The omission disagrees with both NA and RP. This is not quoted in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, and Treg. Out of the 14 citations for this verse only these lack the post-positive. Or(k) is likely to have omitted this due to adjustment to context.

Or(chj) omit σου after σκληρότητά. Or(h) appears to be a copy of Or(c). This reading in Or(c) is the follow up to the fuller, consistent, citation in the same section.

This omission disagrees with both NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. All three readings have nearby Romans citations.

Or(abcdefghj) have nearby citations. Or(bcdefn) have introductory markers.

RP has καί before δικαιοκρισίας against the reading of NA. The conjunction is present in Or(bcfghimno). This variant is in the critical apparatus of NA but is not in the apparatus of Tisch or Treg. Origen normally corresponds with 33 1739 1881, while 018 020 025 reflect a later text. The former agree with the corrections of 01 and 06, which

were first in support of Origen's reading. Or(a) supports the original reading in 01 and 06. It is a good indication that the reading with καὶ is later and that Origen's text has been altered.

#### Romans 2:6

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Or(a) is the source for Or(b). Both have the same nearby citations and introductory markers as well. Or(d) has a marker following the citation.

#### Romans 2:7

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Again, Or(b) follows Or(a) in content, nearby citations and introductory marker.

#### Romans 2:8

τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσιν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς

-----

μέν Or(ac) RP 01c 02 06c 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 2464.] omit Or(bd) NA 01 03 06 012 1739. 1881.

ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς Or(abd) NA 01 02 03 06 E 012 5. 21. 41. 69. 73. 116.] θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή Or(c) RP 06c 018 020 025

The reading ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς is in Or(abd), though the RP reading θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή is in Or(c). Or(ab) have the same introductory marker and citation. This unit is in the apparatus of Tisch and Treg but not NA. The lemma of *Rom.Frag A* often reflect a later text in places where NA and RP disagree.

#### Romans 2:9

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Or(b) is a copy of Or(a) with the same introductory marker and citation. This is the result of one long citation that is found in both. Origen's citational text is consistent.

#### Romans 2:10

δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι

-----

δέ Or(abd) NA RP ] omit Or(c)



Or(c) omits the post-positive δέ, against the other two citations and NA/RP. This reading is a lemma.<sup>86</sup> This is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Again, Or(b) is a copy of Or(a) in introductory marker and citation.

Romans 2:11  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 2:12  
Ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἥμαρτον, ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται, καὶ ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται

-----  
γάρ Or(c) ] omit Or(ab) NA RP

Or(c) adds a post-positive γάρ. This reading disagrees with the NA/RP reading as well as one other citation for this verse. The unit of variation is not located in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The addition of γάρ is an accommodation to the abbreviated citation.

Romans 2:13  
οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ \* νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ \*\* νόμου δικαιωθήσονται

-----  
\*τοῦ Or(acd) RP ] omit Or(b) NA  
\*\*τοῦ Or(ad) RP ] omit Or(b) NA

Or(a) has been adjusted to the later reading of RP. Or(ad) have τοῦ as in RP. Or(c) shows signs of alteration to fit the context of the citation, divergent from both NA and RP with the addition of τῶν δικαιωμάτων τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Romans 2:14

---

<sup>86</sup> See page 47 in reference to lemmata.

ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσὶν νόμος

-----  
δέ Or(bf) ] Or(acdg) NA RP  
ποιῶσιν Or(abdegh) ] ποιη Or(c) RP

Or(bf) have the post-positive δέ instead of γάρ. This reading disagrees with the NA/RP reading as well as eight other citations of this verse in Origen's work. This unit of variation is located in the critical apparatus Treg, but not NA or Tisch. *Matt.Com C* has a reading of Romans 2:14 which reads οἱ τοιοῦτοι instead of οὗτοι as it appears in NA/RP. This reading is in a Romans citation group. This reading is in the critical apparatus of NA, which only lists manuscript 012. *Matt.Com C* reading is the only instance where this unit is cited this way in Origen, opposed to the other 8 readings of this verse elsewhere. Or(c) corresponds to RP with the verb ποιη. So far, *Rom.Frag A* has shown tendency to reflect a RP reading.

Romans 2:15  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 2:16  
ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε κρίνει ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου διὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ

-----  
Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ NA ] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Or(ab) RP

Or(a) has the transposition Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, which is a change to Origen's authorial citation text to conform to the later text of RP.

Romans 2:17-20  
*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse and therefore will not be discussed, as it cannot be confirmed to be copied from a work of Origen.

Romans 2:21-22

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 2:23

ὅς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις

-----

omit Or(b) ] τὸν θεὸν Or(acdefg) NA RP

Or(b) omits τὸν θεόν, which disagrees with the reading found in NA and RP.

However, the reference does not cite the whole verse and looks as if this omission is related to the abbreviation of the verse. The other citation from *Cels*, Or(a), has the full verse and is identical to NA, RP and the other Origen citations.

Romans 2:24-25

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 2:26-27

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 2:28-29

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Chapter Three

Romans 3:1

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 3:2

πολὺ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον. πρῶτον μὲν [γὰρ] ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ

-----

μὲν γὰρ ὅτι NA RP 01 02 06c 018 020 33. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 2464c ]  
γὰρ Or(bd) 6. 67. 1908., omit Or(cd), μὲν ὅτι 03 06 012 044 81. 365. 1506. 2464., γὰρ  
ὅτι 1881.

Or(d) reads γάρ instead of μὲν γὰρ ὅτι. Or(ce) is lacunose in this variant. None of Origen's citations reflect the reading of NA and RP. This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, and Treg. Origen's text is inconsistent and even the various readings in the manuscript witnesses are divided. MS 6 often supports Origen's reading.

Romans 3:3  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 3:4  
μὴ γένοιτο· γινέσθω δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής, \* πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης, καθὼς γέγραπται· ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσεις ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε  
-----  
\*omit Or(ac) NA RP ] ἐστὶν Or(b)

Or(b) has ἐστὶν before πᾶς. This reading disagrees with NA and RP, which omit the verb. Or(b) omits the beginning of the verse which has a verb. The addition of ἐστὶν is an adaptation of the grammatical structure of the verse in Origen. Origen adds the verb ἐστὶν to make up for the dropping of the verb γινέσθω and changes the declension of the noun ἀληθής which renders "God is true". The unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg.

Romans 3:5  
εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην συνίστησιν, τί ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω  
-----  
τί ἐροῦμεν Or(c) NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Or(b) does not have the article (o) after θεός. This reading disagrees with NA and RP. The reading is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. This verse is cited in *Rom.Frag C* elsewhere, Or(a), but the second half of the verse is not recorded. Both citations are only partial with adjustments due to context.

Romans 3:6

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 3:7

εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, τί ἔτι καγὼ ὡς ἀμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι;

-----

ἐμῷ Or(b) NA RP ] ἀνθρωπίνῳ Or(a)

Or(a) has one reading of Romans 3:7 that has ἀμαρτωλός instead of ἐμῷ, but a second reading in close proximity has the same reading as NA/RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Origen's change is a contextual adjustment of Paul's first person reference to a more general reference in ἀνθρωπίνῳ to apply his own prose and the verse to people in general.

Romans 3:8

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 3:9

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 3:10

καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς

-----

ὅτι Or(bc) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

This is a citation of the LXX. Only those citations of Origen within groups of other Romans text will be mentioned. Or(a) does not have ὅτι after γέγραπται, appears in the text of NA and RP. This reading is located in the commentary lemma in *Rom.Frag A*, which is often different from the NA text. The unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg.

Romans 3:11  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 3:12  
πάντες ἐξέκλιναν ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν· οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός.

-----

ὁ NA ] omit Or(ab) RP

Or(ab) both reflect the reading of RP. The Romans commentary fragments have undergone change to reflect a later text form.

Romans 3:13-18  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 3:19  
οἶδαμὲν δὲ ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῆ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ

-----

δέ Or(c) NA RP ] γάρ Or(a)

Or(a) is in *Rom.Frag A* that reads γάρ instead of δέ. The latter reading is in the text of NA and RP. The reading of *Rom.Frag A* is a commentary lemma. The unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg.

Romans 3:20  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 3:21

Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν

-----

\*omit Or(abcef) NA RP ] γάρ Or(d)

\*\*omit Or(abdf) NA RP ] καὶ ἐν τῷ Or(ce)

Or(ce) have an extra phrase καὶ ἐν τῷ that is not present in the text of NA and RP. This unit is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. He does cite this verse five times; the other three times are identical with NA/RP. Despite Or(c) being unique, Or(b) is identical to NA/RP. The reading in Or(d) has γάρ but it is abbreviated which requires grammatical adjustment. The variation unit is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg.

Romans 3:22

δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. οὐ γάρ ἐστὶν διαστολή

-----

\*omit Or(b) NA ] καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας Or(a) RP

Or(a) reflects the reading of RP. This is likely a later adjustment.

Romans 3:23

πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ

-----

γὰρ Or(acd) NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Or(b) does not have the post-positive γὰρ, which disagrees with the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, and Treg. The fragments of *Rom.Frag A* and *Rom.Frag C* often omit post-positives.

Romans 3:24

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 3:25

ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων

-----

διὰ πίστεως Or(abcde) 01 04 06 010 012 0219. 104. 365. 1505. 1506. 1881. ] διὰ τῆς πίστεως NA RP P40 03 04c 06c 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 630. 1175. 1241. 2464. αὐτοῦ Or(cd) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

Or(abcd) do not have τῆς before πίστεως, as it reads in NA and RP. This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of NA and Treg. The evidence in favor of the Origen reading is very strong, which includes witnesses that were later changed to the reading of NA/RP. The longer reading does have other strong witnesses such as P40 and 03.

Or(a) omits the word αὐτοῦ. This is a non-NA/RP reading. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The other three usages of this verse in Origen's writings all contain the αὐτοῦ except for this reading in Or(a). This omission is stylistic.

Origen has two readings that differ from the text of NA and RP. Or(ad) are lacunose in the middle of their citations, reading αὐτοῦ and ἱλαστήριον δέ, respectively, instead of the fuller εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ as it is in the critical editions. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA. Both of Origen's citations that contain the different text omit much of what is present in the critical editions.

Romans 3:26

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 3:27

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.



Romans 3:28

λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου

-----

γάρ NA 01 02 06 010 012 044 81. 365. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881. 1908. ] οὖν Or(a) RP 03 04 06c 018 020 025 33. 69. 104. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464., omit Or(b)  
δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει Or(bc) NA ] πίστει δικαιοῦσθαι Or(a) RP

Or(a) corresponds to RP. Or(b) has a line that reflects Romans 3:28, but it omits γάρ (NA) and οὖν (RP). This omission is not listed in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg, though the unit of variation is in NA and Tisch. This is the only instance of Romans 3:28 in Origen with an omission in this unit of variation. The evidence is strong for both post-positives, however no witnesses are listed for an omission.

Romans 3:29

ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον; οὐχὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν

-----

Or(a) is expansive compared to NA and RP. Or(b) is again in correspondence with RP. This unit of variation is not found in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Or(c) is the only citation of Origen here that corresponds to NA.

Romans 3:30

εἶπερ εἶς ὁ θεὸς ὃς δικαιοῦσθαι περιτομῆν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως

-----

ὁ Or(bc) NA RP 06 656.] omit Or(a)  
εἶπερ Or(a) NA 01 02 03 04 06c 6. 81. 365. 1506. 1739.] ἐπέπερ Or(b) RP 01c 06 010 012 020 025 044 33. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. 2464.  
δικαιοῦσθαι Or(a) NA] δικαίσει RP

Or(a) has a reading of Romans 3:30 in which the article (ὁ) is omitted, against NA and RP. The unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. It also reads εἶπερ instead of ἐπέπερ, in agreement with the text of NA and against RP.

This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of NA. 01 02 03 04 support Origen. The correction of 01 as well as 06 010 012 020 025 1881 are witnesses to the text of RP. The second reading is later and could not be the text of Origen as it appears in Or(b). The reading of εἶπερ is probably Origen's authorial citation text with ἐπέειπερ which has been changed in Or(b) since.

#### Romans 3:31

νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ νόμον ἰσχύνομεν  
-----

Or(a) is intermittent, though is still recognizably Romans 3:31. Or(c) is contextualized and has other added content. Other than these two citations the other citations are consistent.

#### Chapter Four

##### Romans 4:1

Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν εὐρηκέναι Ἀβραὰμ τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα;  
-----

εὐρηκέναι before Or(a) NA 01 02 04 06 010 012 044 81. 365. 629. 1506. 1739. ]

εὐρηκέναι after RP 018 020 025 33. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. 2464.

Or(a) reads εὐρηκέναι before Ἀβραὰμ. It corresponds with NA, against RP. This unit of variation appears in NA and Tisch.

##### Romans 4:2

εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἔχει καύχημα, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς θεόν  
-----

omit Or(b) NA ] τόν Or(a) RP

Or(a) corresponds to the RP reading with τόν at the end of the verse.

##### Romans 4:3-7

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 4:8

μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὐ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν.

-----

\*οὐ Or(b) NA ] ᾧ Or(a) RP

Rom.Frag A, again, corresponds to the RP reading against NA.

Romans 4:9

Ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν; λέγομεν γάρ· ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

-----

The lemma of Or(b) has unique features compared to the text of NA and RP. The phrase ἐπὶ τῷ Δαυιδ is added before μακαρισμὸς. Οὖν οὗτος is replaced by οὐκ, and ἢ καὶ is replaced by ἄλλ. Or(a) is consistent with NA and RP.

Romans 4:10

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 4:11

καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι [καὶ] αὐτοῖς [τὴν] δικαιοσύνην,

-----

καὶ NA RP 01c 04 06 010 012 018 020 025 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. RP ] omit Or(bc) 01 02 03 044 6. 81. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881. 2464.

τὴν NA RP 03 04 06c 010 012 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464. RP ] omit Or(bc) 01 04c 06 6. 365. 424c. 1506. 1739, εἰς 02 424. 1881.

The units of variation at the end of 4:11 show mixture of several textual traditions that is likely due to the copying process as opposed to corrected readings within the manuscripts. The two units revolve around the two words καὶ and τὴν. Or(b) which omits both is supported by 01. 6. 1506. 1739. The MSS that support the presence of both are more recent (04 010 012 018 020 025 104 1175 1241 1505 RP). This shows

that the reading was most likely introduced later. The earlier manuscripts that have only one reading or the other without signs of correction demonstrate differing independent readings. 02 and 1881 omit καί but read εἰς instead of τήν or omit. This second reading τήν is in a very small number of manuscripts. 06 and 365. read καί but omit τήν . Conversely, manuscripts 03 044 81 630. 2464. have the opposite reading (omit καί, has τήν).

Romans 4:12

καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν τοῖς ἔχουσιν τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστία πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ

-----  
 ἐν Or(b) NA ] πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ Or(a) RP  
 πίστεως Or(b) NA ] omit Or(a) RP

*Rom.Frag A* is identical to RP against NA. *Rom.Frag A* is commonly adjusted to match the text of later witnesses. This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of Tisch, and Treg, but not NA.

Romans 4:13

Οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι \* κόσμου, ἀλλὰ διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως

-----  
 γάρ Or(b) NA RP ] omit Or(a)  
 \*omit Or(b) NA RP ] τοῦ Or(a)

Or(a) omits γάρ and ἡ against the text of NA and RP. These units of variation are not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. There is a unit of variation where Or(a) corresponds with NA and not RP with the omission τοῦ.

Romans 4:14-15

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 4:16

Διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως, ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι, οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὅς ἐστιν πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν

-----

Or(a), NA, and RP are identical. Or(b) has some supplements to the reading, including καί, the omission of εἰς and the transposition of εἶναι. The fluid nature of Or(b) shows Origen's technique in adjusting the biblical text to fit his own writings and commentary.

Romans 4:17-18

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 4:19

καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει κατενόησεν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἤδη νενεκρωμένον, ἑκατονταετῆς που ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας Σάρρας

-----

ἑαυτοῦ Or(b) ] omit Or(ac) NA RP ]

ou RP 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 33. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. 2464. ] omit Or(ab) NA 01 02 03 04 6. 81. 365. 1506. 1739.

ἤδη Or(ab) NA RP 01 02 04 06 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 2464. RP ] omit Or(c) 03 010 012 630. 1739. 1881.

Or(b) reads εαυτοῦ, though elsewhere this word is not present in Origen's citations, nor the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Or(a) is the only citation that reflects the NA text, omitting the ou before κατενόησεν. This variant is in the apparatus of NA, however it is not present in Tisch, or Treg.

Romans 4:20-24

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 4:25

ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν

-----  
omit Or(ac) NA RP ] γάρ Or(b)

*Rom.Frag C 222:14* has a reading where γάρ is present, though not in NA or RP.

The citation is abbreviated, which makes the γάρ more likely to be an addition to adjust the abbreviated verse to the context of Origen's own writing. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg.

Chapter Five

Romans 5:1-2

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 5:3

οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, \* εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις  
ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται

-----  
καυχώμεθα Or(f) NA RP ] καυχωμένοι Or(bcdegi) 03 0220. 365.

\*omit Or(bef) NA RP ] καί Or(cd), not available Or(aghjk)

Or(begi) reads καυχώμενοι, and Or(cd) read καυχώμενος, opposed to the reading in Or(f), NA and RP, which is καυχώμεθα. Or(cd) read καί, though this is absent in the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. There are seven other citations of this verse in Origen that omit καί.

*Rom.Frag A* is likely to have been altered to the Byzantine text, and *Philocalia* is a compilation of Origenian writings which here share the same reading and probably the same source material.

Romans 5:4-5

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 5:6

Ἔτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν ἔτι κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν

-----  
omit Or(ab) RP ] ετι NA

Or(a) is with RP, a common feature in *Rom.Frag A*.

Romans 5:7

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 5:8

συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἔτι ἀμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν

-----  
δὲ Or(cd) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

ὄντων ἀμαρτωλῶν Or(b) ] ἀμαρτωλῶν ὄντων Or(acd) NA RP

Or(a) omits the post-positive δέ as it appears in the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The citation, other than the omission of δέ, has the entire verse, which is a grammatical adjustment. Or(c) is a full citation, which includes δέ. Or(b) transposes ἀμαρτωλῶν ὄντων to ὄντων ἀμαρτωλῶν. The former reading is the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. It is probable that this is an adjustment to Origen's prose as the citation begins just before the unit of variation.

Romans 5:9

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 5:10

εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλῶ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ·

-----  
ἐχθροὶς ὄντες Or(ab) NA RP ] ὄντες ἐχθροὶς Or(c)

Or(c) transposes ἐχθροὺς ὄντες, against the text of NA and RP. The unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Treg, but is present in Tisch.

Romans 5:11

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 5:12

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 5:13

ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου \* ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου

-----

\*omit Or(ef) NA RP ] ἢ Or(f)

δέ Or(de) NA RP ] γὰρ Or(af), omit Or(bc)

Or(f) has the article before ἁμαρτία. The text of NA and RP do not. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Or(adf) all have a different post-positive than NA/RP. The text of NA and RP reads δέ. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Or(abcd) also begin mid-verse which will affect most post-positives and their connection to previous sentences. Or(b), a compilation, seems to share the same source material as Rom.Frag A, Or(c). Or(d) is the only identical citation with NA and RP.

Romans 5:14

ἀλλ' ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ ὃς ἐστὶν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος

-----

καὶ Or(b) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

μὴ Or(b) NA RP 62. 63. 67. ] omit Or(ac) 614. 1739. 2495.



Or(c) is lacunose for several words, including μή (which is supported by 614.

1739. 2495.) though earlier in the same work, it is cited in full.

Romans 5:15

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 5:16

καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος τὸ δῶρημα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς  
κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα.

-----  
δέ NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Or(b) has a lacuna where the text of NA and RP reads δέ. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. This reading is abbreviated, drops the post-positive, and connects directly to Origen's context.

Romans 5:17

εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός, πολλῶ  
μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης  
λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

-----  
ἐν Or(ab) 1739. 1881.] τῷ τοῦ NA RP 01 03 04 018 020 025  
τῆς δωρεᾶς Or(a) NA RP] omit Or(b) 03  
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Or(a) NA RP] Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ Or(b) 03

Or(b) cites ἐν instead of τῷ τοῦ as it is in the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of NA and Tisch. Later in the citation, Or(b) omits δωρεᾶς τῆς, as well as transposes Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. MS 03 omits τῆς δωρεᾶς as well as transposes Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ as it reads in Or(b). 03 is likely to be related to Origen's authorial citation text of Origen in this verse and perhaps in general to *John.Com B*.

Romans 5:18-21

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

## Chapter Six

### Romans 6:1

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

### Romans 6:2

μη̄ γένοιτο. οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ;

-----  
\*omit Or(b) NA RP ] δέ Or(a)

ἐν Or(b) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

Or(a) has δέ where the text of NA and RP are lacunose. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The citation also omits ἐν, which is in the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The citation is abbreviated and connects to Origen's context with the added post-positive. P46 reads ζήσωμεν against Or(a) and ζήσομεν.

### Romans 6:3

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

### Romans 6:4

συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὡσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν.

-----  
Or(a) reads γάρ, while NA/RP read οὖν. The citation is shortened and is connected to Origen's writing by the post-positive. Or(d) at the end of the citation has a different conjugation of the verb, but it too is an abbreviation and has alteration due to its connected Origen text.

### Romans 6:5

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 6:6-7

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 6:8

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Roman 6:9

εἰδότες ὅτι Χριστὸς \* ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει, θάνατος \*\* αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει

-----

\*omit Or(ef) NA RP ] δέ Or(a), γάρ Or(bc)

\*\*omit ] γάρ Or(d)

Or(abc) have a post-positive after Χριστός. Or(a) has δέ and Or(bc) both read γάρ. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. All three of these citations have left off the beginning of the verse, based on adjustment to Origen's writings and use a post-positive for transition. Or(d) adds γάρ after θάνατος against the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg.

Romans 6:10

ὃ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· ὃ δὲ ζῆ, ζῆ τῷ θεῷ

-----

γάρ Or(aceg) NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Or(b) omits the γάρ that is in the text of the NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. It is adjusted at the beginning and is expanded at the end to accommodate Origen's discussion of Jesus. Here, Origen cites phrases of the biblical content that are connected by his own words to make a sentence that is both a mixture of citation and prose.

Romans 6:11

οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτία ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

-----

νεκροὺς μὲν εἶναι Or(ab) RP ] εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν Or(c) NA

*Rom.Frag A* has been accommodated to the RP reading in both citations.

Romans 6:12

Μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ

-----

ἡμῶν Or(abcef) NA RP ] τοῦτω Or(d)

αὐτῇ ἐν Or(e) RP 04c 018 020 025 044 33. 104. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464. ] omit Or(af) NA P94 01 02 03 04 81. 365. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881. ] αὐτῇ P46 06 010 G, τὴν ψυχὴν Or(d)

Or(d) reads τοῦτω, not ἡμῶν as it is found in the text of NA and RP. There is no evidence in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg for this unit of variation. This citation has left off the beginning of the verse, based on an adjustment to Origen's preceding sentence. Or(d) reads τὴν ψυχὴν. There is no reading in NA here, but RP has αὐτῇ εν. This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of NA, but Origen's reading is not listed.

Or(a) is in agreement with the text of NA against RP. The RP reading is αὐτῇ ἐν. The MSS P46 06 010 012 read αὐτή. The variant is in the critical apparatus of NA but not Tisch or Treg. The cause of the variant appears to be theological in nature. Simply put, the addition qualifies a statement that could otherwise be interpreted in different ways. There is an early witness (P46) as well as the Greek-Latin bilinguals in favor of the reading αὐτῇ. The longer reading αὐτῇ ἐν is supported by the correctors of 04, and

late majuscules 018 020 025. The omission is supported by a late papyrus P94, the earliest majuscules, and both 1739 and 1881.

Romans 6:13-14

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 6:15-17

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 6:18

ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ

-----

δέ Or(ab) NA RP 01c 02 03 06 010 012 018s 020 025 33. ] omit Or(c) 69., οὖν 01 04 81

Or(c) omits δέ, which is in NA. The unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of NA. There is evidence of a third reading οὖν, which has support from 01 and 04.

Romans 6:19-21

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 6:22

νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες \* ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον

-----

δέ Or(abe) NA RP ] omit Or(c)

\*omit Or(abde) NA RP ] μὲν Or(c)

δέ Or(abce) NA RP ] omit Or(d)

Or(c) has two variants that disagree with NA and RP. The post-positive δέ is omitted and μὲν is added after ἐλευθερωθέντες. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The μὲν is a grammatical compensation for the loss of δέ. Here, Origen adjusts the biblical text to fit his writing. Or(d) omits δέ after

δουλωθέντες. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA or Tisch but is in Treg. The beginning of the verse is trimmed for Origen's usage and the δέ is removed because the verse is being adjusted to Origen's argumentation instead of Paul's.

Romans 6:23  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Chapter Seven  
Romans 7:1-4  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 7:5  
*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 7:6-7  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 7:8  
ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν· χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά  
-----  
γάρ Or(c) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

Or(a) omits γάρ after χωρὶς, where it is present in NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The mid-verse start of the citation is a customization of the reading to fit Origen's sentence.

Romans 7:9  
ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ, ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν  
-----  
omit Or(acd) NA RP ] μὲν Or(b)

Or(b) reads μέν between ἡ and ἀμαρτία. NA and RP read ἡ μὲν ἀμαρτία. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The beginning of the verse is trimmed for Origen's usage and the δέ is removed because the verse is being adjusted to Origen's writing.

Romans 7:10  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 7:11  
ἡ γὰρ ἀμαρτία ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐξηπάτησέν με καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν  
-----

λαβοῦσα Or(ac) NA RP ] δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἀμαρτία Or(b)

Or(b) has two places of additional in relation to NA and RP. These units of variation are not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. In Romans 7:8, a few verses prior is the phrase ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἀμαρτία, which is also in 7:11, in Or(b). This is not a different reading of 7:11, but probably a mistake repetition of 7:8 due to similar wording.

Romans 7:12  
ὥστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἀγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθὴ  
-----

μέν Or(acd) NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Or(b) omits μέν before νόμος, though it is present in NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The citation abbreviates the beginning of the verse.

Romans 7:13  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 7:14

Οἶδαμὲν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστιν, ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινός εἰμι πεπραμένος  
ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν

-----

γάρ NA RP Or(bcde) 01 03 04 010 012 ] δέ Or(a) 02 06 020

Or(a) reads δέ against γάρ in NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA or Tisch, but is in Treg. The citation is a shortened reading of the verse and δέ has been used to transition to the citation.

Romans 7:15

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 7:16-21

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 7:22

συνήδομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον

-----

γάρ Or(bc) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

Or(a) omits the post-positive γάρ that is in the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The citation is an abbreviation of the verse, which helps to connect it to Origen's context.

Romans 7:23

βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ  
νοός μου καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς  
μέλεσίν μου

-----

εν NA ] omit Or(a) RP

*Rom.Frag A* is omits ἐν in agreement with RP against NA (omit).

Romans 7:24

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.



Romans 7:25

χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. Ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῦ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας.

-----  
χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ NA 01 044 33. 81. 104. 365. 1506., χάρις τῷ θεῷ 03, ἢ χάρις δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ 06, ἢ χάρις κυρίου 010 012 ] ευχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ RP Or(a) 01 02 018 020 025 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739.

The NA apparatus lists Origen as a witness for the reading for the NA text. His reading of ευχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ is only in *Rom.Frag A*.

Chapter Eight

Romans 8:1-2

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 8:3-4

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 8:5

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 8:6

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 8:7

διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν, τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται, οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται

-----  
omit Or(cdf) NA RP ] γὰρ Or(be)

Or(be) adds γὰρ as opposed to NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Or(b) is a shortened reading of the verse and requires a connective since διότι was removed. Or(e) is also an appendix to a sentence

in *Gen.Sel.* Or(a) has no variants to the NA/RP reading though it is abbreviated. Despite Or(b) containing γὰρ which is different from NA/RP there is another reading in this work Or(c) which is a full citation with no variant readings. Or(ef) show elements of grammatical change as they are fitted to Origen's sentences. Or(f) is also a shortened version of the verse added to the end of an Origen sentence which then connects to further commentary with ἐστίν.

Romans 8:8

οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῶ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται

-----

δέ Or(def) NA RP ] omit Or(abi), μὲν γάρ Or(c), γάρ Or(hj)

There are several readings in Origen that differ from the NA and RP reading. These differences are mainly at the beginning in relation to the post-positive δέ. Or(abi) are lacunose, Or(hj) read γάρ, and Or(c) reads μὲν γάρ. Origen adjusts the post-positive to implement the citational text in his own writings in acceptable grammar.

Romans 8:9

Ἕμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. εἰ δὲ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ

-----

δέ Or(cd) NA RP ] omit Or(a)  
ὑμῖν Or(acd) NA RP ] αὐτοῖς Or(b)

Or(a) is a complete recital of the verse yet it omits the δέ which is in the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. This omission is a reflection of Origen's adjustment of biblical content to his own grammar. Or(b) has a lexical change from ὑμῖν to αὐτοῖς, against the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg.

Romans 8:10-12

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 8:13

εἰ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ζητε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν· εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε.

-----

γάρ NA RP ] omit Or(a)

Or(a) omits the γάρ in NA/RP to reconcile the grammar of his own writings to the cited text.

Romans 8:14

ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν

-----

γάρ Or(d) NA RP ] omit Or(abc)

υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν Or (bd) NA 01 02 04 06 81. 630. 1506. 1739. 1908. ] υἱοὶ εἰσιν θεοῦ Or(ac) 03 010 012 Or, εἰσιν υἱοὶ θεοῦ RP 018 020 025 044 33. 69. 104. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. 2464.

Or(abc) all omit γάρ that is present in the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Origen has adjusted his cited text to fit his context.

The reading of υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν is in Or(b) which is a reflection of NA. Elsewhere in *Contra Celsum*, Or(a), the citation places εἰσιν between υἱοί and θεοί. This unique reading is copied in the *Philocalia* by Or(c) and is supported by manuscripts 03 010 012.

Romans 8:15

οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον ἀλλ' ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· ἀββα ὁ πατήρ

-----

πάλιν Or(ac) NA RP ] omit Or(b) 33.

Or(b) omits πάλιν after δουλείας. It is in the text of the NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA or Treg, but is in Tisch. Or(a) reads πάλιν.

Though it is likely a simple omission, Origen's point in citing the verse may not have made sense to include "again" as the argument requires in the Pauline text.

Romans 8:16  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 8:17-18  
*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 8:19  
ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαρδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ  
ἀπεκδέχεται  
-----

γὰρ Or(ae) NA RP ] omit Or(b)  
τῆς κτίσεως ἀποκαρδοκία Or(c) NA RP ] ἀποκαρδοκία τῆς κτίσεως Or(ab)

Or(b) lacks γὰρ which is present in NA and RP. The omission is not listed in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. This reading reflects Origen's liberty in dropping the post-positive in order to accommodate his own literary work.

Or(a) has the exact reading of NA/RP. Later, Or(b) omits the post-positive γὰρ to acclimate the citation to context. Or(c) again omits γὰρ, but also transposes ἀποκαρδοκία to follow τῆς κτίσεως. This variant is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The second half of this verse is consistent in all Origen's citations.

Romans 8:20  
τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἔκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐφ' ἐλπίδι  
-----

γὰρ Or(abdg) NA RP ] Or(cef)

Or(cef) lack γὰρ, which is in the text of NA and RP. The omission is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. This reading reflects Origen's liberty in dropping

the post-positive of the verse in order to attach biblical content to his own writings. After the post-positive Origen's citations are unified and consistent.

Romans 8:21

ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἢ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται \* ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ

-----

πάσα Or(c) ] omit Or(abefg) NA RP

Or(c) reads πάσα after ἐλευθερωθήσεται. This is against his other citations, and the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Or(f) changes the conjugation of the verb. Both citations are an abbreviated version of the full verse, showing Origen's liberty in citing only what is relevant to his context.

Romans 8:22-23

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 8:24

τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν· ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὃ γὰρ βλέπει τίς ἐλπίζει;

-----

ἐλπίζει NA P46 03 ] τι ἐλπίζει Or(b) 03c 06 010 012, τι καὶ ἐλπίζει Or(a) RP 01c 02 04 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 1881. 2464., καὶ ἐλπίζει Or(c) 01 1739

Or(b) reads τί ἐλπίζει, which is different from NA (ἐλπίζει), and RP (τί καὶ ἐλπίζει). This unit is in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, and Treg. Or(b) is probably the result of a later change, perhaps a conflation of both. The support for his reading consists of later 03c 06 010 012. Or(a) again has probably been adjusted to an RP reading by subsequent copyists and is not a reflection of Origen's authorial citation text.

Romans 8:25

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 8:26

Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν· τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῖ οὐκ οἶδαμεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις·

-----  
τῇ Or(c) NA ] ταῖς Or(b) RP

ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Or(b) RP ] omit Or(a), ὑπερεντυγχάνει Or(c) NA

Or(a) transposes ὑπερεντυγχάνει after στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις. However, it reads τῷ θεῷ instead of ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. This transposition is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The reading of this verse is within a two-verse citation with 8:27 in agreement with NA/RP. *Rom.Frag A* reflects the reading of RP. Or(a) is abbreviated and is connected to Origen's context with the added φησίν.

Romans 8:27

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 8:28

Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν

-----  
τὸν θεόν Or(bcdefghijklm) NA RP ] αὐτόν Or(a)

omit Or(abcdfghik) NA RP ] ὁ Θεός Or(l)

Or(a) reads αὐτόν instead of τὸν θεόν which is in NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. It is a shorter presentation of the verse.

Or(l) adds ὁ Θεός before τοῖς. For this unit there is a lacuna in the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA or Treg, but it is in

Tisch. This reading reflects Origen's liberty in order to accommodate his own literary work. Overall, the citations for 8:28 are consistent and show that here, the *Philocalia* citations are copied from *Rom.Frag A*.

Romans 8:29

ὅτι οὐς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνας τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς

-----

omit Or(bfgklm) NA RP ] γάρ Or(ch), οὕτω Or(d)

omit Or(abcfghkl) NA RP ] ἔσομένους Or(deij)

Or(a) has two additions in comparison to the NA/RP text. After προέγνω, there is ὁ θεὸς, τούτους. Later in the reading τῆς δόξης is after τῆς εἰκόνας. The units are not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. This reading reflects Origen's liberty in citing the New Testament.

Or(cdh) have a post-positive that is not in the text of NA or RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Origen drops a post-positive that is present in the verse in order to accommodate the text to his writings. Here, the opposite takes place where the critical editions of the verse have no post-positive, yet one is added to fit the context of the citation.

Or(di) lack the conjunction καί as it is in the text of NA and RP. There are 10 citations of this verse in Origen's works, which do not lack καί. More than likely this reading reflects Origen's liberty in the dropping of the conjunction of the verse in order to accommodate his own literary work.

Or(deij) add ἔσομένους after συμμόρφους where the text of NA and RP are lacunose. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. This

reading is not Origen's majority reading as there are 7 other citations that lack the εσομένου. Both works that contain this reading have highly repetitive sections with surrounding Romans material.

Romans 8:30-31  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 8:32  
ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν,  
πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίζεται  
-----  
παντῶν Or(abcefg) NA RP ] omit Or(d)

Or(d) lacks the πάντων before παρέδωκεν and omits τὰ πάντα, while transposing ἡμῖν and χαρίζεται. These units of variation are not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. *Rom.Frag A* often reflects a correspondence to RP, when NA and RP differ, but here it is unique. The rest of Origen's citations for this verse are the NA/RP reading.

Romans 8:33  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 8:34  
*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 8:35-37  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 8:38  
πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωὴ οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαὶ οὔτε  
ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα οὔτε δυνάμεις  
-----



οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα οὔτε δυνάμεις Or(a) NA P27 01 02 03 04 06 010 012 0285. 69. 81. 104. 365. 1505. 1506. 1739. 1881. 1908. ] οὔτε δυνάμεις οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα RP 018 020 33. 630. 1175. 1241., δυνάμεις οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα 044 2464, ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα οὔτε δυνάμεις P46

Or(a) is in agreement with the reading found in NA against RP. There are 3 different readings for this sequence of words in the NA apparatus. Origen reads ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα οὔτε δυνάμεις whereas RP transposes οὔτε δυνάμεις before instead of after. The variant is also in the apparatus of Tisch. The Origen reading has stronger external support. *Rom.Frag A* corresponds to RP.

Romans 8:39

οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν

-----

τις Or(b) NA RP 01 02 04 04 018 020 044 0285 33. 69 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1506. 1739. 1881. 2464. ] omit Or(a) P46 06 010 012 1505

Or(a) omits τις before κτίσις. Both NA and RP have the word present. This unit of variation is in the apparatus of NA and Tisch. P46 06 010 012 support Or(a). However, there is strong support for the reading (τις) which is in Or(b). Both cite the verse in its entirety. MSS 1739 and 1881, which normally support Origen, are against the omission.

Chapter Nine

Romans 9:1

Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυροῦσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ

-----

μου NA RP ] omit Or(a)

Or(a) has an omission where NA/RP read μοι. The second variant occurs where NA/RP read μου. Origen omits the pronoun. Neither of the two variants are in the critical

apparatus of NA or RP. The citation is abbreviated when often affects the presence of certain words, in this case pronouns. This is often an indicator that Origen is presenting the text specifically for his purposes and not to present biblical text.

Romans 9:2  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 9:3  
ηὐχόμεν γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα

-----  
ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ NA ] αὐτὸς ἀνάθεμα εἶναι Or(a), αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι RP

Origen reads αὐτὸς ἀνάθεμα εἶναι, against both NA (ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ) and RP (αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι). Though Or(a) reflects the transposition of RP, in only reads αὐτὸς with no γὰρ or ἐγὼ. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, but is in Tisch, and Treg, with limited witnesses listed. Origen begins his sentence with this citation, which could affect his wording considering the dropping of ἐγὼ, which is a personal reflection of Paul's writing.

Romans 9:4  
οἵτινες εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι

-----  
ἡ NA RP ] omit Or(a)

Or(a) is an intermittent citation of the text as it appears in NA/RP. Where it is extant, there are two places where there is a deviation. First, where the two critical editions have ἡ before δόξα, Origen has an omission. Immediately after δόξα Origen

has no text where the editions read καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία. Neither of these variants are in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The middle gap, and only text from the middle of the verse on reflect Origen's style of mixing parts of the biblical text with his own. There is an introductory marker.

Romans 9:5-6  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 9:7 - No citations

Romans 9:8  
τοῦτ' ἔστιν, οὐ \* τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς  
ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα

-----  
\*omit Or(c) NA RP ] γάρ Or(abde)

Or(abde) have the post-positive γάρ after οὐ. The text of *Philocalia* is taken from *Princ*. The critical editions NA and RP do not have this unit of variation in their texts, which is absent from the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, but is in Treg. Or(c) omits γάρ. Both Or(ad) have other citations of Romans near. Origen added the connective in order to connect his citation to his writing.

Romans 9:9-10 - No citations

Romans 9:11  
μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων μήδὲ πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ φαῦλον, ἵνα ἢ κατ' ἐκλογὴν  
πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ μένη

-----  
γάρ NA RP, μήτε Or(b) ] omit Or(a)  
φαῦλον Or(ab) NA 01 02 03 04 6. 23. 57. 67. 69. 81. 365. 630. 945. 1506. 1739. 1881.  
1908. ] κακόν RP P46 06 010 012 018 020 044 33. 104. 1175. 1241. 2464.

Or(ab) both differ from the beginning of NA and RP, which reads μήπω γάρ. Or(a) omits γάρ, while Or(b) has a lexical change of γάρ to μήτε. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Both readings of Origen have multiple citations surrounding the text of this verse. The differences are a result of attaching biblical content to context.

Or(ab) both read φαῦλον with NA, against κακόν (in RP, which is supported by P46). This textual problem is in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, and Treg. *John.Com* A differs from P46 with the reading of φαῦλον, but is in agreement with the omission of αὐτῇ in 9:12.

Romans 9:12

οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος, ἐρρέθη αὐτῇ ὅτι ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι

-----  
αὐτῇ ὅτι NA RP ] ὅτι Or(a), omit Or(b) P46 06c

Or(ab) both omit αὐτῇ . The readings in NA and RP have the pronoun present. This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch and Treg. P46 and the first hand of 06 support Origen. This could be retention of an early reading only present in Origen and P46. Both citations are in proximity with other Romans material, though consistency in Origen's writings as well as the uniqueness of the reading makes it probable that this was Origen's authorial citation text.

Or(a) is within a string of citations of 9:11 to 9:14. Here in 9:12 Origen lacks the feminine pronoun in both citations extant for this verse in his works. The only documents that support this reading are P46 and 06. However elsewhere in the chain Origen disagrees with P46 and 06 where there are variants such as with φαῦλον vs κακόν

(9:11) and with καθάπερ vs καθώς. Again, except this time in Euches, Origen represents the reading of φαῦλον and the omission of αὐτῆ. Verse 13 is not present in Or(b).

Romans 9:13-14  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 9:15 - No citations

Romans 9:16  
ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεῶντος θεοῦ

-----  
omit Or(abcdefgi) NA RP ] εἶναι Or(h)

Or(h) has εἶναι after θέλοντος . The text of NA and RP are lacunose in this unit of variation. The unit is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Or(h) is the only citation here with εἶναι. His citations are very consistent for this verse.

Romans 9:17  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical. However, The *Philocalia* readings Or(ab) were copied from Or(c).

Romans 9:18  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 9:19  
Ἐρεῖς μοι οὖν· τί οὖν ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν;

-----  
μοι οὖν Or(ab) NA 01 02 03 025 69. 1908. 57. 93. ] οὖν μοι Or(cd) RP 06 08 010 012 018 020

οὖν NA P46 03 06 010 012 ] omit Or(abcd) RP 01 02 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 1739. 1881. 2464.

The omission of οὖν before ἔτι is the only difference between Or(ab) and NA.

RP's reads οὖν μοι, against μοι οὖν in NA. This unit of variation is not found in the NA

apparatus though it is present in Tisch and Treg. The earlier majuscules favor μοι οὖν as the later majuscules and Greek/Latin bilinguals support the reading in RP. Though Origen's text in this unit of variation agrees with the NA text, the following unit of variation is in favor of RP with the exclusion of the second οὖν of the verse. Or(b) is a copy of Or(a). Or(c) is probably a copy of Or(d). The omission of οὖν is supported by 01 and 02 against P46 and 03 where it is present.

#### Romans 9:20

ὦ ἄνθρωπε, μενοῦνγε σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ; μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι· τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως;

-----  
 ὦ ἄνθρωπε μενοῦνγε NA 01 02 81. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881. ] μενοῦνγε ω ανθρωπε Or(ab) RP 01c 06c 018 020 025 044 33. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464., ὦ ἄνθρωπε μενοῦν 03, ὦ ἄνθρωπε P46 06 010 012 629

The beginning of the verse has several readings. Both Or(ab) read μενοῦνγε ὦ ἄνθρωπε with RP against NA (ὦ ἄνθρωπε μενοῦνγε). The support for Origen and RP is the correction of 01 and 06. The first hand of 01 originally supported the NA reading, with 06 supporting the P46 reading of ὦ ἄνθρωπε. MS 03 is similar to the P46 reading though shows some signs of accommodation to the other readings with the addition of μενοῦν. *Princ* normally does not show accommodation to later readings. Or(b) has copied Or(a).

#### Romans 9:21

ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν;

-----  
 ἔχει Or(bd) ] omit Or(ac) NA RP

NA and RP both read ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεύς. Or(d) was copied from Or(b), both reading ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ κεραμεύς. This unit of variation is not in the critical editions of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The transposition of ἔχει is a result of the abbreviation of the first bit of the verse and the need for the citation to begin with ἐξουσίαν, which eliminated the verb as it would appear in the verse. Due to the abbreviation of the verse in these two citations, the verb is moved to make sense. Despite this transposition, in a previous section Or(a) provides a full reading as is found in NA and RP, which is also found in Or(c).

Romans 9:22-23  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 9:24-25  
No citations

Romans 9:26- 29  
These verses cannot be distinguished between Old and New Testament

Romans 9:30-32 - No citations

Romans 9:33  
These verses cannot be distinguished between Old and New Testament  
Chapter Ten  
Romans 10:1-3  
*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 10:4  
τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι  
-----  
γὰρ Or(b) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

Or(a) omits γάρ as the post-positive. The texts of NA and RP both have this marker. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. More than likely this reading reflects Origen's liberty in dropping the post-positive of the verse in order to accommodate his own literary work.

Romans 10:5

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 10:6-7

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 10:8

ἀλλὰ τί λέγει; ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, τοῦτ' ἐστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν.

-----

This passage is linked to Deuteronomy 30:14 and therefore will not be discussed considering outside factors involving textual transmission of the LXX

Romans 10:9

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 10:10

καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν

-----

γὰρ Or(ab) NA RP ] omit Or(cde)

Or(cde) do not have γάρ as the post-positive after καρδίᾳ. This marker is in the text of NA and RP. The unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. More than likely this reading reflects Origen's liberty in dropping the post-positive of the verse in order to accommodate the citation to his own literary work.

Romans 10:11



These verses cannot be distinguished between Old and New Testament

Romans 10:12

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 10:13

These verses cannot be distinguished between Old and New Testament

Roman 10:14-21

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Chapter Eleven

Romans 11:1-4

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 11:5

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 11:6

εἰ δὲ χάριτι, οὐκέτι ἐξ ἔργων, ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκέτι γίνεται χάρις

-----

omit NA RP ] ἐστὶν Or(a)

Or(a) adds the verb ἐστὶν where there is no verb in NA and RP. This difference arose from the changing of the verse to fit Origen's writings.

Romans 11:7-9

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 11:10

These verses cannot be distinguished between Old and New Testament

Romans 11:11

Λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἔπαισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς

-----

Or(cdeg) have differing readings from the text of NA and RP. All four add the verb γέγονεν either before or after ἡ σωτηρία. Origen's other citations of 11:11 are identical to NA/RP.

Romans 11:12  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 11:13-20  
*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 11:21  
εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, μή πως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται

-----

γὰρ ὁ θεός Or(b) NA RP ] omit Or(a)  
μή πως NA RP P46 06 010 012 020 044 33. 104. 1175. 1241. 1505. ] omit 01 02 03 04  
025 6. 81. 365. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881., πόσῳ πλέον Or(a)

Or(a) omits γὰρ ὁ θεός which is in the text of the critical editions NA and RP.

This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The beginning of the citations is abbreviated. It is adjusted to fit the context of Origen's prose.

Or(a) is different to the reading in the text of NA and RP which both read μήπως. Or(a) omits this, which is probably due to it being a homily and Origen's tendency to preach extemporaneously. The unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of NA and Treg, but not Tisch. Or(a) reads πόσῳ πλέον. Manuscripts 01 02 03 04 are among those that lack this phrase. The reading of NA is supported by P46. The earliest manuscripts are again in disagreement for this unit of variation.

Romans 11:22

ἴδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτομία, ἐπὶ δὲ  
σὲ χρηστότης θεοῦ, ἐὰν ἐπιμένης τῇ χρηστότητι, ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήση.

-----  
χρηστότης θεοῦ Or(c) NA ] χρηστότητα Or(b) RP

Or(b) adds two phrases, ἔθνος καὶ πεσόν and τὸ δεύτερον ἔθνος ἐπαγγελίαι  
καί, which are different than NA and RP. There is another unit of variation, which  
corresponds to RP in that it omits θεοῦ.

Romans 11:23-24

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 11:25

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 11:26

καὶ οὕτως πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται, καθὼς γέγραπται· ἤξει ἐκ Σιών ὁ ρυόμενος,  
ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ.

-----  
omit Or(abcdef) NA RP ] ὁ Or(d)

Or(d) has the article before Ἰσραὴλ, though NA and RP do not. This unit of  
variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The reading in *Matt.Com*  
C is surrounded by Romans citations. This reading reflects Origen's use of liberty in  
accommodating biblical text to his own literary work as the citation has been attached to  
the end of his sentence.

Romans 11:27

These verses cannot be distinguished between Old and New Testament

Romans 11:28-32

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 11:33-6

These verses cannot be distinguished between Old and New Testament

Chapter Twelve

Romans 12:1

Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν·

-----  
αγίαν Or(a) NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Or(b) has no ἁγίαν before εὐάρεστον. The critical editions of NA and RP read ἁγίαν. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The citation is abbreviated, omitting the first half of the verse.

Romans 12:2-7

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 12:8

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 12:9-13

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 12:14

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 12:15

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 12:16

τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονούντες, μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονούντες ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς

-----  
τὰ NA RP ] omit Or(a)

Or(a) omits the particle before ὑψηλὰ to connect the citation to his sentence.

Romans 12:17-8

No citations

Romans 12:19

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 12:20

ἀλλ' ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν· ἐὰν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

-----  
ἀλλ' ἐὰν NA ] ἐὰν οὖν Or(a) RP

*Rom.Frag A* is in agreement with RP against NA.

Romans 12:21

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Chapter Thirteen

Romans 13:1

Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὐσαὶ ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσὶν

-----  
ὑπὸ Or(a) NA 01 02 03 06 010 012 0285. 6. 81. 365. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881. ] ἐξουσία ὑπὸ τοῦ RP 06c 020 025 044 33. 104. 1175. 1241. 1505.

Or(a) is in agreement with NA against RP. It has nearby Romans citations and a marker after the citation.

Romans 13:2

ὥστε ὁ ἀντιτασσόμενος τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ διαταγῇ ἀνθέστηκεν, οἱ δὲ ἀνθεστηκότες ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λήμψονται.

ἀντιπασσόμενος NA RP ] ἀνθεστηκότες Or(a)  
ἀνθέστηκεν NA RP ] ἀνθίστανται Or(a)

Or(a) changes the conjugation of both verbs, the rest is identical to NA/RP. The end of the citation is abbreviated.

Romans 13:3-6  
No citations

Romans 13:7

ἀπόδοτε \* πᾶσιν \*\* τὰς ὀφειλάς, τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν φόρον, τῷ τὸ τέλος τὸ τέλος,  
τῷ τὸν φόβον τὸν φόβον, τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμὴν

-----

\*omit Or(a) NA 01 02 03 06 ] οὖν RP 01c 06c 08 010 012 020 025

\*\*omit Or(a) NA RP ] ἀποδιδούς Or(b)

τῷ τὸ τέλος τὸ τέλος before Or(b) NA RP ] after Or(a)

Or(b) inserts ἀποδιδούς between πᾶσιν and τὰς ὀφειλάς. NA and RP are lacunose here, nor is this unit of variation in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Other than the addition of ἀποδιδούς, Or(b) is identical to NA and RP.

Or(a) omits οὖν against RP, in favor of the NA reading. This reading is in Tisch and Treg, but their witnesses disagree with each other. It transposes τῷ τὸ τέλος τὸ τέλος after τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν φόρον whereas it is before in the critical edition texts of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. It is probable that this phrase was simply reproduced from memory, which jumbled the order. The citation is a two-verse sequence (13:7-8). In verse 8, Origen corresponds to the NA reading as there is a difference of position between it and RP. This reading of Origen is unlike both critical editions in 13:7.

Romans 13:8

Μήδενὶ μήδεν ὀφείλετε εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν· ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν

-----  
ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν Or(a) NA 01 02 03 06 08 010 012 025 69. ] ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους RP 020 33. 1908.

Or(a) is in agreement with NA against RP.

Romans 13:9

τὸ γὰρ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἕτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται [ἐν τῷ]· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

-----  
οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις NA RP ] οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις Or(a)  
οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις NA RP ] omit Or(a)  
τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ Or(ab) NA P46 01 03 06 08 010 012 45. 69. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1505. 1506. 1739. 1881.] τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ RP 02 020 025 044 048. 33. 1175. 1241. 1908.  
ἐν τῷ Or(a) NA RP 01 02 06 020 025 044 048. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 1739. 1881. ] omit Or(b) P46 03 010 012

The transposition of the phrase (οὐ μοιχεύσεις) is the only difference between Or(a) and NA, This unit of variation is in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, and Treg. The LXX in Deuteronomy 5:17-19 reads οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις (like NA) while Exodus 20:13-15 reads οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ φονεύσεις. It is hard to know what Origen is citing considering he places οὐ μοιχεύσεις in the second position and skips the commandment οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις. This difference is most likely a grammatical adjustment to his context.

Or(b) corresponds to NA, except for the omission of ἐν, which is present in NA, RP 01 02 06. The omission of ἐν τῷ has early strong support. The two citations here are both from *Matt. Com C*, which supports Origen using multiple text forms, or that, his citation was changed. Again, 01 and 02 united against Origen when he does not correspond to either NA or RP but has manuscript support. Though the external

evidence is split between these two readings, whenever Origen is against NA and RP and has P46 and 03 as support, it is usually a good indication of an unaccommodated citation in Origen's writings.

Romans 13:10-11  
No citations

Romans 13:12  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 13:13  
ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν, μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ  
ἀσελγείαις, μὴ ἔριδι καὶ ζήλῳ  
-----  
μὴ NA RP ] οὐ Or(b)

Or(b) has a different conjugation of the verb (περιπατοῦσιν) as well as οὐ instead of μὴ, which is the reading of NA and RP. The unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. The citation is within a series of surrounding citations of Romans. The verse is cited in full despite the difference in the negative particle.

Romans 13:14  
No citations

Chapter Fourteen  
Romans 14:1

Τὸν δὲ ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει προσλαμβάνεσθε, μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν  
-----  
δὲ Or(a) NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Unlike NA and RP, which have the post-positive δέ, Or(b) omits this. The unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch or RP. Even though this reading is a



full citation, with one difference in the omission, it is an example of Origen incorporating biblical content into his own writings.

Romans 14:2

ὁς μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα, ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει

-----  
δέ Or(ab) NA RP ] omit Or(c)

Or(c) omits δέ, which is in NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch or RP. Even though this reading is a full citation, with one difference in the omission it is an example of Origen's again using phrases of biblical text mixed with his own words.

Romans 14:3-8

No citations

Romans 14:9

εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ Χριστὸς \* ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν, ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ

-----  
γὰρ Or(b) NA RP ] omit Or(c)

\*omit Or(bc) NA 01 02 03 04 06 010 012 025 044 33. 365. 630. 1506. 1739. ] καὶ RP 01c 04c 06c 020 81. 104. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881.

ἔζησεν NA 02 03 04 365. 1506. 1739. 1881. ] ἀνέστῃ Or(bc) RP 010 012 629. ]

ἀνέστῃ καὶ ἔζησεν 01c 06 020 025 044 0209. 33. 69. 81. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. Χριστὸς Or(c) NA RP ] Ἰησοῦς Or(b)

Though Or(a) is from Romans 14:9, Origen's own writing separates phrases of the biblical text. He also changes the sequence of the biblical text. Or(c) omits the post-positive γὰρ, which is the reading of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or RP. This citation is an abbreviated version of the full

verse as found in the critical editions. This shows Origen's poetic license in the proof-texting of his citations.

Or(b) reads Ιησούς instead of Χριστός, which is in NA and RP. This reading is not in the apparatus of NA. Or(b) also omits καὶ ἔζησεν. This omission is in Or(abc). The unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of NA and Treg. The text of RP has καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη. The NA text lacks καὶ ἀνέστη. Origen lacks καὶ ἔζησεν.

Romans 14:10

Σὺ δὲ τί κρίνεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου; ἢ καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενεῖς τὸν ἀδελφόν σου; πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ

-----

γάρ NA RP ] omit Or(ab)

Or(a) omits γὰρ which is in NA and RP. This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of Treg. The beginning of the verse is omitted, which has been accommodated with the omission of the post-positive marker.

Romans 14:11-14

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 14:15

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 14:16-20

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 14:21

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 14:22

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 14:23

ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος ἐὰν φάγη κατακέκριται, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως· πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν.

-----  
δέ Or(c) NA RP ] γάρ Or(a), omit Or(b),

NA and RP read δέ, where Or(a) has γάρ, and Or(b) is lacunose. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. Both citations, other than the variant, are full renderings of the verse as it appears in the critical editions. This reading reflects Origen's liberty in accommodating citations into his own work.

[Note: RP adds what NA calls "16:25-27" after 14:23. See comments for 16:25 below]

Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος, μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.]

Chapter Fifteen

Romans 15:1-9

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Romans 15:10-12

These verses cannot be distinguished between Old and New Testament

Romans 15:13-18

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for these verses.

Romans 15:19

ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος [θεοῦ]· ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ

-----

θεοῦ NA RP P46 01 06c 020 025 044 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. RP ] omit 03, αγίου 02 06 010 012 33. 81. 104. 365. 630 1739. 1881.  
καὶ κύκλω Or(cd) NA RP ] omit Or(a), καὶ Or(b)

NA and RP read Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ κύκλω μέχρι against Or(a) Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ  
μέχρι, and Or(b), Ἱερουσαλήμ μέχρι . Or(a) is near other citations in Origen's writings.  
The critical apparatus of Tisch and Treg have this unit of variation but do not list  
Origen's reading. NA does not list the unit of variation.

Or(a) is surrounded by two citations which do not deviate from the NA text: Luke  
5:8 and 1 Timothy 1:15. Verse 19 is the first of a two-verse chain in which verse 20 also  
follows the text of the NA. Only verse 19 is different. The presence of this reading in  
Or(c) could be due to a later adjustment considering it is known to show signs of  
accommodation to a later text.

Although Or(d), marginal notes deemed to be the text of Origen, agree with 1739,  
however, 03 omits the gloss. The text of Origen is often in agreement with 03.

Romans 15:20  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Romans 15:21-33  
*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

Chapter Sixteen  
Romans 16:1-19  
No citations

Romans 16:20  
ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης συντρίψει τὸν σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. Ἡ  
χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν.  
-----

τῆς εἰρήνης NA RP ] omit Or(ab)

Or(ab) are omissive, NA and RP read τῆς εἰρήνης. There are no witnesses that support Origen's reading.

Romans 16:21-24  
No citations

Romans 16:25

Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου,

-----  
καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Or(d) NA RP ] omit Or(d)

Or(d) lacks the phrase καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ that is in the text of NA and RP. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg for this phrase. Origen often omits sections of text that do not pertain to his context. Metzger has correctly pointed out that Origen knew of manuscripts where the doxology is located at 16:25-27 and after 14:23, and that he considered the manuscript evidence to be balanced, which means Origen is not particularly helpful in understanding the earliest reading of this passage.<sup>87</sup>

Romans 16:26

φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος

-----  
δέ Or(abcdgh) NA RP ] omit Or(ef)

omit Or(vcdfgh) NA RP ] ἐν ταῖς προφητικαῖς φωναῖς Or(a), νῦν μυστηρίον πεφανέρωται Or(e)

---

<sup>87</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian*, New Testament Tools and Studies volume VIII (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 99.

Or(ef) both omit the post-positive δέ, which is in NA and RP. John.Com A often supports the reading of RP or alternate readings to both NA and RP. Both Or(ae) have added text within the citation of the verse. The omission of the connective δέ and the supplementary words within the citation show Origen's freedom of citing the New Testament in his works.

Romans 16:27

*Rom.Frag D* is the only witness for this verse.

## 2.8 Summary of Origen's citations of Romans

The citations from the works of Origen are mainly identical to a combined NA/RP reading. Likewise, when Origen's citations are different, they normally differ from both NA and RP. There is very little correspondence with NA or RP alone against the other. This is also the case with the secondary sources (excluding *Rom.Frag A* and *Rom.Frag D* which are fairly one-sided).

Origen's citations of Romans are consistent (with NA serving as a benchmark for the second century text). That is, most of Origen's citations are identical to NA and RP but when there is variation, Origen is four times more likely to be unique than side with either NA or RP. When he is not unique, Origen's citations correspond to RP alone more often than NA alone. This is due to the fact that Origen's works, which have been changed to a text resembling RP (e.g. *Rom.Frag A*) often contain more citations than those that have not been changed.

Origen's tendency to cite unique forms of Romans is either an indication of an unknown text form in areas he appears to be free, or his free citations represent a very

lax perspective on citing in general. The readings that are against both NA and RP are typically substitutions of nouns, pronouns, and the post-positives γάρ and ὃέ, grammatical changes, or adjustments that would naturally appear in writings that would attach cited material mid-sentence, which is typically how Origen cites. The differences within these 204 readings from both NA and RP are almost all contextual changes.

*Cels* always corresponds with NA against RP. *John.Com A & B*, *Rom.Frag C*, *Euches*, *Matt.Com C* are consistent with the joint NA/RP readings. *Princ* and *Jer.Hom B* also have a high affinity to the common NA/RP reading though when the Greek New Testament editions differ, these two works typically correspond with RP (as does *Rom.Frag A*). These are the only works of Origen that seem to be accommodated to RP, *Rom.Frag A* being the most altered. *Mart*, *Lam.Frag*, and *Jer.Hom A* (except for 1 reading) are identical to the shared NA/RP readings.

Considering the NA as the benchmark for the second century New Testament text, Origen's works have maintained the purity of his authorial citational text. The citations from Romans have not undergone a major accommodation to the Byzantine text. Nor have the free citations been accommodated to the Byzantine or text corresponding to NA. This demonstrates the resilience of Origen's citations.

## CHAPTER THREE

Origen cites Paul's second letter to the Corinthians a total of 292 times in available sources. Not all of Origen's works contain citations of 2 Corinthians, however. There are 37 works of Origen that do, most of which (23) have fewer than five citations. This chapter consists of discussion of secondary sources, primary sources, and a textual commentary on Origen's citations of 2 Corinthians.

### 3.1 Secondary Sources for Origen's Citations of 2 Corinthians

There are 11 secondary sources for Origen's citations of 2 Corinthians. In these sources there are 67 citations. For the secondary sources, citations of 2 Corinthians are less likely to agree with NA and RP, than citations of Romans. The difference is approximately 20 per cent. This means there are fewer instances where citations correspond to either hand-edition alone.

Table 6

Variant Readings of 2 Corinthians in Secondary Sources		
Against Both	38	71.70%
With NA against, RP	8	15.09%
With RP, against NA	7	13.21%
Total	53	100%

The percentages in Table 6 only reflect Origen's citations that occur in places where there is variation between Origen, NA, and RP. Therefore, because identical readings do not contain units of variation, these percentages only represent places where there is variation. If these citations are to be addressed as a whole they can be weighted in order to determine the relationship between identical and variant citations. If



citations of secondary sources of 2 Corinthians with variation contain 52 readings in 34 variant citations, the average of 1.53 readings per citation can be applied to the identical citations in order to compare them as a whole. The following table reflects these numbers for the secondary sources:

**Table 7**

Weighted Readings of 2 Corinthians in Secondary Sources		
Identical to NA/RP <sup>88</sup>	50	48.54%
Against Both	38	36.89%
With NA against, RP	8	7.77%
With RP, against NA	7	6.80%
Total	103	100%

There are considerably fewer citations of 2 Corinthians than Romans in secondary sources. However, these citations are less likely to be identical, and further, likely to be against both NA and RP. These readings reflect free citations which could be the work of the catena compiler, Origen’s copyists/readers/editors, or Origen himself.

### **3.2 Origen’s Primary Sources as Sources for Citations of 2 Corinthians**

Origen cites 2 Corinthians 237 times in his primary sources. There are 117 citations of 2 Corinthians with no variation, leaving 120 citations to reveal the affinity of Origen’s citations, at least what his citations have become. These variant citations contain 229 readings as seen in the table below:

---

<sup>88</sup> The “identical readings” in Origen’s primary sources are determined by multiplying the number of identical citations (33) by the average of readings per variant citation (1.51).

Table 8

Variant Readings of 2 Corinthians in Primary Works		
Against Both	116	66.28 %
With NA against, RP	48	27.43 %
With RP, against NA	11	6.29%
Total	175	100%

The other verses that are identical are not quantified in this data considering this table represents units of variation. Again, if the amount of identical citations (117) is multiplied by the average unit per citation (1.45) that would make roughly 170 “Identical” units of variation that can give an estimate of a fuller representation of where Origen’s affinity lies. In the 121 citations where there are units of variation, Origen has 175 readings in the units of variation. For every citation of Galatians in Origen, there are roughly 1.45 units of variation in each of the citations that have variation. These are shown in the following table:

Table 9

Weighted Readings of 2 Corinthians in Primary Works		
Identical to NA/RP	170	49.28%
Against Both	116	33.62%
With NA, against RP	48	13.91%
With RP, against NA	11	3.19 %
Total	345	100%

Using this average as help, Origen agrees with NA 63.19% (Identical + NA only), with RP 73.53% (Identical + RP only), and is unique 52.47% of the time. This weighted data for Origen’s primary sources is more likely to correspond to the NA different from the secondary sources attributed to Origen. The citations are equally likely to be identical to both NA and RP. However, if affinity in places of variation is compared, the

works of Origen correspond to NA three times as much as to RP, meaning that Origen's works have not undergone a major accommodation to the Byzantine text. In the secondary sources, readings against both are more likely, and readings that would correspond to NA now reflect a RP reading due to accommodation.

### 3.3 Verses of 2 Corinthians Origen Does Not Cite

There are a total of 257 verses in 2 Corinthians. However, Origen only cites 88 verses. The following verses of 2 Corinthians are not cited in Origen's works: 1:1-4, 6, 11, 13-24; 2:1, 3-6, 9-10, 12-14, 17; 3:1-2, 4, 11-12, 14; 4:1-2, 5, 9, 11-15; 5:2-3, 5, 9, 11-15, 18; 6:1, 6, 8-9, 13, 17-18; 7:1-4, 6-9, 11-16; 8:1-8, 10-13, 15-24; 9:1-5, 7-15; 10:1-2, 7-17; 11:1, 3-5, 8-13, 16-22, 26, 30-32; 12:1, 3, 7, 12-18, 20; 13:1-2, 5-14.<sup>89</sup>

Using the NA as a benchmark for Origen's affinity, his citations of 2 Corinthians generally correspond to NA or reflect a unique text. Exclusive RP readings are rare in Origen's citations of 2 Corinthians. This shows a lack of accommodation to later readings through his transmission history. Though there are some readings that correspond to RP against NA, these readings are either in his most popular works (*Euches*, *Jer.Hom A & B*, *Mart*, *Matt.Com*), which show accommodation to later texts (*Jer.Frag B* and *Rom.Frag C*).

When Origen's citations differ from a common NA/RP text, the differences are often minimal. Many of the differences in Origen's citational text are the result of connecting biblical content with his own context. He often employs simple omissions, changes in declension, conjugation, and connecting words. Considering the

---

<sup>89</sup> Verses not cited by Origen make up over 65.75% of 2 Corinthians.

grammatical placement of these in various places in citations, the subjective nature of choosing which would be Origen's biblical text or simply intermittent sections of biblical text has resulted in the inclusion of minimal differences in regard to variant readings. It seemed inappropriate to remove the connective biblical content and count it among the identical verses.

Other features of Origen's unique readings concern connective, contrastive, explanatory, transitional logical functions as well as purpose/result statements. Basically, words are added or taken away to better suit a transition into the biblical content, to make it grammatically acceptable, or to explain his reasoning for citing. These features are often similar to the catena sources as anthologists proof-texted the Church Fathers and this involves some adjustment to their compilations.

Despite these differences, Origen's citational text of 2 Corinthians is rather consistent, (1) with the readings of NA/RP, and (2) with himself in other citations across all of his writings. Origen's works, for the most part, have maintained their authorial citational text. Likewise, because Origen's works have retained unique readings to NA/RP, it shows that his citations have not undergone substantial accommodation to the known text-forms of his copyists. This is significant considering that throughout the transmission process of Origen's works since the second century, his style and unique presentations of biblical content are still present in certain works.

### **3.4 Markings and Introductory Material**

When Origen cites 2 Corinthians, his citations are often marked either with an introductory formula or a following marker attributing the citation text as written by Paul,

from Paul's second letter to the Corinthians, or written by the "apostle". There are 91 citations of 2 Corinthians that have markers. Out of these citations, 58 have no variation from NA/RP. Considering that there are a total of 208 citations with no variation, this means there are more identical citations with no marker than there are with markers.

Origen sometimes prefaces his citations with specific information, but it does not necessarily result in a consistent reading with known documents or other citations of the same verse elsewhere in his works. If Origen's citations had undergone accommodation to other text forms different from his authorial citational text, it is highly unlikely that such changes would also result in the adjustment of context including markers.

Origen could use introductory markers for any type of rendition of biblical content whether or not he is using exemplars or citing freely. Consequently, markers of any kind cannot be relied upon to determine the biblical text of Origen or even his authorial citational text (for Romans markers, cf. §2.4).<sup>90</sup>

### **3.5 Secondary Sources in Order of their Citational Frequency**

*Ps.Sel*, 2:7, 11, 15; 3:3, 18(2x); 4:8(4x), 17; 5:4(2x), 10, 16, 17, 19(2x); 6:10, 11, 12(2x), 14; 10:5; 12:10, 21

*Ps.Sel* has 26 citations of 2 Corinthians. In all of the units of variation where *Ps.Sel* is present there are 16 citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. Where there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are 2 instances of agreement with RP alone. There are no instances where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Ps.Sel* is unique from both in 11 units of variation, with one citation that had just met the

---

<sup>90</sup> Carroll Osburn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism," (*NovT* 47.4, 2005), 319 and 323.

requirements of being a citation (see Chapter 1, page 22) despite its many intermittent variants. When *Cels* is different from both NA and RP, he drops direct objects (2:15), pronouns (4:17), post-positives (5:19), prepositions (5:10), transposes words (5:16) and substitutes words (2:21). These are simply accommodations to Origen's context or style with evidence of later accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Basil.Phil A*, 4:6(2x),7(2x),18; 5:10,19; 11:2,23,24,25; 12:4,21

*Basil.Phil A* has 13 citations of 2 Corinthians. There are four citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Basil.Phil A* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are no instances of agreement with RP alone. There are two units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Basil.Phil A* has unique differences from both in 11 units of variation, with one citation despite meeting the designated formula contained enough variants to be removed. In Origen's free citations he substitutes words (4:6), removes verbs and pronouns (4:6,7,18), adds verbs and adjectives (4:7; 11:2,23; 12:21). There is no evidence of an accommodation to the Byzantine text though many of the citations are free. These could be Origen's authorial citations taken from his works and compiled in this catena.

*1Cor.Com*, 3:6; 5:10(2x); 10:3,4,5; 11:6; 12:11

*1Cor.Com* has eight citations of 2 Corinthians. There are three citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *1Cor.Com* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are 2 instances of

agreement with RP alone. There is one unit of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *1Cor.Com* has unique differences from both in three units of variation. Here, Origen drops post-positives and markers (5:10), substitutes verbs (10:3), adds the article (11:6). This source demonstrates accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Jer.Frag B*, 2:2(2x); 4:7; 7:10; 10:5(2x), 6

*Jer.Frag B* has six citations of 2 Corinthians. There are two citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Jer.Frag B* is present where there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are two instances of agreement with RP alone. There are no units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Jer.Frag B* has unique differences from both in four units of variation. Here, Origen drops or changes post-positives for connective purposes (4:7), transposes words (7:10), and drops verbs (10:5). *Jer.Frag B* shows accommodation to the Byzantine text and therefore does not retain Origen's authorial citations.

*Lam.Frag*, 3:16,17,18(2x); 5:4; 11:29

*Lam.Frag* has six citations of 2 Corinthians. There are five citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. *Lam.Frag* has unique differences from both in one unit of variation. Here, Origen adds a post-positive for connective purposes (3:16). *Lam.Frag* shows no accommodation to the Byzantine text and has free citations, which demonstrates that Origen's citational text has been preserved.

*Eph.Com*, 1:8,9,10(2x); 3:18

*Eph.Com* has five citations of 2 Corinthians. There are two citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Eph.Com* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are no instances of agreement with RP alone. There are three units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Eph.Com* has unique differences from both in seven units of variation, which includes the dropping of post-positives (1:8) and their additions (1:10). There is no indication that there has been accommodation to the Byzantine text and it has free citations, which demonstrates that Origen's citational text has been preserved.

*Rom.Frag A*, 3:7; 11:23,24,25

*Rom.Frag A* has four citations of 2 Corinthians. In all of the units of variation where *Rom.Frag A* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are no instances of agreement with RP alone. There are two units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Rom.Frag A* is different to both in four units of variation, which includes the addition of verbs (11:23). This lack of accommodation to the Byzantine text is in opposition to the textual nature of its citations of Romans, which is almost entirely Byzantine.

*John.Frag*, 4:3,4; 11:2

*John.Frag* has three citations of 2 Corinthians. In all of the units of variation where *John.Frag* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there is no instance of agreement with RP alone. There is one unit of variation where Origen



corresponds to NA against RP. *John.Frag* has unique differences from both in five units of variation including the omission of verbs (4:3) and addition of nouns that fit his context (4:4).

*Luke.Frag*, 5:10, 6:2; 12:10

*Luke.Frag* has three citations of 2 Corinthians. There is one citation where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Luke.Frag* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there is no instance of agreement with RP alone. There is one unit of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Luke.Frag* has unique differences from both in one unit of variation with the dropping of the post-positive (12:10). There is no evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Prov.Exp*, 6:14; 10:4,5

*Prov.Exp* has 3 citations of 2 Corinthians. There are 2 citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. *Prov.Exp* is different from both in one unit of variation with a word substitution (6:14). There is no evidence of accommodation in *Prov.Exp*.

*Ps.Exc*, 7:10; 13:3

*Ps.Exc* has two citations of 2 Corinthians. There is one citation where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Ps.Exc* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there is one instance of agreement with RP alone. *Ps.Exc* shows some agreement with the Byzantine text alone.

[The next two sources show no accommodation to the Byzantine text.]

*Ex.Sel*, 5:17

*Ex.Sel* has one citation of 2 Corinthians. There is one citation where Origen, NA and RP are identical.

*Nave*, 11:33

*Nave* has one citation of 2 Corinthians. There is one citation where Origen, NA and RP are identical.

The only secondary sources with substantial accommodation to the Byzantine text are *1Cor.Com* and *Jer.Frag B*. The other sources are primarily identical to the common reading of NA and RP. However, these sources contain citations that are unique to both NA and RP, mainly representing Origen's adjustment of the biblical text to his own writings. Free citations are the most likely to be authorial. Considering that most of these secondary sources preserve these free readings, many show places that are likely to be authorial.

### **3.6 Primary Sources in Order of their Citational Frequency**

*John.Com A*, 2:7, 2:15-6, 3:7-10, 3:18 (4x); 4:3-4, 4:7,10(2x); 5:6,7(4x), 5:8(2x),19(2x), 21(2x); 6:15(2x); 7:10(2x); 8:14; 9:6; 10:5, 11:29; 12:4(5x); 12:5,6; 13:3(3x)

*John.Com A* has the most citations of 2 Corinthians with 45. In all of the units of variation where *John.Com A* is present there are 25 citations where Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Where there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are no instances of Origen's agreement with RP alone. There are 12 units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *John.Com A* has unique differences from both in 21

units of variation. When *John.Com A* has unique differences from both NA and RP, the most common difference is the addition of extra explanatory comments between the words of the verse (2:15, 4:10, 7:10, 12:4). Citations are also accommodated or abbreviated to fit the style or context of the work itself (4:10, 5:7, 5:8, 6:15, 10:5, 12:4). Single word omissions are less common (3:7), as well as the exchange or removal of a post-positive (5:7). Overall *John.Com A* is consistent internally and with the texts of NA/RP. This source maintains a correspondence to the NA text throughout with no signs of accommodation to the Byzantine text. The free citations also demonstrate a high number of authorial readings.

*Cels*, 2:15; 3:5,6; 3:7,8,15(2x),16, 18(2x); 4:6(2x); 4:10,17,18(3x); 5:1,4(2x),6,8,16(2x),20; 10:3(2x),4(2x),5(2x); 12:2,4(2x)

*Cels* contains 34 citations of 2 Corinthians. In all of the units of variation where *Cels* is present, there are 20 citations where Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Where there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are no instances of agreement with RP alone. There are 8 units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Cels* has unique differences from both in 11 units of variation. Here, *Cels* often accommodates the citation to surrounding context, either through dropping verbs or pronouns (2:15, 3:15, 5:8, 20), adding explanatory commentary between words of the verse (3:16,18; 4:6), with transposition (5:16), and substitution (10:3). The citations suggest an authorial text in agreement with the NA text, in that they often reflect a common NA/RP reading with no signs of accommodation to the Byzantine text. The number of free citations demonstrates a lack of alteration.

*Ps.Frag*, 1:12(3x); 2:7,11,15,16; 4:10(2x); 5:17(2x), 19(2x); 6:11,14; 7:5,10; 8:9; 10:5,6; 12:10; 13:3

*Ps.Frag* has 22 citations of 2 Corinthians. There are 13 citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Ps.Frag* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are 2 instances of agreement with RP alone. There are no units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP.

*Ps.Frag* has unique differences from both in 9 units of variation, with one highly adapted citation. In citations different from NA/RP Origen drops verbs (1:12), direct objects (2:15), and adds his own post-positives for connection (3:16, 8:9) in order to accommodate the citations to his writings. *Ps.Frag* shows a greater correspondence to RP, which signifies that in places besides where NA and RP are identical, *Ps.Frag* has been altered.

*Matt.Com C*, 3:10,18; 4:10,18; 5:6,10(4x),17; 5:21; 6:2; 11:7,29; 12:4

*Matt.Com C* has 15 citations of 2 Corinthians. There are 5 citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Matt.Com C* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are no instances of agreement with RP alone. There are 4 units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Matt.Com C* has unique differences from both in 8 units of variation. Here, Origen adds words mid-citation (3:10; 5:10, 21), adds post-positives where he decides to start a citation (5:17), and omits sections of verses (6:2). *Matt.Com C* shows no accommodation to the Byzantine text, maintains a consistent agreement with the NA text, with many free citations. This is a good example of an authorial citation text.

*Jer.Hom B*, 2:8; 3:13,18; 4:10; 5:10; 11:23,27,28; 12:8,9,10; 13:3,4(2x)

*Jer.Hom B* has 14 citations of 2 Corinthians. There are 6 citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Jer.Hom B* is present and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are 3 instances of agreement with RP alone. There are 3 units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP.

*Jer.Hom B* has unique differences from both in 4 units of variation with with the addition of conjunctions (11:27), and the adding of post-positives (4:10). *Jer.Hom B* shows some signs of later accommodation, though there is a balance in agreements with each hand-edition alone. There remain some free readings, which demonstrate a lack of major alteration.

*Mart*, 1:5(2x), 7,12; 4:17(2x), 18; 6:2,3,4,5,7; 10:18; 12:2

*Mart* has 14 citations of 2 Corinthians. There are 5 citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Mart* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are 2 instances of agreement with RP alone. There are no units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Mart* has unique differences from both in 12 units of variation. Here, Origen drops pronouns (1:5), drops phrases for context (1:5,12), drops post-positives (4:17), and adds words for clarity (4:18; 6:5). That *Mart* has no NA-only readings versus several RP-only readings demonstrates that it contains a later text. The free citations show a technique of changing the biblical text to fit grammatically. *Mart* is not a good source for Origen's authorial citations.

*Euches*, 3:18; 4:8(2x); 5:10; 6:14,15; 11:23,25,28,29; 12:4,6

*Euches* has 12 citations of 2 Corinthians. There are 6 citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Euches* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there is one instance of agreement with RP alone. There is one unit of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Euches* is different to both in three units of variation, with one citation that despite meeting the designated formula contained enough variants to be considered high adapted. Here, Origen's unique readings come in the form of added conjunctions (3:18) comments between the wordings of the biblical content (4:8). Citations in *Euches* are mainly in agreement with NA and RP, but show around an equal level of agreement with NA and RP alone.

*Jer.Hom A*, 3:13, 3:15,16,18; 4:3; 5:21; 6:14; 11:23,24,25; 12:9

*Jer.Hom A* has 11 citations of 2 Corinthians. There are 7 citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Jer.Hom A* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there is one instance of agreement with RP alone. There are two units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Jer.Hom A* has unique differences from both in two units of variation. Here, they are in the form of dropped pronouns (4:3) and adjectives (12:9) with contextual style. *Jer.Hom A* agrees with Byzantine readings alone, which might be due to accommodation.

*John.Com B*, 2:7,15,16(2x); 3:18(2x); 4:6(2x); 5:21; 7:10; 12:4; 13:3

*John.Com B* has 12 citations of 2 Corinthians. There are seven citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *John.Com B* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are no instances of agreement with RP alone. There are three units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *John.Com B* has unique differences from both in two units of variation. Here, Origen adds commentary in the midst of his citation (2:15). The citations' lack of agreement with RP in units of variation, mixed with his free citations indicates an unaccommodated text that is most likely Origen's authorial citation text.

*Matt.Com B*, 3:7,10,16(2x), 17(2x); 4:4,18; 5:16; 11:2; 13:4

*Matt.Com B* has 11 citations of 2 Corinthians. There are three citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Matt.Com B* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there is one instance of agreement with RP alone. There are two units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Matt.Com B* has unique differences from both in eight units of variation. One citation is highly adapted, with added commentary mid-citation (3:16; 4:18), dropped verbs (5:16), and substituted nouns (11:2). These citations demonstrate an authorial nature considering their freedom with the text and the higher correspondence to the NA text.

*Hera.Dial*, 2:15, 16; 3:18; 4:16; 5:8

*Hera.Dial* has five citations of 2 Corinthians. There are two citations where Origen,

NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Hera.Dial* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are no instances of agreement with RP alone. There are three units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Hera.Dial* has unique differences from both in three units of variation. Here, Origen differences include the transposition of words (2:15), addition commentary mid-citation (2:15), and additional post-positives (4:16). *Hera.Dial* demonstrates no accommodation to the Byzantine text and contains free citations, which suggests this work contains authorial citations.

*Rom.Frag C*, 3:3,7,10; 4:10; 12:19

*Rom.Frag C* has five citations of 2 Corinthians. There is one citation where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Rom.Frag C* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there is one instance of agreement with RP alone. There is one unit of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Rom.Frag C* has unique differences from both in three units of variation. Here, Origen drops post-positives (3:10) and substitutes words (3:10; 4:10). *Rom.Frag C* shows a mixture of readings, agreeing with NA and RP alone against each other. There are examples of free citations, but the mixture demonstrates accommodation.

*Cant.Frag*, 2:15,16; 3:18

*Cant.Frag* has 4 citations of 2 Corinthians. There are two citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Cant.Frag* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are no instances of agreement with



RP alone. There are two units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Cant.Frag* has unique differences from both in one unit of variation. Here, this includes omission of key words of the verse but not necessary for Origen's context (2:16). Citations of 2 Corinthians in *Cant.Frag* show a consistent NA-only reading with one unique reading, which shows it has not been accommodated to the Byzantine text and probably contains authorial citations of Origen.

*Cant.Sch*, 2:15,16; 5:16

*Cant.Sch* has three citations of 2 Corinthians. There are two citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical. In all of the units of variation where *Cant.Sch* is present, and there is disagreement between NA and RP, there are no instances of agreement with RP alone. There are two units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Cant.Sch* has unique differences from both in one unit of variation with the omission of key words of the verse but not necessary for Origen's context (2:16; cf. *Cant.Frag*). These citations demonstrate a consistent NA-only affinity, which shows it has not been accommodated to the Byzantine text and probably contains authorial citations of Origen.

*Princ*, 4:7; 5:10; 12:21

*Princ* has three citations of 2 Corinthians. There are three units of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Princ* has unique differences from both in seven units of variation. Here, Origen adds a verb (4:7), drops a post-positive (5:10), and omits a phrase mid-citation (12:21). These citations demonstrate a consistent NA-only affinity,

which shows it has not been accommodated to the Byzantine text and probably contains authorial citations of Origen.

*Engas*, 11:14,15

*Engas* has two citations of 2 Corinthians. There is one citation where Origen, NA and RP are identical. Where there is disagreement between NA and RP, there is one instance of agreement with RP alone, which is probably an example of accommodation.

*Ex.Hom*, 6:14,16

*Ex.Hom* has two citations of 2 Corinthians. There is one unit of variation where Origen corresponds to NA against RP. *Ex.Hom* has unique differences from both in one unit of variation (dropping of conjunction (6:14) and post-positive (6:16)), with one citation that is highly adapted. There is no accommodation in these citations.

[The rest of these primary sources show no signs of accommodation to the Byzantine text, and are most likely to be Origen's authorial citational text.]

*Gen.Com*, 5:19; 12:4

*Gen.Com* has two citations of 2 Corinthians where Origen, NA and RP are identical.

*Matt.Com A*, 2:7; 5:21

*Matt.Com A* has two citations of 2 Corinthians. There is one citation where Origen, NA and RP are identical. *Matt.Com A* has unique differences from both in one unit of variation with an omission of a key word that does not apply to his context (5:21).

*Prov.Com*, 10:4,5

*Prov.Com* has two citations of 2 Corinthians. There are two citations where Origen, NA and RP are identical.

*Ex.Com*, 4:18

*Ex.Com* has one citation of 2 Corinthians. There is one citation where *Ex.Com* is against a unified NA and RP.

*Gen.Sel*, 2:15

*Gen.Sel* has one citation of 2 Corinthians. There is one citation where Origen, NA and RP are identical.

*Osee*, 11:2

*Osee* has one citation of 2 Corinthians. *Osee* has unique differences from both in two units of variation.

*Pass*, 5:19

*Pass* has one citation of 2 Corinthians. *Pass* has unique differences from both with an addition of a post-positive to attach to the end of his sentence (5:19).

*Rom.Frag B*, 13:4

*Rom.Frag B* has one citation of 2 Corinthians. *Rom.Frag B* is different to both NA and RP.

Though some sources for 2 Corinthians such as *Ps.Frag*, *Mart*, *Euches*, *Jer.Hom A*, *Rom.Frag C*, and *Engas* demonstrate examples of their readings having been accommodated to the Byzantine text, the other sources mainly contain citations that are identical to the joint reading of the Initial and Byzantine text. These citations show no sole agreement with RP, and preserve free readings, which demonstrate what Origen

probably wrote for his citational text. Both the NA-only readings and Origen's free readings show that his sources for 2 Corinthians primarily agree with the NA text.

### 3.7 Textual Commentary on Origen's Citations of 2 Corinthians

Chapter One

2 Corinthians 1:5

ὅτι καθὼς περισσεύει τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς, οὕτως διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ  
περισσεύει καὶ ἡ παράκλησις ἡμῶν

-----  
εἰς ἡμᾶς Or(b) NA RP ] omit Or(a)  
διὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ Or(a) NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Both of these citations are from *Mart* and have a single unit of variation that involves an omission. Or(a) omits εἰς ἡμᾶς. Likewise, Or(b) has a different omission, διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Both citations abbreviate with the lack of ὅτι, since Origen's purpose of using such texts is often not the same as the grammatical structure of the biblical content. Both citations are located in the same paragraph of text. The differences are not a result of Origen having available multiple text forms of the New Testament, but rather his accommodation of the biblical content to his own context.

2 Corinthians 1:7

καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν βεβαία ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν εἰδότες ὅτι ὡς κοινωνοὶ ἐστε τῶν  
παθημάτων, οὕτως καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως.

-----  
ὡς κοινωνοὶ Or(a) NA 01 02 03 04 06 6. ] ὥσπερ κοινωνοὶ RP 06c 69. 1908. 018 020.

Or(a) follows the previous citations in *Mart* from 1:5. There is a difference between the readings of NA and RP for this verse. Origen and NA read ὡς κοινωνοί, RP reads ὥσπερ κοινωνοί. This is an example of a citation retaining its citational text

instead of adjustment to later text-forms of the copyists. This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of Treg, but not Tisch or NA.

## 2 Corinthians 1:8

Οὐ γὰρ θέλομέν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὑπὲρ τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν τῆς γενομένης \* ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὑπὲρ δύναμιν ἐβαρῆθημὲν ὥστε ἐξαπορηθῆναι ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν·

-----  
γάρ θελομέν NA RP ] θέλω γάρ Or(a) 018

ὑπὲρ NA RP P46 03 018 020 044 0121. 0243. 630. 1241. 1739. 1881. 2464. περί Or(a)

\*omit Or(a) NA ] ἡμῖν RP

κατὰ δύναμιν ἐβαρῆθημὲν Or(a) NA ] περί Or(a) 01 02 04 06 010 012 025 0209. 6. 33. 69. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1505. 1908., ἐβαρῆθημὲν ὑπὲρ δύναμιν RP

NA and RP have three different units of variation between them. In these three units of variation, Origen corresponds to the NA text. There are also three units of variation where Origen disagrees with the common reading of NA/RP. They read θέλομέν, Origen reads θέλω. The editions read ὑπὲρ and Origen reads περί. NA and RP read ὑπὲρ again and Origen reads κατὰ. Out of these six units, there are three that are in the critical apparatus of NA. This citation is the first of a three-verse chain in the Ephesians commentary (1:8-10). The chain has an introductory formula, specifically "Paul" as author of the text cited. In regard to Origen's reading of θέλω, there is only one witness for this reading in the NA apparatus: 018. The difference is more than likely due to Origen's adaptation from Paul's third person plural (he and Timothy) to the first person singular. This unit of variation is in the apparatus of NA and Treg.

There is evidence of Origen replacing ὑπὲρ with περί elsewhere (cf. Gal 1:4). Here, Origen's reading (περί) stands against the text of NA and RP, which both read ὑπὲρ. The support for περί in 2 Corinthians 2:8 is quite extensive (01 02 04 06 010 012

025 0209. 6. 33. 69. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1505. 1908.). The witnesses for ὑπέρ are P46 03 018 020 044 0121. 0243. 630. 1241. 1881. 2464. That 018 contains Origen's reading of θέλω and not περὶ could further indicate that this source for Origen's text, the commentary, is somewhat unaffected by later readings. Origen, in general, tends to have a high correspondence to manuscript 1881 (especially Rom.Frag D), though again the retention of περὶ is significant concerning identifying early New Testament readings. The manuscripts that contain so-called "Alexandrian" readings, namely 02, 33. 81. 326 are in agreement with Origen, however, 044 is not. It would seem that these manuscripts would be unified based on their groupings together.

NA and Origen both omit ἡμῖν. It is not surprising that Origen has this reading given the dominant support of the earliest witnesses in favour of the omission. Support for ἡμῖν is mainly from corrected hands and later Byzantine documents. This is probably Origen's authorial citation text, considering the reading's support. It might even be his biblical text, or exemplar text. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of Treg, but is in NA. The unit of variation for the transposition of κατὰ δύναμιν ἐβαρήθημὲν [Or(a), NA] to ἐβαρήθημὲν ὑπὲρ δύναμιν (RP) is not listed in the apparatus of NA. Origen corresponds to NA here as well. The citations for this verse show two opposing characteristics of Origen's citation text: His agreement with NA against RP, and his free citations against both NA and RP.

2 Corinthians 1:9

ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου ἐσχήκαμεν, ἵνα μὴ πεποιθότες ὦμεν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ ἐγείροντι τοὺς νεκρούς

-----

There is a unit of variation listed in the apparatus of NA in this verse. However, Origen, NA, and RP all correspond to the same reading. This citation is the second in a three-verse citation chain.

## 2 Corinthians 1:10

ὃς ἐκ τηλικούτου θανάτου ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ρύσεται, εἰς ὃν ἠλπικαμεν ὅτι καὶ ἔτι ρύσεται

-----  
τηλικούτου θανάτου NA RP ] τηλικούτου θανάτων Or(ab) P46 630.

εἰς ὃν NA RP ] omit Or(ab)

ὅτι καὶ ἔτι NA RP 01 02 04 06c 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 365. 1175. 1241. 2464. ] ὅτι καὶ Or(a) 06c 104. 630. 1505., καὶ ετι P46 03 06 0121. 0243. 1739. 1881., καὶ ὅτι 010 012

ρύσεται NA P46 01 03 04 025 0209. 33. 81. 365. 1175. ] ρύεται Or(ab) RP 06c 010 012 018 020 0121. 0243. 104. 630. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464., — 02 06 044

These citations are the last of a three-verse citation chain. There are three units of variation within this final verse of the chain. The first variant τηλικούτου θανάτων disagrees with τηλικούτου θανάτου in NA and RP. The only evidence in the NA apparatus supports Origen's reading (P46 and 630). Origen's reading is preferred.<sup>91</sup> Both witnesses disagree with Origen in the first verse of this chain (cf. 1:8; there no variants listed for 1:9). The second unit of variation for 1:10 is the verb ρύσεται vs ρύεται. NA reads ρύσεται. Origen and RP read ρύεται. The support for Origen's reading of ρύεται is not as strong as for the NA reading. Also, 018 supports Origen, as it supported Origen's reading of θέλω and against Origen's περὶ in 1:7. Both 1739. and 1881. correspond to Origen's reading. Perhaps Origen's text was later changed to a reading similar to, or to 018, which then in turn affected 1739 and 1881. The second unit of variation is not noted in the apparatus of NA. Origen simply omits εἰς ὃν in reading

---

<sup>91</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, (German Bible Society: Stuttgart, 1994), 506.

Or(a), and Or(b) is lacunose. The beginning and end of verses are often omitted due to context, so the absence of this text in Or(b) is not unusual. The last unit of variation in 1:10 Origen is against the common reading of NA/RP (ὅτι καὶ ἔτι). The apparatus of NA notes Origen as supporting the reading ὅτι καὶ. In the first verse of this chain, 104. corresponds to Origen's περί, is against Origen's omission of ἡμῖν, but corresponds to Origen's reading of ῥυεταί. On the other hand 630 reads ὑπέρ, omits ἡμῖν, and supports Origen's τηλικούτου θανάτων, and καὶ ῥυεταί. Likewise, manuscript 1505 supports περί, and καὶ ῥυεταί. There are a few manuscripts that alone support Origen in units of variation between the NA and RP in 1:10. However, the manuscript's correspondence to Origen is mixed. To follow certain manuscript's correspondence to Origen over the period of a citation chain provides the opportunity to see specific manuscripts relationship to Origen. Manuscripts 104. 630. and 1505. correspond to Origen's text in this verse but there is little evidence to determine why they are different in places where they do not correspond to Origen.

## 2 Corinthians 1:12

Ἡ γὰρ καύχησις ἡμῶν αὕτη ἐστίν, τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐν ἀπλότητι καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, [καὶ] οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ ἀλλ' ἐν χάριτι θεοῦ, ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, περισσοτέρως δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

καύχησις Or(b) NA RP ] καύχημα Or(ad)  
αὕτη ἐστίν Or(b) NA RP ] omit Or(a)  
τοῦ NA ] omit Or(a) RP  
καὶ NA ] omit Or(a) RP

The three citations from the commentary provide only the beginning sections of the verse. These three Or(bcd) are found in different parts of the Psalms fragment which helps to gauge Origen's consistency. Or(d) is precluded with an identifying introduction,



that names Paul as the citations source. Or(a), also begins with τοῦτο γάρ ἐστί, which then omits αὐτῆ ἐστίν, as it is omitted in Or(a). The citations Or(bc) do not have any variants. However Or(d) has the same introduction as Or(a), the same omission, yet is somewhat shorter than Or(a). The two units where NA and RP differ concern the genitive article, and the conjunction καί.

Or(a) is the longest citation of this verse which includes the units of variation between NA and RP. It has some correspondence to RP, though it omits several words. Considering these four citations, three are abbreviated, while Or(a) is intermittent. This is an example of Origen's stylistic citational text, while having a common reading in the middle of the verse. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of Tisch or NA, but is in Treg (though the omission of τοῦ is not listed).

## Chapter Two

### 2 Corinthians 2:2

εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ λυπῶ ὑμᾶς, καὶ τίς \* ὁ εὐφραίνων με εἰ μὴ ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἐμοῦ;

-----

\*omit NA 01 02 03 04 81 ] ἐστίν Or(ab) RP 01c 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 0243 0285 6 33 69 104 365 630 1175 1241 1505 1739 1881. 1908. 2464.

Both citations correspond to RP, against the omission of ἐστίν by NA. Or(a) has an introductory formula naming Paul. ἐστίν (Origen's reading) is supported by 01c 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 0243. 0285. 6. 33. 69. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 1908. 2464. The omission is supported by 01 02 03 04 81. Both readings have strong support.

### 2 Corinthians 2:7

ὥστε τούναντίον μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς χαρίσασθαι καὶ παρακαλέσαι, μὴ πως τῆ περισσοτέρῃ λύπῃ καταποθῆ ὁ τοιοῦτος

-----  
Or(b) is the first of a two-verse chain, neither of which has variants. Or(e) has an introductory formula mentioning the author of the biblical text as Paul. The one unit in this verse where Origen's citations are different from the New Testament critical editions comes from his John commentary, which omits ὁ τοιοῦτος from the reading. This unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA. Or(f), as well as Or(d), add a phrase to the end of the citation which shows elements of freedom and style in citing.

2 Corinthians 2:8

διὸ παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς κυρῶσαι εἰς αὐτὸν ἀγάπην·  
-----

Or(a) is the second of a two-verse chain. Though the beginning of the citation shows elements of adaptation to context, there are no variants between the text of NA and RP.

2 Corinthians 2:11

ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ σατανᾶ· οὐ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ νοήματα ἀγνοοῦμεν.  
-----

Or(a) has an introductory marker indicating Paul as author. The latter is also marked, though there is a series of Pauline citations of Romans 13:12-13. Both of these readings are the same as is found in both the text of NA and RP. There are not variants for this verse in the NA critical apparatus. This should be considered Origen's authorial citational text of his Psalms commentary and fragment, or a reading portrayed in his own personal biblical documents.

2 Corinthians 2:15

ὅτι Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ θεῷ ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις,  
-----

Χριστοῦ εὐωδιὰ Or(abdefghi) NA RP ] εὐωδιὰ Χριστοῦ Or(c)

ἐσμὲν Or(bcdefghi) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

There are not any variants between the text of NA and RP. Origen's readings are all fairly equal in comparison to NA/RP. Or(a) is lacking the verb ἐσμὲν, which is a very abbreviated form of 2:15. It is likely due to adaptation to the surrounding context despite its explicit indication of Paul as author. Or(b) is the first of a two-verse chain, with a longer reading of ἐν παντί τόπῳ. This longer reading is also reflected in Or(cfi). Or(c) has a transposition that reads εὐωδιὰ Χριστοῦ right after its introductory marker "from Paul". It is the first of a two-verse chain, variant free other than the addition of ἐν παντί τόπῳ, which is against NA/RP. Or(d) is variant free. Or(eg) both omit τῷ θεῷ. Or(g) would reflect the reading of NA/RP otherwise. Both citations relating to Origen's work on the Song of Solomon are identical and variant free. Origen's citations from his Psalms commentary are also identical. Overall, Origen has different forms of this verse throughout his literature. Because of the differences among his citational text, his biblical text is impossible to reconstruct, though these varying citations indicate they are his authorial citational texts.

2 Corinthians 2:16

οἷς μὲν ὁσμη ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὁσμη ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν. καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα τίς ἰκανός;

-----  
ἐκ Or(abcde) NA P46 01 02 03 04 0243. 33. 81. 104. 630. 1175. 1739. 1881. ] omit RP 06 010 012 018 020 044 365. 1241

ὁσμη ἐκ Or(ab) NA ] ὁσμη RP, ἐκ Or(c), omit Or(d)

There are two units of variation in 2:16 between NA and RP. Both units of variations consist of an omission of ἐκ in RP. Origen cites this verse five times. Or(abe) all reflect the same reading of 2:16 as NA. Or(c) omits ἐκ as it is found in RP. Both of

these writings in the Canticles omit ὁσμὴ directly before the second ἐκ. Or(abe) are all the second in a two-verse citation chain and reflect the text of NA and RP. Or(cd) are both attributed to Paul through an introductory marker. Origen's citations are fairly consistent for this verse despite the omissions in the Canticles material. Considering the consistency throughout Origen's writings for this verse and the expected support from early witnesses, these are probably Origen's authorial citations. The omissions in Origen's Canticles are not listed as a unit of variation and are therefore probably representation of his liberty in citing biblical material.

### Chapter Three

#### 2 Corinthians 3:3

φανερούμενοι ὅτι ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι ἀλλὰ πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίνοις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίνοις.

-----  
πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίνοις Or(a) NA RP ] πλαξὶν καρδίας σαρκίνοις Or(b) 010 044 629. 945. 1505.

There is a unit of variation at the end, which involves a variation of the final three words. Or(a) reads πλαξὶν καρδίας σαρκίνοις in agreement with RP and NA. Or(b), πλαξὶν καρδίας σαρκίνοις, is supported by 010 044 629. 945. 1505. Or(b) has an introductory marker indicating Paul as the author of the citation's content. Or(a) despite their differences are probably both Origen's authorial citational text, though Or(b) appears to be an amelioration of the awkward reading.<sup>92</sup>

#### 2 Corinthians 3:5

οὐχ ὅτι ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν ἱκανοὶ ἐσμὲν λογίσασθαι τι ὡς ἐξ ἑαυτῶν, ἀλλ' ἡ ἰκανότης ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ,

-----  
<sup>92</sup> Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 509.

αφ' ἐαυτῶν ἱκανοὶ ἐσμὲν NA ] ἱκανοὶ ἐσμὲν αφ' ἐαυτῶν RP

*Cels* has a partial rendition of the verse as it is found in NA and RP. It is the first of a two-verse citation which both correspond to the text of NA. These two critical editions are different from one another in one unit of transposition. However, this unit is not in the apparatus of NA. There are no units of variation where the verse is extant in Origen.

### 2 Corinthians 3:6

ὃς καὶ ἰκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης, οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος· τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτέννει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ.

-----  
ἀποκτέννει NA Or(a) P46c 01 03 010 012 018 025 044 0243. 6. 33. 104. 326. 614. 945. 1739. ] αποκτενεῖ P46 02 04 06 020 81. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. 2464.

There is one unit of variation between the text in NA and RP, the spelling of the verb ἀποκτέν(ν)ει. Origen and NA both read ἀποκτέννει, while RP has ἀποκτένει. This unit is in the critical apparatus of NA. It lists P46 02 04 06 020 81. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. 2464. as support for RP reading of ἀποκτένει. The support for Origen's citation is P46c 01 03 010 012 018 025 044 0243. 6. 33. 104. 326. 614. 945. 1739. The divided support for these two readings is significant. Or(a) is the second of a two-verse citation, both of which have the same readings as the NA text. This is an example of an early reading of Origen in disagreement with P46.

### 2 Corinthians 3:7

Εἰ δὲ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον Μωϋσέως διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τὴν κατάργουμένην,

-----  
ἐν RP ] omit Or(abcde) NA  
ἀτενίσαι Or(acd) ] omit Or(b)

There is only one unit variation between the texts of NA and RP (omission of ἐν). All five of Origen's citations omit this word that is present in RP. The omission is supported by P46 01 02 03 04 06 010 012 025 0243. 6. 33. 81. 630. 1739. The support for ἐν is 01c 06c 018 020 044 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. Or(b) is the only citation of the five that has a reading different from the NA text (omit δύνασθαι). The citations Or(cd) both have a specific mention of 2 Corinthians as its source. All of the citations are marked as originating from Paul, either before or after the citation. Or(a) is the first of a two-verse citation, while Or(b) is the first of four-verse citation (all of which are in agreement with NA when it differs from RP). These citations are probably Origen's authorial citational text and their consistency might indicate his biblical text.

#### 2 Corinthians 3:8

πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἢ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος ἔσται ἐν δόξει;

-----

There are no units of variation between the text of NA or RP. Also, there are no variants between the critical editions and Origen. The citation in the commentary is the second of a four-verse citation (which is in agreement with NA throughout, though there is one unit where NA and RP disagree). Or(a) is the second of a two-verse citation (corresponding to NA in the one place it differs from RP). This is most likely to be Origen's authorial citation text and could possibly be his biblical text.

#### 2 Corinthians 3:9

εἰ γὰρ τῇ διακονίᾳ τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα, πολλῶ μᾶλλον περισσεύει ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης δόξη.

-----

\*omit Or(a) NA ] ἐν RP

The text of Origen's one citation corresponds to the text of NA in the two units of variation between NA and RP. This citation is the third of a four-verse citation (all of which correspond to NA where NA and RP differ). This is probably Origen's authorial citational text and might reflect his biblical text.

#### 2 Corinthians 3:10

καὶ γὰρ οὐ δεδόξασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει εἵνεκεν τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης.

-----

For this verse, there are no variants between the texts of NA and RP. However, Origen has some different readings from NA/RP. Or(c), for example, adds πρότερον. Or(d) has the phrase ὡς πρὸς σύγκρισιν added. These show signs of stylistic adjustment or cause by contextual acclimation. Despite disagreement with known readings, Origen might still indicate a citation as "according to Paul". Other citations have markers such as Or(ab) the former being in a four-verse citation (identical yet *without* a marker). Or(b) is noted as being from Paul yet there are no differences between it and NA/RP. The markers or introductory material in these verses are not consistent with Origen's presentation of his biblical text. Considering the confections of Or(cd) and the likelihood that these all reflect Origen's authorial citational text, the probable choice for his biblical text would be Or(b).

#### 2 Corinthians 3:13

καὶ οὐ καθάπερ Μωϋσῆς ἐτίθει κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου.

-----

Origen's citation is considerably shorter compared with the full verse as found in NA/RP. Origen's citation has a marker at the beginning of the citation.

#### 2 Corinthians 3:15

ἀλλ' ἕως σήμερον ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται Μωϋσῆς, κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κεῖται·

-----

ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται Or(bc) NA P46 01 02 03 04 044 33. 81. 104. 1175. ]

ἀναγινώσκεται RP 010 012 018 020 0243. 365. 630. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. ]

ἀναγινώσκηται 06 025

There are two units of variation. The first concerns the particle *αν* and the spelling of the verb ἀναγινώσκηται (NA). The text of Origen and NA read ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται while RP reads ἀναγινώσκεται. Or(ab) both contain the reading of NA. Or(c) has a partial phrasing from the verse that lacks enough content to not be considered an intention to cite nor clear enough to discuss its differences as real units of variation. Or(c) has another citation of 2 Corinthians nearby (3:18) where Paul is referenced as the author. The abbreviated reading of Or(b) is marked with "Paul" as well. The second unit of variation concerns the omission of αὐτῶν in Or(a) though both NA and RP have it. This unit of variation is not listed in the NA apparatus and is probably a unique reading to Origen. Or(ab) agree with each other where both extant, and probably reflect Origen's authorial citational text given the early support for ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται.

#### 2 Corinthians 3:16

ἡνίκα δὲ ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα.

-----

ἐπιστρέψῃ Or(cde) NA RP ] τι ἐπιστρέψῃ Or(e), ἐπιστρέψῃ τι Or(abf)



The apparatus of NA lists no variants for 3:16. Also, the readings of NA and RP are the same. However, Origen's citations show several variations on the verse in disagreement with NA/RP. First, Or(bcde) drop the linking material of the verse probably due to accommodation to its literary context. Modifiers that help the biblical text transition into Origen's own context such as the use of γάρ, τι, or the article can be seen in Or(bde). Alternatively, the transition words in the biblical text are often dropped in Origen to accommodate his transitions or argument flow, which might require one later in the citation.

Four of the citations for 3:16 cover several verses: Or(a) is first of a two-verse citation, Or(b) is second of a two-verse citation, Or(d) is first of a three-verse citation, and Or(e) is first of a two-verse citation. Or(af) are cited in a fuller manner including the transition comments of Paul. In these two citations, as well as Or(b), the verse is cited fully yet Origen adds τι. These idiosyncracies of Origen are probably a reflection of his authorial citational text. The accommodation is evidence that Origen's biblical text is probably not represented in the other citations besides Or(cd).

2 Corinthians 3:17

ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν· οὐ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου, \* ἐλευθερία.

-----  
\*omit NA ] ἐκεῖ RP

The text of NA and RP differ in only place. None of Origen's citations contain the variant location. All three citations are identical and do not differ from the two New Testament critical editions. These three citations are also one of a string of verses in

one citation for 2 Corinthians: Or(a), the second of a two-verse citation, Or(b), the second of three-verse citation, and Or(c), the second of two-verse citation.

### 2 Corinthians 3:18

ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος.

-----  
omit Or(defklopqrs) NA RP ] καὶ Or(bg)  
κατοπριζόμενοι Or(bdefjklhpqrs) NA RP ] κατοπριζόμεθα Or(hi) P46 33.,  
κατοπριζομέννος in Or(o), κατοπριζεσθαι in Or(m)

Here, there are no differences between the critical texts of NA and RP. However, there are variants amongst the text of Origen's citations. There are several omissions in Origen's text, which can be expected considering how many times he cites the verse. Or(abcfgijmnpors) all leave off the beginning of the verse as it is found in NA and RP. This might have occurred for various reasons but is probably due to the lack of the grammatical lead in for his text. For example, in Or(o) there is the word τι which emphasises Origen's arguments as opposed to the verse's πάντες. Or(a) is recognisably 3:18 but is also probably an accommodated form.

The second verb in the verse introduces the first unit of variation among Origen's citations. The text of NA and RP read κατοπριζόμενοι . Origen reads this in Or(bdefjklhpqrs) but also has κατοπριζόμεθα in Or(hi), κατοπριζομέννος in Or(o) and κατοπριζεσθαι in Or(m). The reading of κατοπριζόμεθα is supported by P46 33. Origen and GA33 often share the same readings, especially when Origen seems to depart from what is found in the NA and RP. Or(abg) all add words, e.g. καί, that fill out the citation of 3:18. Only Or(dl) have the ending of the verse. There is quite a bit of

introductory material found near these citations of Origen. Or(behlq) all have markers as well as Or(j) being the last of a three-verse citation. Though these varying citations might reflect Origen's authorial citational text, the common reading of NA/RP is probably his biblical text.

#### Chapter Four

#### 2 Corinthians 4:3

εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον,

-----

Or(ab) are both the first of a two-verse citation. Or(c) appears to reflect contextual accommodation. The text of NA and RP are identical, with no units of variation in the critical apparatus of NA. Or(b) is one of a two-verse citation, though it has some omissions when compared to the critical texts of the NT editions. The differences in citations probably reflect Origen's authorial citations.

#### 2 Corinthians 4:4

ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι \* τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ

-----

αὐγάσαι Or(b) NA RP P46 01 03 010 012 018 020 025 044 0243. 81. 630. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. ] διαυγάσαι Or(a) 02 33. 104. 326. 2464., κατάυγασαι Or(c) 04 06 015 365. 1175.

\*omit Or(ac) NA P46 01 02 03 04 06 010 012 0243. 33. 81. 326. 630. 1175. 1739. 1881.] αυτοί Or(b) RP 06c 018 020 025 044 0209. 104. 365. 1241. 1505. 2464.

The NA and RP only differ from each other in one place, which is an addition of αὐτοῖς in RP. Besides this unit of variation, the apparatus of the NA has listed other variations, which are represented in Origen's citations. Other than the often-abbreviated beginning of verses, Origen for the most part cites this verse consistently. One

difference concerns the verb αὐγάσαι (as it stands in NA and RP). Origen represents all forms present in the NA apparatus. This unit of variation is in the critical apparatus of Treg as well. The support for διαυγάσαι is 02 33. 104. 326. 2464. The following witnesses support κατάυγασαι: 04 06 015 365. 1175. The strongest witnesses support the reading of NA and RP (αὐγάσαι), which is also in Or(b), including P46 01 03 010 012 018 020 025 044 0243. 81. 630. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. It is common to see Origen reflect the same reading as 33, so Or(a) is somewhat expected. The citation Or(b) shows adaptational aspects that probably deviate from a biblical text he may have known. The differences in the conjugation of αὐγάζω are probably due to Origen's style or accommodation to context, or less likely, that Origen was aware of multiple readings of this verse. Another unit of variation includes the pronoun αὐτοῖς which is seen in Or(b) and RP. This reading is supported by late witnesses 06c 018 020 025 044 0209. 104. 365. 1241. 1505. 2464. There is little reason to think this could reflect Origen's authorial citational text. The omission is supported by P46 01 02 03 04 06 010 012 0243. 33. 81. 326. 630. 1175. 1739. 1881. Or(ab) are the last of two-verse citations. Or(c) is also surrounded by much text from the epistle, and is consistently cited in the previous verses of the chain. Or(c) is the most consistent with the NA text and is likely to be Origen's authorial citation text.

## 2 Corinthians 4:6

ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπών· ἐκ σκοτοῦς φῶς λάμψει, ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πρόσωπῳ [Ἰησοῦ] Χριστοῦ.

-----  
 τῆς γνώσεως Or(aceg) NA RP ] τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Or(bdf)

This verse contains many units of variation, none of which really affect the readings of NA, RP, or Origen. Some of Origen's citations mesh aspects from 4:4 with 4:6. The noun φωτισμὸν is in both verses and is followed by a genitive chain. It seems that Origen has taken the εὐαγγελίου from 4:4 and put it in the place of γνώσεως in 4:6. This is probably a lapse in memory considering the similarity between the verses in such a close proximity. Origen frequently employed an amanuensis, which would exclude the option of his own dittography, unless he was reading a manuscript.

The final variant in 4:6 involves the naming of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ or just Χριστοῦ. NA and RP both have the fuller reading as well as P46 01 04 015 018 81. The reverse, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ is supported by 06 010 012 0243. 630. 1739. 1881. The support for Χριστοῦ is 02 03 33. The reading of NA and RP is in two of the citations for this verse, both of which are in *John.Com B* (which often contains citations that intentionally reproduce text). However, Origen reads Χριστοῦ in three citations only.<sup>93</sup> Again, Origen's text has appeared to be changed to that of the reading in 33. The first hand of 1739 reads Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, but was changed to the opposite. It appears again that Or(cf) best reflects what could be Origen's biblical text, although these citations could all be his authorial citational text. Or(cf) are also located in a consecutive-verse citation with Pauline markers.

#### 2 Corinthians 4:7

Ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν, ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ᾗ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν·

-----  
 τὸν Or(bcdf) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

τοῦτον Or(bcdf) ] omit Or(ae)

---

<sup>93</sup> Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 510.

ἵνα Or(bef) ] ἵνα λάμψη Or(ae)

There are no differences between the text of NA and RP. However, Origen has some unique variants that do not appear in the critical apparatus of the NA. Only two of his citations begin the verse as it is found in the New Testament critical editions due to abbreviation. Or(de) substitute δέ for γάρ. Or(c) sometimes omits a connective all together. This reflects a liberty to adapt verses to the context of Origen's own writing. Or(ae) both omit the τοῦτον present in his other citations, NA, and RP. Not all of Origen's citations are complete reflections of the entire verse, as Or(cd) end abruptly. Or(ae) both add λάμψη. Their agreement here and in the omission mentioned above show signs of interdependence. Or(ef) is an anthology that borrows directly from Origen's more popular works such as Or(a). Or(e) contains a different reading as well, which reflects the text form presented in NA and RP, and has a Pauline introductory marker. Or(f) is also marked. The connections and added material are probably Origen's authorial citational text, though Or(bf) are more likely to reflect Origen's biblical text.

2 Corinthians 4:8

ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι, ἀπορούμενοι ἀλλ' οὐκ  
ἐξαπορούμενοι

-----  
The text of NA and RP reflect the same reading. The apparatus of NA has no variants listed for 4:8. Or(a) is a good example of a citation that has an introductory marker ("Paul said") yet is a mixture of Origen's context and biblical content. The rest of Origen's citations of 4:8 are the same as the form found in the text of the NA/RP. Or(b) is the only other citation that indicates Paul as the author of the text cited.

2 Corinthians 4:10

πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ \* Ἰησοῦ \*\* ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν φανερωθῇ.

-----

\*omit Or(abcdefgh) ] κυρίου RP

\*\*omit Or(abdegh) ] πάντοτε Or(cf)

There is one unit of variation between the text of NA and RP, but this is not listed in the NA apparatus. Origen is consistent in citing 4:10 throughout his works, as the only two citations that have significant differences are from Or(cf), which transpose πάντοτε and abbreviate the ending of the verse. Or(f) has a marker after the citations which reads "the apostle said". Or(adeg) cite the verse as it stands in NA/RP yet abbreviates the ending. Both Or(ad) have introductory markers ("Paul"/"the apostle", respectively). Or(b) appears to cite parts of 4:10 as evidence in the commentary but the theological implications are emphasised as opposed to a reproduction of an exact biblical text. This can be said of Or(c) as well, considering its unique accommodating features. Or(h) cites the verse as it stands in NA/RP yet omits the phrase ἐν τῷ σώματι, picks up again with a different verbal form of περιφέροντες, then transitions to commentary. Origen cites the beginning of the verse consistently, though often stops, abbreviating the end of the verse. Or(bcf) all have connectives that omit the first word of 4:10 which looks to be change to acclimate to commentary context. There is not much evidence that Origen's biblical text was different to NA and RP, yet his inconsistency in some areas does reveal that Origen's authorial citational text is intact.

2 Corinthians 4:16

Διὸ οὐκ ἐγκακοῦμέν, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ' ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἀνακαίνουται ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα.

-----

ἡμῶν Or(a) NA ] RP

There are two units of variation between NA and RP. Origen is present in one of these variants, in which he reads εσω ἡμῶν, which agrees with the NA text. The witnesses for ἔσωθεν is 018 020 629. 1241. The witnesses for ἔσωθεν ἡμῶν are 06c 044 1505. The witnesses for ἔσω are 025 323. 945. Or(a) is from an early source for Origen among the Tura papyri. Though there is only one citation for this verse, this is probably Origen's authorial citational text, and it might be Origen's biblical text.

2 Corinthians 4:17

τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν,

-----

ἡμῶν Or(abc) NA RP 01 04 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 0243. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. ] omit Or(d) P46 03

There are no variants between the text of NA and RP. There are several units of variation for 4:10 in the apparatus of NA, however. The omission of ἡμῶν is listed and supported by Or(d) P46 03. The presence of ἡμῶν is supported by 01 04 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 0243. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. The fact that Origen omits ἡμῶν in Or(d) could indicate a whole adoption of a later reading in the witnesses that have ἡμῶν present. It is not often that P46 and 03 are against Origen. Or(ab) are variant free in regard to the New Testament critical editions. Or(a) is the first of a two-verse citation chain and has a marker indicating Pauline authorship. Or(c) begins a two-verse citation.

2 Corinthians 4:18

μὴ σκοποῦντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα· τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα πρόσκαιρα, τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰώνια..



-----  
The text of NA and RP are identical in this verse. Three citations are found in *Contra Celsum*. Only once in Or(a) does Origen cite the full verse, which is the second of a two-verse citation. It is marked from "Paul" as well as 2 Corinthians. Or(fg) are highly accommodated to the commentary text. Or(bcdg) are intermittent and only reproduce phrases from the verse (though without variation). Or(c) is marked as from "Paul" and Or(d) is the second of a two-verse citation. Or(eh) are also intermittent throughout the citation. Or(a) is the only full citation of 4:18 and also happens to correspond to both NA and RP. The varying differences in the citations indicate that Origen's authorial citational text is intact, but Or(a) is the only citation that might be his biblical text.

#### Chapter Five

#### 2 Corinthians 5:1

Οἶδαμὲν γὰρ ὅτι ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους κατάλυθῆ, οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ ἔχομεν, οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

-----

Origen, NA, and RP are identical where Origen is extant. Origen only cites the latter parts of the verse.

#### 2 Corinthians 5:4

καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὄντες ἐν τῷ σκηνεὶ στενάζομεν βαρούμενοι, ἐφ' ᾧ οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι ἀλλ' ἐπενδύσασθαι, ἵνα καταποθῆ τὸ θνητὸν ὑπὸ τῆς ζωῆς

-----

NA and RP are identical. All five citations are incomplete with Or(a) citing only the end of the verse (also with an introductory marker for Paul as author), Or(b) citing the middle section, and Or(cde) only the beginning of the verse. Or(cde) are marked as written by "the apostle", "Paul said" and from "Paul", respectively. Considering the

intermittent nature of the citations, a full reading of Origen is unavailable for the verse. If, however, the sum of the parts were to be put together, the result reading would correspond to the reading of NA and RP.

#### 2 Corinthians 5:6

θαρροῦντες οὖν πάντοτε καὶ εἰδοτες ὅτι ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι ἐκδημοῦμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου.

-----

There are no variants between NA and RP. The three citations of Origen are consistent and produce the same reading where extant. Or(a) provides a full presentation of the verse, is introduced with a "Paul" marker, and is followed by a three-verse citation of 5:5-7 immediately after. Or(b) is the first of a two-verse citation. The readings from *Cels* and the Matthew commentary, the latter being the first of a two-verse citation, are both incomplete with most of the beginning of the verse omitted.

#### 2 Corinthians 5:7

διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν, οὐ διὰ εἴδους

-----

Or(abcd) all four citations are by each other as well as 5:6 & 7

Origen, NA, and RP are identical for this verse. All of the citations are fairly close to each other in the John Commentary. This repetition is evidence of Origen's consistency, but might possibly indicate his biblical text. They also contain markers that identify Paul as the author.

#### 2 Corinthians 5:8

θαρροῦμεν δὲ καὶ εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον ἐκδημησαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημησαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον.

-----

θαρροῦντες Or(b) 01 0243. 6. 33. 81. 630. 1739. 1881. ] θαρροῦμεν NA RP  
εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον NA RP ] μᾶλλον εὐδοκοῦμεν Or(b), εὐδοκοῦμεν Or(a)

ἐκ Or(abc) NA RP ] ἀπὸ Or(d)

NA and RP are identical, though Origen has a conflicting reading with them. Or(b) has the reading θαρροῦντες with support from 01 0243. 6. 33. 81. 630. 1739. 1881. This reading could have originated with Origen and made its way into 01 et al, affecting a large amount of later manuscripts. The other three citations are not extant in this part of the verse. Or(a) omits the beginning of the verse as well as μᾶλλον which appears to be a change to fit argumentation in *Cels*. This citation is within a consecutive verse chain of two (5:6,8). This might have been a very early reading of the verse only retained in Origen's tradition. Or(b) also transposes εὐδοκοῦμέν μᾶλλον . There is reason to think that Or(b) has been adapted to context given the lack of the connective δὲ καὶ as well as the transposition. There is no other evidence that Origen is aware of a reading other than the transposition in Or(b). Or(d) reads ἀπὸ instead ἐκ as it appears in the other three citations and the New Testament critical editions. However, this unit of variation is not in the critical apparatus of NA. Though all are probably reflections of Origen's authorial citaitonal text. It might be Or(d) that retains his biblical text, though it is different to the Initial and RP texts.

#### 2 Corinthians 5:10

τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον

-----  
φανερωθῆναι Or(jkl) NA RP ] παραστήν αι Or(acfi)  
δεῖ Or(acdefik) NA RP ] omit Or(j)  
πρὸς Or(abcdefghijk) NA RP ] omit Or(l)  
φαῦλον Or(abcdefghij) NA ] Or(kl) RP

Or(a) is marked with "Corinthians" and "Paul." Or(d) mentions the text as from an "apostle", while Or(e) has other Pauline texts in proximity to the citation (Philippians). The text of NA and RP has only one variant between them. This unit of variation is a difference of lexical choice: NA's φαῦλον vs RP's κακόν at the end of the verse. Several variants in Origen are present, such as a frequent use of the verb παραστήναι instead of φανερωθῆναι in Or(jkl). The apparatus of NA does not list this variant. Or(l) has the reading of ἴδια as opposed to διὰ . The NA apparatus lists the following witnesses in favour of ἴδια: P46 P99 365. This is a rare reading of the early papyri in support of Origen against most other witnesses. Another variant in the NA apparatus is the omission of πρὸς which is also in Or(l). The omission is supported by 06 010 012. Or(kl) both have the κακόν reading which corresponds with RP P46 03 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 104. 1175. 1241. All but one of Origen's citations for 5:10 read φαυλον, supported by 01 04 048. 0243. 33. 81. 326. 365. 630. 1739. 1881. It would have to be an early reading of the same textual tradition as P46, which gradually made its way out of the main manuscripts of the New Testament. The eventual dominance of διὰ and πρὸς over Origen's readings is clear as all but one has been affected.

## 2 Corinthians 5:16

Ὡστε ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἶδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα· εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν.

-----  
 εἰ καὶ Or(abc) NA P46 01 03 06 0225. 0243. 33. 326. 1739. 1881. 1249. ] καὶ εἰ 010 012, εἰ δὲ 018, εἰ δὲ καὶ RP 01c 04c 06c 020 025 044 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464.

Χριστόν ποτέ κατὰ σάρκα ἐγνώκαμεν Or(abc) ] καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν Or(d) NA RP, ἐγνώκαμεν Χριστόν κατὰ σάρκα Or(d)

The text of NA and RP only differ in the omission of δέ (RP). None of Origen's citations have δέ though Or(d) reads γὰρ. Despite having an introductory marker from "Paul", Or(c) and Or(ab) transpose the verb ἐγνώκαμεν and Χριστόν. Or(d) reads ἐγνώκαμεν first but brings Χριστόν forward as well. This reading Χριστόν ποτέ ante κατὰ σάρκα is noted as Origenian in Treg. The reading in Or(e) is the only citation of 5:16 that corresponds to NA and RP. The transpositions in *Ce/s* and the Matthew commentary are consistent, however, it is hard to determine what text would be of Origen's biblical documents or why he would have transposed these phrases. These citations probably reflect Origen's authorial citational text.

#### 2 Corinthians 5:17

ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις· τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρήλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινά.  
-----

NA and RP are identical except for the addition at the end of the verse in RP where Origen is not extant. All of Origen's citations of this verse are abbreviated and accommodated to his commentary. These citations are probably Origen's authorial citational text.

#### 2 Corinthians 5:19

ὥς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν \* Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς.  
-----

\*omit Or(abcdefghi) NA RP ] τῷ Or(g)

Here, NA and RP are identical. Origen, however, differs in two places. Or(a) is marked as from Paul. Or(gh) both have markers mentioning an "apostle". The second half of the verse is omitted in all of Origen's citations. The NA text's connective ὥς ὅτι is

omitted as well in Or(abcdefhi) which is a result of contraction at the beginning and end of the verse. This shortened form is consistently presented which seems not to consider the verse in full but rather a specific selection text of 5:19 for the sake of Origen's writings. Only one reading, Or(b), has a different verb κατάλλασσει, which, again, appears to be liberty.

#### 2 Corinthians 5:20

Ἐπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν· δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ.

οὖν NA RP ] omit Or(a) ]

NA and RP are identical, though Origen omits οὖν, which is supported by P46 06 010 012 044. The witness support for ουν is P34 01 03 04 06c 018 020 025 048. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. As this is the only citation of the verse in Origen, there is no other evidence to confirm this omission was his authorial citational text.

#### 2 Corinthians 5:21

τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.

There is one difference between NA and RP (NA omits γάρ), though no units of variation are listed in the NA critical apparatus. None of Origen's citations have γάρ, though his citations often omit connectives that are in NA and RP. Or(e) has αὐτόν as well as a transposition of ἐποίησεν. This citation stands out from the rest, which is probably just supplementary to his context. Or(bf) have introductory markers naming Paul. Or(b) is also the only full citation for this verse, which corresponds to NA/RP. Or(d)

lacks the second ἀμαρτίαν. Origen's longer citations Or(bf), both in *John.Com*, probably serve a different purpose than the shorter intermittent citations, though both are probably authorial citational text.

#### Chapter Six

##### 2 Corinthians 6:2

λέγει γάρ· καιρῷ δεκτῷ ἐπήκουσά σου καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας ἐβοήθησά σοι ἰδοὺ νῦν καιρὸς ὑπρόσδεκτος, ἰδοὺ νῦν ἡμέρα σωτηρίας.

-----

NA and RP are identical. Or(a) is located near other citations of 2 Corinthians (6:3-5) and is marked from "the prophet of God". Or(b) is introduced with "I remember Paul saying". Both of these citations agree with the text of NA and RP but Or(a) is the first half of the verse and Or(b) is the second half. Or(c) has many lacunose sections of the verse and could be described as unpredictable. Though the citations are probably Origen's authorial citational text, the sum of Or(ab) is probably Origen's biblical text as it reflects the common reading of the NA and RP text.

##### 2 Corinthians 6:3

Μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενὶ διδόντες προσκοπήν, ἵνα μὴ μωμηθῆ ἡ διακονία

-----

This citation is located near other citations of 2 Corinthians (6:2, 4, 5) and marked as "through the prophet". The citation is only of the first half of the verse yet corresponds to the reading of NA and RP.

##### 2 Corinthians 6:4

ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ συνιστάντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι, ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ, ἐν θλίψεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν στενοχωρίαις

-----

This citation is in the same paragraph as citations of 2 Corinthians 6:2, 3, 5. The citation is only of the middle section of the verse yet corresponds to NA and RP. This is likely to be Origen's authorial citational text.

2 Corinthians 6:5

έν πληγαῖς, έν φυλακαῖς, έν ἀκαταστασίαις, έν κόποις, έν ἀγρυπνίαις, έν νηστείαις,

-----

This citation is in the same paragraph as citations of 2 Corinthians 6:2, 3, 4. The citation corresponds to the texts of NA and RP except that Origen's citation adds the conjunction καί between the individual items, which do not appear in NA and RP. Other than these added conjunctions the text is the same. This is most likely Origen's authorial citational text.

2 Corinthians 6:7

έν λόγῳ ἀληθείας, έν δυνάμει θεοῦ· δια τῶν ὄπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν,

-----

The citation is only of the second half of the verse yet corresponds to NA and RP (which are identical). This is probably Origen's authorial citational text.

2 Corinthians 6:10

ὡς λυπούμενοι ἀεὶ δὲ χαίροντες, ὡς πτωχοὶ πολλοὺς δὲ πλουτίζοντες, ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες

-----

This citation only reflects the last part of the verse yet corresponds to the reading of NA and RP, where there is no variance. The citation has an introductory marker, from "Paul". This is most likely Origen's authorial citational text.



2 Corinthians 6:11

Τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν ἀνέφωγεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Κορίνθιοι, ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτυνται·

-----  
ἡμῶν Or(b) NA RP ] μου Or(a), ὑμῶν 01 03 0243. 1881. 2464.

Here, NA and RP are identical. Or(a) is specifically marked as a Pauline, however there is a change from ἡμῶν to μου. The other citation is from his Psalms commentary, which has the same readings as NA and RP. Both are probably authorial citational text and perhaps Or(b) reflects Origen's exemplars.

2 Corinthians 6:12

οὐ στενοχωρεῖσθε ἐν ἡμῖν, στενοχωρεῖσθε δὲ ἐν τοῖς σπλάγχνοις ὑμῶν

-----  
δέ Or(a) NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Origen, NA, and RP are identical for this verse. Or(a) is introduced as from a letter to the Corinthian church while Or(b) notes both the Corinthians and Paul by name. This is likely to be Origen's authorial citational text and possibly a reflection of his exemplars.

2 Corinthians 6:14

Μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις· τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνομία, ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος;

-----  
ἀνομία Or(abde) NA RP ] ἀδικία Or(cf)

There is one difference between NA and RP. At the end of the verse NA reads ἢ τίς, RP reads τίς δέ. Origen only has two citations that are available for this part of the verse, one reads τίς, the other ἢ τίς. Another feature of Origen is the twice-changed gloss from ἀνομία to ἀδικία in Or(cf). Or(abde) are consistent and agree with the

readings of NA and RP. In all of his citations, Origen is consistent in the presentation of the middle of 6:14, which reflects his authorial citational text.

#### 2 Corinthians 6:15

τίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελιάρ, ἢ τίς μερίς πιστῶ μετὰ ἀπίστου

-----  
Χριστοῦ Or(ab) NA P46 01 03 04 025 0243. 33. 326. 1739. 1881. ] Χριστῶ Or(c) RP 06 010 012 018 020 044 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464.

Or(ab) have different connectives than NA and RP changing τίς δέ to γάρ and τίς γάρ respectively. Origen is most likely creating his own personal transition for his commentary. Or(c) does not have any connectives starting the citation with συμφώνησις. There is a unit of variation, which includes the difference of Χριστοῦ (NA P46 01 03 04 025 0243. 33. 326. 1739. 1881.) and Χριστῶ (RP 06 010 012 018 020 044 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464.). Or(ab) both read Χριστοῦ. Or(c) has Χριστῶ. No other units of variations are available to discuss that involve Origen's citations. He cites consistently and there is no reason to believe this was not his authorial citational text.

#### 2 Corinthians 6:16

τίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις ναῶ θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων; ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ζῶντος, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεὸς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μου λαός.

-----  
Origen has a different connective to the text of NA and RP. This citation did not require the γάρ, which served as a transition to the text of 2 Corinthians. As Origen only cites this verse once, there is little to determine whether Origen might have indeed had a different authorial citational text.

[The second half of 6:16 - 6:18 are Old Testament citations and therefore will not be considered in this study as New Testament citations considering the lack of ability to identify them securely]

## Chapter Seven

### 2 Corinthians 7:5

Καὶ γὰρ ἐλθόντων ἡμῶν εἰς Μακεδονίαν οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἢ σὰρξ ἡμῶν ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι· ἔξωθεν μάχαι, ἔσωθεν φόβοι

-----

Origen cites 7:5 once in his Psalms commentary (fragmentary). Where Origen is present in this verse there are no units of variation between the NA, RP or Origen.

### 2 Corinthians 7:10

ἢ γὰρ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον ἐργάζεται· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη θάνατον κατεργάζεται.

-----

εἰ σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον Or(abdef) NA RP ] ἀμεταμέλητον εἰ σωτηρίαν Or(c) ἐργαζομένην Or(abf) ] ἐργάζεται P46 01 03 04 06 025 81. 1175., κατεργάζεται RP P99 01c 010 012 018 020 044 0243. 0296. 104. 365. 630. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464.

The texts of NA and RP are different in the form of a verbal change as NA reads ἐργάζεται and RP κατεργάζεται. The reading of NA is supported by P46 01 03 04 06 025 81. 1175. The RP reading's witnesses are P99 01c 010 012 018 020 044 0243. 0296. 104. 365. 630. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. Origen's readings of 7:10 in his John Commentary (3x), has a participle conjugation of ἐργάζομαι, which serves as a transition to his written text in the commentary. However, his commentary on Jeremiah, and Psalms both support the reading in RP. Or(ac) have additions and omissions, respectively, that show them as accommodated readings of the verse despite Or(c) having introductory material (Pauline markers), as well as other epistolary literature

cited nearby. This is a good example of marked citations not always reflecting exemplars or even a primary citational text, as they were probably corrected to κατεργάζεται.

## Chapter Eight

### 2 Corinthians 8:9

γινώσκετε γὰρ τὴν χάριν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπώχευσεν πλούσιος ὢν, ἵνα ὑμεῖς τῇ ἐκείνου πτωχεῖα πλουτήσητε.

-----  
ἡμᾶς Or(a) 04 018 6. 323. 614. ] ὑμᾶς NA RP

NA and RP are identical, though Origen shows some liberty in citing. He abbreviated citation required a post-positive and he added ὁ Κύριος for the sake of clarity. There is one unit of variation that is noted in the NA apparatus where Origen reads ἡμᾶς supported by 04 018 6. 323. 614. This unit of variation is a rare example of Origen against both New Testament critical editions and supported by other manuscript witnesses.<sup>94</sup> This is probably his authorial citational text.

### 2 Corinthians 8:14

ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ τὸ ὑμῶν περίσσευμα εἰς τὸ ἐκείνων ὑστέρημα, ἵνα καὶ τὸ ἐκείνων περίσσευμα γένηται εἰς τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα, ὅπως γένηται ἰσότης

-----  
There is a verse-level separation in RP where the first half of what is 8:14 in NA is the ending of 8:13 in RP, which makes this verse in RP much shorter. Where Origen, NA, RP are extant together they are identical. The citation is marked from the "second letter written to the Corinthians".

## Chapter Nine

### 2 Corinthians 9:6

Τοῦτο δέ, ὁ σπείρων φειδομένως φειδομένως καὶ θερίσει, καὶ ὁ σπείρων ἐπ' εὐλογίαις ἐπ' εὐλογίαις καὶ θερίσει.

---

<sup>94</sup> Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 514.

-----  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical

Chapter 10

2 Corinthians 10:3

Ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα,

-----  
περιπατοῦντες NA RP ] ζῶντες Or(ac)

There are no variants between NA and RP. All three of Origen's citations are consistently different from NA and RP. The word περιπατοῦντες is substituted with ζῶντες. All three citations are the first of two and three-verse citations. Or(ac) are marked as from the apostle Paul. This is probably Origen's authorial citational text and possibly a rare example of his biblical exemplar. This unit of variation is not found in the apparatus of NA.

2 Corinthians 10:4

τὰ γὰρ ὄπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ πρὸς  
καθαίρεσιν ὀχυρωμάτων, λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες

-----  
The text of NA and RP have the same reading. RP does consider the last two words as being a part of the next verse. All of the citations are within multi-verse citations: Or(abc) are the second in a two-verse citation, Or(de) are first in a two-verse citation. Or(ac) are labeled as Paul. The various sources and repetition give good reason to think this is Origen's authorial citational text.

2 Corinthians 10:5

καὶ πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες  
πᾶν νόημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ,

The texts of NA and RP are identical. RP begins with what is considered the previous verse in NA. Origen consistently cites 10:5 throughout all of his citations. However, Or(d) omits ἐπαιρόμενον. The middle section of the verse is represented in all of Origen's citations. There is a level of abbreviation at the beginning and end of the citations. Five readings are within multiverse citations of 2 Corinthians: Or(b) is the third of a three-verse citation (with 10:3, 4) with an introduction naming Paul, Or(d) has an introduction naming Paul is in a citation with 10:6 immediately before, Or(e) is third of three-verse citation with a marker for Paul following the citation, and Or(hi) are the second of a two-verse citation. The introductory markers seem to coincide with a consistent authorial citational text for Origen.

2 Corinthians 10:6

καὶ ἐν ἐτοίμῳ ἔχοντες ἐκδικῆσαι πᾶσαν παρακοήν, ὅταν πληρωθῆ ὑμῶν ἡ ὑπακοή.  
 -----

Origen is consistent between his two citations for this verse. The connective at the beginning and the ending are abbreviated when compared to the text of NA and RP, probably an accommodation to his text. Or(a) is found in a citation chain yet 10:6 is first and 10:5 follows. There are not any variants between Origen, NA, and RP that are listed in the apparatus of NA.

2 Corinthians 10:18

οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἑαυτὸν συνιστάνων, ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν δόκιμος, ἀλλ' ὃν ὁ κύριος συνίστησιν  
 -----

συνιστάνων NA P46 01 03 06 010 012 015 I0121. 0243. 6. 33. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1505. 1739. 2464. ] συνιστών RP 06c 018 020 044 630. 1241. 1881.

Origen cites 10:18 once in his work On Martyrdom. The reading of RP has συνιστών as opposed to NA's συνιστάνων. Origen corresponds to NA. He drops the post-positive connective (due to context) yet presents a variant free citation in comparison to NA and RP outside (other than the mentioned unit of variation).

#### Chapter Eleven

#### 2 Corinthians 11:2

ζηλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς θεοῦ ζηλω, ἡρμοσάμην γὰρ ὑμᾶς \* ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ παρθένον ἀγνήν παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ·

-----

\*omit Or(a) NA RP ] τοῦ πάντα Or(bcd)

Χριστῷ Or(ac) NA RP ] Κυρίῳ Or(bd)

There are no units of variation between the texts of NA and RP for the verse, and no units of variation in the critical apparatus of NA. Or(a) has an introduction both naming Paul and the Corinthian church. It omits the connective γάρ yet represents the remaining text as it stands in the New Testament critical editions. Or(bcd) are paraphrastic in that Origen takes much liberty in these citations with the addition of τοῦ πάντα and substitutions.

#### 2 Corinthians 11:6

εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ φανερώσαντες ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς.

-----

There are no units of variation between NA and RP. There is an addition of the article in Or(a). There is no other evidence for 11:6 in Origen. This is probably Origen's authorial citational text.

#### Corinthians 11:7

Ἡ ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησα ἑμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε, ὅτι δωρεὰν τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγέλιον εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν;

-----  
Origen cites 11:7 once in his Matthew commentary. Origen, NA, and RP are identical. The citation is introduced as from Paul and is probably Origen's authorial citational text.

#### 2 Corinthians 11:14

καὶ οὐ θαῦμα· αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ σατανᾶς μετασχηματίζεται εἰς ἄγγελον φωτός.

-----  
θαῦμα NA P46 01 03 06 010 012 025 098. 0243. 0278. 6. 33. 81. 326. 365. 630. 1175. 1739. 1881. 2464. ] θαυμαστόν RP 06c 018 020 044 0121. 104. 1241. 1505.

There is variation between NA and RP. The reading of θαυμαστόν is supported with 06c 018 020 044 0121. 104. 1241. 1505. The reading of Origen and NA is supported by P46 01 03 06 010 012 025 098. 0243. 0278. 6. 33. 81. 326. 365. 630. 1175. 1739. 1881. 2464. Origen's citation for this verse is the first of a two-verse chain with 11:15. This is probably Origen's authorial citational text.

#### 2 Corinthians 11:15

οὐ μέγα οὖν εἰ καὶ οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ μετασχηματίζονται ὡς διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης· ὧν τὸ τέλος ἔσται κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν.

-----  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Origen's citation for this verse is the second of a two-verse chain with 11:15.

#### 2 Corinthians 11:23

διάκονοι Χριστοῦ εἰσιν; παραφρονῶν λαλῶ, ὑπὲρ ἐγώ· ἐν κόποις περισσοτέρως, ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως, ἐν πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις.

-----  
φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως ἐν πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως Or(ce) NA P46 03 06 33. 629. 630. 0243. 1739. 1881 ] πληγαῖς περισσοτέρως ἐν φυλακαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως Or(ad) 01 010 025, φυλακαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως ἐν πληγαῖς περισσοτέρως 025, πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως RP 01c 06c 015 018 020 044 0121. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464.



Or(b) is marked as from Paul yet it is extremely abbreviated. Or(ce) are both the first of a three-verse citation. There is one main unit of variation between the text of NA and RP. The sequence of words in NA is supported by Or(ce) NA P46 03 06 33. 629. 630. 0243. 1739. 1881. The reading of RP is supported by 01c 06c 015 018 020 044 0121. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464. There is a third reading which is supported by Or(ad) 01 010 P. The RP reading is clearly a later correction that was put into 01 and 06. This leaves two early readings: P46 [Or(ce)], and 01 [Or(ad)]. That Origen would have both of these early readings might be due to an awareness of both, and probably does reflect Origen's authorial citational text, but his biblical text is hard to determine given both readings are early.

2 Corinthians 11:24

Ἰπὸ Ἰουδαίων πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν ἔλαβον,  
 -----

Or(ac) both read ληψεται instead of ἔλαβον. The difference appears to be due to style. Or(ac) are the second of two-verse citations. This is probably Origen's authorial citational text. Its lack of accommodation to both NA and RP shows its purity in transmission.

2 Corinthians 11:25

τρὶς ἐρραβδίσθην, ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθην, τρὶς ἐναυάγησα, νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκα·  
 -----

There are no units of variation between the text of NA and RP. Origen is consistent in citing this verse. It is apparent he is accommodating the text to his own

writings. Or(a) is labeled as Paul. Or(b) is the second of a two-verse citation, with Or(cd) being the third of a three-verse citation. These are Origen's authorial citational texts.

2 Corinthians 11:27

κόπω καὶ μόχθῳ, ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις πολλάκις, ἐν λιμῶ καὶ δίψει, ἐν νηστείαις  
πολλάκις, ἐν ψύχει καὶ γυμνότητῃ·

-----

ἐν NA RP 01c 015 018 020 025 0121. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881.  
2464. ] omit Or(a) P46 01 03 06 010 012 044 0243. 1739.

The citation is found as the first of a two-verse citation. There is one unit of variation between the text of NA and RP, which is the presence of ἐν. P46 01 03 06 010 012 044 0243 support the omission. 1739. Or(a) RP 01c 015 018 020 025 0121. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. 2464. support ἐν. Origen might have been changed to this as RP normally retains the older reading. However, the manuscripts that would typically support Origen unanimously are split between two variants. His authorial citational text is hard to determine here.

2 Corinthians 11:28

χωρὶς τῶν παρεκτὸς ἢ ἐπίστασίς μοι ἢ καθ' ἡμέραν, ἢ μέριμνα πασῶν τῶν  
ἐκκλησιῶν

-----

This is the second of a two-verse citation. There are no variants between Origen, NA, and RP where text is available for this verse.

2 Corinthians 11:29

τίς ἀσθενεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; τίς σκανδαλίζεται καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι;

-----

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Or(d) is labeled as the words of Paul. This is more than likely Origen's authorial citational text.

2 Corinthians 11:33

καὶ διὰ θυρίδος ἐν σαργάνῃ ἐχαλάσθην διὰ τοῦ τείχους καὶ ἐξέφυγον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ.

-----

This citation is labelled as from "the apostle" and as the "second letter to the Corinthians". Origen, NA, and RP are identical. This is probably Origen's text as he would have cited it and found in his biblical manuscripts.

Chapter Twelve

2 Corinthians 12:2

οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, εἴτε ἐν σώματι οὐκ οἶδα, εἴτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν, ἀρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ.

-----

Both citations are labeled as from "Paul". Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Where Origen's text is available this is probably Origen's authorial citational text.

2 Corinthians 12:4

ὅτι ἠρπάγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον καὶ ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι.

-----

There are no units of variation between NA and RP and Origen is consistent in citing this verse. Though there are some variations such as the addition of οὐχί in Or(e), the omission of ἃ οὐκ for οὐκ in Or(f), and the substitution of ἃ οὐκ for ἃ μή in Or(i). The commentary of John is the source for six of these citations, which might explain the variation, as these citations are located in the same section. Or(abcdegik) all contain introductory labels such as "the apostle" or "Paul". The NA/RP reading is probably Origen's authorial citational text.

2 Corinthians 12:5

ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοιοῦτου καυχῆσομαι, ὑπὲρ δὲ ἑμαυτοῦ οὐ καυχῆσομαι εἰ μὴ ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις.

-----  
ὑπὲρ NA RP ] περὶ Or(a)

Origen often replaces περὶ for ὑπὲρ, which is often found in the New Testament critical editions.

2 Corinthians 12:6

Ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσω καυχῆσασθαι, οὐκ ἔσομαι ἄφρων, ἀλήθειαν γὰρ ἐρῶ· φείδομαι δέ, μὴ τις εἰς ἐμέ λογίσηται ὑπὲρ ὃ βλέπει με ἢ ἀκούει [τι] ἐξ ἐμοῦ

-----  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

2 Corinthians 12:8

ὑπὲρ τούτου τρίς τὸν κύριον παρεκάλεσα ἵνα ἀποστῆ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

-----  
There are some minor differences between Origen and the text of NA and RP in the form of verbal conjugation of παρακαλέω and the personal pronoun αὐτοῦ for ἐμοῦ. There are other 2 Corinthians citations in proximity to the citation as well as the mention of Paul.

2 Corinthians 12:9

καὶ εἰρηκέν μοι· ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου, ἡ γὰρ δύναμις \* ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖται. Ἥδιστα οὖν μᾶλλον καυχῆσομαι ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις μου, ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

-----  
\*omit NA P46 01 02 03 06 010 012 ] μου Or(a) RP 01c 02c 06c 018 020 025 044 0243. 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. ]  
τελειούται Or(a) RP 01c 06c 018 020 025 044 0243. 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. ] τελεῖται P99 01 02 03 06 010 012

The NA omits the μου that is present in the text of RP. Origen corresponds to μου as well as 01c 02c 06c 018 020 025 044 0243. 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. These manuscripts are against the omission supported by P46 01 02 03 06 010 012. There is another unit of variation that involves the spelling of NA (τελεῖται). Again, Or(a) corresponds the reading of RP as well as 01c 06c 018 020 025 044 0243. 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. This is no doubt a corrected reading as the support for τελεῖται are the original hands of many of the witnesses for the alternate reading τελεῖται P99 01 02 03 06 010 012. Or(a) follows a citation of 12:8 and is introduced as from "Paul". Or(b) is also noted as from "Paul."

#### 2 Corinthians 12:10

διὸ εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὑβρεσιν, \*ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διωγμοῖς \*\*καὶ στενοχωρίαις, ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ· ὅταν γὰρ ἀσθενῶ, τότε δυνατός εἰμι.

-----  
 \*ἐν Or(cd) NA RP ] καὶ Or(b) P46 01

\*\*καὶ Or(b) NA P46 01 03 104. 326. 1175. ] ἐν Or(cd) RP 01c 02 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 365. 1241. 1505. 2464., καὶ ἐν 0243. 0278. 630. 1739. 1881.

There are two units of variation. The first contains the reading of ἐν and καὶ. Origen is split with two readings Or(cd) agreeing with both New Testament critical editions, though Or(b) is in agree with P46 and 01 which is more than likely his reading given their early dates and that they and Origen are the only witnesses for this reading. Later in the verse, there is another unit of variation that involves the same words. The reading of καὶ ἐν is supported Or(b) NA P46 01 03 104. 326. 1175. The reading of καὶ ἐν is supported by 0243. 0278. 630. 1739. 1881. Or(cd) RP 01c 02 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 365. 1241. 1505. 2464 supports the reading ἐν. In this second unit,

Origen's citations are again set against each other, the same as the last verse. These two units together support the idea that Or(b) is an early reading of Origen's manuscripts and reflect his authorial citational text.

#### 2 Corinthians 12:11

Γέγονα ἄφρων, \* ὑμεῖς με ἠναγκάσατε. ἐγὼ γὰρ ὄφειλον ὑφ' ὑμῶν συνίστασθαι· οὐδὲν γὰρ ὑστέρησα τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων εἰ καὶ οὐδὲν εἶμι.

-----  
\*omit Or(a) NA P46 01 02 03 06 010 012 018 6. 33. 81. 629. 1175. 1739. 2464. ]  
καυχωμένος RP 020 025 044 0243. 104. 365. 630. 1241. 1505. 1881.

There is one unit of variation between NA and RP. NA and Origen omit the καυχωμένο that is present in RP. Here, Origen's textual family is split for this unit of variation where they would normally be united, though Or(a) is probably Origen's authorial citational text.

#### 2 Corinthians 12:19

Πάλαι δοκεῖτε ὅτι ὑμῖν ἀπολογούμεθα. κατέναντι θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν· τὰ δὲ πάντα, ἀγαπητοί, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν οἰκοδομῆς.

-----  
τοῦ Or(a) RP ] omit NA

There is one unit of variation between NA and RP. NA omits the genitive article before θεοῦ. Origen corresponds to the text of RP. This is a good example of a very early reading from the Tura find in agreement with the Byzantine text. However, the citation is attached to the end of Origen's sentence, which would require some grammatical help. This might be the reason for this article added. The addition is somewhat insignificant. Unfortunately, there are no other citations for this verse in Origen.

2 Corinthians 12:21

μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντος μου ταπεινώσῃ με ὁ θεός μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ πενθήσω πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ ἀσελγείᾳ ἧ ἔπραξαν.

ἀκαθαρσία καὶ πορνεία NA RP, ἁμαρτία καὶ ανομία Or(c) ] ἀσελγεία καὶ ακρασία Or(ab)

There is no variance between NA and RP where Origen is extant. Or(ab) are marked as being from "Corinthians". Or(b), is probably taken from Or(a) as they are the same reading. There are some significant differences between the New Testament critical editions and Or(ab). Origen omits and transposes items in this list of sins. Or(c) has its own unique words which reflect Origen's tendency to take liberty in his citations for these particular works. Establishing the reading of Origen's biblical text is difficult though these citations are probably a reflection of his authorial citational text.

Chapter Thirteen

2 Corinthians 13:3

ἐπεὶ δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ, ὃς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀσθενεῖ ἀλλὰ δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.

There are no units of variation between Origen, NA or RP. Or(df) are both labelled as originating with "Paul".

2 Corinthians 13:4

καὶ γὰρ \* ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ ζῆ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ. καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἀσθενοῦμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ ζήσομεν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς.

\*omit NA P46 01 03 06 010 012 018 025 0243. 33. 81. 104. 365. 1241. 1739. ] εἰ RP 01c 02 06c 020 044 630. 1175. 1505. 1881. 2464., καὶ Or(ab)

Both of Origen's citations for this verse contain καὶ at the beginning, which is simply a transition to the biblical content from his own writing.

### 3.8 Summary of Origen's Citations of 2 Corinthians

The citations of Origen are mainly identical to a combined NA/RP reading. However, when his readings depart from the common NA/RP text, Origen often cites freely, often without any manuscript support. Almost all of Origen's readings are either identical to the NA/RP reading or a free citation. This means that his readings rarely agree with NA or RP alone. However, when this does occur, he is in agreement with the NA text most often.

Origen's citations of 2 Corinthians are consistent when compared to his other citations of the same location. Origen's tendency to cite free forms of 2 Corinthians is often a reflection of his own grammatical control over the biblical text that is annexed to his own words. The agreement with the NA text and the presence of free citations suggests that Origen's citations have undergone little accommodation. If they had, there would be more late readings in agreement with the Byzantine text alone. However, the presence of both free citations and those identical with the often-identical NA and RP texts raises the question as to whether previously free citations have been accommodated to a text like the NA. This is of course possible. Works that have a high number of free citations and common NA/RP readings, coupled with only NA readings when NA and RP differ, are the most likely to have been accommodated to a text like the NA in the earliest stages of Origen's transmission.

Overall, Origen's citations of 2 Corinthians have not undergone a major accommodation to the Byzantine text, which might also suggest that they have not undergone a major accommodation to a text like NA, but instead are a second or third



century witness that can be verified as support for the NA reconstruction of the Greek New Testament in light of the extant manuscripts.

Such a preservation of Origen's citations is significant considering the possibility of transmissional changes. However, despite the ability in some places to arrive at the authorial citations of Origen, the nature of his citations is often undergone morphological changes to meet his own uses as a citer.

## CHAPTER FOUR

Origen cites Paul's letter to the Galatians the least often out of the three epistles at hand, (Romans, 2 Corinthians and Galatians). There are a total of 181 citations of Galatians. There are 16 works and 11 secondary sources that contain these citations. Out of these, there are only three works that have more than 15 citations (*Cels*, *Rom.Frag A*, and *Matt.Com C*), which means that it is only a few sources that make up the predominant trends that are found in Origen's citations of Galatians.

Out of 181 citations, there are 83 citations (45.86%) where Origen, NA, and RP are identical. The remaining 94 citations contain units of variation between Origen, NA, and RP that reveal Origen's affinity in regard to the New Testament text forms.

### 4.1 Secondary Sources for Origen's Citations of Galatians

There are 11 secondary sources for Origen's citations of Galatians. In these sources there are 75 citations.

Table 10

Variant Readings of Galatians in Secondary Sources		
Against Both	19	45.24%
With NA against, RP	14	33.33%
With RP, against NA	9	21.43%
Total	42	100

Citations of Galatians in secondary sources attributed to Origen correspond to either NA and RP more than half of the time. When Origen's citations are more likely to be unique to contain readings that are not represented in the manuscript evidence, his citations of Galatians stand against his trend.

If the identical readings are weighted, an overall perspective of citations of Galatians from secondary sources attributed to Origen can be factored into the variant citations. If secondary citations of Galatians with variation contain 42 readings in 32 variant citations, the average of 1.31 readings per citation can be applied to the number of identical citations (43) in order to compare their approximate relationship. The following table reflects these numbers for the secondary sources:

Table 11

Weighted Readings of Galatians in Secondary Sources		
Identical to NA/RP <sup>95</sup>	56	57.14%
Against Both	19	19.39%
With NA against, RP	14	14.29%
With RP, against NA	9	9.18%
Total	98	100%

Secondary sources for Origen’s citations overall reflect a higher tendency to correspond with the NA text. This likely due to free readings being accommodated to NA or RP.

#### **4.2 Origen’s Primary Sources as Sources for Citations of Galatians**

In Origen’s works, he cites Galatians 106 times. There are 40 citations of Galatians with no variation, leaving 66 citations to reveal the affinity of Origen’s citations, or at least, what his citations have become. These variant citations contain 89 readings as seen in the table below:

---

<sup>95</sup> The number of “identical readings” was determined by multiplying the number of identical citations (43) by the average of readings per variant citation (1.31).

Table 12

Variant Readings of Galatians in Primary Works		
Against Both	55	61.80%
With NA against, RP	23	25.84%
With RP, against NA	11	12.36%
Total	89	100%

Though there are a significant number of readings that correspond to the NA text only, there are less than normal levels of readings that are unique, as Origen's citations often contain elements that are not shared with other manuscripts. At the same time, the lower level of unique readings appear to have shifted to Byzantine readings considering the lower percentages in Romans (5.08%) and 2 Corinthians (7.86%). The identical citations (40) can be weighted, considering that there are 89 readings in 66 citations of variation (1.35 readings per citation).

Table 13

Weighted Readings of Galatians in Primary Works		
Identical <sup>96</sup>	54	37.76%
Against Both	55	38.46%
With NA against, RP	23	16.08%
With RP, against NA	11	7.69%
Total	143	99.99%

Origen's citations most often conflict with a shared NA/RP reading. This is because when Origen cites Galatians (as well as Romans and 2 Corinthians, as seen in the previous chapters), he takes citational liberty in the presentation. This liberty is especially noticeable when the same cited verses are compared among his various

---

<sup>96</sup> The number of "identical readings" are determined by multiplying the number of identical citations (40) by the average of readings per variant citation (1.35).

works. On the other hand, his citations are for the most part in agreement with both NA and RP, with more agreements with NA alone than RP.

### 4.3 Verses of Galatians Origen Does Not Cite

From the extant citations of Origen, there are 96 verses in Galatians he does not cite (1:1-2, 6, 7, 9-14, 17, 18, 20-24; 2:1-8, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21; 3:2, 3, 5-9, 11, 12, 14-18, 20-23, 26-29; 4:3, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 25, 28-31; 5:1, 3, 5-7, 10-13, 18, 21, 24, 26; 6:1-6, 9-13, 15-18).

### 4.4 Markings and Introductory Material

Origen's citations in Galatians are often marked with an introductory formula or a marker following the citation. These can be as specific as καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Γαλάτας δὲ ἐπιστολῇ Παῦλος... (Galatians 2:2, *Cels* 2:1:50) or more vague, such as γὰρ, φησὶν... (*Galatians* 5:4, *Ps.Exc* 17:144:32). However, the specificity of a marker, or simply the presence of any marker, is not an indication of specificity or intention in regards to Origen's citing technique. For example, out of the 52 citations without markers, only 26 are identical. That means that at least half of the identical verses do not have a marker. Again, as earlier stated in the previous chapters, it should not be expected that any specific information provided by Origen concerning the citations would make it more likely to be his biblical text or an indication that he is attempting to cite his exemplars. Although it is helpful to know that Origen's markers are not an indication of his citing consistency, even if a Church Father indicated somehow through a marker or phrase that he was attempting to cite an exemplar, this should not entail that it reflects the

current text of any document or edition. If a text has undergone adjustment through transmission, the likelihood that a copyist is going to keep such markers in the context is almost certain. This means that any such markers are only important if it can be established that a Church Father uses such devices consistently (which Origen doesn't) and that a Church Father's citational text can be established as his biblical exemplar. Consequently, markers of any kind cannot be relied upon to determine the biblical text of Origen.

#### **4.5 Secondary Sources in Order of their Citational Frequency**

*Basil.Phil A*, 1:4, 1:15, 16; 3:10, 19, 24, 25, 26; 4:21(x2), 22(x2), 23(x2), 24, 26; 5:22, 23

*Basil.Phil A* has 18 citations of Galatians. There are 11 citations that are identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *Basil.Phil A* corresponds to NA in three units, and with RP in three units. There are also four units that disagree with both NA and RP. *Basil.Phil A* shows a mixture of affinity as there are an equal number of readings for both NA and RP alone. Either the sources used for this compilation are mixed and show accommodation, or the compiled text has undergone accommodation.

*Rom.Frag A*, 1:15, 16; 2:20; 3:10, 19, 24(x2), 25, 26; 4:21(x2), 22, 23; 5:4(x2); 6:14

*Rom.Frag A* has 17 citations of Galatians. There are 11 citations that are identical to NA and RP. When there is variation, *Rom.Frag A* corresponds to NA in one unit, and with RP in three. There are three units that disagree with both NA and RP. There is a citation of Galatians 3:10 that shares both NA reading against RP, and a RP reading against NA. This is probably due to a later change on the part of the reading

that agrees with RP. The citations of Galatians in *Rom.Frag A* are similar to those of Romans in that they show a high level of accommodation to the Byzantine text (unlike those of 2 Corinthians).

*Ps.Sel*, 1:4; 2:9, 20; 4:6, 16; 4:21, 22, 26; 5:19(x2), 22(x2)

*Ps.Sel* has 11 citations of Galatians. There are five citations that are identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *Ps.Sel* corresponds to NA in three units, and with RP in one. There are four units that disagree with both NA and RP. The main differences between Origen and the NA/RP text occur in lists such as 5:19 and 5:22, but there are also contextual changes such as nouns that are different (4:6). This difference is a reflection of Origen's usage. There is evidence of accommodation, though the high number of NA-only readings, free citations, and readings in agreement with the NA/RP show a well-preserved authorial work.

*1Cor.Com*, 1:4, 2:9, 2:19, 20; 3:13, 4:24; 5:9, 22, 23; 6:14(x2)

*1Cor.Com* has 11 citations of Galatians. There are six citations that are identical to NA and RP. When there is variation, *1Cor.Com* corresponds to NA in two units, and one with RP. There are two units that disagree with both NA and RP. There is an addition of τοῦτο οὐ in for Galatians 5:9 that is unique among Origen's citations. Though for the most part, the citation in *1Cor.Com* are consistent and identical. There is evidence of accommodation, though the high number of NA-only readings, free citations, and readings in agreement with the NA/RP show a well-preserved authorial work.

*Eph.Com*, 1:4; 2:20; 4:4, 14; 5:19(x2), 22

*Eph.Com* has seven citations of Galatians. There are three citations that are identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *Eph.Com* corresponds to NA in no units, and with RP in four. There is one unit that disagrees with both NA and RP. One unique reading appears in a partial listing of 5:19. *Eph.Com* shows signs of major accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Jer.Frag B*, 4:19; 5:9(x2), 22

*Jer.Frag B* has four citations of Galatians. There are two citations that are identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *Jer.Frag B* corresponds to NA in one unit, and none with RP. There are three units that disagree with both NA and RP. There is a verbal change against both NA/RP with a verbal change from ὠδινήσαντες to ὠδίνω (4:19) and a post-positive in 5:9. There is no evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text. These probably reflect Origen's authorial citations.

*Luke.Frag*, 5:9, 22, 23

*Luke.Frag* has three citations of Galatians. There are two citations that are identical to both NA and RP. There are no citations that correspond to either NA or RP alone. However, there is one citation against both. *Luke.Frag* shows consistency, which differences only resulting from interjections, which label the citation as biblical content (5:9). There is no sign of accommodation to the Byzantine text. There are no readings that agree only with NA or RP and the source has retained its free citations. This is probably Origen's authorial citation text.



[The remaining sources do not show any accommodation to the Byzantine text and either agree with both NA/RP or are free citations, which demonstrates they have preserved their authorial citations].

*Ps.Exc*, 5:4; 6:7

*Ps.Exc* has two citations of Galatians. There is one citation that is identical to both NA and RP. There is one unit that disagrees with both NA and RP.

*Deut.Adnot*, 3:10

*Deut.Adnot* has one citation of Galatians. There is one citation that is identical to both NA and RP.

*John.Frag*, 4:9

*John.Frag* has one citation of Galatians. There is one unit that disagrees with both NA and RP.

*Eze.Frag*, 5:15

*Eze.Frag* has one citation of Galatians. There is one citation that is identical to both NA and RP.

Citations from Origen's secondary sources are rather consistent with each other. Only two sources show accommodation to the Byzantine text (*Rom.Frag A* and *Eph.Com*). There are several sources that have only a few citations with no NA or RP only readings but rather simply a united agreement with NA and RP together. These are good indications of an authorial citation text. Other works with more substantial citations show either no accommodation (*Jer.Frag B* and *Luke.Frag*), or minimal accommodation (*Ps.Sel* and *1Cor.Com*) to the Byzantine text. Such works, with free citations, readings

that agree with both NA and RP, and little or no Byzantine readings, should be considered Origen's authorial citational text.

#### 4.6 Origen's Primary Sources in the Order of their Citational Frequency

*Cels*, 1:4, 1:19, 2:9, 12, 19; 4:4, 10, 11, 21(x2), 22, 24(x2), 23, 26; 5:2, 8, 17(x2), 25; 6:14(x2)

*Cels* has 22 citations of Galatians. There are 11 citations that are identical to NA and RP. When there is variation, *Cels* corresponds to NA in three units, and with RP in two. There are 10 units that disagree with both NA and RP. In the places where *Cels* is different to NA and RP, it is mainly the adjustments to grammar such as ἐξελόμενος instead of ἐξέληται (Galatians 1:4, *Cels* 5:32:22), Παύλω instead of ἐμοὶ (Galatians 2:9, *Cels* 2:1:56), ἀναγινώσκοντες for θέλοντες εἶναι (Galatians 4:21, *Cels* 2:3:7, 4:44:25), and ἐπιθυμοῦσαν for ἐπιθυμεῖ (Galatians 5:17, *Cels* 3:28:40). *Cels* shows accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Matt.Com C*, 2:9, 10, 19, 20; 3:19; 4:1(x2), 2, 22; 4:23, 26; 5:14(x2), 17, 22, 23, 6:14(x2)

*Matt.Com C* has 18 citations. There are eight citations that are identical to NA and RP. When there is variation, *Matt.Com C* corresponds to NA in three units, and with RP in two. There are five units that disagree with both NA and RP. Typically, when *Matt.Com C* is divergent from NA and RP, it is by significant omission or addition (Galatians 3:19, 4:1, 4:2, 4:23) not substitutions or grammatical changes, which the later is most common in Origen. *Matt.Com C* in its citations of Galatians shows accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Ps.Frag*, 1:3, 4, 8; 3:1; 4:6, 26(x4), 5:22; 6:14

*Ps.Frag* has 11 citations of Galatians. There are no citations that are identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *Ps.Frag* corresponds to NA in six units, and with RP in three. There are ten units that disagree with both NA and RP. *Ps.Frag* shows accommodation to the Byzantine text and agrees little in comparison to the NA and RP text which should suggest caution in using its readings for Origen's authorial citational text.

*Jer.Hom A*, 4:23, 26, 27(x2), 5:17, 19; 5:20; 6:8, 14

*Jer.Hom A* has nine citations of Galatians. There is one citation that is identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *Jer.Hom A* corresponds to NA in one unit, and with RP in two. There are six units that disagree with both NA and RP. *Jer.Hom* has some contextual changes in lists (5:19) and omissions of text that do not pertain to his reasons for citing (6:8). *Jer.Hom A* demonstrates accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*John.Com A*, 2:19, 20(x2); 4:2; 5:9; 5:16; 6:7, 6:8

*John.Com A* has eight citations of Galatians. There are four citations that are identical to both NA and RP. If Origen's citations are not identical to NA and RP, they are against both, which occurs in five units of variation. The citations that are unique to NA/RP are all adaptations to context. There is no evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text and free citations are retained. *John.Com A* is a good primary source for finding Origen's authorial citational text.

*Jer.Hom B*, 1:4; 3:4, 3:19; 4:4, 9, 16(x2); 6:7, 14

*Jer.Hom B* has seven citations of Galatians. There are four citations that are identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *Jer.Hom B* corresponds to NA in two units, and to RP in none. There are two units that disagree with both NA and RP. *Jer.Hom B* shows no accommodation to the Byzantine text and is a good indication of Origen's authorial citation text.

*John.Com B*, 2:9, 2:14, 2:19, 2:20; 4:9; 6:14(x2)

*John.Com B* has seven citations of Galatians. There is one citation that is identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *John.Com B* corresponds to NA in five units, and to none in RP. There are five units that disagree with both NA and RP. *John.Com B* is consistent and retains its early readings. There is no evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text and free citations are retained. This is a good source for Origen's authorial citational text.

*Euches*, 1:4; 4:1, 2, 6, 10; 6:8

*Euches* has six citations of Galatians. There are two citations that are identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *Euches* corresponds to NA in one unit, and with one in RP. There are four units that disagree with both NA and RP. The few differences in *Euches* involve substitution of nouns (τῶν μακαρίων for ἡμῶν, 4:6) and intermittent omissions in (4:10, 6:8). There are some signs of accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Princ*, 4:21, 22, 23, 24, 26

*Princ* has five citations of Galatians. There are three citations that are identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *Princ* corresponds to NA in one unit, and one with RP. There is one unit that disagrees with both NA and RP. The only difference with the NA/RP reading is a post-positive (4:26). There are some signs of accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Matt.Com B*, 1:19; 3:13; 4:24, 26

*Matt.Com B* has four citations of Galatians. There are three citations that are identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *Matt.Com B* corresponds to NA in one unit, and none with RP. These citations are a good representation of an early second century text. There is no evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Rom.Frag C*, 3:13; 5:2; 6:14

*Rom.Frag C* has three citations of Galatians. There is one citation that are identical to both NA and RP. Origen does not correspond with NA or RP alone against the other. There are three units that disagree with both NA and RP. There are two simple omissions in 3:13 and 6:14. There is no evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text.

[The following sources demonstrate no evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text]

*Pass*, 2:20; 6:14

*Pass* has two citations of Galatians. There is one citation that is identical to both NA and RP. When there is variation, *Pass* corresponds to NA in one unit, and none with RP. There is no evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text.

*Cant.Sch*, 3:13

*Cant.Sch* has one citation of Galatians. There is one unit that disagrees with both NA and RP.

*Luke.Hom*, 5:23

*Luke.Hom* has one citation of Galatians. There is one unit that disagrees with both NA and RP.

*Mart*, 2:20

*Mart* has one citation of Galatians. There are two units that disagree with both NA and RP.

*Matt.Com A*, 2:19

*Matt.Com A* has one citation of Galatians. There is one citation that is identical to both NA and RP.

The differences between these primary sources in their presentation of Origen's citations are varied. Several works (*Cels*, *Matt.Com C*, *Ps.Frag*, and *Princ*) show evidence that their citations have been changed to the Byzantine text. On the other hand, other works (*John.Com A*, *John.Com B*, *Jer.Hom B*, *Matt.Com B*, and *Rom.Frag C*) show no accommodation to the Byzantine text, are consistently in agreement with NA-only readings, and preserve free citations. The preservation of free citations mixed

with correspondence with the text of NA indicates that Origen's authorial citation text has been maintained.

In summary, Origen's citations of Galatians are relatively inconsistent in comparison to the NA text. This suggests that Origen's citations of Galatians have undergone more accommodation to the Byzantine text than other epistles such as 2 Corinthians. However, there are some sources that are likely to preserve his authorial citation text.

#### 4.7 Textual Commentary on Origen's Citations of Galatians

Galatians 1:1-2  
No citations

Galatians 1:3

χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ \* θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

-----  
\*omit NA RP ] τοῦ Or(a)

ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Or(a) NA 01 02 025 044 6. 33. 81. 326. 365. 1241. 2464. ] καὶ  
κυρίου ἡμῶν RP P46 P51(vid) 03 06 010 012 015 018 020 69. 104. 630. 1175. 1505.  
1739. 1881. 1908., καὶ κυρίου 0278

This verse is only attested in *Ps.Frag*, where a two-verse citation (1:3-4) is explicitly introduced as coming from the Epistle to the Galatians. Here, Origen adds τοῦ before θεοῦ, disagreeing with NA/RP. This unit is not in the critical apparatus of NA Tisch, Treg, or VS. The next unit of variation involves a transposition of ἡμῶν. Origen corresponds to the NA reading (before). The Byzantine reading of καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν has a claim to be very early, attested by P46, P51, and 03. The NA reading is the normal form of Paul's greetings (cf Rom 1:7, 1 Co 1:3, 2 Co 1:2, Eph 1:2, Phil 1:2, Phlm 3).<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> Ernest de Witt Burton, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Galatians," *The International Critical Commentary*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark: 1964, 11.

This difference might have come about later when after issues of Jesus' divinity were more established. If ἡμῶν follows κυρίου, translation options increase, leaving ambiguity whether the phrase is an apposition to "God" or independent. If ἡμῶν comes immediately after πατρός it emphasizes a distinction between πατρός and κυρίου ("from God our Father, and Lord Jesus Christ"). The two Origenian-related minuscules 1739 and 1881 side with the RP against his citation.

#### Galatians 1:4

τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός ἡμῶν

-----  
 τοῦ δόντος NA RP ] τῷ δόντι Or(b)  
 ὑπὲρ Or(a) NA P51 01(2) 03 015 0278. 6. 33. 81. 326. 365. 630. 1175. 1505. 2464 ]  
 περί Or(b) RP P46 01 02 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 69. 104. 1739. 1881. 1908.  
 ἁμαρτιῶν Or(a) NA RP ] αμαρτωλῶν Or(b).  
 ἐξέληται Or(bcdeh) NA RP ] ἐξελόμενος Or(gi)  
 ἐκ Or(bcdef) NA RP ] ἀπό Or(gi) 015 (142). 330. 1912.  
 αἰῶνος τοῦ Or(bcdef) NA P46 P51 01 02 03 6. 33. 81. 326. 630. 1241. 1739. 1881. ]  
 ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος RP 01c 06 010 012 015 018 020 025 044 0278. 69. 104. 365.  
 1175. 1505. 1908. 2464.

The dative use of the article and verb in Or(b) is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, or Von Soden [VS]. It appears that it was required by the context of this verse. This is a good example of Origen's adjustment of biblical content for his arguments as opposed an expectation that he would reproduce readings as found in exemplars. Origen often uses περὶ against ὑπὲρ. Or(a) reads ὑπὲρ in correspondence to NA, while Or(b) reads περί. This variant is found in the apparatus of NA Tisch Treg and VS. περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν appears in the LXX (8x) and reflects a Johannine usage. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν is strictly Pauline appearing twice in his corpus, once in LXX. Origen contains both readings but significantly uses περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν more



frequently (15x) instead of ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν (2x). It appears περί is the earlier reading yet ὑπέρ reflects Pauline usage as would be expected here in Galatians.<sup>98</sup> Origen's reading of ὑπέρ probably reflects a later change, not what he would have cited as in Or(b). Likewise, Or(b) and its reading of καὶ ἐξέληται is a result of parablepsis as it appears earlier in the verse. If not accidental, then it is probably a clarification of or emphasis on the verbal action. Or(d) has an introductory marker which reads καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Γαλάτας. Or(ε) also reads καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολός φησίν.

Or(gi) and the reading of ἀπὸ does not correspond to either NA or RP (both read ἐκ). This unit of variation is not in the apparatus of NA, but is in Tisch, Treg, and VS. Out of the 8 citations of Origen where this unit is present, these two are the only places where ἀπό is used which means the other 6 places were either changed or these two minority readings are not initially Origen's wording. What is particularly interesting is the unanimous support of Origen for αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος. However, when Origen is referring to “this evil age” outside the context of Galatians 1:4, Origen uses ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος. For him to use this phrase only when he cites Galatians 1:4, yet uses the more compact first attributive position when citing elsewhere, could show Origen was conscious of an accurate text which is differentiated from his other commentary. These citations are probably Origen's authorial citational text. Despite the agreement with RP against NA, Origen probably cited περί.

---

<sup>98</sup> Burton, “Critical and Exegetical Commentary”, 13 states “Intrinsic probability is in favour of ὑπέρ, for though Paul uses both prepositions with both meanings, “concerning” and “on behalf of”, he employs περί much more commonly in the former sense and ὑπέρ in the latter.

Galatians 1:5

This passage cannot be represented as a unique reading of Galatians as there are overlapping instances in Matthew 6:13, 2 Timothy 4:18, 1 Peter 4:11, and Revelation 7:12.

Galatians 1:6-7

No citations

Galatians 1:8

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

-----  
εὐαγγελίζεται NA RP 020 6. 33. 69. 945. 010 012 044 ] εὐαγγελίσηται Or(a) 01 02 010 012 81. 104. 326. 1241., ευαγγελίζεται 018 025 0278. 365. 614. 1505. 1881. 1908. 2464.

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ NA RP ] ὑμῖν εὐαγγελίζεται P51 03 015 630. 1175. 1739., ἵνα κἂν Or(a) ]

Or(a) is marked with ἡ διδᾶξη ἡμᾶς παρ' ὃ ὁ Παῦλος ἐδίδαξεν. There are no variants in this verse in the critical editions. Origen however differs from both NA and RP at the beginning of the reading. There is an omission of ἡμεῖς ἢ. The presence of the reading in Origen can be explained as an adjustment to context. He does not use the full verse in his citation. He cites text, breaks away, and then resumes the citation at ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. The difference at the beginning, with the disjointed use of the remaining text shows that Origen accommodates biblical content to his context. This reading is not in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, or VS. The citation is probably Origen's authorial citational text given its uniqueness, though it is probably not a reading of his exemplar.

Galatians 1:9-14

No citations

Galatians 1:15-16  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 1:17-18  
No citations

Galatians 1:19  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 1:20-24  
No citations

Galatians 2:1-8  
No citations

Galatians 2:9  
καὶ γνόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ  
δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι, δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρναβᾶ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς  
εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν·

-----  
ἐμοὶ Or(cde) NA RP ] Παύλῳ Or(b)  
\*omit NA 01 03 010 012 015 018 020 025 ] μὲν RP 01c 02 04 06 08 5. 6. 43. 88. 104.  
206. 263. 296. 330. 378. 390. 440. 467. 459. 547. 625. 642. 921. 1149. 1245. 1315.  
1425. 1611. 1739.  
δέ Or(cde) NA RP] omit Or(b)

Or(b) is intermittent, omitting ἵνα ἡμεῖς μὲν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη and δέ, as well as substituting the reading of ἐμοὶ for Παύλῳ. These differences reveal Or(b) to be affected by accommodation to Origen's text. The critical apparatus of both NA and VS do not present any variants in these locations. The first two are in Tisch and Treg but Origen's reading is not present. However, the citation is marked with καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Γαλάτας δὲ ἐπιστολῇ Παύλος and is in the vicinity of other Galatians citations.

The unit of variation (μέν/omit) is in a place where the NA and RP text do not correspond to one another. All of Origen's readings omit μέν and Or(bcde) are all abbreviated in relation to the full verse. Origen's citations correspond to the RP Text. Though this variant is not in the NA apparatus, it is in Tisch, Treg, and VS. However, VS does not list any witnesses for Origen's reading. The diversity of works and the level of consistency among them indicates this is probably Origen's authorial citational text and that the omission of μέν is Origen's reading.

Galatians 2:10  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 2:11  
No citations

Galatians 2:12  
πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον,  
ὑπέστειλλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς.  
-----

Or(a) shows several grammatical adaptations which allow Origen to use biblical content and also maintain the structure of his own writings.

Galatians 2:13  
No citations

Galatians 2:14

ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾷ ἔμπρόςθεν πάντων· εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαΐζειν;

καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς NA 01 02 03 04 015 025 044 0278. 6. 8. 33. 69. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. ] καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς Or(a) 010 012 630. 1739. 1908., ζῆς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς RP 06c 020, ζῆς P46 1881., ζῆς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς 06 018 020 326. 1505. 2464.

πῶς Or(a) NA P46 01 02 03 04 06 010 012 015 025 044 0278. 6. 33. 69. 81. 104. 218. 330. 365. 436. 623. 630. 808. 922. 1175. 1241. 1243. 1319. 1739. 1835. 1838. 1881. 1912. 2127. 2464. ] τι RP 018 020 1505. 1908.

Or(a) corresponds to NA, not RP, in both units of variation. This variant is in the apparatus of NA Tisch, Treg, and VS. The best witnesses favor καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς. There seems to be a case of mixture in that, regardless of the transposition, there is the difference of οὐχὶ vs οὐκ. Origen retains the word order of the NA text yet has the negative particle of the Byzantine text. Regardless, the strong manuscript evidence overrules internal issues of verb location. Origen's reading corresponds to NA (πῶς), not RP (τι). This unit of variation is in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, and VS. Similar to the previous variant in this verse, the external evidence strongly supports the reading of Origen.

Galatians 2:15

No citations

Galatians 2:16

This citation is more than likely from Romans 3:20, considering the source is *Rom.Frag D 3:20:1* (cf. Chapter 2).<sup>99</sup>

Galatians 2:17-18

No citations

---

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Page 81.

Galatians 2:19

ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῶ ζήσω. Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι·

-----  
συνεσταύρωμαι Or(ade) NA RP ] συνεσταύρωται Or(b)

The differences in Or(b), which is in the third person singular as opposed to Paul's first-person singular, is the result of accommodation to his own text. Other than this, Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 2:20

ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοί Χριστός· ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.

-----  
ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι Or(befghi) NA RP ] οὐκέτι ζῶ Or(a), ζῶ οὐκέτι Or(cd), ζῶ γὰρ, φησὶν οὐκέτι Or(j).  
δὲ ἐν ἐμοί Or(abdefghij) NA ] ἐν ἡμῖν Or(c).

The first variant is an omission of the post-positive δέ at the beginning of the verse. This reading does not correspond to NA or RP and is not found in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, or VS. The next two units of variation are just like it. Here, there is an omission of οὐκέτι before ἐγώ in Or(a). The third is another omission of δέ in Or(c). This is another reading that does not correspond to NA or RP and is not present in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, or VS. This is an example of Origen's tendency to paraphrase the biblical text. The omitted γάρ is needed in Paul's argumentation for his letter, yet only the verse was deemed useful in this particular place in Origen's argumentation. Other than these differences, which are still probably Origen's authorial citational texts, Origen is rather consistent and also in agreement with both NA and RP.

Galatians 2:21

No citations

Galatians 3:1

ᾠ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν \*, οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη \*\* ἐσταυρωμένος;

-----  
\*omit NA 01 02 03 06 010 012 6. 33. 81. 630. 1739. ] ἐν Or(a) ] τῇ ἀλήθεια μὴ πείθεσθαι RP 04 06c 08 018 020 025 044 0278. 33c. 69. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. 1908. 2464.,

\*\*omit 01 02 03 04 025 044 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1739. 1881. ] ἐν ἡμῖν 06 010 012 018 020 33. 1505. 2464.

Or(a) is the only instance of Galatians 3:1 in Origen's works. It is an isolated citation, however it is marked with καὶ Γαλάταις δὲ Παῦλος ἐπέτιμα. It does not correspond to NA or RP. This unit of variation is found in Tisch Treg and VS but Origen's reading is not listed. The nature of the variant is the presence or absence of τῇ ἀλήθεια μὴ πείθεσθαι. RP contains the longer reading that is not in NA, and Origen reads ἐν.

Origen's reading of ἐν in favor of RP against NA is probably a later adjustment as in the case with GA33. Also, Or(a) consists primarily of late documents (Migne) where later readings are to be expected.

Galatians 3:2-3  
No citations

Galatians 3:4  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 3:5-9  
No citations

Galatians 3:10  
Ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν· γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι ἐπικάταρος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει \* πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά.

ὅτι NA 01 02 03 04 06 08 010 012 025 6. 33. 436. 441. 442. 463. 618. 1944. ] omit Or(bc) RP 018 020 69. 1908.

\*omit Or(bc) NA P46 01 03 044 0278. 6. 17. 31. 33. 73. 81. 104. 116. 118. 365. 424. 441. 442. 462. 463. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. ] ἐν Or(d) RP 01c 02 04 06 08 010 012 018 020 025 1908.

This verse is a LXX reading of Deuteronomy 26:27 and cannot be distinguished from Galatians 3:10. Both readings are against RP. This variant is located in the apparatus of Tisch and Treg. The variant is in VS but this edition does not list witnesses for Origen's reading.

Galatians 3:11-12  
No citations

Galatians 3:13

Χριστὸς \* ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρης τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρη, ὅτι γέγραπται· ἐπικατάρητος πᾶς ὁ κρεμᾶμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου

-----  
omit NA RP ] γάρ Or(a)

ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν NA RP Or(ab) ] ἐξηγόρασεν ἡμᾶς Or(d)

ἐκ Or(ab) NA RP ] ἀπό Or(c)

τοῦ νόμου Or(acd) NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Or(d) transposes ἡμᾶς and the verb. Similarly, the reading of ἀπό in Or(c) is at the start of the citation. This difference is due to accommodation to Origen's literary context. Neither unit of variation is in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, or VS. The former unit of variation is marked with καὶ Παῦλος and in the proximity of other biblical citations.

Or(c) omits τοῦ νόμου. Here, NA and RP agree, but do not correspond to Origen's reading. The variant is not in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, or VS. Origen's



authorial citational text is probably present in all the readings, especially in Or(bcd)  
which show his contextual changes.

Galatians 3:14-18  
No citations

Galatians 3:19

Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν πρόσετέθη, ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθη τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται, διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου.

-----  
νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν πρόσετέθη NA RP 01 02 03 04 06c 018 020 025 044 0176. 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. ] νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν ἐτέθη Or(b) 2464., νόμος; τῶν παραδοσεων χάριν ἐτέθη 06, νόμος τῶν πραξεων; ἐτέθη 010 012, νόμος τῶν πράξεων P46, νόμος γὰρ τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν ἐτέθη Or(d)

Or(d) shows the explanatory nature of using citations for argumentations (γάρ).

Origen is often different from both NA and RP (ἐτέθη). Other than these differences there is no variance between the Origen, NA, and RP.

Galatians 3:20-23  
No citations

Galatians 3:24-26  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 4:1

Λέγω δέ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος \* νήπιός ἐστιν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου κύριος πάντων ὧν

-----  
κληρονόμος Or(ab) NA RP ] κληρονόμον Or(c)  
\*omit Or(a) NA RP ] ἢ Or(b), παρὰ τὸν χρόνον Or(c)  
οὐδὲν Or(a) NA RP ] μηδέν Or(b)  
διαφέρει Or(a) NA RP ] διαφέρων Or(b)

Or(bc) both show signs of contextual adjustment. Or(b) adds the article, while Or(c) adds an explanatory clause. Or(b) continues with another change from οὐδέν to μηδέν. Where extant Or(a) corresponds to the shared reading of NA and RP.

Galatians 4:2

ἀλλ' ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶν καὶ οἰκονόμους ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρὸς

-----

ἐστὶν Or(b) NA RP ] τυγχάνουσι Or(a), omit Or(c)

Or(b) is identical to NA and RP. Or(a) is only partially cited and it shows adjustment to the context in the form of a verb change. Or(c) is a rather short citation and lacks the verb. *Euches* reflects the shared reading of NA and RP for the last two verses.

Galatians 4:3

No citations

Galatians 4:4

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 4:5

No citations

Galatians 4:6

Ὅτι δὲ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κράζον· αββα ὁ πατήρ

-----

ἡμῶν NA, τῶν ἀγίων Or(b), τῶν μακαρίων Or(a), ὑμῶν RP

κράζον Or(a) NA RP ] κράζειν Or(b)a

NA reads ἡμῶν, RP reads ὑμῶν and Origen reads καρδίαις τῶν μακαρίων in Or(a). It is an independent citation, outside of any Galatians citation chains. This variant

is found in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, but Origen is not mentioned. It is not found in VS. Based on the context, it seems that Origen is not intending to cite a specific reading but is instead drawing on the theme also found in Mark 14:36 and Rom 8:15. This inclusive language could be in response to the variant reading ὑμῶν in contrast to the second person verb ἐστε.<sup>100</sup> Or(b) is marked ὁ Ἀπόστολος appearing in a series of individual biblical citations, but no other Galatians text is cited. This is probably a singular reading, which mixes characteristics of biblical text and Origen's commentary.

Galatians 4:7-8

No citations

Galatians 4:9

νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῦειν θέλετε;

-----  
θεοῦ NA RP ] τοῦ θεοῦ Or(b) ] αὐτοῦ Or(a)

In *John.Frag*, the citation is unmarked and is in proximity to other biblical citations, none of which are from Galatians. The nature of the variant is a lexical difference. The text of NA and RP read θεοῦ, as Or(a) reads αὐτοῦ. Even in Origen's text, the genitive is a reference to the previously mentioned "God". The variant is not in NA, Treg, or VS apparatus. The unit is present in Tisch but Origen's reading is not present.

Galatians 4:10

There are no units of variation between Origen, NA, and RP other than the additional articles in Or(b)

---

<sup>100</sup> F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary, Exeter: The Paternoster Press: 1982, 198.

Galatians 4:11  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 4:12-13  
No citations

Galatians 4:14  
καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπύσατε,  
ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελον θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν

-----  
ὑμῶν NA 01 02 03 04 06 010 012 6. 33. ] υμῆν τόν Or(a) 04 6. 69. 1739. 1881., μου  
τόν RP 04 06c 08 018 020 025 044 365. 630. 1175. 1505. 1908., μου P46, τόν 0278.  
81. 104. 326. 1241. 2464.

Origen's reading corresponds with NA, not RP. This variant is found in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, and VS. The external evidence is split between ὑμῶν and μου. The primary issue is the possessive pronoun indicating the “test” belongs to Paul or the Galatians congregation. The external evidence for ὑμῶν is strong: majuscules 01 02 03 04, the Latin bilinguals, and minuscules 1739 and 1881. Though the support for μου is mainly Byzantine documents, P46 does support the reading.

An internal assessment of the various readings is somewhat challenging. The intrinsic probabilities seem to have a stronger influence on how multiple variants arose. First, the main issue concerns the “test, in my flesh” Paul refers to, but also the presence of the qualifying article. τόν is an apposition joining the two clauses. The addition of the article is simply to clarify: the “test” which is “in my flesh”. The article is primarily found in the longer, explanatory Byzantine readings. Conversely, the lexical issue of ὑμῶν/μου is possession. The following verb concerns the Galatians reaction to the “test,” but it is unclear whether the “test in my flesh” was indeed Paul's, or the

Galatians' "test" which had an impact on Paul. The adjective "my" that follows the variant could grammatically govern "test" which would make the μου variant redundant. Though μου is found in P46, it seems that it is grammatically redundant and the clarifying nature of the article in the other readings seems like a later development. There is very strong external evidence and a high intrinsic possibility that Paul is referring to the Galatians' "test" via his own illness, but it is unclear (cf. Luke 22:28 for example of objective genitive ὑμῶν after πειρασμόν).

Galatians 4:15  
No citations

Galatians 4:16  
ὥστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν;

-----  
 ὑμῶν Or(b) NA RP ] γάρ Or(a), ὑμῖν Or(c)  
 γέγονα Or(bc) NA RP ] γέγονε Or(a)  
 omit Or(bc) NA RP ] τοῖς ἀκούουσιν Or(a)  
 ὑμῖν Or(bc) NA RP ] αὐτοῖς Or(a)

The first variant is a matter of Origen using the post-positive to begin his statement, which often shows adjustment. The biblical text addresses the hearer in the second person as Origen is referring to a third. The second variant is a result of the first variant. By removing the first person verb of Paul with the change to third person, Origen needs a qualifier for his sentence to make sense. This is not a conflation or expansion but rather the result of integrating biblical content into his writing. Again, the third variant is a change from "to you" to "to them." These variants are not in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. However, VS has Origen's reading ὑμῶν in the second variant, but this appears to be an error. Nor are there any disagreements between NA

and RP in this verse. This is a good example of how Origen freely uses scripture, and makes adjustments according to context, which often requires further adaptation later on in the verse. This is probably Origen's authorial citational text.

Galatians 4:17-18  
No citations

Galatians 4:19

τέκνα μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῆ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν·

-----

ὠδινήσαντες Or(a) ] ὠδίνω NA RP

μέχρις Or(a) NA 01 03 69. 116. ] ἄχρι RP 01c 02 04 06 08 010 012 018 020 025

omit Or(a) ] οὗ NA RP

αὐτοῖς Or(a) ] ὑμῖν NA RP

Or(a) reading corresponds with NA, not RP. The variant unit is found in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, and VS. Origen's reading is not in the VS apparatus.

Ἄχρι is found only once in the letter to the Galatians (cf 3:19). μέχρις has one occurrence in Galatians. Or(a) shows a lot of adjustment with changes in verb, negative and pronouns. This is probably Origen's authorial citational text as it does not reflect Paul's style.

Galatians 4:20  
No citations

Galatians 4:21

Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε;

-----

θέλοντες εἶναι Or(abcde) NA RP ] ἀναγινώσκοντες Or(fgh)

ἀκούετε Or(abc) NA RP ] ἀναγινώσκετε Or(d) 06 010 012 104. 436. 642. 1175. 1838.

Or(d) has introductory material including Παῦλος πεποιήκεν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Γαλάτας ἐπιστολῇ γράφων. This citation starts a two-verse chain of Galatians. Origen uses the verb ἀναγινώσκετε whereas the reading of NA and RP is ἀκούετε. This variant is in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, and VS. Out of the 8 citations of Origen for this verse, this is his only reading for ἀναγινώσκετε. Or(f) is the beginning of a two-verse chain of Galatians. There is an introductory marker ἐν τῇ πρὸς Γαλάτας φάσκη. When compared to the readings found in NA and RP there are two differences. In the first unit of variation Origen reads τόν instead of υπό. In the second, Origen reads ἀναγινώσκοντες instead of θέλοντες εἶναι. There are readings in the apparatus of Tisch Treg and VS for these units. Or(g) is the first of a three-verse citation chain of Galatians.

Galatians 4:22

γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας.

-----

ὅτι Or(abcdefgh) NA RP ] omit Or(e)

Or(e) is an abbreviated form of the verse and shows stylistic changes to Origen's text.

Galatians 4:23

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας δι' \* ἐπαγγελίας.

-----

μὲν Or(abcdeg) NA RP 01 02 03 04 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 062. 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. ] omit Or(f) P46 03 δι' NA P46 01 02 04 044 33. 81. 104. 1241. 2464. ] τῆς Or(abcdefg) RP 03 06 E 010 012 018 020 025 062. 0278. 365. 630. 1175. 1505. 1739. 1881., κατ 323. 945.

Or(f) is intermittent regarding its presentation of the verse. The only difference between NA and RP is the genitive article at the end which all of Origen's citations have present. Other than Or(c) there is no variance between all of Origen's citations and NA, which makes this verse very consistent in Origen's works.

Galatians 4:24  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 4:25  
No citations

Galatians 4:26  
ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἣτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ \* ἡμῶν·

-----  
δέ Or(bdgjkl) NA RP ] omit Or(cehi)  
\*omit Or(abcdeghil) NA P46 01 03 04 06 08 010 012 044 5. 6. 17. 33. 67. 177. 178.  
1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. ] παντῶν Or(j) RP 01c 02 04c 018 020 025 0261. 0278.  
69. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1908.

Or(abcdefghik) omit the word πάντων in agreement with NA against RP.

Or(cdfgi) have introductory markers containing either the church of Galatia, Paul or "the apostle". Or(a) has a post-positive marker φησίν. This unit of variation is in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, and VS. Both readings have strong witnesses. The reading in Or(j) is probably a reflection of a later change, though the earlier reading is in this work earlier Or(i). The various omissions of δέ at the beginning reflect adjustment to Origen's text. These are probably Origen's authorial citational texts other than Or(j).

Galatians 4:27  
γέγραπται γάρ· εὐφράνθητι, στείρα ἢ οὐ τίκτοῦσα, ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον, ἢ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα· ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα.



omit Or(b) NA RP ] γάρ Or(a)

The addition of γάρ in Or(a) reflects Origen's explanatory use of biblical content, but only the parts of the verse he needs.

Galatians 4:28-31  
No citations

Galatians 5:1  
No citations

Galatians 5:2  
Ἴδὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει.

-----

ὕμᾶς οὐδὲν Or(b) NA RP ] οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς Or(a)

NA and RP read ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν whereas Origen reads οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς. There are no markers for this citation and no chains or other Galatians text is related to it. The unit of variation is not in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, or VS.

Galatians 5:3  
No citations

Galatians 5:4  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 5:5-7  
No citations

Galatians 5:8  
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 5:9

μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα \* ζυμοί.

-----  
\*omit Or(abcd) NA RP ] τοῦτο οὐ Or(e)

Origen's citations of 5:9 are very consistent, other than Or(e) which adds τοῦτο οὐ. This appears to be an addition by Origen for clarity.

Galatians 5:10-13

No citations

Galatians 5:14

ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

-----  
πεπληρωκέναι Or(a) ] πεπλήρωται NA P46 01 02 03 04 062 0254. 0278. 6. 69. 33. 81. 104. 326. 1175. 1241. 1739., πληροῦται RP 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 0122. 630. 1505. 1881. 1908. 2464.

ἐν τῷ NA RP ] τὴν Or(ab)

σεαυτόν NA 01 02 03 04 06 018 6. ] εαυτόν Or(ab) RP 010 012 020 025 69. 1908.

Or(a), NA and RP all have different readings for πληρώω. Or(a) has adjusted this citation to his own context grammatically. NA has the strongest external support for πεπλήρωται against RP. The use of the accusative article is another example of Origen's accommodation to his commentary text.

Galatians 5:15

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 5:16

Λέγω δέ, πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε.

-----  
περιπατεῖτε NA RP ] περιπατεῖν Or(a)

οὐ NA RP ] omit Or(a)

τελέσητε NA RP ] ἐπιτελεῖν Or(a)

The three units of variation in Or(a) are not listed in the apparatus of NA. Though the elements of 5:16 are present, it is clearly an adjustment to his commentary. This is most likely Origen's authorial citational text.

Galatians 5:17

ἢ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται, ἵνα μὴ ἂ ἐὰν θέλητε ταῦτα ποιῆτε.

-----

γὰρ NA RP ] μὲν Or(c), omit Or(ab)  
omit Or(bc) NA RP ] οὐδέ Or(a)  
δέ Or(bc) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

The beginning of Origen's citations often reveal contextual adjustments and this verse is no different with the various omissions and additions of the post-positives Or(abc). Or(d) begins the citation with a verbal change which is typically the other way in which Origen starts citations if there is not post-positive marker. Or(a) replaces the δέ of the verse and makes up for the loss with the addition of ουδέ. Other than that, Origen is rather consistent.

Galatians 5:18

No citations

Galatians 5:19

φανερὰ δὲ ἐστὶν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, ἅτινά ἐστιν πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια,

-----

Or(b) shows some affinity to RP against NA with μοιχεία, though Or(cde) do not.

All of these citations show several elements of adjustment to context. This is probably due to the nature of Origen's commentaries and homilies. These citations more than likely represent Origen's citational text given their unique features. The first half of the

verse is very consistent though lists are often places of high disagreement among the various texts.

Galatians 5:20

εἰδωλολατρία, \* φαρμακεία, ἔχθραι, ἔρις, ζήλος, θυμοί, ἐριθείαι, διχοστασίαι, αἰρέσεις,

-----

εἰδωλολατρία Or(a) NA ] εἰδωλολάτρεια RP

\*omit NA RP ] οὐ Or(a)

Or(a) corresponds with NA verbally. However, Or(a) is different to both NA and RP with οὐ before φαρμακεία.

Galatians 5:21

No citations

Galatians 5:22

ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγάπη χαρὰ εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία χρηστότητος ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις

-----

omit Or(acdfg) NA RP ] γὰρ Or(e)

ἐστιν ἀγάπη NA RP Or(acde) ] ἐστιν Or(fg), καὶ ἡ Or(b)

ἀγάπη χαρὰ εἰρήνη Or(acde) NA RP ] καὶ ἡ χαρὰ καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἡ Or(b), χαρὰ

εἰρήνη ἀγάπη Or(f), χαρὰ, ἀγάπη, εἰρήνη Or(g)

χρηστοτήτης, ἀγαθωσύνη Or(ac) NA RP ] omit Or(e)

Within these citations are four units of variation which all pertain to the sequence of Paul's list of the spiritual fruits. Or(bfg) has a different sequence in that ἀγάπη never appears in the list. NA and RP have this item as the first in the list. There is no variant in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, or Treg. However, VS has a reading in which ἡ is before ἀγάπη, which Origen places in front of the "spiritual fruits" in one reading. Or(h) has a different sequence that reads ἀγάπη εἰρήνη χαρὰ. The list within this text and the various ways in which Origen cites the verse give a good indication of the extent to

which Origen presents multiple forms of the text. These are probably his authorial citational texts.

Galatians 5:23

πραύτης ἐγκράτεια· κατὰ τῶν τοιοῦτῶν οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος

-----

πραύτης Or(b) NA 01 02 03 04 6. 31. 80. 118. 1908. ] πραοτηῆς Or(acde) RP 06 08 010 012 018 020 025 69.

All of his citations have the first two elements of 5:23 though his citations are clearly abbreviations of the verse. Or(b) has included a conjunction as opposed to the other citations. The way in which 5:23 is presented in his works is consistent.

Galatians 5:24

No citations

Galatians 5:25

Εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν

-----

ζῶμεν πνεύματι NA RP ] πνεύματι ζῶμεν Or(a)

The NA and RP both read ζῶμεν πνεύματι while Origen reads πνεύματι ζῶμεν. There are no introductory markers or citation chains in this section of Origen's text. This reading is in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, and VS. The apparatus of VS contributed no new variants to those reported in NA. Origen's sequence with the double πνεύματι looks strange and could possibly be harder to read.

Galatians 5:26

No citations

Galatians 6:1-6

No citations

Galatians 6:7

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

Galatians 6:8

ὅτι ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον

-----  
σπείρων Or(b) NA RP ] σπείρας Or(a) ] σπείρομεν Or(c)  
τὴν σάρκα εαυτοῦ NA RP ] εἰς τὴν σάρκα Or(bc), εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἀλλά Or(a)  
σαρκὸς Or(b) NA RP ] σάρκα Or(ac)  
θερίσει Or(ab) NA RP ] θερίσωμέν Or(c)  
ζωὴν αἰώνιον Or(bc) NA RP ] αἰώνιον ζωὴν Or(a)

There are many units of variation that do not correspond to the shared reading of NA and RP. To treat these as individual units of variation (none of which are found in the NA apparatus) would be counter-productive. It suffices to say that he takes much liberty in his expressions of 6:8, none of which are consistent.

Galatians 6:14

Ἔμοι δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἔμοι κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ \* κόσμῳ.

-----  
δέ Or(acgikmn) NA RP ] omit Or(el)  
ἡμῶν Or(cehin) NA RP ] μου Or(akl), omit Or(m)  
Χριστοῦ Or(acehilmn) NA RP ] omit Or(k)  
omit Or(abcdefghilmn) NA RP, ὁ Or(j)  
ἐσταύρωται Or (abcdefghijlmn) NA RP ] ἐσταυρώθη Or(j)  
\*omit Or(bdlmn) NA 01 02 03 04 06 010 012 044 025 6. 81. 104. 459. 1739. ] τῷ  
Or(acefhij) RP 04c 06c 08 018 020 69. 1908.

Origen cites Galatians 6:14 in his works 15 times. Of these citations Or(adlmn) do not read τῷ but omit the gloss as is found in RP. Only Or(abdn) have any surrounding citations, though not from Galatians. None of these readings have markers as Pauline or from the Letter to the Galatians, except for Or(l) which reads ὁποῖα ἦν ἡ Παύλου λέγοντος. The variant unit is in the apparatus of NA, Tisch, Treg, and VS. The

external evidence for the presence or absence of the article (τῷ) favors the omission. All major early uncials support the omission while support for the article is found in later minuscules. This is probably Origen's authorial citational text. The internal evidence looks to be an addition to suit the dative κόσμῳ, which would otherwise be implied. Also, there is another dative article within this verse, which could have resulted in a parablepsis on the part of the scribe or an unconscious addition in light of the previous occurrence. Origen once more is split between the two readings. This verse is one of the most cited verses by Origen in Galatians. Because the verse was cited more frequently, it might have had a higher chance of getting adjusted sporadically as opposed to a full adherence to RP.

Origen cites 6:14 more than any other verse in Galatians (15x). There are four places where Origen does not correspond to either NA or RP. All four readings involve the same unit of variation, a different or omitted possessive pronoun before Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Or(a) is the second verse in a two-verse chain of Galatians text and has a concluding marker reading Παύλῳ. The other, Or(k) has two introductory markers, Παύλου λέγοντος and γὰρ φησίν. The unit of variation is not listed in the apparatus of NA or Treg. However, it is in VS and Tisch. The reading of Origen is a first-person singular pronoun, whereas the Galatians text found in NA/RP is the 1st person plural (ἡμῶν). This is yet another example of Origen adapting his text, which probably means it represents his authorial citational text.

#### 4.8 Summary of Origen's Citations of Galatians

The citations of Galatians in Origen's writings are rather inconsistent. There is a varying affinity among his primary sources and secondary sources. However, the works do not always reflect his authorial citation text. Likewise, the secondary sources are not always accommodated to the Byzantine text. In fact, most of the secondary sources are consistently in agreement with the NA/RP text, do not show accommodation to Byzantine-only readings and maintain free citations. The only secondary sources that do not reflect the NA text are *Rom.Frag A* and *Eph.Com*. Secondary sources such as *Jer.Frag B* and *Luke.Frag* show very little accommodation to the Byzantine text and have high numbers of identical readings and free citations.

It is the primary sources that vary more in quality in regards to accommodation. For the citations of Galatians, *Cels*, *Matt.Com C*, *Ps.Frag*, and *Princ* all show later changes. On the other hand, other works (*John.Com A*, *John.Com B*, *Jer.Hom B*, *Matt.Com B*, and *Rom.Frag C*) show no accommodation to the Byzantine text, are consistently in agreement with NA-only readings, and preserve free citations.

Some readings show a mixture of NA and RP within the same citation such as Galatians 1:3-4 with one unit with NA-only and the next with RP-only readings. Such examples suggest that Origen was partially accommodated to the Byzantine text and that the intervention of later editors has now changed the affinity of his writings. However, such mixture could also be an example of an early Church Father like Origen reflecting an early mixed text-form that shows the beginnings of the Byzantine text.



Such issues and implications concerning Origen's textual affinity and the textual transmission of the wider Greek New Testament will be discussed in the final chapter.

## CHAPTER FIVE

The final chapter consists of three main sections. The first section is an overview of the primary sources of Origen and their citations of Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians. This data will be supplemented with an overview of the textual nature of each of the three individual epistles as represented in Origen's primary and secondary sources. The second section is a presentation of significant readings as they pertain to specific ways in which Origen contributes to a better understanding of the earliest text of the Greek New Testament. This is followed by findings relevant to the research questions set out in Chapter 1. These questions and their implications will be addressed in light of the current investigation of Origen's citations. Finally, there is a discussion of limitations of the current thesis, and recommendations for future research, including possible issues moving forward in patristic textual studies and their use for Greek New Testament textual criticism.

### **5.1 Secondary and Primary Sources of Origen and the Citations They Contain**

As the previous three chapters have done in respect to the three epistles, this chapter will first discuss the particular works that cite all three (Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians), followed by works that cite only two.

Demonstrated below, secondary sources often contain earlier readings of the New Testament while some of Origen's primary sources contain later Byzantine readings. For this reason secondary sources are included in the evidence presented. Those works that have been deemed secondary sources will be included but it must be kept in mind that if biblical content in such sources is contrary to other citations of

Origen, it is likely due to the compiler of the secondary source and not to Origen. On the other hand, if a citation occurs in works deemed to be copies of Origen’s actual writing, and then a unique reading is possibly that of Origen himself. Of course, even citations taken from Origen’s genuine works could have undergone change by any subsequent user or scribe.

In the tables below, “Citations” is the number of citations from each epistle. “Identical” are readings where Origen agrees with both NA and RP. “Neither” are readings where Origen disagrees with both NA and RP (regardless of their agreement with each other). “NA” and “RP” represent readings where Origen corresponds to one of these critical editions of the Greek New Testament, but not the other.

### 5.1.1. Secondary Sources That Cite All Three Epistles

The secondary sources for Origen that contain citations of Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians are listed here individually with a chart that shows the statistics for the individual epistles and Origen’s citations of them. There are 7 secondary sources of Origen that contain citations of all 3 of the epistles in question:

*1Cor.Com, Basil.Phil A, Eph.Com, Jer.Frag B, John.Frag, Ps.Exc, Ps.Sel, Rom.Frag A.*

Table 14

1Cor.Com Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	5	2	4	-	2
2 Corinthians	8	3	3	1	2
Galatians	11	6	2	2	1
Total	24	11	9	3	5

1Cor.Com shows evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text in all three epistles that it cites (Rom 9:3, 2 Co 5:10; Gal 6:14). Galatians is preserved the best in

1Cor.Com considering the higher number of NA-only readings, free citations, and readings in agreement with both NA and RP.

Table 15

<i>Basil.Phil A Readings</i>					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	59	36	26	6	5
2 Corinthians	13	4	11	2	-
Galatians	17	11	4	3	3
Total	89	51	41	11	8

Citations of Romans demonstrate an accommodation to the Byzantine text and should not be considered authorial citations of Origen (1:1, 9:19). There is no evidence of accommodation for 2 Corinthians citations. The Galatians readings are mixed like the Romans citations (with RP: Gal 4:23), however the high number of identical readings demonstrates a lack of variance and could possibly show areas of authorial citations text in Origen.

Table 16

<i>Eph.Com Readings</i>					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	1	-	1	-	-
2 Corinthians	5	2	7	3	-
Galatians	7	3	-	4	1
Total	13	5	8	7	1

Eph.Com has no readings that correspond to RP for Romans and 2 Corinthians. However, its citations of Galatians contain an RP-only reading as well as several NA-only and identical readings. The first of these is likely to be a reflection of a single change to a Byzantine-like text.

Table 17

<i>Jer.Frag B</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	4	3	1	-	-
2 Corinthians	6	2	4	-	2
Galatians	4	2	3	1	-
Total	14	7	8	1	2

Jer.Frag B shows no evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text in either Romans or Galatians. However there is evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text in 2 Corinthians (2:2). These citations are likely to be authorial considering the presence of identical readings to NA/RP and free citations against both.

Table 18

<i>John.Frag</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	3	2	1	-	-
2 Corinthians	3	-	5	1	-
Galatians	1	-	1	-	-
Total	7	2	7	1	-

John.Frag is a probably good representation of Origen's authorial citations in all three epistles considering the free readings and identical readings.

Table 19

<i>Ps.Exc</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	1	-	1	-	-
2 Corinthians	2	1	-	-	1
Galatians	2	1	1	-	-
Total	5	2	2	-	1

The citation text in Ps.Exc for Romans and Galatians demonstrates that Origen's citational text corresponds to the NA text. However, the free nature of many of the citations demonstrates a departure from that stabilization or is perhaps an indication of

a later stabilization in Origen's citations after they were written. However, there is evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text for 2 Corinthians (7:10).

Table 20

<i>Ps.Sel</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	32	17	18	1	-
2 Corinthians	26	16	11	-	2
Galatians	11	5	4	3	1
Total	69	38	36	4	3

There is no evidence of Byzantine accommodation in the citations of Romans.

The free citations demonstrate the authorial nature of the citations in *Ps.Sel*. The citations of 2 Corinthians are show accommodation to the Byzantine text (5:10) though the repetition in 4:8 is likely his biblical text. There is evidence of accommodation in the citations of Galatians, though the high number of NA-only readings, free citations, and readings in agreement with the NA/RP show a well-preserved authorial work.

Table 21

<i>Rom.Frag A</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	142	109	15	3	24
2 Corinthians	4	-	4	2	-
Galatians	17	11	3	1	3
Total	163	120	22	6	27

A significant number of readings of Romans are accommodated but still have some evidence of the NA text and possibly authorial citations of Romans. Overall, the Romans citations are not a good representation of what Origen's biblical text would have looked like. However, it does demonstrate the effect of the Byzantine text on Origen's writings over time. The lack of accommodation to the Byzantine text in 2

Corinthians is in opposition to its citations of Romans, which is mainly Byzantine. The citations of Galatians demonstrate some accommodation (3:10, 4:23, 6:14).

Of the works that contain citations of the three epistles, most citations are identical to a common early and Byzantine reading which is a reflection of the fact that most New Testament manuscripts agree most of the time.<sup>101</sup> When Origen does not agree with a combined reading of NA and RP, he is most often free. This dual nature of being identical to the united NA/RP reading and those of a free nature suggests that either Origen varied only in the extremes when citing, or his mainly free text was accommodated to an NA/RP-like text. This means that depending on how Origen's citations have been transmitted over the years his authorial citations could have been more or less fluid than they stand today.

The sources *1Cor.Com*, *Jer.Frag B*, and *Rom.Frag A* correspond to RP more than NA. On the other hand, *Eph.Com*, *John.Frag*, and *Ps.Sel* are more likely to correspond to NA than RP. Despite the varying affinity of these sources to the hand editions of the Greek New Testament, all of these sources contain more readings that correspond to neither than they do readings that correspond to the Initial or Byzantine Text. This means that secondary sources are not more susceptible to Byzantine readings or the opposite, or that primary sources hold a particular textual affinity.

---

<sup>101</sup> "Most manuscripts included in the *Editio Critica Maior* apparatus agree at more than 85%. Above all, we are able to nominate for each manuscript text potential ancestors that agree at a level exceeding this average value by far...This evidence enforces the conclusion that the efforts of scribes to copy their exemplar as precisely as possible was, on the whole, successful." Klaus Wachtel, "The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research," eds Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes, *Text Critical Studies 8* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 221.

### 5.1.2. Primary Sources That Cite All Three Epistles

The primary sources for Origen that cite Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians are listed here individually, beginning with a chart that shows the individual epistles and Origen's citations of them. There are 13 primary sources of Origen that contain citations of all 3 of the epistles in question: *Cels*, *Euches*, *Jer.Hom A*, *Jer.Hom B*, *John.Com A*, *John.Com B*, *Mart*, *Matt.Com A*, *Matt.Com B*, *Matt.Com C*, *Pass*, *Princ*, and *Ps.Frag*.

Table 22

<i>Cels</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	87	52	32	6	-
2 Corinthians	34	20	11	8	-
Galatians	22	11	8	3	2
Total	143	83	51	17	2

*Cels* shows no signs of accommodation to the Byzantine text in the Romans and 2 Corinthians citations. It is in complete agreement with the NA text except for places where he is against both NA and RP. This means this source is a strong candidate for finding Origen's authorial citational text considering the presence of free citations. The citations of Galatians show accommodation (4:23, 6:14).

Table 23

<i>Euches</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	27	13	14	2	1
2 Corinthians	12	6	4	1	1
Galatians	6	2	4	1	1
Total	45	21	22	4	3

*Euches* shows little accommodation to the Byzantine text in Romans, 2 Corinthians (4:8 contrasting readings in the same section), and Galatians (1:4). The agreement with the identical readings of the Initial and Byzantine Text shows a



considerable number of early readings and demonstrates some authorial citations, but *Euches* has undergone some accommodation.

Table 24

<i>Jer.Hom A Readings</i>					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	8	11	1	-	-
2 Corinthians	11	7	2	2	1
Galatians	9	1	6	1	2
Total	28	19	9	3	3

The citations of 2 Corinthians and Galatians (4:23, 6:14) show accommodation to the Byzantine text. The citations of Romans have no RP-only readings. Most of the readings of Romans are identical to the NA/RP text, which shows authorial readings.

Table 25

<i>Jer.Hom B Readings</i>					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	13	6	5	-	1
2 Corinthians	14	6	4	3	3
Galatians	7	4	2	2	-
Total	34	16	11	5	4

The citations of Romans and 2 Corinthians (11:23, 12:9) show signs of accommodation to the Byzantine text. These later readings do not appear to have affected the readings in Galatians. Origen's authorial citations are preserved in the Galatians citations.

Table 26

<i>John.Com A Readings</i>					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	50	30	25	3	1
2 Corinthians	44	25	21	12	-
Galatians	8	4	5	-	-
Total	102	59	51	15	1

Overall *John.Com A* is consistent internally and with the texts of NA/RP. This source maintains a strong agreement with the NA text throughout with no signs of accommodation to the Byzantine text except for one reading in Romans. *John.Com A* is a source with a combination of authorial and free citations, which makes it an optimal source for finding Origen’s authorial citational text.

Table 27

<i>John.Com B</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	24	16	10	2	-
2 Corinthians	12	7	2	3	-
Galatians	7	1	5	5	-
Total	43	24	17	10	-

*John.Com B*'s citations of Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians demonstrate a lack of later accommodation to the Byzantine text. The correspondence to the NA text and the presence of free citations demonstrate a partial agreement with the NA text and a free textual nature with readings against both NA and RP.

Table 28

<i>Mart</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	9	8	1	-	-
2 Corinthians	14	5	12	-	2
Galatians	1	-	2	-	-
Total	24	13	15	-	2

The citation of Romans and Galatians show no evidence of accommodation to the Byzantine text in *Mart*. On the other hand, the 2 Corinthians citations have no NA-only readings and agree mostly with the RP text, which suggests later accommodation.

Table 29

<i>Matt. Com A Readings</i>					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	1	1	-	-	-
2 Corinthians	2	1	1	-	-
Galatians	1	1	-	-	-
Total	4	3	1	-	-

*Matt. Com A*, in the few citations that are available, demonstrates no accommodation to the Byzantine text and represents Origen's authorial citation text for Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians.

Table 30

<i>Matt. Com B Readings</i>					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	7	7	-	-	-
2 Corinthians	11	3	9	2	1
Galatians	4	3	-	1	-
Total	22	13	13	3	1

*Matt. Com B*, in the few citations that are available, demonstrates no accommodation to the Byzantine text and represents what should be considered Origen's authorial citation text for Romans, and Galatians. There is one agreement to the Byzantine text in 2 Corinthians 4:4.

Table 31

<i>Matt. Com C Readings</i>					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	24	12	11	3	-
2 Corinthians	15	5	8	4	-
Galatians	18	8	1	3	2
Total	57	25	20	10	2

*Matt. Com C*'s citations of Galatians show accommodation to the Byzantine text (6:14). On the other hand, citations of Romans and 2 Corinthians have no RP-only

readings, but are identical to the NA text, and with free citations, which demonstrate authorial citations.

Table 32

<i>Pass</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	1	1	-	-	-
2 Corinthians	1	-	1	-	-
Galatians	2	1	-	1	-
Total	4	2	1	1	-

None of the citations in *Pass* of Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians have RP-only readings. The readings are either against both NA/RP or have identical readings to the NA/RP readings. This demonstrates an authorial citation text in the citations of *Pass*.

Table 33

<i>Princ</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	26	17	8	2	5
2 Corinthians	3	-	7	1	-
Galatians	5	3	1	1	1
Total	34	20	16	4	6

The citations of Romans in *Princ* show an agreement with the Byzantine text (2:8, 9:19), though the citations from Romans 9:8 and 9:16 are likely to be authorial as they show no signs of accommodation. There are five and six citations of these verses, respectively, that are identical. In other words throughout this work, Origen cites these two verses the same everytime. There is one Byzantine reading in Galatians (4:23). Conversely, the citations of 2 Corinthians have no RP-only readings, mixed with free citations. This demonstrates an authorial citational text of Origen for 2 Corinthians, however, not for Romans.

Table 34

<i>Ps.Frag</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	20	11	11	-	-
2 Corinthians	22	13	9	-	2
Galatians	11	-	9	5	3
Total	53	24	29	5	5

All of the citations of Romans in *Ps.Frag* are examples of free citations, which demonstrate an authorial citational text in Origen. On the other hand, the citations of 2 Corinthians (7:10) and Galatians (3:1, 4:26) demonstrate a significant accommodation to the Byzantine text.

The primary sources that cite all three epistles contain a more significant amount of citations. In the same way that secondary sources do not necessarily contain a later text-form, so too, the primary sources do not necessarily reflect the NA text. The works *Cels*, *Euches*, *John.Com A*, *John.Com B*, *Matt.Com B*, and *Matt.Com C* are all likely to correspond to the NA text in places of variation. On the other hand *Princ* and *Mart* agree more with the RP text when it and the NA text disagree. *Matt.Com A*, *Jer.Hom A*, *Jer.Hom B*, and *Ps.Frag* are all split almost evenly between agreement with NA and RP. All of the works above that correspond to the NA text more often than not also share the likelihood that they have an even amount of readings that are identical to NA/RP and readings that have no manuscript support. Readings that agree with either NA or RP against the other is a small percentage of readings in all of Origen's works. This means that almost all citations are either in agreement with a unified NA/RP reading or they disagree with both.

### 5.1.3. Secondary Sources That Cite Romans and 2 Corinthians

There are three secondary sources that contain citations of Romans and 2 Corinthians. These are: *Lam.Frag*, *Prov.Exp* and *Rom.Frag B*.

Table 35

<i>Lam.Frag</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	9	9	4	-	-
2 Corinthians	6	5	1	-	-
Total	15	14	5	-	-

*Lam.Frag* shows no accommodation to the Byzantine text in either Romans or 2 Corinthians. The matching of these citations to NA and RP demonstrate places where Origen's citational text is authorial.

Table 36

<i>Prov.Exp</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	6	2	3	-	1
2 Corinthians	3	2	2	-	-
Total	9	4	5	-	1

*Prov.Exp* and its citations of Romans show accommodation to the Byzantine text. There is no evidence of this in the 2 Corinthians citations.

Table 37

<i>Rom.Frag B</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	6	1	4	-	1
2 Corinthians	1	-	1	-	-
Total	7	2	5	-	1

None of the citations of Romans in *Rom.Frag B* agree with NA. They are either free, or in the case of one unit of variation, in agreement with only the RP text. The one citation of 2 Corinthians is free (against both NA and RP).

#### 5.1.4. Primary Sources That Cite Romans and 2 Corinthians

There are five primary sources that cite Romans and 2 Corinthians only: *Ex.Com*, *Gen.Com*, *Gen.Sel*, *Hera.Dial*, and *Rom.Frag B*.

Table 38

<i>Ex.Com</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	6	5	-	-	1
2 Corinthians	1	-	1	-	-
Total	7	5	1	-	1

In *Ex.Com*, there is one example of accommodation to the Byzantine text in the citations for Romans (2:13). On the other hand, there is not evidence to suggest that the citation of 2 Corinthians has been changed. The citation of 2 Corinthians is authorial.

Table 39

<i>Gen.Com</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	1	1	-	-	-
2 Corinthians	2	2	-	-	-
Total	3	3	-	-	-

There is no evidence of later changes to the Byzantine text in *Gen.Com* in its citations of Romans and 2 Corinthians.

Table 40

<i>Gen.Sel</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	4	2	3	1	-
2 Corinthians	1	1	-	-	-
Total	5	3	3	1	-

There is no evidence of later changes to the Byzantine text in *Gen.Sel* in its citations of Romans and 2 Corinthians

Table 41

<i>Hera.Dial</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	2	-	2	-	-
2 Corinthians	5	2	3	3	-
Total	7	2	5	3	-

In *Hera.Dial*, there is no evidence of its citations of Romans and 2 Corinthians being accommodated to the Byzantine text. These citations reflect Origen's authorial citational text.

Table 42

<i>Rom.Frag B</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	6	1	4	-	1
2 Corinthians	1	-	1	-	-
Total	7	1	5	-	1

*Rom.Frag B* has undergone accommodation to the Byzantine text in its readings of Romans (1:1), but no readings of 2 Corinthians corresponding to the RP-only readings. The citation of 2 Corinthians is likely to be authorial.

The data for sources that only cite Romans and 2 Corinthians is very limited due to the overall low number of citations. *Lam.Frag* is the only source that has more than a total of 10 citations. It, and *Prov.Exp*, the only secondary sources, have only one unit of variation between them that is sided with one of the hand editions of the Greek New Testament against the other.

The primary sources of Origen that cite Romans and 2 Corinthians also have minimal citings and have only 5 readings in places where NA and RP disagree. They



too, show similar characteristics as already seen in Origen's citations, namely, that almost all citations are in agreement with a unified NA/RP reading or are unsupported by Greek New Testament manuscripts.

### 5.1.5. Secondary Sources That Cite Romans and Galatians

There is one secondary source that cites Romans and Galatians only: *Eze.Frag*.

Table 43  
*Eze.Frag* Readings

Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
Romans	1	1	-	-	-
Galatians	1	1	-	-	-
Total	2	2	-	-	-

The citations of *Eze.Frag* show no evidence of being accommodated to the Byzantine text.

### 5.1.6. Secondary Sources That Cite 2 Corinthians and Galatians

There is one secondary source that cites 2 Corinthians and Galatians only: *Luke.Frag*.

Table 44  
*Luke.Frag* Readings

Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
2 Corinthians	3	1	1	1	-
Galatians	3	1	1	-	-
Total	6	2	2	1	-

The citations of *Luke.Frag* show no evidence of being accommodated to the Byzantine text. The readings against both NA and RP suggest a possible authorial reading.

### 5.1.7. Primary Sources That Cite 2 Corinthians and Galatians

There are two primary sources that cite 2 Corinthians and Galatians only:

*Cant.Schol* and *Rom.Frag C*:

Table 45

<i>Cant.Sch</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
2 Corinthians	3	2	1	2	-
Galatians	1	-	1	-	-
Total	4	2	2	2	-

The citations of *Cant.Sch* demonstrate a consistent NA-only affinity, which shows it has not been accommodated to the Byzantine text and probably contains authorial citations of Origen.

Table 46

<i>Rom.Frag C</i> Readings					
Epistle	Citations	Identical	Neither	NA	RP
2 Corinthians	5	1	3	1	1
Galatians	3	1	3	-	-
Total	8	2	6	1	1

*Rom.Frag C* has an accommodated reading in Romans. However, there is not evidence of accommodation in its readings of Galatians. The free citations of Galatians are likely to be authorial. A citation of 2 Corinthians 12:19 agrees with the Byzantine text.

The two sources that cite only 2 Corinthians and Galatians contain only a few citations and provide minimal data to make a full assessment of their textual nature.

### 5.1.8. Summary of Sources and Their Citations

The data above is a presentation of the primary and secondary sources for the citations of Origen. Their affinity is reflected overall and in citing each of the three

epistles. The sources for Origen's citations have a varying level of agreement with the Initial and Byzantine Texts. The percentage is very low in general for any reading in agreement with one hand-edition against the other. The majority of Origen's citations are the same as the shared reading of NA and RP, or, are unsupported (free) readings. However, regardless of affinity, the individual works have retained this dual nature of polarized readings.

Could the authorial citations of Origen only fall on the opposite ends of a spectrum of precision? This seems doubtful. Considering that later adjustments would not result in a more free reading of Origen, the data suggests that many of Origen's free citations have been partially altered to a text like that of NA and RP. Because NA and RP agree most of the time, the chances of an accommodated text of Origen being in agreement with both are high.<sup>102</sup> Since this is not a wholesale accommodation to one text-form from the other, the individual sources of Origen appear to display varying levels of accommodation because they were not completely changed. This is seen in both readings that agree with either NA or RP against the other, and the number of readings that are identical or against both.

Sources that cite all three epistles (Rom, 2Cor, and Gal) tend to have more citations than the sources that cite only two or less. This is not just in total but also in citations per epistle. Primary sources *Cels*, *Euches*, *John.Com A and B*, and *Matt.Com C* all reflect more NA-like readings, while secondary sources like *Ps.Sel* and *Rom.Frag*

---

<sup>102</sup> Fee, states "I have shown elsewhere that a Byzantine type of textual transmission (smoothing out the text) goes on as early as P66" in Gordon Fee, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations" from *Biblica* 52 (1971), 313.

A have more RP only readings. All of these works cite all three epistles, yet their textual agreements vary greatly. Thus, neither the number of epistles a work cites, nor how many citations each work contains indicates the nature of a work's citation text in relation to NA or RP.

The sources that cite only one epistle typically only have a few citations in total. The sources *Lev.Hom*, *Luc.Schol*, *Matt.Schol*, and *Apoc.Sch* cite Romans roughly once each. Several works cite 2 Corinthians only: *Eze.Hom*, *Cant.Frag*, *Engas*, *Ex.Hom*, *Prov.Com*, *Nave*, and *Osee*. There is only one source that cites only Galatians and it has one citation (*Luke.Hom*).

The next section shows how the individual epistles are cited in Origen. The statistics will show the number of citations for each individual epistle, but also how each citation corresponds to forms of the Greek New Testament.

## 5.2. Overall Textual Affinity of Citations from Individual Epistles

Based on an understanding of the individual works of Origen above, the sources for his citations are consistent. Or rather, the sources attributed to Origen cite the various epistles with a similar textform for all of the three epistles that they cite. This need not be affinity to a particular text-form *per se* but that his works show a consistent ratio of readings as individual works.<sup>103</sup> Below, the nature of how all of Origen's citations

---

<sup>103</sup> *John.Com* A and B in Table #26 and Table #27 (page 236-7) are a great example of this ratio. No matter how many citations there are for each epistle, in places of variation, the units are roughly half identical to NA/RP, half against both, and consistently in agreement with NA when NA and RP differ. This consistency is not simply stating Origen's affinity is the same in all of his works, but rather that each of his individual works are consistent in their ration of NA to RP readings in all three epistle in places where NA and RP disagree.

together reflect the three epistles will be discussed, but also how the citations of the individual epistles have been altered independent of the citations of the other epistles.

If such information does not confirm Origen's authorial citations, it can demonstrate how Origen's citations of the individual epistles have changed. For example, if we know that Origen's citations contain a relatively high number of independent readings and common NA/RP readings, but there is a variance among the epistles in this category, then it would indicate a multi-text-form New Testament used by Origen instead of a homogeneous text-form throughout his New Testament.<sup>104</sup> As seen in previous studies of Origen, Origen does not appear to be citing lost readings from manuscripts no longer extant, nor have his citations been later adopted in Greek New Testament manuscripts.<sup>105</sup> On the other hand, his free citations could demonstrate that Origen's works were accommodated. This accommodation sways overall affinity in regard to how he cites individual epistles. Again, the secondary sources and primary sources will be treated separately.

---

<sup>104</sup> "...the textual history of the New Testament differs from corpus to corpus, and even book to book;" Ernest C. Colwell, "The Origin of Text-types of New Testament Manuscripts" pp 128-38, in *Early Christian Origins: Studies in Honor of Harold R. Willoughby*. Ed. A. Wikgren. Chicago: Quardrangle Reprinted as "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationshops between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts," pp. 56-62 in "Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament"; Eldon J. Epp "The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission" from *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (ed. William L. Peter: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 1-32.

<sup>105</sup> F.C. Burkitt, "W and Θ: Studies in the Western Text of St. Mark," JTS 17 (1916), 20; Gordon D. Fee, "Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt", NTS 28 (1982): 348-64; Kwang-Won Kim, "Origen's Text of John in His On Prayer, Commentary on Matthew, and Against *Celsus*." JTS ns1 [1950]: 83); Roderic Mullen, The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem, *SBLNTGF 7* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pages 31-52 deal most directly with Origen's history of research relating to the so-called Caesarean text of the Gospels.

### 5.2.1. The Overall Textual Affinity of Romans Citations

Table 47

Affinity of Variant Citations of Romans in Secondary Sources			Affinity of Variant Citations of Romans in Primary Sources		
Against Both	123	53.25%	Against Both	160	82.47%
With NA against, RP	57	24.67%	With NA against, RP	25	12.89%
With RP, against NA	51	22.08%	With RP, against NA	9	4.64%
Total	231	100%	Total	194	100%
Weighted Affinity of All Romans Citations in Secondary Sources <sup>106</sup>			Weighted Affinity of All Citations of Romans in Primary Sources <sup>107</sup>		
Identical to NA/RP	586	71.73%	Identical to NA/RP	262	57.46%
Against Both	123	15.06%	Against Both	160	35.09%
With NA against, RP	57	6.97%	With NA, against RP	25	5.48%
With RP, against NA	51	6.24%	With RP, against NA	9	1.97%
Total	817	100%	Total	456	100%

Citations of Romans in Origen’s secondary sources have a much lower percentage of readings that disagree with both NA and RP. This is due to *Rom.Frag A*, which has more citations than any other source for Origen, is almost always in agreement with the Byzantine text. Conversely, this raises the overall percentage of “Identical to NA/RP” readings. This is an example of an accommodation of “Against Both” readings to “Identical” as a result of this change from free citations to the Byzantine text where RP and NA agree.

Out of the three epistles, Romans is cited the most in Origen’s primary sources. When NA and RP disagree and Origen is in agreement with one against the other, he is most likely to reflect the NA text against RP. The citations from his primary sources are roughly 35% against both NA and RP, which is fairly standard across all three epistles as they appear in Origen (2 Corinthians: 34%, Galatians: 38%). The citations of Romans

<sup>106</sup> See page 50 in ch. 2 concerning the “weighting” of readings.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

in Origen's primary sources have the highest weighted percentage of the three epistles for readings that are identical to both NA and RP. While the other two epistles show a lower overall percentage of units that are identical to both NA and RP, there are much higher percentages in the categories of NA-only or RP-only readings. In places where there is disagreement between NA and RP, Origen's citations of Romans are approximately 82% "Against Both" which is significantly higher than 2 Corinthians (66%) and Galatians (62%).

Despite the Romans citations having a higher overall percentage of agreement with a unified NA/RP reading, in the places where there is variation, Origen is more likely to cite freely with a lower percentage of readings siding with NA or RP against the other. This is evidence that Origen's citations have undergone accommodation, or he represents simultaneously two opposite techniques of citing: (1) citing the same readings as the NA/RP text, and (2) citing freely. The presence of both frequent citations identical to the NA/RP text and citations that are free appears to indicate Origen's citations represent two opposing techniques. Instead, the presence of citations identical to the NA/RP texts should be considered later changes to Origen's writings.

In places of variation, Origen's citations of Romans in his primary sources are most likely to be against both, which shows his frequent citing of a free text. A free citation is most likely an unsupported text (even in his time) or possibly a text-form known to him but not extant today. This alone proves the free nature of his citations, as no accommodation would have left his citations free. So, the citations that are identical to NA/RP reveal that Origen's free citations have been preserved and are likely

authorial. However, the readings that are identical to the NA/RP readings are likely to not be authorial, but instead to be a result of subsequent changes to Origen’s writings.

### 5.2.2. The Overall Textual Affinity of 2 Corinthians Citations

Table 48

<b>Affinity of Variant Citations of 2 Corinthians in Secondary Sources</b>			<b>Affinity of Variant Citations of 2 Corinthians in Primary Sources</b>		
Against Both	38	71.70%	Against Both	116	66.28%
With NA against, RP	8	15.09%	With NA against, RP	48	27.43%
With RP, against NA	7	13.21%	With RP, against NA	11	6.29%
Total	53	100%	Total	175	100%
<b>Weighted Affinity of All 2 Corinthians Citations in Secondary Sources</b>			<b>Weighted Affinity of All Citations of 2 Corinthians in Primary Sources</b>		
Identical to NA/RP	50	48.54%	Identical to NA/RP	170	49.28%
Against Both	38	36.89%	Against Both	116	33.62%
With NA against, RP	8	7.77%	With NA, against RP	48	13.91%
With RP, against NA	7	6.80%	With RP, against NA	11	3.19%
Total	103	100%	Total	345	100%

In comparison to the citations of Romans, the citations of 2 Corinthians in secondary sources have a much lower overall percentage of “Identical to NA/RP” readings and a higher overall percentage of “Against Both” readings in places of variation. This, again, is fairly standard for the overall nature of Origen’s citations, namely the number of readings “Identical to NA/RP” has a negative correlation to the number of free citations. The citations of 2 Corinthians in secondary sources, in relation to those in Romans, are less likely to side with NA or RP (approx. 30% in units of variation) compared to Romans (more than 50%), which means that 2 Corinthians citations in secondary sources represent Origen’s authorial citations better than those of



Romans in secondary sources.<sup>108</sup> Just as Origen's citations of Romans in primary sources are most likely to be against the common reading of NA and RP in places of variation, so too, are Origen's citations in secondary sources of 2 Corinthians.

However, Origen's citations of 2 Corinthians in primary sources have about the same overall percentage as secondary sources in regard to readings against both the NA and RP. Despite these overall percentages being only a few points in difference, within places of variation, 2 Corinthians is 20% lower than Romans. This means that in places of variation, Origen's primary sources have been accommodated to a text-form like NA where they were previously free citations. In conflicted units, Romans citations from primary sources are roughly 13% in agreement with NA alone, but citations of 2 Corinthians (also in primary sources) are 27%. Rom.Frag A does reduce the overall agreement of Origen's citations with NA. However, if Romans is clearly freer, this could indicate that Origen cited 2 Corinthians with exemplars. That the citations of 2 Corinthians in primary sources still have a relatively high percentage of readings "Against Both" in units of variation demonstrates that he didn't cite differently. If he cited them both freely, then one of them has been changed (roughly 20% of these citations are now in agreement with an NA-like text).

From Romans to 2 Corinthians, the varying affinities are apparent in terms of overall percentages between secondary and primary sources. The secondary sources

---

<sup>108</sup> Among the works of Origen that are only available in the editions of Migne, there is not a significant accommodation to the Majority Text for 2 Corinthians. The works with the most citations that are only extant in Migne are *Ps.Sel* and *Ps.Frag*. They both have two units of variation in which they correspond to the RP text against the NA text. *Ps.Exc* has one unit corresponding to the Byzantine text. On the other hand, *Cant.Sch* has two units that correspond to the NA text against the RP text. *Prov.Exp*, *Ex.Com*, *Osee* each have one reading against an identical Initial/Byzantine reading. There is no variance in any of the citations of *Gen.Com*, *Prov.Com*, *Ex.Sel*, *Gen.Sel* or *Nave*, though these only may contain 1 or 2 citations in total.

contain citations that are free in regards to their affinity (like primary sources for Romans). The secondary sources are much more likely to be against NA and RP in 2 Corinthians in comparison to Romans. However, agreement with NA and RP is split when they disagree. The citations of 2 Corinthians in secondary sources are unlike the textual nature of the other two epistles' citations from secondary sources. However, as will be seen below, it is the citations of Galatians in primary sources, which are the outlier in terms of accommodation.

### 5.2.3. The Overall Textual Affinity of Galatians Citations

Table 49

<b>Affinity of Variant Citations of Galatians in Secondary Sources</b>			<b>Affinity of Variant Citations of Galatians in Primary Sources</b>		
Against Both	19	45.24%	Against Both	55	61.80%
With NA against, RP	14	33.33%	With NA against, RP	23	25.84%
With RP, against NA	9	21.43%	With RP, against NA	11	12.36%
Total	42	100	Total	89	100%
<b>Weighted Affinity of All Galatians Citations in Secondary Sources</b>			<b>Weighted Affinity of All Citations of Galatians in Primary Sources</b>		
Identical to NA/RP	56	57.14%	Identical to NA/RP	54	37.76%
Against Both	19	19.39%	Against Both	55	38.46%
With NA against, RP	14	14.29%	With NA against, RP	23	16.08%
With RP, against NA	9	9.18%	With RP, against NA	11	7.69%
Total	98	100%	Total	143	99.99%

The epistle to the Galatians is the least cited epistle of the three in Origen's primary sources and in the secondary sources. In the secondary sources, as it is in 2 Corinthians, a little more than half of the overall citations are identical to NA and RP. Despite this similarity in number of identical readings, in units of variation it is very different to 2 Corinthians in Origen's writings. In units of variation, the 2 Corinthians citations are much more likely to be against both NA and RP. On the other hand,

citations of Galatians are less likely to be against both NA and RP. The main difference between the citations of these epistles in secondary sources is in the percentage of readings that correspond only to NA or RP. The citations of Galatians are more likely to reflect a reading of NA or RP (14% and 9%, respectively), while 2 Corinthians is roughly 8% and 7%, respectively. These split readings coupled with a higher number of readings “Identical to NA and RP” result in a far less number of readings “Against Both” as is in the case with 2 Corinthians. Even so, the citations of Galatians are much more like the citations of 2 Corinthians in secondary sources than Romans.

As for the citations of Galatians in primary sources, the affinity in places of variation is more like that of 2 Corinthians, roughly 61% against both readings, and corresponding to the NA text more often than the RP text. However, the citations of Galatians show more evidence of mixture, either from a result of accommodation or citing. Considering the other three epistles, it is more likely that this is a result of accommodation rather than citational practices of Origen.

The citations of 2 Corinthians in the secondary sources are demonstrate a free text in places of variation, whereas the citations of Romans and Galatians show a much higher affinity to either NA or RP. Alternatively, Romans shows the highest level of identical readings to NA and RP in the secondary sources.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> For the Gospels, Fee states that the “vast majority of Byzantine variants from Origen’s usual Neutral text of John are found in citations where Migne is the best edition available!” Gordon D. Fee, “The Text of John in Origen and Cyril,” 305. However, this is not the case with Origen’s citations of Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians in secondary sources (which are all mostly from Migne). Of the 12 Secondary Sources that have more than one citation *Basil.Phil*, *Eph.Com*, *John.Frag*, *Luke.Frag*, and *Ps.Sel* agree with NA more than RP. Likewise, *Lam.Frag* and *Eze.Frag* also lack any readings that side only with NA or RP.

The primary sources of Origen reflect similar affinity in 2 Corinthians and Galatians, though Galatians has a slightly higher number of RP readings. The citations of Romans are much more likely to be against both or reflect a more fluid text in the primary sources. Romans and 2 Corinthians are similar in overall weighted numbers, but Galatians shows a lower number of identical readings to NA and RP, and more readings sided with one or the other.

#### **5.2.4 Summary of Overall Textual Affinity**

As can be seen above in the previous section on the individual sources, the transmission history of Origen's works and the textual nature of the individual epistles he cites vary between each of his works. Likewise in this section, the overall affinity of Origen's citations varies from epistle to epistle. However, the reasons for this are different for the individual works and the individual epistles.

There are several possible explanations for why the citations of Origen vary so much from epistle to epistle: Origen's fluid citing nature, his use of manuscripts of a varying affinity among the epistles, a collective accommodation of certain epistle that he cited and not others, or the difference between Origen's works coupled with the amount of citations in each work may affect the overall affinity of citations of certain epistles. The previous section shows that the individual works are individually consistent in how each work cites similar ratios in comparison to the NA and RP text. This section shows that because these comparative ratios differ from work to work, the works that have the most citations will affect Origen's overall percentages in regards to the individual epistles. Or rather, when one speaks of Origen's citations of a specific epistle, if one particular work

is against the rest in text-form, a perspective of Origen's citations is skewed. This is clear in Rom.Frag A, as it has the most citations for Romans and most of its readings are changes to the Byzantine text. This suggests that Romans, as opposed to 2 Corinthians or Galatians, will be more accommodated to the Byzantine readings when it is in fact only one source that is has been accommodated.

The free nature of Origen's text does not best explain the current evidence.<sup>110</sup> Nor does the theory that his biblical exemplars changed over his career due to his various geographical placements.<sup>111</sup> The similarity in numbers between the epistles (when factors such as *Rom.Frag A* are considered) demonstrates a fairly consistent balance of comparative ratios to the Initial and Byzantine Texts as can be seen below:

---

<sup>110</sup> Carroll D. Osburn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism," *NovT* 47.4 (2005): 319-20 "When the Father actually cites a known variation to his own text, e.g., Origen in Hom. 6.40 in John, mentions that other MSS known to him...in John 1:28, which he prefers..." Examples like this suggest Origen isn't just mindlessly free-citing, but is aware of readings yet still shows free citations despite awareness of his open manuscripts. Osburn goes on later, "On the other hand, it is conceivable that a Father could misquote a text consistently from memory rather than from an actual text." *Ibid* 322. Again, the explanation of free citations has not been properly explained by only faulty memories yet at the same time having manuscripts open and yet still citing in a fluid manner. See further Bruce Metzger, "Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts," *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (eds. J. N. Birdsall and R. W. Thompson; Freiburg; Herder, 1963) 78-95.

<sup>111</sup> This of course, has been attempted in various monographs dealing with the "Caesarean text" which by and large has been deemed unacceptable as an explanation of differing affinity in Origen's citations. Osburn's description of Fee's guidelines shows the tendency for such conclusions in "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations," 322: "When a Father has two or more quotations reflecting two or more text forms, the following guidelines suggested by Fee are serviceable. 1. ...knew and used only one text form, and that the second citation reflects either (a) faulty memory, or (b) inconsequential omissions or adaptations to the new context...2. ...the Father knew and used two different forms of the text.... 3. When a decision cannot be made in this regard, Fee says that, "it is less likely that a Father actually knew and used two different texts than either that he is guilty of carelessness or that an error has made its way into his own textual tradition." In such instances, Fee holds that one must admit to not knowing the Father's text.

Table 50

Overall Affinity of Secondary Sources		Overall Affinity of Primary Sources	
Identical to NA/RP	48-71%	Identical to NA/RP	37-57%
Against Both	15-37%	Against Both	34-38%
With NA against, RP	7-14%	With NA against, RP	5-16%
With RP, against NA	6-9%	With RP, against NA	2-8%

As a result of the varying sources, with a disproportionate amount of readings of certain epistles within certain works, and a disproportionate amount of readings from work-to-work, results in the appearance that Origen cited the epistles differently, or that the exemplars he used for the individual epistles were textually unrelated. However, these factors are best explained by accommodation in certain epistles, which results in citations at the epistle-level appearing textually unrelated.

### 5.3. A Presentation of Significant Readings

This section consists of a selection of verses already mentioned that demonstrate key characteristics of Origen's citations as they pertain to Origen's citation techniques, textual readings, affinity, possible authorial citations, and, ultimately, how he relates to the Greek New Testament manuscripts. These readings will be categorized by citations of mixed affinity, citations that are against both the NA and RP text, citations in places of early units of variation, citations that differ among Origen's works, and citations that differ within the same work of Origen.

#### 5.3.1. Origen's Citations of Mixed Affinity

Romans 2:8

τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσιν \* τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς

-----

\*μέν Or(ac) RP 01c 02 06c 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 2464.] omit Or(bd) NA 01 03 06 012 1739. 1881.  
ὀργή καὶ θυμός Or(abd) NA 01 02 03 06 08 012 5. 21. 41. 69. 73. 116.] θυμός καὶ ὀργή Or(c) RP 06c 018 020 025

Or(a) from *Princ* shows a mixture of two readings. Later accommodations made to the text at the verse level are typically holistic, in that if there are multiple units of variation within a verse, a change of one unit results in the change of the others, which is seen in *Rom.Frag A* through Romans.<sup>112</sup> However, *Princ* reads μέν with RP, yet at the end of the verse reads ὀργή καὶ θυμός against RP, with NA. The partial change to this citation is apparent: μέν is added and the transposition at the end of the verse was not changed. If this is Origen's authorial citation text, it demonstrates that the texts of the late-2<sup>nd</sup> or early-third centuries were either unlike the textual traditions as they are found in critical editions today or Origen simply cites freely.<sup>113</sup>

Romans 9:19

Ἐρεῖς μοι οὖν· τί οὖν ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν;

-----

μοι οὖν Or(ab) NA 01 02 03 025 57. 69. 93. 1908. ] οὖν μοι Or(cd) RP 06 08 010 012 018K 019

οὖν NA P46 03 06 010 012 ] omit Or(abcd) RP 01 02 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 1739. 1881. 2464.

NA and RP differ in two variants. The first is the reading μοι οὖν (NA) and its transposition (RP). The second variant involves the post-positive οὖν which is present in NA and omitted in RP. *Princ* contains the NA reading in the first variant, but omits οὖν

---

<sup>112</sup> see Or(c) for this verse, Appendix #1

<sup>113</sup> "The broad outlines seem clear; the difficulties lie with the evidence from the Fathers in Palestine and Asia Minor, where there seem to have been various degrees of textual mixture—of more than one kind. Gordon D. Fee, "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism: The State of the Question" in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, Second Edition, eds Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 359.

against NA. The other citations reflect the Byzantine reading with both the transposition and the omission. The other citation, namely *Ex.Com*, has both readings of the Byzantine text. *Ex.Com* was completely accommodated to the Byzantine text, while *Princ* was partially. However, *Princ* has support for its mixed reading (01 02). This leaves the possibility open that Origen's citational text was not changed, that this is an authorial citation, and is a late second century reading as it is still in the extant manuscripts 01 and 02.

Galatians 1:4

τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν

-----

τῷ δόντι Or(b) ] τοῦ δόντος NA RP

ὑπὲρ Or(a) NA P51 01(2) 03 015 0278. 6. 33. 81. 326. 365. 630. 1175. 1505. 2464 ]

περὶ Or(b) RP P46 01 02 06 010 012 018 020 024 044 69. 104. 1739. 1881. 1908.

αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος Or(bcdef) NA P46. 51(vid) 01\* 02 03 6. 33. 81. 326. 630. 1241.

1739. 1881. ] ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος RP 01c 06 010 012 015(vid) 018 020 025 044 0278.

69. 104. 365. 1175. 1505. 1908. 2464.

*Euches* [Or(b)] shows a mixture of readings with *περὶ* (RP), but, like all of Origen's citations, it reads αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος. As has been seen in the previous chapters, Origen often reads *περὶ* where NA reads ὑπὲρ (cf. Chapter 3, 2 Cor 1:8, 12:5, 12:8). Considering the consistency in Origen's citations, it is more likely that the reading of αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος in the second variant was his authorial citation. Likewise, *περὶ* should be considered authorial as well despite the NA/RP conflict. This appearance of mixture is due either to Origen's preference for *περὶ* against his own manuscripts of the New Testament, or his manuscripts reflected a second- or third-



century mixture of the two readings that were later separated in the establishment of the Byzantine text against what is now the NA text.

Galatians 3:1

ᾠ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν, \* οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη \*\* ἐσταυρωμένος;

-----

\*ἐν Or(a) ] omit NA 01 02 03 06 010 012 6. 33. 81. 630. 1739., τῇ ἀλήθεια μή πείθεσθαι RP 04 06c E 018 020 025 044 0278. 33c. 69. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. 1908. 2464.,

\*\*ἐν ὑμῖν 06 010 012 018 020 33. 1505. 2464. ] omit 01 02 03 04 025 044 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1739. 1881.

There are two units of variation in this verse. RP has two readings where NA has nothing: (1) τῇ ἀλήθεια μή πείθεσθαι, and (2) ἐν ὑμῖν. Or(a), or *Ps.Frag*, has the latter reading in agreement with the Byzantine text. However, in the former unit of variation, *Ps.Frag* reads ἐν. The earliest manuscripts support the omission. Considering the reading of RP is significantly longer, Origen's short reading of ἐν reflects either a lack of knowledge of the longer form, or is simply paraphrasing. Perhaps it is a solution on Origen's part for what seems to be missing text if his manuscripts were in agreement with the NA text. The Byzantine change would be a clarifying addition, so Origen adding ἐν should not be doubted. If his authorial citation had an omission for both units of variation, and Origen's citation was later accommodated to the Byzantine text for the latter variant and not the former, it is yet another example of a partial change to Origen's citations. None of the earliest manuscripts agree with Origen in regard to ἐν, which appears to be an early authorial reading on the grounds of having no support. There is no evidence that his own manuscripts would have read ἐν, but then there is no

evidence that he is simply citing from memory and mistakingly added to his own reading that reflected a text like NA.

### 5.3.2. Origen's Readings Against the Initial Text and Byzantine Text

Romans 1:13

οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν

-----  
καὶ ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο Or(ab) NA RP ] omit Or(c)

Or(c), *Rom.Frag B*, omits the phrase καὶ ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, which is present in NA, RP, and *Rom.Frag A*, which often reflects the Byzantine text in Romans citations. The citation in *Rom.Frag B* is abbreviated, as the beginning of the verse is not cited, which could be the reason the middle phrase “but was prevented until now” was omitted. However, this phrase looks to be an added explanatory phrase. There are many factors that could have resulted in Origen citing a shorter form, such as him citing from memory, or not needing this section of the verse for his argument. Origen does have citations of the New Testament that are against a unified NA-RP reading. However, if this is his authorial citation, it might indeed be a shorter text form he knew that is lost from the extant manuscript tradition.

Romans 1:14

Ἕλλησίν τε\* καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε\*\* καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί

-----  
\*τε Or(defgh) NA RP ] omit Or(abc)

\*\*τε Or(defgh) NA RP ] omit Or(abc)

*Cels* [Or(ab)] contains two citations of Romans 1:14 which omit τε in two places.

Otherwise, Origen's citations are rather consistent in including it both times. NA and RP

read τε in both places. In light of the otherwise consistent nature in which this verse is cited, *Cels* is an apologetical treatise, which is claimed to be more precise considering the differing manuscripts among authors and the conflicts of exegesis that resulted from different readings. The likelihood of τε being removed from both citations is unlikely, which means this is Origen's authorial citation text. It is uncertain whether this is Origen's biblical text if indeed it is an authorial citation.

#### Romans 3:2

πολύ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ

-----

γάρ Or(bd) 6. 67. 1908. ] omit Or(cd), μὲν σι 03 06 012 044 81. 365. 1506. 2464., γὰρ ὅτι 1881., μὲν γὰρ ὅτι NA RP 01 02 06c 018 020 33. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 2464c,

Both *Ps.Frag* [Or(cd)] and *Ps.Sel* [Or(e)] lack μὲν and ὅτι. The NA and RP readings of this variant are μὲν γὰρ ὅτι. None of Origen's citations have the reading of NA and RP. The data demonstrates that the longer version was either not a reading Origen was aware of or at least that he consistently cited a shorter form of the verse either from memory or habit. The consistency in lacking both μὲν and ὅτι, which are present in some form in all the earliest documents, suggests that Origen's authorial reading is unlike all early manuscripts of this verse that are extant.

#### Romans 3:25

ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων

-----

διὰ τῆς πίστεως NA RP P40 03 04c 06c 017 020 025 044 33. 81. 630. 1175. 1241. 2464. ] — 02, διὰ πίστεως Or(abcde) 01 04 06 010 012 0219. 104. 365. 1505. 1506. 1739. 1881.

None of Origen's citations have the article between *διὰ* and *πίστεως*. This reading stands against P40 03 33. 81. The consistent omission of the article in Origen is against the reading of both NA and RP. The omission of the entire phrase *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* in 01 demonstrates an early unit of variation with support from a major manuscript. These consistent citations attest to an authorial citation of Origen, which also suggests that in this particular part of the verse, the textual readings among late second-century and early third-century manuscripts were fluid. If so, then it appears that readings from documents such as 03, which is the primary manuscript behind the NA text, shows that they are a better representation of the beginning of the textual tradition, but not necessarily the best indication of biblical readings in the time of Origen.

Romans 4:11

καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι [καὶ] αὐτοῖς τὴν δικαιοσύνην

-----

καὶ NA RP 01c 04 06 010 012 018 020 025 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. ] omit Or(bc) 01 02 03 044 6. 81. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881. 2464.  
 τὴν NA RP 03 04 06c 010 012 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464. ] omit Or(bc) 01 04c 06 6. 365. 424c. 1506. 1739, εἰς 02 424. 1881.

There is one unit of variation, *καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν*, at the end of the verse where NA and RP agree. As expected *Rom.Frag A*, or (a), reflects the reading of the New Testament editions, due primarily to its accommodation to the Byzantine reading. However, *Rom.Frag C* lacks both *καὶ* and *τὴν*. There are a variety of manuscripts that support the omission of one or the other, both and neither. The unit demonstrates early mixture and when Origen corresponds to neither of the New Testament editions, it exemplifies places where Origen's citational text has been maintained and could reflect

his biblical text. This departure possibly reveals a text of Origen that predates the extant Greek New Testament manuscripts.

Romans 5:17

εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός, πολλῶ  
μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης  
λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

-----  
ἐν Or(ab) 1739. 1881 ] τῷ τοῦ NA RP 01 03 04 018 020 025  
τῆς δωρεᾶς Or(a) NA RP ] omit Or(b) 03  
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Or(a) NA RP ] Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ Or(b) 03

Or(b), from *John.Com B*, in comparison with NA and RP contains three units of variation. The John commentary cites ἐν instead of τῷ τοῦ (the latter is the text of NA and RP). The reading of the hand editions is supported by 1739 and 1881, including 03. This variant is important because it shows Origen's free reading in relation to the extant manuscripts. This does not occur in the other two units of variation. In these two units there is simultaneously (1) a deviation from the hand editions of the Greek New Testament, and (2) agreement with 03 alone. The second reading in the John commentary omits the phrase τῆς δωρεᾶς and is supported by 03. The NA critical apparatus shows several readings for this unit, which demonstrates a problematic variant in the textual tradition. *John.Com B* again is only supported by 03 in the third unit of variation, the transposition of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, again against both the Initial and Byzantine text. The opposition to the reading found in NA and RP, coupled with a partial correspondence to 03 only, suggests that Origen's authorial reading differed from the extant manuscripts and was accommodated later to a manuscript resembling 03. If all three units of variation been in agreement with 03 (or any other manuscripts) it would be

impossible to distinguish other scenarios other than Origen's readings agreeing with known manuscripts. However, since there are differences, readings that are only found much later in manuscripts such as 1739 and 1881, this suggests that Origen's readings were fluid and only later were changed to reflect the minority reading of 03. If Origen's biblical text was changed to 03 and did not reflect such a textual tradition in his authorial citations as can be seen here, the question remains as to what textual nature does Origen of Alexandria's biblical text reflect? The most likely scenario would be a general freedom in the citations that are only later accommodated to a NA-like text.

Romans 6:22

νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωῆν αἰώνιον

-----

The citations from *Ps.Frag*, *Ps.Sel*, and *Prov.Exp* all contain the phrase δῆλον ὅτι κατ' ἀρετὴν καὶ γνῶσιν, which is against both the NA and RP text. This variant is most likely due to an explanatory expansion and its repetition in the citation suggests that it has not been changed but is Origen's authorial text.

Romans 8:14

ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν

-----

υἱοὶ εἰσιν θεοῦ Or(ac) 03 010 012 ] υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν Or (bd) NA 01 02 04 06 81. 630. 1506. 1739. 1908., εἰσιν υἱοὶ θεοῦ RP 018 020 025 044 33. 69. 104. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. 2464.

Or(ac), *Cels* and *Basil.Phil A*, share the same reading which is unlike either the NA or RP text. This alternative reading is supported by 03 010 012. Again, 03 is one of few manuscripts that have the same reading as Origen when he is against most

manuscripts, with very little support. It is possible that Origen reflects an early reading that has been preserved in 03. Based on extant manuscripts this is the likely explanation of its agreement with Origen. Alternatively, to suggest that Origen read an earlier form of the New Testament that was later changed to 03 is possible. Though what the data suggests is that Origen, in his practice of citing with less concern for textual precision, cited forms that did not reflect his exemplars but showed enough freedom to be changed to what is now a text like the NA.

Romans 8:39

οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν

-----

τις Or(b) NA RP 01 02 03 04 018 020 044 0285 33. 69 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1506. 1739. 1881. 2464. ] omit Or(a) P46 06 010 012 1505

*Cels* omits τις before κτίσις, which is present in 01 02 03. This reading is against both NA and RP. The support for Origen is P46 and the Latin bilinguals. *Rom.Frag A* corresponds to the united NA/RP reading (as expected). When Origen is different from NA and RP, and there is manuscript evidence to support it, it tends to be 03 not P46. The reading of τις is the best representation of the earliest form of our extant manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. However, Origen's omission could be due to the nature of his citing technique. However, it could be a result of a later correction to the omission. The fact that he is conflicted in his citations suggests that later editors caused the differences. In the theme of a free early citational text that is sometimes preserved in Origen's writings, the reading in agreement should be considered as Origen's authorial citation. This demonstrates a later accommodation of

his citation in *Rom.Frag A* to the Byzantine text. Because the NA text too reads τις, then Origen’s citation might have been changed to it, is yet another example of his “loose” citations being made like later forms.

Romans 9:12

οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος, ἐρρέθη αὐτῇ ὅτι ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι

-----

αὐτῇ ὅτι NA RP ] ὅτι Or(a), omit Or(b) P46 06

In relation to the NA and RP reading of αὐτῇ ὅτι, *John.Com A* omits αὐτῇ, and *Euches* omits both αὐτῇ and ὅτι. Though there are no manuscripts listed in the NA apparatus to support the *John.Com A* reading, *Euches* is supported by P46 and 06. Again, P46 (and especially 06) are not normally supporters of Origen's reading when he is against the texts of both NA and RP. This early reading has been preserved throughout the transmission history of *Euches*, which demonstrates only a partial accommodation to a NA-like text at the earliest stages of the copying process of Origen’s writings and yet demonstrates that Origen’s authorial readings appear to be freer before what appears to be later accommodation by Byzantine scholars.

Romans 13:9

τὸ γὰρ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται \*ἐν τῷ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

-----

\*ἐν τῷ Or(a) NA RP 01 02 06 020 025 044 048. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 1739. 1881. ] omit Or(b) P46 03 010 012

The external evidence is evenly split between these two readings. Both readings have strong support. This unit, too, demonstrates an early agreement with 03 against



other early witnesses. This would be an indication not of a free reading in Origen accommodated to a prominent reading at the beginning stages of his writings' copying process, but rather an authorial citation that reflected a common reading to that of P46 and 03. Though previously, there is evidence that shows Origen was accommodated partially to 03's text, this looks to be a natural agreement as the manuscript evidence demonstrates an early division among the witnesses.

#### 2 Corinthians 1:10

ὅς ἐκ τηλικούτου θανάτου ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ῥύσεται, εἰς ὃν ἠλπικαμεν ὅτι καὶ ἔτι ῥύσεται

-----  
τηλικούτων θανάτων Or(ab) P46 630.] τηλικούτου θανάτου NA RP  
ὅτι καὶ ἔτι NA RP 01 02 04 06c 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 365. 1175. 1241. 2464. ] ὅτι  
καὶ Or(a) 06c 104. 630. 1505., καὶ ἔτι P46 03 06 0121. 0243. 1739. 1881., καὶ ὅτι 010  
012  
ῥύσεται NA P46 01 03 04 025 0209. 33. 81. 365. 1175. ] ῥύεται Or(ab) RP 06c 010  
012 018 020 0121. 0243. 104. 630. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464., omit 02 06 044

The diversity in Origen's reading shows signs of possibly a natural mixture (freedom) or the effects of multiple text forms that later found their way into his authorial reading. The use of the genitive (τηλικούτων θανάτων) in both citations from *Eph.Com* show consistency in this work though the reading ὅτι καὶ which is later, shows that he has undergone partial accommodation. The reading of P46 and 03 is to be considered earlier than Origen considering that his text appears to have been changed in the transmission process. However, P46 also demonstrates mixture in that its genitive reading (like Origen) is relatively unsupported, yet reflects the same reading as 03 with καὶ ἔτι and ῥύσεται. Like Origen's citations, P46 often presents a mixture in its text-form, not unlike Origen's free citations. Perhaps P46, like Origen has (1) also undergone

partial accommodation to a NA-like text, and (2) retains either a mixture of readings that would appear to be Byzantine, or has been accommodated to the Byzantine text at a later time.

#### 2 Corinthians 4:17

τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως \*ἡμῶν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν,

-----

\*ἡμῶν Or(abc) NA RP 01 04 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 0243. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. ] omit Or(d) P46 03

There are four citations of this verse in Origen, three of which agree on the presence of ἡμῶν. Concerning an omission, since only one of Origen's readings omits yet his others have it present, especially in his authorial readings, it is difficult to say that Origen knew both forms of the reading. However, *Ps.Sel* omits, though it is an abbreviated form of the verse. This omission might have been affected by an awareness of the P46 and 03 texts. Origen, when he is against both critical editions NA and RP, often corresponds to 03.

#### 2 Corinthians 5:8

θαρροῦμεν δὲ καὶ εὐδοκοῦμέν μᾶλλον ἐκδημήσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημήσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον.

-----

θαρροῦμεν NA RP ] θαρροῦντες Or(b) 01 0243. 6. 33. 81. 630. 1739. 1881.

Origen's John.Com A reads θαρροῦντες. Against both critical editions NA and RP, 01 and 1739 support Origen's reading. As indicated by the critical apparatus of NA, the evidence that supports its main text reads θαρροῦμέν. Again, Origen would be against the reading of 03, which demonstrates this participle form of the verb is authorial as well as the unchanged transposition of μᾶλλον, which is clearly different to most

early evidence. This means that if Origen had been altered to agree with later forms of the text, the transposition would have been an easy place to notice differences in Origen which, remains unchanged and yet the participle form is also unaltered. The text of 01 could have influenced Origen's citations resulting in the loss of Origen's authorial citation.

#### 2 Corinthians 5:10

τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπρόσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον.

-----  
φαῦλον Or(abcdefghij) NA 01 04 048. 0243. 33. 81. 326. 365. 630. 1739. 1881. ]  
κακόν Or(kl) RP P46 03 06 010 012 025 044 104. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464.

All but two of Origen's citations read φαῦλον and this is most likely what Origen's authorial citation would have been. However, two of Origen's citations read κακόν. These are from two sources that often have accommodated readings to the Byzantine text. This would normally be a simple example of later readings showing up in copies of manuscripts after the fifth century AD. The reading κακον does have strong manuscript support including P46 03 04 06, which suggests the change was not simply a later change by Byzantine scholars. This unit of variation is an example of mixture in the earliest of documents. What first appears to be a later adjustment is really a demonstration of the fluid text in the earliest extant manuscripts, which is no doubt seen in Origen's apparently "fluid" citations. However, the what appears to be fluidity, based on extant manuscripts, could simply be the norm of the second and third centuries as seen in Origen's citations.

2 Corinthians 5:16

Ὅστε ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἶδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα· εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν.

-----  
Χριστόν ποτέ κατὰ σάρκα ἐγνώκαμεν Or(abc) ] καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν Or(d) NA RP, ἐγνώκαμεν Χριστόν κατὰ σάρκα Or(d)

The three citations Or(abc) are all consistent in their reading Χριστόν ποτέ κατὰ σάρκα ἐγνώκαμεν. There is no support in the critical apparatus of NA for this transposition. Tischendorf correctly notes the differing readings in Origen for the transposition but there are no manuscripts listed. Though there are other readings that correspond to NA and RP such as Or(de), this came about by their accommodation to an identical NA/RP text. This could reflect an early reading, which Origen cited consistently, though such evidence does not exist. This reading is not in the critical edition of NA, Tisch, VS or Treg. This suggests an authorial Origen citation, and quite possibly his biblical text.

2 Corinthians 5:20

Ἐπεὶ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν· δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ.

-----  
οὖν NA RP P34 01 03 04 06c 018 020 025 048. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. ] omit Or(a) P46 06 010 012 044

Origen's citations of 5:20 omit the word οὖν. This reading is present in the NA and RP texts. P46 06 010 012 044 support Origen. The support for οὖν are manuscripts 01 03; even 1739. and 1881, which are often in agreement with Origen's readings, are against Origen. Again, when Origen is different from both critical editions NA and RP, and supported by manuscripts, he does not typically agree with P46. This is an example of an authorial citation by Origen. The often-mixed nature of P46's text and Origen's free

citations demonstrates that the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament are of a mixed textual nature.

2 Corinthians 10:3

Ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα,

-----  
περιπατοῦντες NA RP ] ζῶντες Or(abc)

The readings of NA and RP are the same in 10:3. However, in two different works (one work citing the same thing twice) Origen reads ζῶντες, not περιπατοῦντες. This unit of variation is not in the NA apparatus, though it is noted in Tischendorf with no manuscript support. However, *Cels* often retains early readings for Origen and considering that this reading is consistent in all of Origen's citations for 10:3 this should be considered an authorial citation. This might also be Origen's preference considering the metaphorical language of "walking" instead of "living" instead of a manuscript preference.

2 Corinthians 12:8

ὑπὲρ τούτου τρίς τὸν κύριον παρεκάλεσα ἵνα ἀποστῆ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

-----  
ὑπὲρ NA RP] περί Or(a)

Origen in two different commentaries cites these two verses where his citation reads περί instead of ὑπὲρ. Both NA and RP both read ὑπὲρ. This methodical preference for περί appears often in Origen's citations (cf. Galatians 1:4 below). If this is his authorial citation, then it exemplifies the tenacity of Origen's authorial citations despite the common occurrence of his citations being adjusted to the later forms.

### 5.3.3. Mixture in the Early Sources for the Greek New Testament

Romans 3:28

λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιούσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου

-----  
γάρ NA 01 02 06 010 012 044 81. 365. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881. 1908. ] οὖν Or(a) RP 03  
04 06c 018 020 025 33. 69. 104. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464., omit Or(b)  
δικαιούσθαι πίστει Or(bc) NA ] πίστει δικαιούσθαι Or(a) RP

Or(a) corresponds to RP and is supported by 03. Or(a) has undergone a significant amount of accommodation to the Byzantine text. This later reading is in agreement with the first hand of 03. The reading from 1739, claimed to represent the text of Origen's Romans commentary reads γάρ. 01 and 02 supports this reading. It is difficult to determine what would be Origen's text given the variation. However, given that Origen's readings from *Rom.Frag A* are mainly adjusted to later texts, the marginal notes of 1739 are questionable in nature, the source that deserves the most credibility is the *Rom.Frag C*. If this is Origen's authorial citation, omitting the particle, it demonstrates how 01 and 02 can conflict with 03, and yet Origen remains independent of both. Or(b) is an attachment of biblical text to the end of a sentence and therefore might not be a good reflection of Origen's biblical text despite the fact that it is likely his authorial citation.

Romans 4:11

καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν δικαιοσύνην

-----  
καί NA RP 01c 04 06 010 012 018 020 025 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. ] omit Or(bc)  
01 02 03 044 6. 81. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881. 2464.  
τὴν NA RP 03 04 06c 010 012 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505.  
2464. ] omit Or(bc) 01 04c 06 6. 365. 424c. 1506. 1739, εἰς 02 424. 1881.

The units of variation at the end of 4:11 are somewhat complex with the mixture of several texts. The issue of correction within manuscripts is less of an issue as opposed to the mixture of readings in the copying process. The two units revolve around the two words, καί and τήν . Or(b), which omits both, is supported by 01. 6. 1506. 1739. The MSS that support the presence of both are more recent (04 010 012 018 020 025 104 1175 1241 1505 RP). This shows that they were most likely introduced later. The earlier manuscripts that have only one of the readings without signs of correction shows that these readings were competing in the earliest stages of New Testament transmission. 02 and 1881 omit καί but read εἰς instead of τήν. This second reading of τήν is in a very small number of manuscripts. 06 and 365. read καί but omit τήν. Conversely, B 044 81 630. 2464. have the opposite reading (omit καί, include τήν).

Romans 8:24

τῆ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν· ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τίς ἐλπίζει

-----

τίς NA P46 03 1739 ] τίς τι καὶ Or(a) RP 01c 02 04 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 1881. 2464., τίς τι Or(b) 03c 06 010 012 Or(NA), τίς καὶ Or(c) 01 1739

Or(b) reads τι ἐλπίζει, which is different from NA (ἐλπίζει), and RP (τι καὶ ἐλπίζει). This unit is in the critical apparatus of NA, Tisch and Treg. Or(a) corresponds to the RP reading as it is normally accommodated to the later Byzantine text. The text of 1739, or Or(c), normally corresponds to the NA text, but not here. Like 01, it contains the conjunction καί. What is most interesting about this reading is that 01 02 and 03 are all different. The most likely citation to represent Origen's authorial citations is Or(b) which is the corrected 03 reading. For Origen to differ from all three of these

manuscripts, as well as all of them to disagree with each other demonstrates the fluidity of the earlier period of the New Testament text. When Origen's citations appear to be fluid or free in relation to the extant manuscripts, it appears to be an anachronistic assessment considering that examples such as this show a number of readings in the earliest of documents. Perhaps Origen is not quite as fluid as he is deemed, but rather simply a good indication of the fluidity of the earliest periods of transmission?

Romans 9:20

ὦ ἄνθρωπε, μενοῦνγε σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ; μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι· τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως;

-----  
ὦ ἄνθρωπε μενοῦνγε NA 01 02 81. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881. ] μενοῦνγε ὦ ἄνθρωπε Or(ab) RP 01c 06c 018 020 025 044 33. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464. ] ὦ ἄνθρωπε μένουῖν 03, ὦ ἄνθρωπε P46 06 010 012 629

This is another example of multiple variants in the New Testament tradition. *Princ* often reflects an NA-like text in units of variation but is also sometimes supported by the later readings that correspond to RP, readings which early manuscripts like 01 have been corrected to. Not only is Origen supported by the late Byzantine text, but also three alternate readings exist which are supported by 01 03 and P46 respectively. The earliest and strongest witnesses all disagree and Origen has been altered. There is little hope in establishing Origen's authorial citation if it was not the Byzantine reading.

2 Corinthians 1:8

Οὐ γὰρ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὑπὲρ τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν τῆς γενομένης ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὑπὲρ δύναμιν ἐβαρῆθημὲν ὥστε ἐξαπορηθῆναι ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν·

-----  
θέλω γάρ Or(a) 018 ] γάρ θελομέν NA RP  
περὶ Or(a) 01 02 04 06 010 012 025 0209. 6. 33. 69. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1505. 1908. ]  
ὑπέρ NA RP P46 03 018 020 044 0121. 0243. 630. 1241. 1739. 1881. 2464.



There are two places in this citation, which are worthy of note. The citation from *Eph.Com* reads θέλω against both NA and RP, whose reading is θέλομεν. Here, Origen is different from the two critical editions yet is supported only by 018. When Origen's citations do not correspond to NA/RP, his citations are normally free. Elsewhere, he is supported by P46 01 02 or 03.

The second unit of variation involves what has occurred throughout Origen's citations of the three epistles: the reading of περί where NA and RP read ὑπέρ. Origen is supported by 01 02 04 06 against P46 03 and 1739. This is another example of how the early four documents with Pauline writings (specifically P46 01 02 03) are not consistent in their agreement with each other, as they agree and disagree in various groups depending on the unit of variation. Also, considering that this reading of Origen's is supported by early evidence, it would seem that if this were an early text of Origen's then he would correspond to 1739 but he does not. The relationship between 1739 and Origen's citations should be reconsidered.

#### 2 Corinthians 7:10

-----  
ἐργάζεται NA P46 01 03 04 06 025 81. 1175., ] ἐργαζομένην Or(abf), κατεργάζεται RP P99 01c 010 012 018 020 020 044 0243. 0296. 104. 365. 630. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464.

The readings for the unit of variation at the end of the verse show disagreement between Origen, P46 01 03 and P99. Origen is different to the New Testament editions with his participial form of the verb. This shows that in places of variation in the early documents, Origen is often free, reflecting a reading that is not supported by any manuscripts, yet with consistency throughout his works of the same reading.

Galatians 4:23

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας δι' ἐπαγγελίας.

-----

μὲν Or(abcdeg) NA RP 01 02 03 04 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 062. 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. ] omit Or(f) P46 03 δι' NA P46 01 02 04 044 33. 81. 104. 1241. 2464. ] δια τῆς Or(abcdefg) 03 06 010 012 018 020 025 062. 0278. 365. 630. 1175. 1505. 1739. 1881. 1881. RP.

*Matt.Com C* is intermittent regarding its presentation of the verse. The only difference between NA and RP is the genitive article at the end which all of Origen's citations have present. In agreement with RP, all of Origen's citations read διὰ τῆς with support from 03. Against this reading is δι' as it reads in P46 01 02. Typically, when Origen corresponds to the RP text against the NA, he is not supported by 03.

#### 5.3.4. Different Readings Between Origen's Works

2 Corinthians 3:18

ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένω πρόσωπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος.

-----

μεταμορφούμεθα Or(deklpqr) NA RP ] μεταμορφουμένοι Or(b) P46 02 614., μεταμορφοῦσθαι Or(c), μεταμορφοῦνται Or(fs)

There are several differing forms of the verb μεταμορφόω among the witnesses. Four different forms appear in the writings of Origen. The reading of P46 and 02 is supported by Or(b), which is from *Cels*, a work of Origen with an often early citation text. Often P46 and 02 are against the early readings of Origen 01 and 03. Despite these various forms of μεταμορφόω, the rest of the citations are very consistent considering that there are 19 different citations, many of which are from different works of Origen.

2 Corinthians 11:23

διάκονοι Χριστοῦ εἶσιν; παραφρονῶν λαλῶ, ὑπὲρ ἐγώ· ἐν κόποις περισσοτέρως, ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως, ἐν πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις.

-----  
φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως ἐν πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως Or(ce) NA P46 03 05 33. 629. 630. 0243. 1739. 1881. ] πληγαῖς περισσοτέρως ἐν φυλακαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως Or(ad) 01 010, φυλακαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως ἐν πληγαῖς περισσοτέρως 025, πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως RP 01c 05c 015 018 020 044 0121. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464.

There are four main readings for a longer variant reading in the textual tradition.

Origen has four citations, which contain this variation. The NA reading is supported by *Basil.Phil A* and *Rom.Frag A*, which is unusual given that *Rom.Frag A* normally supports the Byzantine text. This is likely to show that *Rom.Frag A* once did reflect an early reading as appears in 01 here, as the correction in 01 indicates a later change to the Byzantine text.

*Euches* and *Jer.Hom B* both correspond to the reading of 01, which has very little support in the critical apparatus of the various hand-editions. Therefore, all of Origen's reading corresponds to a NA-like text (GA01).

2 Corinthians 12:10

διὸ εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὕβρεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διωγμοῖς καὶ στενοχωρίαις, ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ· ὅταν γὰρ ἀσθενῶ, τότε δυνατός εἰμι.

-----  
ἐν Or(cd) NA RP ] καὶ Or(b) P46 01  
καὶ Or(b) NA P46 01 03 104. 326. 1175. ] καὶ ἐν 0243. 0278. 630. 1739. 1881., ἐν Or(cd) RP 01c 02 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 365. 1241. 1505. 2464.

There are two units of variation where Origen is a witness to a very early reading. The first concerns the reading of ἐν vs καί. Origen is split with two readings Or(cd) agreeing with both New Testament critical editions, though Or(b) is in agreement with P46 and 01 which is more than likely his reading given their early dates and that they

and Origen are the only witnesses for this reading. Later in the verse, there is another unit of variation that involves the same words. The reading of καί is supported Or(b) NA P46 01 03 104. 326. 1175. The reading of καὶ ἐν is supported by 0243. 0278. 630. 1739. 1881. The reading of ἐν is supported by ἐν Or(cd) RP 01c 02 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 33. 81. 365. 1241. 1505. 2464. In this second unit, Origen's citations contain both readings. Origen's commentary on Jeremiah shows Origen in one unit of variation against both NA and RP with second-century support (P46, and in the other unit of variation also supported by 01 03

The examples above have discussed and attempted to reconcile the various issues in Origen's text including: (1) citations that demonstrate a mixed textual affinity, (2) Citations that agree with neither the Initial or Byzantine text, (3) units of variation where the early documents of the Greek New Testament disagree, and (4) the variation of citations between certain works of Origen for the same place in Scripture.

Other readings and examples of differing readings within Origen's works that need not be discussed here in full include: Romans 2:13; 15:19; and Galatians 5:19. Likewise, three more examples of differences within the same works of Origen include: Romans 1:23, 2:23; and 2 Corinthians 1:5. The next section will address the citational and biblical text of Origen.

#### **5.4. Origen's Citational and Biblical Text**

Despite the obvious attraction of studying the text of the Greek New Testament in the writings of a prominent individual such as Origen, there are many problems one

must face in an attempt to responsibly use Origen as a witness in the wider discipline of Greek New Testament textual criticism.

If NA and RP share the same in reading in most places, and a shared reading typically demonstrates places of very little textual variation in the New Testament manuscripts, it should be expected that an early writer such as Origen would mainly reflect a text-form that is consistently in agreement with NA and RP if he is citing his biblical manuscripts. About half of Origen's citations are identical to a shared NA and RP reading. Considering this, Origen is most likely not citing directly from his manuscripts.

In places of conflict between NA and RP, a citation that is identical to the NA text is more likely to be an earlier representation of the textual history of the New Testament rather than any reading that only agrees with the RP text. It is widely known and observable in manuscripts of the Greek New Testament that documents were edited and texts accommodated to fit the evolving biblical text.<sup>114</sup> If Origen's citations, too, were changed during any period after his life, the chances of his readings being changed to a united agreement of NA and RP is more likely than not, considering that the two agree in most places.<sup>115</sup> The fluctuation of Origen's agreements with either NA or RP is

---

<sup>114</sup> Fee states "that a Byzantine type of textual transmission (smoothing out the text) goes on as early as P66," *Papyrus Bodmer II (P66): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics*, SD 34, Salt Lake City, UT: Univeristy of Utah Press, 1968; "...the work done by later editors and textual workers in shaping the stylized Byzantine text." Frank Pack, "The Methodology of Origen as a Textual Critic in Arriving at the Text fo the New Testament" Unpublished Dissertation. Univeristy of Southern California, 1948, 346-7; Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Test of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 127.

<sup>115</sup> "...that it will tend to harmonize passages, not remove or change such wordings and that it will tend to alleviate difficulties, not engender them." Gordon D. Fee, "P75, P66, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria" from *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney; Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pulbusing House, 1974), 270.

insignificant in comparison to the varying levels of readings that are identical to the NA/RP texts, and those that have no support. The contrasting nature of his readings that reflect the best-reconstructed texts of the Greek New Testament and his readings that are unsupported demonstrates that Origen has been accommodated to the texts of our earliest extant manuscripts of the New Testament.

The earliest documents of Origen show that his citations are most similar to an NA-like text mixed with free citations of the Greek New Testament.<sup>116</sup> The correspondence to the NA would appear to confirm the early nature of our hypothetical reconstructions in modern eclectic hand-editions of the New Testament. In units of variation, Origen's citations overall have only a small number of readings in agreement with NA-only or RP-only,<sup>117</sup> and that most readings at the epistle-level are either fluid or identical to both NA and RP,<sup>118</sup> it suggests that Origen agrees with the Initial and Byzantine text together slightly less than they agree with each other, yet in the places they do not, his citations are free.

His high agreement with both text-forms when they are the same is not surprising considering the high percentage of the NA/RP agreement, but a high level of free citations in the extant witnesses and the clear examples of mixture at the citation level, indicates that his citations had already undergone change by the sixth century.<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup> The Papyrus Cairo 88748, found in 1941 near Tura is the earliest document of a writing by Origen.

<sup>117</sup> See Table 36.

<sup>118</sup> See Table 33-35.

<sup>119</sup> "There have been many attempts to solve the great riddle of the New Testament text used by Origen, but always on much too narrow a basis and with unrealistic presuppositions. If the question of the existence of a 'Caesarean text' and its character is to be answered fully and finally, this must be done from Origen's quotations. But it still remains unexplained why all the known alternative readings are also usually found attested in Origen's writings." Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual*

Overall, in the units of variation between Origen, NA, and RP, when Origen sides with one over the other, he agrees with NA against RP between 12-27% of the time, depending on which epistle. He agrees with RP against NA between 2-6% of the time. Considering the amount of mixture in affinity of Origen's citations overall, this confirms that Origen's citations are more likely to reflect a reading in agreement with NA when he does side with one or the other. That, however, is only when he agrees with one or the other. In all of his citations where there is some level of variation among Origen, NA, and RP, Origen is against both editions between 61-82% of the time, depending on the epistle cited. This demonstrates that Origen's citations at the earliest stage were probably free, especially considering the alteration of his free citations to the Byzantine text in later stages of transmission history.<sup>120</sup>

The evidence is clear about what Origen's citations were like, considering what can be understood about his citations now. Despite knowing that he is mostly fluid in his citations and yet retains a considerable number of readings in agreement with the NA edition, can Origen's biblical text be established? The nature of the data should call for a strong reservation that would leap from his citational text to his biblical manuscripts. The fact that Origen's citations agree with the NA is probably a result of the same reason he agrees with the RP text, namely, the same editorial practices are constant, yet the form of the text throughout the centuries is different. At bottom, the NA text is the best

---

*Criticism* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1987), 168.

<sup>120</sup> "...handling of the text closely parallels the work done by later editors and textual workers in shaping the stylized Byzantine text...process that ended with the Byzantine text-type finds its beginnings in Origen's methodology, for it was a process of "correction" of the knowledge, use and conflation of different textual traditions, and the handling of the text with the interests of teaching and preaching in mind." Pack, "Origen as a Textual Critic," 6.

representation of the third to fourth century Greek New Testament, and Origen's citations often reflect these readings. However, an author that predates the earliest text reconstructed from manuscripts can establish the nature of the first, second or third century text.

Though there are no documents to support any theory of this period of time before the earliest Greek New Testament manuscripts (or MSS of Origen's works, for that matter), the dual nature of Origen's citations demonstrate that Origen's citations, predominantly free in nature, were adjusted to a text like the NA in the third and fourth centuries and then likewise to the Byzantine text after the 6<sup>th</sup> century.

Even if Origen's authorial texts were found and confirmed to be the first copies of all his works, the matter of his biblical text still is uncertain for two main reasons. First, the corrupted manuscript tradition in his day, which indicates his biblical exemplars were of a mixed textual nature.<sup>121</sup> Second, keeping in mind the nature of Origen's citations, specifically that he presents the New Testament text freely, his readings are often unsupported by manuscript evidence. If there is inconsistency between various works' or even of the same work's presentation of the same verse, for example, then it is difficult to understand any biblical reading that might have been behind it. If there is consistency, is it likely that the reading has been changed over the transmission period (later copyists)? If it has not, is it possible to determine this was the reading of an actual manuscript in the possession of the Church Father, or even an attempt to cite a specific text form?

---

<sup>121</sup> Amy M. Donaldson, "Explicit References to New Testament Variant Readings Among Greek and Latin Church Fathers," PhD thesis, University of Notre Dame, 2009.



In view of his citations, it is clear that he is at times unconcerned with citing even the same verses the same way within a single work. This is seen in the fact that in all three epistles this thesis investigates, where there is variation, Origen is more likely to be independent of the Initial and Byzantine Texts. The possible influences in the text of patristic citations are many. Since various factors determine the form of citations as they reach the modern reader, this makes understanding the biblical text behind them nearly unattainable.

On the other hand, Origen's citational text is rather consistent. In places where the Initial and Byzantine Text agree, Origen is typically in agreement with this reading. This shows either the resiliency of the Greek New Testament text, or that Origen's writings were accommodated very early with no remaining evidence of their authorial readings. It is quite possible that his works were adjusted to a fourth- or fifth-century biblical text after his writings began to circulate. However, given the unique nature of many of Origen's citations, it seems that the fluidity of the biblical text during Origen's day and the possibly frequent citing technique that undervalued exactitude, the earliest forms of what we know to be Origen's works are probably actually what Origen wrote.<sup>122</sup>

If each Origen source cites the three epistles consistently within each work, how is it that the overall affinity for each individual epistle is different? One extreme example is the case with *Rom.Frag A*. It cites all three epistles consistently with an RP agreement, yet it cites Romans 142 times compared to four in Galatians and 17 in 2 Corinthians. Each work of Origen cites the epistles an inconsistent amount of times, or

---

<sup>122</sup> cf. Romans 2:5, 3:25, 29, 6:22, 8:7, 11, 26, 11:22, 13:9; 2 Corinthians 4:18, 5:16, 7:10, 11:2, 12:21; Galatians 4:1, 23, 5:19, 22, 6:8.

rather, certain epistles appear inconsistently within the various works. Therefore, even though Origen's individual works cite the epistles in a consistent affinity throughout each work, and each work is one sided in terms of affinity in relation to RP and NA, the affinity of the individual epistles are different because the number of times each epistle is cited in each work is not consistent.

Ultimately, the textual nature of Origen's works is complex. Each individual work has its own history and therefore cited text. The biblical text behind the citations has its own complexities, which has affected how Origen cites the Greek New Testament. This is coupled with the transmission history of his own works and the citations within them. There are many examples among Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians that demonstrate that Origen's text and citations have undergone accommodation in various places. This mixture through editing has created a complicated scenario, which further data and thorough analysis might solve.

Given this assessment of Origen's citations and the subsequent adjustments to his citational text, citations attributed to Origen will not arrive at a definitive text of Origen's Greek New Testament manuscripts but rather his citational text, or rather, the words he wrote. Considering that roughly half of his citational text is free, and his authorial citations are demonstrated to have reflected a greater percentage of free readings, the citational text of Origen is not his biblical text.

The current thesis has demonstrated that despite Origen's consistency, he is still sporadic and unconcerned with wording in many places. Though he mentions the depravity of the manuscripts of his day and their corrupted nature, he then cites as if

there were no set form of the epistles.<sup>123</sup> Alas, the supposed textual critic Origen, through his voluminous citations, fails to provide that which the 21<sup>st</sup> century textual critic desires, a presentation of his exact text.

## **5.5. Implications Relevant to the Research Questions in Chapter 1**

This section will address the implications of this study as they pertain to the questions raised in Chapter 1.

### **5.5.1. Goals of New Testament Textual Criticism and the Church Fathers**

Historically, the goal of textual critics of the Greek New Testament has been to recover the “original text.” Having discussed in §1.4 the various explanations of what this term means, the purpose of discussing it here will not require a rehashing of the varying perspectives. However, in the attempt to go further in the past, further than our extant biblical manuscripts, textual critics have employed the witnesses of the Church Fathers to extend the evidence for the purposes of attaining the earliest forms of the New Testament. Ideally, this theory is the best way to recover the known readings of the New Testament in the first three centuries of Christian Scripture.

The way in which the Church Fathers are used as evidence is often a reflection of the goals of the individual textual critic. It would be hard to find a biblical scholar in the twenty-first century that would deny the value of patristic evidence. However, if the primary goal is the recovery or finding of the “original text” and the Church Father as a textual witness is used for this purpose, it requires that the “original text” or authorial

---

<sup>123</sup> Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 201. “In a different category are instances where, because of some exegetical difficulty, Origen suggests that perhaps all of the manuscripts existing in his day may have become corrupt.”

citations of the patristic authors be recovered first. Unfortunately, this thesis has shown that this is highly problematic for three main reasons: (1) the majority of Origen's citations are against both the NA and RP readings. (2) Even when Origen agrees with either of these hand-editions, he shows a mixture of various readings where NA and RP disagree. Lastly, (3) where he is in agreement with the both NA and RP, there are sometimes alternative forms of his citations, or evidence of accommodation, which makes Origen's actual citation questionable.

These three points do not suggest that the Greek New Testament is so wild that there is no way to know what the text actually read in the second century. Rather, if Origen's authorial citations cannot be determined, and the evidence from his citations clearly shows that most of the time he is not citing known readings of extant Greek New Testament manuscripts, then he can hardly be used confidently to reproduce a textual tradition that predates the extant biblical manuscripts.

### **5.5.2. Reconstructions and Memory in Relation to Patristic Citations**

The limits of determining definitive biblical citations of the Church Fathers is very problematic for methodologies that call for the reconstruction of single citations as representatives for the patristic New Testament, especially those as a means for comparison to the wider Greek New Testament manuscript tradition. Suggs held reconstructions to be best practice for understanding the Church Fathers' text.<sup>124</sup> Fee agrees "critical reconstructions, especially of the biblical text of the early Greek Fathers,

---

<sup>124</sup> M. Jack Suggs, "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for the Primitive New Testament Text," NTS 4 (1958), 147 had suggested, "More ambitiously than merely presenting all the data we might aim at publishing 'critically reconstructed' texts of these patristic witnesses."

are currently the most urgent need for the study of patristic citations in NT textual criticism."<sup>125</sup> Mullen, current editor of the *NTGF*, speaks of the "eminent" contribution of its instalments, which depend solely on critical editions of the Church Fathers and reconstructions.<sup>126</sup> If such designated representative citations are compared to the wider Greek New Testament manuscripts, this can result in false relationships between the Church Fathers and extant biblical manuscripts if issues of accommodation are not considered.<sup>127</sup> The concept of reconstructing the single representative citational text has come about by the "original text" presupposition of Greek New Testament textual criticism, in general. As long as the goal of establishing the "original text" in New Testament textual criticism is made the goal of the study of patristic citations (as seen in several Origen studies recently), selected citations standing as a representation of the Church Fathers' text will be compared to the Greek New Testament manuscripts to determine affinity.<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> Fee, "Use of the Greek Fathers," 191-207.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, 364.

<sup>127</sup> For example, "Furthermore, the one man skilled in such textual matters (Origen) shows no concern for such a recension; and it is doubtful that someone earlier than he would have had such a concern. Finally, an analysis of the textula character of P75 B *when compared with other manuscript traditions* indicates that there is little evidence of recensional activity of any kind taking place in this text-type. The MSS seem to represent a "relatively pure" form of preservation of a "relatively pure" line of descent from the original text." Fee "P75, P66, and Origen," 272.

<sup>128</sup> Colwell has several articles that outline such a methodology, all collected in his volume *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS IX; Leiden: Brill, 1969). See especially chapters 1-5: "Method in Grouping New Testament Manuscripts," "Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript," "Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts" (with Ernest Tune), and "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and its Limitations." See also Bart Ehrman's evaluation of and improvements to the Colwell-Tune method, "Methodological Developments in the Analysis and Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence" *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), hereafter STCNT, 9-32, repr. from *NovTest* 29 (1987), 22-45; and "The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence," STCNT, 33-56, repr. from *JBL* 106 (1987), 465-86.

The apparent free nature of citations in the Church Fathers is often attributed to an attempt to replicate their manuscripts from memory. This description needs to be reconsidered since citations are not always an attempt to cite verbatim.<sup>129</sup> The awareness of variant readings and attempts to reconcile differing text-forms is apparent in the patristic writings.<sup>130</sup> However, varying citations within the corpus of a Church Father need not be explained by a failed attempt to purposefully cite what their exemplars meant.

When it is suggested that the cause of differing forms of certain verses in the patristic writings is the failure of the Church Fathers' memories, this assumes two things: (1) the Church Fathers attempted to cite their manuscripts verbatim, but (2) failed because of their defective memories. The nature of memorization in antiquity is well documented, which makes the faulty memory explanation on such a wide scale untenable in the citations.<sup>131</sup> This is also inadmissible considering the number of citations of the same verse that show no mixture yet are consistent throughout multiple works of Origen.<sup>132</sup> The use of citations in Origen are often simply a reinforcement of personal argumentation or a reference to Scripture as support for his ideas, oftentimes grammatically altered to fit his own prose, not the opposite.

---

<sup>129</sup> Stanley concludes that when confections occur in Strabo, pseudo-Longinus, Heraclitus and Plutarch, they are rarely due to lapse of memory and are very intentional, cf. Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the language of Scripture Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series 74 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 290-2; Osburn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations," 334.

<sup>130</sup> Donaldson, "Explicit References", 2009; Metzger, "Explicit References in the Works of Origen," 78-95.

<sup>131</sup> Aristotle, "On Memory and Reminiscence" in *Parva Naturalia*, Loeb Classic Library 288, (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1956); Cicero, "Rhetorica ad Herennium, Loeb Classical Library 403, (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1964); for an overview of memory in antiquity, Francis Yates, "The Art of Memory," London: Routledge and Kegan, 1966.

<sup>132</sup> See Origen's citations of Romans 7:4, 8:8, 8:20, 8:28, 8:37, 9:8, 9:16, 10:7, 13:12, 16:25; 2 Corinthians 3:18, 4:8, 5:7, 5:10, 5:19, 10:5, 13:3; Galatians 2:20, 4:21, 4:22, 4:24, 5:9, 6:14.

Ultimately, the use of “faulty memory” as an explanation for differing readings is not wrong in that it attempts to portray the occurrence of non-exemplar reproductions, but it wrongly insinuates such occurrences were failed attempts of their intended purpose.<sup>133</sup> This purpose was to provide verbatim reproductions of their personal manuscripts of the Greek New Testament.

### **5.5.3. What is a citation?**

Considering that the Church Fathers frequently use biblical text in their works, what then is a patristic citation of the Greek New Testament? Again, this is based on certain presuppositions. The use of reconstructions, “original text” (in relation to the Greek New Testament and the Greek Church Fathers’ citations), explanations of faulty memory, and the like, implies that a citation is a verbatim reproduction of the New Testament. If on the other hand, this thesis suggests a citation is first and foremost a recognisable use of the New Testament, and then possibly a window into the biblical text of the Church Fathers. In Origen’s writings, citations are often free, and those that are not free often show indications of accommodation. Considering this, the use of the Church Fathers citations as evidence for the biblical text in its first few centuries should be reconsidered.

If Origen’s citations are freely cited at least fifty percent of the time, with authorial citations appearing more free, this suggests that to categorize citations is a reflection of

---

<sup>133</sup> “...it is conceivable that a Father could misquote a text consistently from memory rather than from an actual text.” Osburn, “Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations,” 322.

presuppositions and not the technique of the individual Church Fathers.<sup>134</sup> This current thesis, in an attempt to gather as many citations of Origen as possible, designated a citation as all biblical content that consisted of 3 consecutive words from the NA (in any order) in a sequence of at most 7 words. This provided a wide variety of results. After the initial gathering of data, many “citations” were removed from the collection, due to the common usage of phrasing, despite it falling within the selected parameters of a citation.<sup>135</sup> For example, a search result of “Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ” does not mean Origen was citing Romans 16:27 and Galatians 1:1, or that a few dozen hits of “ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας” is Galatians 1:5 or Romans 11:36.

However, if categories are to organize the citations according to how they currently stand, and inquiries such as the current thesis are attempting to understand Origen’s authorial citations, to what extent are the categories such as “allusion” or “reference” presumptuous in understanding Origen’s citations? In other words, an altered citation is often labelled a “citation” and a citation that is free (and probably authorial!) is simply an “allusion”. These categories rate the biblical content found in the Church Fathers works based on their relation to the wider Greek New Testament tradition instead of testing first whether they are in fact accommodated to what we now understand to be the extant manuscripts of New Testament.

---

<sup>134</sup> Various categories such as “allusion,” “adaptation,” or “citation” cf. Fee, “Text of John in Origen and Cyril,” 362.

<sup>135</sup> Fee, “Use of the Greek Fathers,” 358, “Also, happily, but for textual purpose somewhat frustratingly, distant allusions, as well as citations and adaptations, are included. For example, many loose references to the “word of God” tend to be indexed as if they are references to John 1:1. As a result, one must frequently sift through a large number of inconsequential listings in order to realize a minimal gain of textual data.” Osburn, “Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations,” 340-1, “Several instances of verbal correspondence in references with no intent to cite a biblical text are explained in terms of the weaving of common patristic terminology into the composition. Common patristic terminology should not be included in assessments of a Fathers text.”



A pre-determined set of categories in which a Church Fathers citations are placed is a working of the evidence into labels that modern scholarship has created, which excludes evidence if it does not fit into the modern understanding of *our* earliest manuscripts. It does not consider that a citation thrown out under the “allusion” label could actually be an unknown reading from a lost manuscript, or what this thesis has found, which is most authorial citations of Origen are not exemplar-based at all.

Therefore, recognizable content from the Scriptures should be deemed “citations” according to generous criteria (as they either cite Scripture or they do not) which then allows for an investigator to make assessments of inclusivity for certain scriptural phrases that are likely to be in common for other parts of the canon (the removal of common phrasing).

The wider problem in patristic citations is that Origen is considered the most “precise” among the citing Church Fathers of the Greek New Testament.<sup>136</sup> Perhaps, his citations have undergone the most alteration to agree with text-forms that correspond to modern critical editions such as NA and RP? Perhaps, the other Church Fathers contain more free citations and appear to have faulty memories when in fact more of their citational readings are authorial (unaccommodated)? This is not to suggest that scholarship should stop basing the affinity of the patristic citations on extant manuscripts. However, if the immediate assessment of affinity is prolonged, a first step of assessing their relationship to the other citations of the same Church Father in the same verse could render a better understanding of the way a specific Church Father

---

<sup>136</sup> Fee says that Patristic citing habits range from rather precise to moderately careful to notoriously slovenly" with Origen representing the "rather precise" category. Fee, "Use of the Greek Fathers," 353.

cites, the ability to determine what are the most probable citations that are authorial, ultimately arriving at an informed position where the likelihood of the citations' being a reflection of an exemplar can be established.

This study has attempted to make definitive statements about Origen's citations of Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians, yet through this process, general issues in regards to patristic citations in general have become apparent. Given the implications of this study, the immediate use of patristic citations should be reconsidered, especially for determining text periods before the third century and text-forms in relation to geographical areas.

The main reason why the Church Fathers do not give us a window into the first and second century biblical texts is not because their "original" citations cannot be determined. This actually is possible in many places. The main problem is that authorial citations are often unrelated to readings in the extant manuscripts (which are only a portion of those that ever existed).

## **5.6. The Future of Patristic Citations**

The possible pitfalls concerning the use of patristic evidence for establishing the earliest possible biblical text are widely known.<sup>137</sup> However, a dominant trend in relation to the value of Greek patristic citations is based on a methodology that all citations of a

---

<sup>137</sup> "...according to Parker it appears methodologically unclear what to do with variants known mainly from patristic sources predating the manuscript tradition, and hence not descended from the initial text." Wachtel, *Textual History of the Greek New Testament*, 217; "Before patristic evidence can be used with confidence, however, one must determine whether the true text of the ecclesiastical writer has been transmitted. As in the case of New Testament manuscripts, so also the treatises of the fathers have been modified in the course of copying." Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 127; "...the critical evaluation of texts noted as biblical quotations is still essential" Osburn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations," 315.

Church Father can be simplified to an eclectic, hypothetical text that represents the text as the Church Father would have read it.<sup>138</sup> Or more specifically, definitive reconstructions of how a Church Father cites individual verses can then be compared to the various manuscripts of the Greek New Testament to establish affinity.

The potential misapplication of patristic data for the purposes of wider studies of the Greek New Testament text has revealed a common misunderstanding of what patristic citations are.<sup>139</sup> If the citations themselves are then used within a system, especially those of “text-types,” then the way they are analysed and applied will be a reflection of this misunderstanding, no matter how efficient or progressive analytic methods have become.<sup>140</sup> It is important to look at both the affinity of individual sources for Origen’s citations across the New Testament as well as look at the overall nature of Origen’s citations of the individual biblical books. In a way, this diminishes the

---

<sup>138</sup> "Following up on the suggestion by Suggs, Fee urged "critical reconstructions, especially of the biblical text of the early Greek Fathers, are currently the most urgent need for the study of patristic citations in NT textual criticism." Fee, "Text of John in Origen and Cyril," 358, 360-361.

<sup>139</sup> Osburn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations," 339, "One must exercise great caution, because uncritical use of allusions in establishing the text of a Father’s biblical exemplar can destroy the very exactitude desired in the process." G. Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), 243. "In the first place, the true text of the writer in question has to be ascertained, just as the text of the Bible or of the classical authors has to be ascertained, by the comparison of authorities. The texts of the Fathers, as they have generally been read until recently in the editions of the Benedictines or Migne’s *Patrologia*, were based (like the received text of the New Testament itself) upon comparatively few and late manuscripts."

<sup>140</sup> H.A.G. Houghton has pointed out recently that a NT textual criticism movement away from “text-types” is needed, however, the discipline of Patristic citations is often behind in regards to the latest developments in NT textual criticism in general, especially in assumptions of “original text” c.f. “Developments in New Testament Textual Criticism” *Early Christianity* 2.2 (2011), 252, “...characteristic of the "Alexandrian" or "Western" text, the percentage gaps separating these groups become ever slighter as more data is taken into consideration. Analyses which rely on statistical agreements with selected witnesses, such as the Claremont Profile Method or Comprehensive Profile Method, are therefore being superseded...The application of the CBGM, too, has demonstrated that the texts of manuscripts assigned to a similar text-type are often widely separated in the diagrams of overall textual flow. For this reason, several leading textual critics now advocate the abandonment of text-types altogether.” An introductory presentation of the CBGM (Coherence-Based Genealogical Method) may be downloaded from the INTF website ([http://www.uni-muenster.de/INTF/Genealogical\\_method.html](http://www.uni-muenster.de/INTF/Genealogical_method.html)).

conclusions from the most recent monographs on Origen's biblical text, as in both of these works there is no substantial consideration of mixture or accommodation but rather reconstruction and textual placement.<sup>141</sup> However, both studies suggest that the affinity of the citations of other individual biblical books would have the same affinity, which is not the case for Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians.

Such conclusions lead to general assessments of Origen's citing practices, his biblical text, and his place among the witnesses to the Greek New Testament in a way that is not entirely accurate. Because of the quantity of Origen's citations and the amount of New Testament text, individual monographs can only describe small portions of the whole, but until there is a fuller picture, such suggestions should be considered unsettled. If for example, the results of this study were to consider only the overall citations of Origen for the three specific biblical books, the result would falsely conclude that he had a significant different textual affinity in his personal copies of Romans. The biggest impact on Origen's citations is his lack of verbatim citing of his biblical text as reflected in his free authorial citations and the subsequent accommodation of his correctors, neither of which tell us about Origen's true affinity.

The potential locating power of citations always depends on the authorial citations of the Church Fathers in regards to establishing the earliest text of the New Testament.<sup>142</sup> The data in this study suggests that the text of many of the citations found

---

<sup>141</sup> B. D. Ehrman, G. D. Fee, & M. W. Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); Darrell D. Hannah, *The Text of I Corinthians in the Writings of Origen* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).

<sup>142</sup> Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 127: "Before patristic evidence can be used with confidence, however, one must determine whether the true text of the ecclesiastical writer has been transmitted. As in the case of New Testament manuscripts, so also the treatises of the fathers have been modified in the course of copying."

in critical editions of Origen's works is not authorial. This is not devastating to the discipline of patristic textual criticism even if such an authorial document were found or authorial text established. The question still remains whether the Church Father has indeed cited specific texts from manuscripts that no longer exist, is citing fluidly, or if his words have been changed.<sup>143</sup> An approach to the patristic writings that accepts the failure of the citations to reveal biblical manuscripts frees the scholar to pursue what can be known.

The future of patristic citations and their importance in the discipline of Greek New Testament textual criticism is not forsaken with their permanent removal from the first- and second-century biblical text.<sup>144</sup> Though the issues are great in dealing with such evidence, what they lack in their ability to recover the earliest biblical text, they make up for in their value as to how the Greek New Testament has changed over the centuries.<sup>145</sup> In Origen alone, his works display a history of the development of the Greek New Testament text through variant readings, issues of exegesis/interpretation, and an overall picture of how the Bible was cited by one of the earliest Christian theologians. There is much to learn from these writings concerning the text of the New

---

<sup>143</sup> Fee, "Use of the Greek Fathers," 353. "Did the Church Father cite scripture by looking up the passage and copying his text, or did he simply cite from memory? If it was from memory, as appears to have been most common, can his memory be trusted to have reproduced the copy of scripture he must have possessed?"

<sup>144</sup> "Up to A.D. 150 the quotations in extant ecclesiastical writers, though important in their bearing on the questions of the date and acceptance of the New Testament Scriptures, are of little value for purely textual purposes." G. Kenyon, *Handbook*, 249.

<sup>145</sup> Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 168 "With more adequate information about the Church Fathers text of the New Testament we would have firmer guidelines for a history of the text" ; Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 281 "Thus, one of the significant breakthroughs of textual scholarship has been the recognition that the history of a text' transmission can contribute to the history of its interpretation: early Christian exegetes occasionally disagreed on the interpretation of a passage because they know the text in different forms. Moreover, some critics have come to recognize that variants in the textual tradition provide data for the social history of early Christianity, especially during the first three Christian centuries, when the majority of all textual corruptions were generated."

Testament. However, the patristic citations must not be forced to answer our questions, for the answers they give do not reflect our questions of Scriptural origins. They must be explained in their own right, without a premature application to the questions we wish they could but cannot answer.

## 5.7. Recommendations for Future Research

One very important asset to studying any textual issues in the Greek New Testament or the citations of the Church Father is transcriptions. At the time of this thesis, several projects are in the process of transcribing manuscripts for the sake of collation and online use. The biggest asset to the current thesis would be transcriptions of the manuscripts behind Origen's critical editions, as well as searchable/tagged texts of the Greek New Testament manuscripts. For the latter, the Institute for New Testament Textual Research at the University of Munster<sup>146</sup> and the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing at the University of Birmingham<sup>147</sup> are making such resources more accessible through projects such as the New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room<sup>148</sup> and the New Testament Transcripts Prototype.<sup>149</sup>

In relation to studies dealing with Origen's texts, opportunities for more in-depth inquiries into his textual affinity are wide open. His writings are worth exploration in their own right, but specifically, still a helpful source in understanding the early Church mindset in regard to Scripture and possibly an indirect source for earlier forms of the Greek New Testament text. Any work that would supplement the projects above in

---

<sup>146</sup> <http://egora.uni-muenster.de/intf/>

<sup>147</sup> <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/research/activity/itsee/index.aspx>

<sup>148</sup> <http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/>

<sup>149</sup> <http://nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de/>

locating, transcribing and analyzing the extant manuscripts of Origen in a complete catalogue would be a great help to all Origen scholars.<sup>150</sup> Specifically pertaining to patristic citations one could evaluate the citations of the rest of the Pauline epistles or remaining Gospels in light of the Greek New Testament manuscript tradition.

Considering the differences between his works, both in content and purpose, the transmission process of each work through comparative readings could target detailed issues and developments that an overview thesis such as this one can only address generally. In a response to what was lacking in Hannah's study of 1 Corinthians, this study has addressed the remaining epistles of the *Hauptbriefe*. As the rest of the Pauline epistles are considered, hopefully a better understanding of Origen's citations will come to bear which will then address the greater Greek New Testament text and its transmission history.

---

<sup>150</sup> Kurt Aland, "The Greek New Testament: Its Present and Future Editions" *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 87, No. 2 (Jun., 1968), p186. "The patristic quotations from the NT present a very difficult problem. The Institute has large collections and has already systematically dealt with quite a number of the church fathers. But there is still important work to be done here, for the material of all the editions, including The Greek New Testament, originates from Tischendorf and is not based on original sources, i. e., the modern critical editions of the church fathers, many of which are indispensable for the early history of the text of the NT."

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aland, Kurt. *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Greek New Testament: Its Present and Future Editions" *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 87, No. 2, 1968.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Twentieth-Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism." in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*, eds. Ernest Best, R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1987.

Allenbach, J., et al., eds. *Biblia Patristica: Index des Citations et Allusions Bibliques dans la Litterature Patristique*, vol. 4. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1987.

Altaner, Berthold. *Patrology*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1960.

Anderson, Jared. "An Analysis of the Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen." MA dissertation. University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, 2008.

Aune, D. E., & Fotopoulos, J. *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Bardy, Gustave., "Le texte de l'epitre aux Romains dans le commentaire d'Origene-Rufin," *RB* 29: 229-41, 1920

Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Translated by R. Kraft and G. Krodel. London: SCM, 1971.

Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Bebb, L. J. M., "The Evidence of the Early Versions and Patristic Quotations on the Text of the Books of the New Testament." pp. 195-213 in *Studia Biblica et ecclesiastica* 2, Essays chiefly in Biblical and Patristic Criticism 195-240, . Oxford: Clarendon, 1890.

Benedetto, Robert, and James O. Duke. *The New Westminster Dictionary of Church History*. Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.



- Bentley, Jerry H. *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Black, David Alan. *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Boeft, J. den, and M. L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk. *The Impact of Scripture in Early Christianity*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Boismard, Marie-Émile. *Critique textuelle et citations patristiques*. RB 57 Paris: Lecoffre, 1950, p388-408.
- Brooks, James. *The New Testament Text of Gregory of Nyssa*. Society of Biblical Literature The New Testament in the Greek Fathers 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Exeter: The Paternoster Press: 1982.
- Burkitt, F. C. "W and Θ: Studies in the Western Text of St. Mark." JTS 17, 1916.
- Burton Ernest de Witt "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Galatians." *The International Critical Commentary*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark: 1964.
- Cate, James Jeffrey. "The Text of the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation in the Writings of Origen." PhD thesis. New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1997.
- Cavallera, Ferdinand. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca: Indices*. Paris: Garnier, 1912.
- Cayré, Fulbert, and H. Howitt. *Manual of Patrology and History of Theology*. Paris: Society of St. John the Evangelist, Desclée & Co, 1936. 1:191-220.
- Chadwick, Henry. *The Church in Ancient Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Chadwick, Henry. *The Early Church*. Revised edition. London: Penguin, 1993.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Clark, Kenneth Willis. *The Effect of Recent Textual Criticism Upon New Testament Studies*. Cambridge: University Press, 1956.

Colwell, Ernest C. "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Its Limitations" in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies IX, ed. by B. M. Metzger. Leiden: Brill, 1969. pp. 63-83 Originally published as "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and its Limitations" in *JBL* 66, 1947, 109-33.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts," in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies IX, ed. by B. M. Metzger. Leiden: Brill, 1969. pp. 45-55. Originally published as "The Origin of Texttypes of New Testament Manuscripts," in *Early Christian Origins*, ed. by Allen Wikgren. Chicago, 1961, 128-38.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships Between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts" in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tool and Studies IX, ed. by B. M. Metzger. Leiden: Brill, 1969. pp. 56-62. Originally published as "The Quantitative Relationships Between MS Text-Types," in *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey*, ed by J. N. Birdsall and R. W. Thomson. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1963. 25-32.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Method in Grouping New Testament Manuscripts" in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies IX, ed. by B. M. Metzger. Leiden: Brill, 1969. pp. 1-25. Originally published as "The Significance of Grouping of New Testament Manuscripts," in *New Testament Studies*, IV, 1958, 73-92.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript" in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies IX, ed. by B. M. Metzger. Leiden: Brill, 1969. pp. 26-44. Originally published as "Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript within the Manuscript Tradition of the Greek New Testament," *Texte un Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, LXXIII 1959, pp 757-77.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Origin of Text-types of New Testament Manuscripts" pp 128-38, in *Early Christian Origins: Studies in Honor of Harold R. Willoughby*. Ed. A. Wikgren. Chicago: Quardrangle Reprinted as "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts," pp. 56-62 in "Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament."

Colwell, Ernest C., and Ernest W. Tune "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings" in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1969. pp. 96-105. Originally published as "Variant Readings: Classification and Use" *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXIII 1964, 253-261.

- Comfort, Phillip. *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism*. Nashville: B & H Pub. Group, 2005
- Comfort, Philip Wesley, and David P. Barrett. *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*. Wheaton, Ill: Tyndale House, 2001.
- Cosaert, C. P. *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Cross, F. L., and Elizabeth A. Livingstone. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Crouzel, Henri. *Origen*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Bibliographie critique d'Origene*. Instrumenta Patristica VIII. Stenbrugis, Belgium: Abbatia Sancti Petri, 1971, and its supplement in 1982.
- Danielou, J. *Origen*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955.
- Dechow, Jon F., *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*. NAPSPMS 13. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988, 25-124.
- Dickens, Charles. *The Manuscript of Great Expectations, from the Townshend Collection, Wisbech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Dihle, A. *Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire: From Augustus to Justinian*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apokrypha and Pseudepigrapha," *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, eds. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. CRINT 1. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990.
- Delobel, Joël, and Adelbert Denaux. *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Di Berardino, Angelo. *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Dively Lauro, E. A. *The Soul and Spirit of Scripture within Origen's Exegesis*. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2005.

Donaldson, Amy M. "Explicit References to New Testament Variant Readings Among Greek and Latin Church Fathers." PhD thesis. University of Notre Dame, 2009.

Donker, G. J. *The text of the Apostolos in Athanasius of Alexandria*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Döpp, Siegmund, and Wilhelm Geerlings. *Dictionary of Early Christian Literature*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Co, 2000.

Doutreleau, L. "Que Savons-nous aujourd'hui des papyrus de Toura." *Recherches des Sciences Religieuses* 43, 1955.

Drobner, Hubertus R., and Siegfried S. Schatzmann. *The Fathers of the Church: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007.

Duplacy, Jean. "Citations patristiques et critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament." *Recherches de science religieuse* 47, 1959; 391-400.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Classification des états d'un texte, mathématiques et informatique : repères historiques et recherches méthodologiques" *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 5, 1975: 249-309.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Etudes de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 78. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Histoire des manuscrits et histoire du texte du Nouveau Testament." *New Testament Studies* 12, 1965: 124-39.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Le texte 'occidental' des épîtres catholiques." *New Testament Studies* 16, 1969: 397-99.

Ehrman, Bart D. *After the New Testament: A Reader in Early Christianity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Ehrman, Bart D. "A Problem of Textual Circularity," *NovT* 29, 1987: 377-88.

Ehrman, B. D. *Didymus the Blind and the text of the Gospels*. SBLNTGF 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Ehrman, Bart D., "Methodological Developments in the Analysis and Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence," *NovT* 29, 1987: 22-45.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament and Other Early Christian Writings: A Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Ehrman, Bart D. "Patristic Evidence and Textual Criticism" in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2006.

Ehrman, Bart D., "The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence," *JBL* 106, 1987: 465-86.

Ehrman, Bart D., Daniel B. Wallace, and Robert B. Stewart. *The Reliability of the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011.

Ehrman, B. D., Fee, G. D., & Holmes, M. W. *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Ehrman, Bart D., and Michael W. Holmes. *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. New Testament Tools, Studies, and Documents. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2014.

Esler, Philip Francis. *The Early Christian World*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Elliott, J. Keith. *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Textual Criticism the Application of Thoroughgoing Principles : Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*. Bibliotheca Phemeridum Theologicarum Iovaniensium 96. Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Survey of Manuscripts Used in Editions of the Greek New Testament*. NovTSup. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism." Pages 321-335 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: A volume in honor of Bruce M. Metzger*. Edited by B. Ehrman and M. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Elliott, W. J., "The Need for an Accurate and Comprehensive Collation of All Known Greek NT manuscripts," *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*. NovT Supp 44; ed. J. K. Elliot; Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Epp, Eldon J. "The Claremont Profile-Method for Grouping New Testament Minuscule Manuscripts" in *Studies in the History and Text for the New Testament*. Edited by B. Daniels and M. J. Suggs. Studies and Documents 29. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Continuing Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism?" *Harvard Theological Review* 73, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism: Moving from the Nineteenth Century to the Twenty-First Century, Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism* ed. David Alan Black. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_. "It's All About Variants: A Variant-Conscious Approach to New Testament Textual Criticism". *Harvard Theological Review*. 100, no. 3: 275-308.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism Collected Essays: 1962-2004*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. "New Testament Textual Criticism, Past, Present, and Future." *Harvard Theological Review* 82, 1989: 213-29.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission" from *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. ed. William L. Petersen; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.

Epp, Eldon Jay, and Gordon D. Fee. *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1993.

Farmer, David Hugh. *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Farstad, Arthur L, and Zane Hodges. *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*. Nashville: Nelson, 1982.

Fee, Gordon D. "Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt," *NTS* 28, 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. "P75, P66, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria" from *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, eds. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Textual Criticism of the New Testament," in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993. First published as *Biblical Criticism: Historical, Literary and Textual*, by R. K. Harrison, B. K. Waltke, D. Guthrie, and G. D. Fee. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations," *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993. First published as "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations," *Bib* 52 1971: 357-94.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Text of John in The Jerusalem Bible: A Critique of the Use of Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism" from *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90,1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism" in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*. Studies and Documents 46 Edited by B. Ehrman and M. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Fee, Gordon D. and Roderic Mullen. "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism: The State of the Question" in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* Second Edition, eds Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Ferguson, Everett, Michael P. McHugh, Frederick W. Norris, and David M. Scholer. *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1998.

Freeman, Charles. *A New History of Early Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Geer, Thomas C. Jr., "Analyzing and Categorizing New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Colwell Revisited," *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*. Studies and Documents 46 Edited by B. Ehrman and M. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Geerard, Maritius, ed. *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*. 4 vols. CChr. Turnhout: Brepols, 1974.

Gignac, F. T. "The Text of Acts in Chrysostom's Homilies" *Traditio* 26, 1970.

Grafton, Anthony, and Megan Hale Williams. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.

Grant, Robert. M. "The Citation of Patristic Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus." Pages 117-24 in *New Testament Manuscript Studies*. Edited by M. Parvis and A. Wikgren. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950

\_\_\_\_\_. *Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Primality in Early Christian Literature*. Louisville: Westminster/J. Knox Press, 1993.

Greenlee, J. Harold. *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Greer, R. A. *Origen*. New York, Paulist Press, 1979.

Greg, W. W. *The Calculus of Variants: An Essay on Textual Criticism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.

Gregg, J. A. F. "The Commentary of Origen upon the Epistle to the Ephesians." *JTS* 3, 1901-1902:233-244, 398-420, 554-576.

Griesbach, Johann Jacob. *Curae in historiam textus Graeci epistolarum Paulinarum*. Ienae: Fickelscherr, 1777.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Dissertatio Critica De Codicibus Quatuor Evangeliorum Origenianis*. Halle: Litteris Hendelianis, 1771.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Opuscula Academica*, ed. J. P. Gabler. vol. I, Hena, 1824.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Commentarius Criticus in Textum Graecum Novi Testamenti*, 2 vols; Jena: Goepferdt, 1798, 1811.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Symbolae Criticae Ad Supplendas Et Corrigendas Variarum N.T. Lectionum Collectiones*, 2 vols.; Halle, 1785, 1793.

Gueraud, Octave. "Note preliminaire sur les papyrus d'Origène decouverts Toura" *Revue d'Histoire des Religions* 131, 1946.



Haines-Eitzen, Kim. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Hammond Bammel, Caroline P. *Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung*. Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 10. Freiburg: Herder, 1985.

Hannah, Darrell. D. *The text of I Corinthians in the writings of Origen*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Hansen, William F. *Classical Mythology: A Guide to the Mythical World of the Greeks and Romans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hartin, P. J., J. H. Petzer, and Bruce Manning Metzger. *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991.

Harvey, Susan Ashbrook, and David G. Hunter. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Hautsch, Ernst. *Die Evangelienzitate des Origenes*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1909.

Hedley P. L., *The Egyptian Text of the Gospels and Acts*," CQR 118, 1934: 223.

Heine, Ronald. "Can the Catena Fragments of Origen's Commentary on John Be Trusted?" VC 40, 1986:118-34.

Helton, Stanley N. "The Text of Acts of the Apostles in the Writings of Origen." Ph.D. dissertation. New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014.

Herren, Michael W., and Shirley Ann Brown. *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*. London: University of London King's College, 1988.

Hilhorst, A. *The Apostolic Age in Patristic Thought*. Leiden, Brill, 2004

Hort, F. J. A. *Two Dissertations*. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1876.

Houghton, H. A. G. *Augustine's Text of John Patristic Citations and Latin Gospel Manuscripts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Recent Developments in New Testament Textual Criticism" Early Christianity 2.2, 2011: 245–68.

Housman, A. E., "The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism" in *Proceedings of the Classical Association*, August, 1921, xviii London, 1922. pp. 68-9. Repr. Housman, A. E., James Diggle, and F. R. D. Goodyear. *Classical Papers, 1882-1988*. Collected and Edited by James Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear, 1972.

Humphries, Mark. *Early Christianity*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Hurtado, Larry W. *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark*. SD 43. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.

Irigoien, Jean, "Stemmas bifides et etats des manuscrits," *Revue de philologie*, lxxx 1954, 211-17.

Jenkins, C. "Origen on I Corinthians." *JTS* 9 (1907-1908). 231-247, 353-372, 500-514.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Origen on I Corinthians. IV" *JTS* 10 (1908-1909) 29-51.

Junod, Eric, ed. and trans. *Origene: Philocalie 21-27. Sur le Libre Arbitre*. SC 226. Paris: Cerf, 1976

Jurgens, W. A. *The Faith of the Early Fathers*. Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1970.

Kaiser, Walter C. *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*. Chicago: Moody, 1985.

Kenney, E. J., *The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* Berkeley, 1974.

Kenyon, Frederic G. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Fasciculus I: General Introduction*. London: Emory Walker, 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. 2d ed. London: Macmillan, 1926. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1912.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Text of the Greek Bible*. 3d ed. rev. and augmented by A. W. Adams. London: Duckworth, 1975.

Kim, Kwang-Won. "Origen's Text of John in His On Prayer, Commentary on Matthew, and Against Celsus." *JTS* 1950.

Koch Dietrich-Alex. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 69. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986.

Lake, Kirsopp. Robert Blake, and Silva New, "The Caesarean Text of Mark." *HTR* 21,

1928.

Lössl, Josef. *The Early Church: Christianity in Late Antiquity*. London: T & T Clark, 2009.

Maas, Paul. *Textual Criticism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Marcos, Natalio Fernández. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Martens, P. W. *Origen and Scripture: The Contours of the Exegetical Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Martini, Carlo M. "Is There a Late Alexandrian Text of the Gospels?" *New Testament Studies*. 24, vol 3, 1978.

Maxwell, J. C., ed. *W. W. Greg: Collected Papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

McGuckin, John Anthony. *The Westminster Handbook to Patristic Theology*. Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

Metzger, B. M. and B. D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Metzger, Bruce M., Eldon Jay Epp, and Gordon D. Fee. *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis : Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

Metzger, Bruce M. *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Explicit References in the works of Origen to Variant readings in new Testament Manuscripts" in *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey*. Edited by J. N. Birdsall and R. W. Thompson. Freiburg: Herder, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Historical and Literary Studies; Pagan, Jewish, and Christian*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The New Testament Its Background Growth and Content*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1969, 3rd Edition, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," in *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic*. New Testament Tools and Studies X. Edited by B. M. Metzger. Leiden: Brill, 1980. rptd of *New Testament Studies*, xviii, 1971-1972, pp. 379-400.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Practice of Textual Criticism Among the Church Fathers", in *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic*. New Testament Tools and Studies X. Edited by B. M. Metzger. Leiden: Brill, 1980. rptd *Studia Patristica*, vol. xii, ed. by Elizabeth A. Livingston. *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Band 115. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. German Bible Society: Stuttgart, 1994.

Migne, J.-P. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Series Graeca Prior*. Paris, 1862

Mink, Gerd. "Problems of a Highly Contaminated Tradition, the New Testament: Stemmata of Variants as a Source of a Genealogy for Witnesses." in *Studies in Stemmatology II*, eds. Pieter van Reenan, August den Hollander, and Margot van Mulken. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004.

Mitchell, Margaret Mary, Frances M. Young, and K. Scott Bowie. *The Cambridge History of Christianity*. Vol. 1, Origins to Constantine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Mullen, Roderic. L. *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Manson, T. W. , "Paul's Letter to the Romans—and other," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 3. 1948. 224-40.

Mursurillo, Herbert. "Some Textual Problems in the Editing of the Greek Fathers," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, lxxviii, 1961.

Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: sa vie et son œuvre*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977.

Nestle, Eberhard, William Edie, and Allan Menzies. *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1901.

Nestle, Eberhard, Erwin Nestle, Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, and Holger Strutwolf. *Novum Testamentum Graece 28<sup>th</sup>* rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

Osburn, Carroll D. "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism." *Novum Testamentum*. 47.4, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.

Pack, Frank. "The Methodology of Origen as a Textual Critic in Arriving at the Text of the New Testament." Unpublished Dissertation. University of Southern California. 1948.

Parker, David C. *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Textual Scholarship and the Making of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Manuscripts, Texts, Theology Collected Papers 1977-2007*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Comparison Between the Text und Textwert and the Claremont Profile Method Analyses of Manuscripts in the Gospel of Luke," *NTS* 49, 2003: 108-38.

Parvis, Merrill M., and Allen P. Wikgren. *New Testament Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Pfeiffer, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Pieri, Francesco and Romano Penna and Origen. *Opere di Origene: Esegese paolina I testi frammentari*. Roma: Città nuova, 2009.

Puech, H.C. "Les nouveaux écrits d'Origène et de Didyme découverts à Toura." *Revue d'Histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 31, 1951.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. Westminster: Newman Press, 1950, Origen:II:37-101.

Racine, Jean-François. *The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta*. 8th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1965.

Ramsbotham, A. "The Commentary of Origen on the Epistle to the Romans." *JTS* 13, 1911-1912, 209-24, 357-368.

\_\_\_\_\_, A. "The Commentary of Origen on the Epistle to the Romans III." *JTS* 14, 1912-1913, 10-22.

Raquel, Sylvie Taconnet "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen," PhD thesis, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002.

Rehder, R., *Greek Textual Criticism, A Reader*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Reynolds, L. D. and D. W. G. Wilson. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Richard, Marcel. *Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues de manuscrits grecs*. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1958. J.-M. Olivier's revision

Richards, W. Larry. *The Classification of the Greek Manuscripts of the Johannine Epistles*. SBLDS 35. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Critique of a New Testament Text-critical Methodology—the Claremont Profile Method," *JBL* 96. 1977: 555-66.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Gregory 1175: Alexandrian or Byzantine in the Catholic Epistles?" *AUSS* 21, 1983: 155-68.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Test Passages or Profiles: A Comparison of Two Text-Critical Methods," *JBL* 115, 1996: 251-69.

Riddle, D. W. "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline," *ATHR* 18, 1936.

Robinson, J. Armitage. *The Philocalia of Origen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893.

Robinson, Charles E. *The Manuscripts of the Younger Romantics*. vol IX. ed. Donald H. Reiman. Garland Publishing, 1996.

Robinson, Maurice A., and William G. Pierpont, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform, 2005*. Southborough, MA: Chilton, 2005.

Schelkle, K.H. Paulus. *Lehrer der Väter: die altkirchliche Auslegung von Römer 1-11*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1956.

Scherer, Jean, ed. *Le Commentaire d'Origene sur Rom. III.5 - V.7*. Institut Francais d Archeologie Orientale. Bibliotheque d Etude 27. Cairo: Institut Francais d'Archeologie Orientale, 1957.

Scherer, Jean, ed. and trans. *Entretien d'Origene avec Heraclide*. SC 67. Paris: Cerf, 1960.

Schumacher, Rudolf. *Die beiden letzten Kapitel des Römerbriefes. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Geschichte und Erklärung*. 14:4. Munster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1929.

Schürer, E. *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*. New York: Schocken Books, 1961.

Shelly, Mary and Percy B. Shelly, *The Original Frankenstein*, ed. by Charles Robinson, New York: Vintage Book, 2009.

Skeat, T. C., & Elliott, J. K. *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1983.

Staab, Karl. "Neue Fragmente aus dem Kommentar des Origenes zum Römerbrief." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 18, 1929.

Stanley, Christopher. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTSMS 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Steinfeld, Matthew R. "Preliminary Investigations of Origen's Text of Galatians." ed. H.A.G. Houghton, *Early Readers, Scholars and Editors of the New Testament*. Texts and Studies 3.11. Piscataway NJ: Gorgias Press, 2014.

Stewart, Robert B., ed. *The Reliability of the New Testament: Bart D. Ehrman and Daniel B. Wallace in Dialogue*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011.

Stowers, S. K. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates*. London: Macmillan, 1930.

Suggs, M. Jack. "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text." *New Testament Studies* 4 1958.

Tanselle, G. Thomas. *A Rationale of Textual Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing*. Charlottesville: Published for the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia by the University Press of Virginia, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Bibliographical Analysis: A Historical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Thorpe, James Ernest. *The Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1963.

Thompson, E. M. *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Tischendorf, Constantin. *Novum Testamentum Graece: Edition Octava Critica Maior*. 3 vols. Vols. 1-2: text Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869-72; Vol. 3: *Prolegomena*, by C. R. Gregory. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Codex Claromontanus*. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1852.

Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux, ed. *The Greek New Testament. Edited from Ancient Authorities, with Their Various Readings in Full, and the Latin Version of Jerome*. London, Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1857-1879.

Trigg, Joseph Wilson. *Origen*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Trobisch, David. *The First Edition of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Turner, Eric G. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1971.



\_\_\_\_\_. *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Tzamalikos, P. *Origen: Philosophy of History & Eschatology*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

von Soden, Hermann. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt, hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911-1913.

Wachtel, Klaus, "Colwell Revisited: Grouping New Testament Manuscripts," in *The New Testament in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000*, ed. by Christian-B. Amphoux and J. Keith Elliot. Lausanne, 2003.

Wachtel, K., & Holmes, M. W. *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Wattel, Evert and Margot van Mulken, "Shock Waves in Text Traditions," in *Studies in Stemmatology*, eds. Pieter van Reenen and Margot van Mulken. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Revisiting the Corruption of the New Testament: Manuscript, Patristic, and Apocryphal Evidence*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2011. September 2012

West, M. L., *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*. Stuttgart, 1973.

Westcott, Brook Foss, and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction and Appendix*. 2 vols. Cambridge/London: Macmillan, 1882. 2d ed. 1896.

White, J. L. *Light from Ancient Letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Whittaker, John. "The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts, or the Art of Misquotation" in *Editing Greek and Latin Texts*. ed J. M. Grant. New York: AMS, 1989.

Wisse, Frederik. *The Profile Method for Classification and Evaluation of Manuscript Evidence as Applied to the Continuous Greek Text of the Gospel of Luke*. Studies and Documents 44. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von, and Hugh Lloyd-Jones. *History of Classical Scholarship*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

Yates, Francis. "The Art of Memory." London: Routledge and Kegan, 1966.

Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth. *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Zuntz, Günther. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

## APPENDIX 1 – ORIGEN'S CITATIONS OF ROMANS

### Chapter One

#### Romans 1:1

- (a) Παῦλος δοῦλος, φησί, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ [John.Com A 2:10:70:2]
- (b) δοῦλον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κλητὸν ἀπόστολον Παῦλον [Basil.Phil A 25:1:29]
- (c) τὸν δοῦλον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κλητὸν ἀπόστολον Παῦλον [Rom.Frag A 1:22]
- (d) Παῦλος δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ κλητὸς ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [Rom.Frag B 2:7]
- (e) Παῦλος δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ [Rom.Frag D 1:1:1]
- (f) Παῦλος δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ [John.Com B 19:5:31:2]

#### Romans 1:2

- (a) ὃ προεπηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις [John.Com A 2:10:70:4]
- (b) ὃ προεπηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις [John.Com B 19:5:31:3]
- (c) ὃ προεπηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις [Rom.Frag D, 1:3:1]

#### Romans 1:3

- (a) περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα [John.Com A 2:10:70:6]
- (b) Τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα [John.Com A 10:5:22:3]
- (c) ὁ δὲ γενόμενος ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα [Mart 35:15]
- (d) Τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα [Rom.Frag C 182:8]
- (e) περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα [Rom.Frag D 1:3:1]
- (f) περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, [John.Com B 19:5:31:4]
- (g) γενόμενος ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα [John.Com B 32:25:323:1]

#### Romans 1:4

- (a) τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν [John.Com A 2:10:70:6]
- (b) τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν [Rom.Frag D 1:4:1]
- (c) τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, [John.Com B 19:5:31:6]

Romans 1:5

- (a) δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ. [John.Com A 2:10:70:8]
- (b) δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ [Rom.Frag D 1:5:1]
- (c) δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ [John.Com B 19:5:31:7]
- (d) δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ. [John.Com A 2:10:71:4]

Romans 1:6

- (a) ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [Rom.Frag D 1:6:1]
- (b) ἐν οἷς ἐστὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [John.Com B 19:5:31:8]

Romans 1:7

- (a) πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἀγίοις· χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [Rom.Frag D 1:7:1]
- (b) πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἀγίοις· χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [John.Com B 19:5:31:9]

Romans 1:8

- (a) ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ [Matt.Com C 13:20:90]
- (b) Πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ [Rom.Frag D 1:8:2]

Romans 1:9

- (a) μάρτυς γάρ μου ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς ᾧ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνεῖαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι [Rom.Frag A, 2:n1]
- (b) μάρτυς γάρ μου ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, ᾧ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνεῖαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι [Rom.Frag D 1:9:1]

Romans 1:10

- (a) πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου δεόμενος εἶπας ἤδη ποτὲ εὐοδωθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς [Rom.Frag A 2:n2]
- (b) πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, δεόμενος εἶ πως ἤδη ποτὲ εὐοδωθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς [Rom.Frag D 1:10:1]
- (c) εὐοδωθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς [Rom.Frag B 7:2]

Romans 1:11

- (a) ἵνα τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν πνευματικὸν εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς [Rom.Frag A, 3:n1]
- (b) ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἵνα τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν πνευματικὸν εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς [Rom.Frag D, 1:12:1]

(c) ἵνα μεταδῶ ὑμῖν χάρισμα πνευματικὸν εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, φησὶν ὁ Ἀπόστολος [Ps.Sel, 12:1317:28]

Romans 1:12

(a) τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ συμπαρακληθῆναι ἐν ὑμῖν διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ [Rom.Frag A, 3:n2]

(b) τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ συμπαρακληθῆναι ἐν ὑμῖν διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ [Rom.Frag D, 1:12:2]

Romans 1:13

(a) οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν [Rom.Frag A, 4:n1]

(b) οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν [Rom.Frag D, 1:13:1]

(c) πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν [Rom.Frag B, 10:6]

Romans 1:14

(a) Ἑλλησι καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς καὶ ἀνοήτοις [Cels, 2:13:63]

(b) Ἑλλησι καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς καὶ ἀνοήτοις [Cels, 3:54:6]

(c) Ἑλλησι καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς καὶ ἀνοήτοις [Basil.Phil A, 18:24:7]

(d) Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί [Matt.Com C, 15:7:56]

(e) Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί. [1Cor.Com, 43:47]

(f) Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις· σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί [Rom.Frag A, 4:n3]

(g) Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί, [Rom.Frag B, 10:8]

(h) Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί. [Rom.Frag D, 1:14]

Romans 1:15

(a) οὕτως τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι. [Rom.Frag D, 1:15:1]

(b) Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις· σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί, οὕτως τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι. [Rom.Frag A, 4:n4]

Romans 1:16

(a) οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι. [Rom.Frag D, 1:16:1]

(b) Οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν

παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι [Ps.Sel, 12:1596:54]

Romans 1:17

- (a) Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται· ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. [Rom.Frag D, 1:17:1]
- (b) Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. [Ps.Frag, Psalm 97:2:7]
- (c) Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν [Ps.Frag, Psalm 118:40:14]
- (d) Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. [Ps.Sel, 12:1557:1]

Romans 1:18

- (a) Ἀποκαλύπτεται ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων [Cels, 6:3:13]
- (b) Ἀποκαλύπτεται ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων [Basil.Phil A, 15:5:16]
- (c) ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων [Rom.Frag A, 5:n1]
- (d) Ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων· [Rom.Frag D, 1:18:1]

Romans 1:19

- (a) Ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφάνερωσεν [Cels, 3:47:24]
- (b) Ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐφάνερωσεν [Cels, 4:30:60]
- (c) διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφάνερωσε [Cels, 6:3:15]
- (d) διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς, ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφάνερωσε [Basil.Phil A, 15:5:18]
- (e) διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐφάνερωσεν [Rom.Frag D, 1:19:1]
- (f) Ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφάνερωσεν [Basil.Phil A, 18:18:25]

Romans 1:20

- (a) Τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἢ τε αἰδῖος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους [Cels, 3:47:26]
- (b) Τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἢ τε αἰδῖος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους [Cels, 6:3:17]
- (c) ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοουμένων [Cels, 6:20:23]
- (d) Τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται [Cels, 6:59:22]
- (e) Τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται·

[Cels, 7:37:18]

(f) Τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου, τουτέστι τὰ νοητά, τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα ἐν τῷ νοεῖσθαι καθορᾶται. [Cels, 7:46:36]

(g) τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶσθαι. [Basil.Phil A, 1:30:12]

(h) τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἢ τε αἰδῖος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους [Basil.Phil A, 15:5:20]

(i) Τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἢ τε αἰδῖος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους [Basil.Phil A, 18:18:26]

(j) τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶσθαι. [Lev.Hom, 333:26]

(k) τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ (τοῦ θεοῦ) ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορῶσι [Matt.Com B 11:18:57]

(l) τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἢ τε αἰδῖος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους [Rom.Frag D 1:20:1]

Romans 1:21

(a) ὅτι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν [Cels, 3:47:22]

(b) διότι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν. [Cels, 3:47:29]

(c) ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν ἀλλ' ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν [Cels, 4:30:62]

(d) διότι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν, ἀλλ' ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία. [Cels, 6:3:19]

(e) γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ εὐχαρίστησαν, ἀλλ' ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη μετὰ τὸ τηλικούτο φῶς τῆς περὶ ὧν ἐφάνέρωσεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς γνώσεως ἢ ἐπειγομένη ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία [Cels, 7:47:5]

(f) διότι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν, ἀλλ' ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία [Basil.Phil A, 15:5:23]

(g) ὅτι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν. [Basil.Phil A, 18:18:21]

(h) διότι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν. [Basil.Phil A, 18:18:29]

(i) διότι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν, ἀλλ' ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη [Rom.Frag D, 1:21:1]

Romans 1:22

(a) φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν [Cels, 3:73:24]

(b) φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν [Cels, 4:30:63]

- (c) Φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν [Cels, 6:3:22]
- (d) φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ [Cels, 7:47:8]
- (e) φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ [Cels, 7:49:15]
- (f) φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν [Euches, 29:12:2]
- (g) φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν [Basil.Phil A, 15:5:25]
- (h) Φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν [Basil.Phil A, 18:25:16]
- (i) φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν [Rom.Frag D, 1:22:1]

#### Romans 1:23

- (a) καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἔρπετῶν. [Cels, 3:73:24]
- (b) καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἔρπετῶν. [Cels, 4:30:64]
- (c) καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἔρπετῶν [Cels, 6:3:23]
- (d) ἥλλάξαντο τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἔρπετῶν [Cels 7:47:11]
- (e) καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἔρπετῶν. [Euches, 29:12:3]
- (f) τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀφθάρτου ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἔρπετῶν, διὰ τοῦ ἐγκαταλείπεσθαι παραδιδόμενοι [Euches, 29:15:2]
- (g) καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἔρπετῶν [Basil.Phil A, 15:5:26]
- (h) καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἔρπετῶν. [Basil.Phil A, 18:25:17]
- (i) καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἔρπετῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 1:23:1]
- (j) Καὶ ἥλλαξαν, φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος, τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ πετεινῶν, καὶ τετραπόδων, καὶ ἔρπετῶν.[Ps.Sel, 12:1565:12]

#### Romans 1:24

- (a) ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν [Cels, 5:32:14]
- (b) ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν [Cels, 7:47:15]
- (c) διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς [Euches, 29:12:5]
- (d) ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν“ τοὺς προημαρτηκότας τι εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, [Euches, 29:12:19]
- (e) ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα [Euches, 29:15:4]
- (f) ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις“ τῆς καρδίας ἑαυτοῦ εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν [Euches, 29:16:16]
- (g) ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν [Basil.Phil A, 22:11:3]
- (h) Διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς



ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς [Rom.Frag D, 1:24:1]

Romans 1:25

- (a) τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει, καὶ ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα. [Cels, 7:47:19]
- (b) οἵτινες μετέλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει, καὶ ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα. [Rom.Frag D, 1:25:1]
- (c) οἵτινες μετέλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει, καὶ ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα [Rom.Frag D, 1:25:2]

Romans 1:26

- (a) διὰ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας· αἶ τε γὰρ θήλειαι αὐτῶν μετέλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν· [Euches, 29:12:7]
- (b) διὰ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας· αἶ τε γὰρ θήλειαι αὐτῶν μετέλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν [Rom.Frag D, 1:26:2]
- (c) παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας. [Ps.Sel, 12:1544:50]

Romans 1:27

- (a) ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ ἄρσενες ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας ἐξεκαύθησαν [Euches, 29:12:9]
- (b) ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρρενες ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας ἐξεκαύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἄρρενες ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρρεσιν τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν [Rom.Frag D, 1:27:1]

Romans 1:28

- (a) καὶ καθὼς οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα. [Euches, 29:12:11]
- (b) Καὶ καθὼς οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα [Rom.Frag D, 1:28:1]

Romans 1:29

- (a) πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ πονηρίᾳ πλεονεξίᾳ κακίᾳ, μεστοὺς φθόνου φόνου ἔριδος δόλου κακοηθείας, ψιθυριστάς [Rom.Frag D, 1:29:1]

Romans 1:30

- (a) καταλάλους, θεοοσυγεῖς, ὑβριστάς, ὑπερηφάνους, ἀλαζόνας, ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς [Rom.Frag D, 1:30:1]

Romans 1:31

- (a) ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυνθέτους, ἀστόργους, ἀνελεήμονας· [Rom.Frag D, 1:31-32 :1]

Romans 1:32

- (a) οἵτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες, ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσίν, οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσιν τοῖς

πράσσουσιν. [Rom.Frag D, 1:32:2]

## Chapter Two

### Romans 2:1

(a) Διὸ ἀναπολόγητος εἶ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσεις ὁ κρίνων. [Rom.Frag D, 2:1:1]

(b) Ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράττεις ὁ κρίνων. [Eze.Frag, 13:796:18]

### Romans 2:2

(a) οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐπὶ τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας. [Rom.Frag D, 2:3:2]

### Romans 2:3

(a) λογίζη δὲ τοῦτο, ὦ ἄνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας καὶ ποιῶν αὐτά, ὅτι σὺ ἐκφεύξῃ τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ; [Rom.Frag D, 2:3:1]

### Romans 2:4

(a) Ἦ τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; [Cels, 4:72:19]

(b) ἢ τοῦ πλοῦτου γὰρ φησι τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; [Princ, 3:1:6:34]

(c) ἢ τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; [Princ, 3:1:11:22]

(d) τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονήσαντες [Jer.Frag B, 52:4]

(e) Ἦ τοῦ πλοῦτου γὰρ, φησὶ, τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; [Basil.Phil A, 21:5:38]

(f) Ἦ τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; [Basil.Phil A, 21:10:25]

(g) Ἦ τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; [Basil.Phil A, 27:10:13]

(h) τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖν [Jer.Hom B, 20:4:24]

(i) τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας [Matt.Com C, 15:11:62]

(j) ἢ τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; [Rom.Frag D, 2:4:1]

(k) Ἡ τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς; καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Ps.Frag, 36:21:19]

(l) Ἡ τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; [Ex.Com, 12:277:45]

Romans 2:5

(a) Κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ. [Cels, 4:72:22]

(b) κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ [Princ, 3:1:6:36]

(c) κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ. [Princ, 3:1:11:22]

(d) Κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς. [John.Frag, 51:8]

(e) ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς. [Jer.Frag B, 52:5]

(f) κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ, [Basil.Phil A, 21:5:40]

(g) κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 21:10:27]

(h) κατὰ τὴν σκληρότητα καὶ ἀμετανόητον αὐτοῦ καρδίαν θησαυρίζοντος ἑαυτῷ ὀργὴν [Basil.Phil A, 21:10:32]

(i) ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ [Jer.Hom B, 20:4:24]

(j) σκληρότητα καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς ὀργὴν [Matt.Com C, 15:11:62]

(k) κατὰ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμεταμέλητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς [Rom.Frag A, 5:7]

(l) κατὰ τὴν σκληρότητά σου θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς, [Rom.Frag B, 13:9]

(m) κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ, [Rom.Frag D, 2:5:1]

(n) δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου, καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς, καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως, καὶ δικαιοσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ, [Ex.Com, 12:277:47]

(o) Κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητόν σου καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρισίας Θεοῦ.[Prov.Exp, 17:193:1]

Romans 2:6 - There is no distinction between OT and NT but the citations below are in chains which prove they are Romans and not the OT verse which is quoted

- (a) ὃς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· [Princ, 3:1:6:39]
- (b) ὃς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· [Basil.Phil A, 21:5:40]
- (c) ὃς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· [Rom.Frag D, 2:5:1]
- (d) ὃς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. [Ex.Com, 12:277:47]

Romans 2:7

- (a) τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι, ζωὴν αἰώνιον [Princ, 3:1:6:39]
- (b) τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι ζωὴν αἰώνιον· [Basil.Phil A, 21:5:44]
- (c) τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι ζωὴν αἰώνιον· [Rom.Frag A, 6:n1]
- (d) τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι ζωὴν αἰώνιον· [Rom.Frag D, 2:7:2]

Romans 2:8

- (a) τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι μὲν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς, [Princ, 3:1:6:39]
- (b) τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς [Basil.Phil A, 21:5:4]
- (c) τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι μὲν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργὴ [[Rom.Frag A, 6:n2]
- (d) τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς. [Rom.Frag D, 2:8:1]

Romans 2:9

- (a) θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνος· [Princ, 3:1:6:41]
- (b) θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνος· [Basil.Phil A, 21:5:47]
- (c) θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνος. [Rom.Frag A, 6:n3]
- (d) θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνος· [Rom.Frag D, 2:8:1]

Romans 2:10

- (a) δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι [Princ, 3:1:6:43]
- (b) δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι. [Basil.Phil A, 21:5:49]
- (c) δόξα καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι· [Rom.Frag A, 7:n1]

(d) δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι. [Rom.Frag D, 2:10:1]

#### Romans 2:11

(a) οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag A, 7:n1]

(b) οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag D, 2:10:1]

#### Romans 2:12

(a) ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἤμαρτον ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἤμαρτον διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται· [Rom.Frag A, 8:n1]

(b) Ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἤμαρτον, ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἤμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται· [Rom.Frag D, 2:12:2]

(c) Ὅσοι γὰρ ἐν νόμῳ ἤμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται, [Ps.Frag, 9:9:8]

#### Romans 2:13

(a) οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ τοῦ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται. [Rom.Frag A, 8:n1]

(b) οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται. [Rom.Frag D, 2:13:1]

(c) Οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ τῶν δικαιωμάτων τοῦ Θεοῦ δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ αὐτῶν, [Ps.Sel, 12:1592:6]

(d) Οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ τοῦ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται. [Prov.Exp, 17:220:45]

#### Romans 2:14

(a) Ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσὶ νόμος· [Basil.Phil A, 9:2:16]

(b) ὅταν δὲ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οἱ τοιοῦτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσὶ νόμος· [Matt.Com C, 17:16:31]

(c) ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῆ καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Rom.Frag A, 10:7]

(d) ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσὶ νόμος· [Rom.Frag A, 36a:37]

(e) ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν [Rom.Frag C, 136:3]

(f) ὅταν δὲ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα [Rom.Frag C, 208:8]

(g) ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσὶ νόμος· [Rom.Frag D, 2:14:1]

(h) Ὅταν ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, [Gen.Sel, 12:105:31]

(i) ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα, καὶ φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶντα· [Gen.Sel, 12:121:29]

#### Romans 2:15

(a) οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως. [Basil.Phil A, 9:2:17]

(b) μεταξύ ἀλλήλων τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων [Jer.Hom B, 16:10:33]

(c) οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως [Matt.Com C, 17:16:34]

(d) συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως καὶ μεταξύ ἀλλήλων τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων [Rom.Frag A, 9:n1]

(e) οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως. [Rom.Frag A, 36a:38]

(f) οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως καὶ μεταξύ ἀλλήλων τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων [Rom.Frag D, 2:15:1]

#### Romans 2:16

(a) ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Rom.Frag A, 9:n2]

(b) ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 2:16:1]

#### Romans 2:17

(a) Ἴδε σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάζη καὶ ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ καὶ καυχᾶσαι ἐν θεῷ [Rom.Frag D, 2:17:2]

#### Romans 2:18

(a) καὶ γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα καὶ δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα κατηχουμενος ἐκ τοῦ νομοῦ [Rom.Frag D, 2:18:1]

#### Romans 2:19

(a) πέποιθάς τε σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει [Rom.Frag D, 2:19:1]

#### Romans 2:20

(a) παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων, διδάσκαλον νηπίων, ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. [Rom.Frag D, 2:20:1]

#### Romans 2:21

(a) ὁ οὖν διδάσκων ἕτερον σεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσκεις; ὁ κηρύσσων μὴ κλέπτειν κλέπτεις; [Rom.Frag A, 10:n1]

(b) ὁ οὖν διδάσκων ἕτερον σεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσκεις; ὁ κηρύσσων μὴ κλέπτειν κλέπτεις; [Rom.Frag D, 2:21:1]

Romans 2:22

(a) ὁ λέγων μὴ μοιχεύειν μοιχεύεις; ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἰδῶλα ἱεροσυλεῖς;  
[Rom.Frag A, 10:n2]

(b) ὁ λέγων μὴ μοιχεύειν μοιχεύεις; ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἰδῶλα ἱεροσυλεῖς;  
[Rom.Frag D, 2:22:1]

Romans 2:23

(a) Ὁς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις  
[Cels, 8:10:3]

(b) διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου ἀτιμάζει [Cels, 8:56:29]

(c) Διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις. [Jer.Hom A, 5:8:30]

(d) διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις [Jer.Hom B, 12:11:12]

(e) διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζειν [Matt.Com B, 10:18:38]

(f) ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις;  
[Rom.Frag A, 10:n3]

(g) ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις;  
[Rom.Frag D, 2:23:1]

Romans 2:24 -- There is no distinction but the citations below are in chains which prove they are Romans and not the OT verse which is quoted

(a) τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμῶν βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι καθὼς γέγραπται. [Rom.Frag A, 10:n3]

(b) τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καθὼς γέγραπται. [Rom.Frag D, 2:24:1]

Romans 2:25

(a) περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ, ἐὰν νόμον πράσσης· ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ᾦς, ἡ περιτομὴ σου ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν. [Rom.Frag A, 10:n5]

(b) περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἐὰν νόμον πράσσης· ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ᾦς, ἡ περιτομὴ σου ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν. [Rom.Frag D, 2:25:1]

Romans 2:26

(a) ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσση, οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται; [Rom.Frag D, 2:26:1]

Romans 2:27

(a) καὶ κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελούσα σὲ τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου. [Rom.Frag D, 2:27:1]

Romans 2:28

(a) ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν, οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή· [Princ, 4:3:6:15]

(b) ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν, οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή· [Basil.Phil A, 1:22:18]

(c) ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν, οὐδὲ ἢ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή.  
[Jer.Hom B, 12:13:12]

(d) οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν, οὐδὲ ἢ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή· [Rom.Frag D, 2:28:1]

#### Romans 2:29

(a) ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γράμματι. [Princ, 4:3:6:16]

(b) ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γράμματι. [Basil.Phil A, 1:22:19]

(c) ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι, οὐ ὁ ἔπαινος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 2:29:1]

#### Chapter Three

##### Romans 3:1

(a) τί οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου, ἢ τίς ἢ ὠφέλεια τῆς περιτομῆς; [Rom.Frag A, 11:n1]

(b) Τί οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου, ἢ τίς ἢ ὠφέλεια τῆς περιτομῆς; [Rom.Frag D, 3:2:1]

##### Romans 3:2

(a) πολὺ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον. πρῶτοι γὰρ ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ.  
[Rom.Frag D, 3:3:1]

(b) πρῶτοι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, [Ps.Frag, 118:98,99:9]

(c) πρῶτον γὰρ ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων [Ps.Frag, 118:161,162:12]

(e) πρῶται ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ. [Ps.Sel, 12:1608:8]

##### Romans 3:3

(a) τί γὰρ εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες; μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ καταργήσει;  
[Rom.Frag A, 11:n3]

(b) τί γάρ; εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες, μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πίστιν καταργήσει; [Rom.Frag D, 3:3:1]

##### Romans 3:4

(a) γινέσθω δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἀληθῆς πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης· καθὼς γέγραπται· ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε. [Rom.Frag A, 12:n1]

(b) ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθῆς ἐστιν, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης [Rom.Frag C, 164:3]

(c) μὴ γένοιτο· γινέσθω δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἀληθῆς, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης, καθὼς γέγραπται· ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε.  
[Rom.Frag D, 3:4:1]



Romans 3:5

- (a) Εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην συνίστησιν. [Rom.Frag C, 124:2]
- (b) Μὴ ἄδικος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω. [Rom.Frag C, 126:10]
- (c) εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην συνίστησιν, τί ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω. [Rom.Frag D, 3:5:1]

Romans 3:6

- (a) μὴ γένοιτο· ἐπεὶ πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον; [Rom.Frag D, 3:6-7:1]

Romans 3:7

- (a) ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ ψεύσματι <ἐπερίσσευσεν> [Rom.Frag C 130:1]
- (b) Ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι ἐπερίσσευσεν. [Rom.Frag C, 130:8]
- (c) ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, τί ἔτι κἀγὼ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; [Rom.Frag D, 3:7:2]

Romans 3:8

- (a) καὶ μὴ καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα καὶ καθὼς φασιν ἡμᾶς τινες λέγειν ὅτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακὰ ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθὰ; ὧν τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστιν. [Rom.Frag D, 3:8:1]

Romans 3:9

- (a) τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως· προητιασάμεθα γὰρ Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας πάντας ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι [Rom.Frag A, 13:n1]
- (b) Τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως· προητιασάμεθα γὰρ Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν πάντας εἶναι, [Rom.Frag D, 3:9:1]

Romans 3:10 -- OT citation but will only list those citations of Origen in chains with other Romans text.

- (a) καθὼς γέγραπται· οὐκ ἐστὶν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n2]
- (b) Καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς [Rom.Frag C, 130:14]
- (c) καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς [Rom.Frag D, 3:10:1]

Romans 3:11

- (a) οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων· οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n3]
- (b) Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν Θεὸν [Rom.Frag C, 132:4]
- (c) οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν· [Rom.Frag D, 3:11:1]

Romans 3:12

- (a) πάντες ἐξέκλιναν ἅμα ἠχρειώθησαν· οὐκ ἔστιν ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n3]
- (b) Οὐκ ἔστι ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός [Rom.Frag C, 132:15]
- (c) πάντες ἐξέκλιναν, ἅμα ἠχρειώθησαν· οὐκ ἔστι ποιῶν χρηστότητα ἕως ἑνός.

[Rom.Frag D, 3:12:1]

Romans 3:13

(a) τάφος ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν· ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιοῦσαν· ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n4]

(b) τάφος ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιοῦσαν, ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν· [Rom.Frag D, 3:13:1]

Romans 3:14

(a) ὦν τὸ στόμα ἀρᾶς καὶ πικρίας γέμει· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n6]

(b) ὦν τὸ στόμα ἀρᾶς καὶ πικρίας γέμει [Rom.Frag C, 132:20]

(c) ὦν τὸ στόμα ἀρᾶς καὶ πικρίας γέμει· [Rom.Frag D, 3:14:1]

Romans 3:15

(a) ὀξεῖς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n6]

(b) ὀξεῖς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα [Rom.Frag C, 134:2]

(c) ὀξεῖς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα, [Rom.Frag D, 3:15:1]

Romans 3:16

(a) σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν [Rom.Frag A, 13:n7]

(b) Σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν [Rom.Frag C, 134:5]

(c) σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν [Rom.Frag D, 3:16:1]

Romans 3:17

(a) καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n7]

(b) Ὀδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, [Rom.Frag C, 134:7]

(c) καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν. [Rom.Frag D, 3:17:1]

Romans 3:18

(a) οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 13:n8]

(b) Οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος Θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. [Rom.Frag C, 134:8]

(c) οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 3:18:1]

Romans 3:19

(a) οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῆ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ· [Rom.Frag A, 14:n1]

(b) Ἴνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῆ. [Rom.Frag C, 144:4]

(c) οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῆ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ· [Rom.Frag D, 3:19:1]

Romans 3:20

(a) διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας [Rom.Frag A 14:n2]

(b) διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· διὰ γὰρ

νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἀμαρτίας. [Rom.Frag D, 3:20:1]

Romans 3:21

(a) Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται. [Basil.Phil A, 9:3:5]

(b) νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 15:n1]

(c) νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, καὶ ἐν τῷ μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 36a:60]

(d) χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται. [Rom.Frag C, 150:4]

(e) Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται· καὶ ἐν τῷ μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. [Rom.Frag C, 152:6]

(f) Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, [Rom.Frag D, 3:21:1]

Romans 3:22

(a) δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. [Rom.Frag A, 15:n2]

(b) δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ διαστολή. [Rom.Frag D, 3:22:1]

Romans 3:23

(a) πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ [Rom.Frag A, 16:n1]

(b) πάντες ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, [Rom.Frag C, 168:5]

(c) πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, [Rom.Frag D, 3:23:1]

(d) Πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, [John.Com B, 20:36:335:7]

Romans 3:24

(a) δικαιοῦμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι· διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [Rom.Frag A, 16:n2]

(b) δικαιοῦμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι [Rom.Frag C, 168:6]

(c) δικαιοῦμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 3:24:1]

Romans 3:25

(a) Ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, [John.Com A, 1:22:139:4]

(b) Ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αἵματι [John.Com A, 1:33:240:11]

(c) Ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως· [John.Com A, 1:33:240:11]

(d) προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι [Matt.Com C, 12:21:15]

(e) ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ αἵματι, ἱλαστήριον δὲ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν γεγονότων ἀμαρτημάτων [Rom.Frag C, 162:5]

(f) ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς ἔνδειξιν

τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἀμαρτημάτων  
[Rom.Frag D, 3:25:1]

Romans 3:26

(a) ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιούντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 3:26:2]

Romans 3:27

(a) ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις; ἐξεκλείσθη· διὰ ποίου νόμου; τῶν ἔργων; οὐχί· ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως. [Rom.Frag A, 17:n1]

(b) Ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις; ἐξεκλείσθη· διὰ ποίου νόμου; τῶν ἔργων; οὐχί, ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως. [Rom.Frag D, 3:27:1]

Romans 3:28

(a) λογιζόμεθα οὖν πίστει δικαιούσθαι ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. [Rom.Frag A, 18:n1]

(b) λογιζόμεθα δικαιούσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. [Rom.Frag C, 164:16]

(c) λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιούσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. [Rom.Frag D, 3:28:1]

Romans 3:29

(a) γὰρ Ἰουδαίων μόνον ὁ θεὸς ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐθνῶν. [Matt.Com B, 11:18:63]

(b) ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον; οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναί, καὶ ἐθνῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 19:n1]

(c) ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον; οὐχὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν; [Rom.Frag C, 168:8]

(d) ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον; οὐχὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν, [Rom.Frag D, 3:29:1]

Romans 3:30

(a) εἴπερ εἷς θεός, ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. [John.Com A, 13:17:108:2]

(b) ἐπεὶ εἷς ὁ θεὸς ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. [Rom.Frag A, 19:n1]

(c) ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον; οὐχὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν, εἴπερ εἷς ὁ θεὸς ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. [Rom.Frag D, 3:30:1]

Romans 3:31

(a) Οὐ γὰρ καταργούμεν νόμον διὰ τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλὰ ιστάνομεν νόμον δι' αὐτῆς. [John.Com A, 13:17:108:4]

(b) νόμον οὖν καταργούμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ νόμον ιστάνομεν. [Rom.Frag A, 20:n1]

(c) καταργεῖται ὁ νόμος; Ἀλλὰ νῦν νόμον ἐλάβομεν τὸν Μωσέως διὰ τῆς πίστεως

οὐ καταργούμενον· [Rom.Frag C, 174:8]

(d) Νόμον οὖν καταργούμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; Μὴ γένοιτο. [Rom.Frag C, 178:4]

(e) νόμον οὖν καταργούμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ νόμον ἴσταμεν.  
[Rom.Frag D, 3:31:1]

#### Chapter Four

##### Romans 4:1

(a) Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν εὐρηκέναι Ἀβραὰμ τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα;

[Rom.Frag C, 178:7]

##### Romans 4:2

(a) εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἔχει καύχημα· ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς θεόν.

[Rom.Frag D, 4:2:1]

##### Romans 4:3 The only citations used here are from chains as it is an OT citation

(a) τί γὰρ ἡ γραφή λέγει; ἐπίστευσε δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. [Rom.Frag A, 21:n2]

(b) τί γὰρ ἡ γραφή λέγει; ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. [Rom.Frag D, 4:3:1]

##### Romans 4:4

(a) τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα·

[Rom.Frag A, 22:n1]

(b) οὐ κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα. [Rom.Frag A, 22:6]

(c) τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα·

[Rom.Frag D, 4:4:1]

##### Romans 4:5

(a) τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιούντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. [Rom.Frag A, 22:n2]

(b) τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιούντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, [Rom.Frag D, 4:5:2]

##### Romans 4:6

(a) καθάπερ καὶ Δαυεὶδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων· [Rom.Frag A, 23:n1]

(b) καθάπερ καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων· [Rom.Frag D, 4:6:1]

##### Romans 4:7

(a) μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι, καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι·

[Rom.Frag A, 23:n2]

(b) μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι·

[Rom.Frag D, 4:7:1]

Romans 4:8

- (a) μακάριος ἀνὴρ ᾧ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν· [Rom.Frag A, 23:n1]  
(b) μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὗ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν· [Rom.Frag D, 4:6:1]

Romans 4:9

- (a) ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος, ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν; λέγομεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην· [Rom.Frag A, 23:n4]  
(b) ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ Δαυίδ μακαρισμὸς οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν [Rom.Frag C, 188:8]  
(c) ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν; [Rom.Frag D, 4:9:1]

Romans 4:10

- (a) πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; ἐν περιτομῇ ὄντι, ἢ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ; οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ ἀλλ' ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ· [Rom.Frag A, 24:n2]  
(b) Πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; [Rom.Frag C, 188:16]  
(c) πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; ἐν περιτομῇ ὄντι ἢ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ; οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ ἀλλ' ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ· [Rom.Frag D, 4:10:1]

Romans 4:11

- (a) καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς, σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν δικαιοσύνην· [Rom.Frag A, 24:n2]  
(b) καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομὴν σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι αὐτοῖς δικαιοσύνην [Rom.Frag D, 4:10:1]

Romans 4:12

- (a) καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσι τοῖς ἴχνεσι τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ. [Rom.Frag A, 24:n2]  
(b) καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσι τοῖς ἴχνεσι τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ. [Rom.Frag D, 4:12:2]

Romans 4:13

- (a) οὐ διὰ νόμου ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμ[ο]ν [αὐ]τ[ὸ]ν εἶναι κόσμου ἀλλὰ διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως. [Rom.Frag C, 196:2]  
(b) Οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἢ ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι κόσμου, ἀλλὰ διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως. [Rom.Frag D, 4:13:1]

Romans 4:14

- (a) εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι κεκένωται ἢ πίστις [Rom.Frag A, 25:16]
- (b) Εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, κεκένωται ἢ πίστις [Rom.Frag C, 202:12]
- (c) εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, κεκένωται ἢ πίστις καὶ κατήργηται ἡ ἐπαγγελία· [Rom.Frag D, 4:15:1]

Romans 4:15

- (a) ὁ γὰρ νόμος ὀργὴν κατεργάζεται· οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι νόμος οὐδὲ παράβασις. [Rom.Frag A, 25:n1]
- (b) ὁ γὰρ νόμος ὀργὴν κατεργάζεται· οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις. [Rom.Frag D, 4:15:1]

Romans 4:16

- (a) διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι· οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὅς ἐστι πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν· [Rom.Frag A, 25:n2]
- (b) ἐκ πίστεως καὶ τῷ κατὰ χάριν τὸ βεβαίαν [Rom.Frag C, 206:22]
- (c) Διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως, ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι, οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὅς ἐστι πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν [Rom.Frag D, 4:16:1]

Romans 4:17

- (a) καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε· κατέναντι οὐ ἐπίστευσε θεοῦ τοῦ ζωοποιούντος τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. [Rom.Frag A, 25:n5]
- (b) καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε, κατέναντι οὐ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ τοῦ ζωοποιούντος τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα· [Rom.Frag D, 4:17:2]

Romans 4:18

- (a) ὅς παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου· [Rom.Frag A, 26:n1]
- (b) παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν, [Rom.Frag C, 212:7]
- (c) ὅς παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον· οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου· [Rom.Frag D, 4:18:1]

Romans 4:19

- (a) καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἤδη νεκρωμένον, ἑκατονταετῆς που ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μητρὸς Σάρρας· [Rom.Frag A, 26:n3]
- (b) καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίστει κατενόησεν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἤδη νεκρωμένον, ἑκατονταετῆς που ὑπάρχων, [Rom.Frag C, 216:21]
- (c) καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα νεκρωμένον, ἑκατονταετῆς που ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μητρὸς Σάρρας· [Rom.Frag D,

4:19:1]

Romans 4:20

- (a) εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἀλλ' ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ [Rom.Frag A, 26:n4]  
(b) εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ [Rom.Frag D, 4:21:1]

Romans 4:21

- (a) καὶ πληροφορηθεὶς ὅτι ὁ ἐπήγγελται δυνατός ἐστι καὶ ποιῆσαι· [Rom.Frag A, 26:n6]  
(b) καὶ πληροφορηθεὶς ὅτι ὁ ἐπήγγελται δυνατός ἐστι καὶ ποιῆσαι. [Rom.Frag D, 4:22:1]

Romans 4:22

- (a) διὸ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. [Rom.Frag A, 26:n7]  
(b) διὸ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. [Rom.Frag D, 4:23:1]

Romans 4:23

- (a) οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι' αὐτὸν μόνον ὅτι ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, [Rom.Frag A, 27:n1]  
(b) Οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ διὰ αὐτὸν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς [Rom.Frag C, 216:24]  
(c) Οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι' αὐτὸν μόνον ὅτι ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, [Rom.Frag D, 4:23:1]

Romans 4:24

- (a) ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς οἷς μέλλει λογίζεσθαι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν· [Rom.Frag A, 27:n2]  
(b) πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν [Rom.Frag C, 220:16]  
(c) ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς, οἷς μέλλει λογίζεσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, [Rom.Frag D, 4:24:1]

Romans 4:25

- (a) ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 27:n3]  
(b) ἠγέρθη γὰρ διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν [Rom.Frag C, 222:14]  
(c) ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 4:25:1]

Chapter Five

Romans 5:1

- (a) Δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, [Rom.Frag D, 5:1:1]  
(b) καὶ εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν· [Rom.Frag C, 224:1]



Romans 5:2

(a) δι' οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν τῇ πίστει εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ ἐστήκαμεν, καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 5:2:1]

Romans 5:3

(a) ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, [John.Com A, 1:26:176:2]

(b) ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται [Mart, 41:10]

(c) καυχώμενος ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι καὶ εἰδὼς ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται καὶ ὑπομένων. [Basil.Phil A, 25:4:36]

(d) καυχώμενος ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι καὶ εἰδὼς ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται [Rom.Frag A, 1:106]

(e) Οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται [Rom.Frag C, 228:6]

(f) οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται [Rom.Frag D, 5:3:2]

(g) Οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν [Ps.Frag, 22:5:18]

(h) Εἰ ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται [Ps.Frag, 137:7:4]

(i) Οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν [Ps.Sel, 12:1261:47]

(j) θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται. [Ps.Sel, 12:1520:20]

(k) Ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται [Ps.Sel, 12:1613:2]

Romans 5:4

(a) ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα [John.Com A, 1:26:176:2]

(b) ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα· ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ κατασχύνει [Mart, 41:10]

(c) οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται [Rom.Frag D, 5:3:2]

(d) ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα [Ps.Frag, 137:7:4]

(e) ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν· ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα. [Ps.Sel, 12:1520:20]

(f) ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα [Ps.Sel, 12:1613:2]

Romans 5:5

(a) ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν [Rom.Frag A, 28:n1]

(b) ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ κατασχύνει, ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν [Rom.Frag D, 5:5:1]

Romans 5:6

(a) ἔτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν. [Rom.Frag A, 28:n2]

(b) ἔτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν. [Rom.Frag D, 5:5:1]

Romans 5:7

(a) μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται· ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν· [Rom.Frag A, 28:n3]

Romans 5:8

(a) Συνίστησι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἔτι ἀμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανε [Cels, 4:28:28]

(b) ἔτι ὄντων ἀμαρτωλῶν ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν. [Jer.Hom B, 14:11:12]

(c) συνίστησι δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός ὅτι ἔτι ἀμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν· [Rom.Frag A, 28:n4]

(d) συνίστησι δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός ὅτι ἔτι ἀμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν. [Rom.Frag D, 5:8:1]

Romans 5:9

(a) πολλῶ οὖν μᾶλλον δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς. [Rom.Frag A, 28:n6]

(b) πολλῶ οὖν μᾶλλον δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς. [Rom.Frag D, 5:8:1]

Romans 5:10

(a) πολλῶ οὖν μᾶλλον δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς. [Rom.Frag D, 5:8:2]

(b) Εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες, φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος, κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ· [Prov.Exp, 17:188:39]

(c) Οἷ ποτε ὄντες ἐχθροὶ, κατηλλάγησαν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ· [Prov.Exp, 17:193:48]

Romans 5:11

(a) οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν. [Rom.Frag D, 5:11:1]

Romans 5:12

(a) Διὰ τοῦτο ὡσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον· [Rom.Frag D, 5:12:1]

(b) Διὰ τοῦτο ὡσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον· [John.Com B, 20:39:364:5]

(c) δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος· καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον [John.Com B, 20:42:388:3]

Romans 5:13

- (a) ἄμαρτία γὰρ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου [John.Com A, 2:15:106:6]
- (b) Ἄμαρτία οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου· [Basil.Phil A, 9:2:24]
- (c) ἄμαρτία οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου· [Rom.Frag A, 36a:43]
- (d) Ἄμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου [Rom.Frag C, 136:1]
- (e) ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἄμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἄμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου· [Rom.Frag D, 5:13:1]
- (f) ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἡ ἄμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ (ἄμαρτία γὰρ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου [John.Com B, 20:39:364:6])

Romans 5:14

- (a) ἀλλ' ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωσέως ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ, ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος· [Rom.Frag D, 5:14:1]
- (b) ἀλλ' ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωσέως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ· [John.Com B, 20:39:364:7]
- (c) ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ [John.Com B, 20:42:388:6]

Romans 5:15

- (a) Ἄλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα· εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἢ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν. [Rom.Frag D, 5:15:2]
- (b) οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα [John.Com B, 20:42:390:1]

Romans 5:16

- (a) καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἐνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος τὸ δῶρημα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἐνὸς εἰς κατάρημα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα. [Rom.Frag D, 5:16:1]
- (b) τὸ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων [John.Com B, 20:42:392:1]

Romans 5:17

- (a) εἰ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἐνός, πολλῶ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσι διὰ τοῦ ἐνός Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 5:17:2]
- (b) Εἰ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἐνός, πολλῶ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἐνός Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. [John.Com B, 20:39:364:9]

Romans 5:18

- (a) Ἄρ' οὖν ὡς δι' ἐνός παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα, οὕτως καὶ δι' ἐνός δικαίωματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς·

[Rom.Frag D, 5:18:1]

Romans 5:19

(a) ὡςπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.

[Rom.Frag D, 5:19:1]

Romans 5:20

(a) νόμος δὲ παρεισηλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα· οὐ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις [Rom.Frag D, 5:20:2]

Romans 5:21

(a) ἵνα ὡςπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 5:21:1]

Chapter Six

Romans 6:1

(a) Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ἐπιμένομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ [Rom.Frag D, 6:1:1]

Romans 6:2

(a) οἵτινες δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν αὐτῇ [Lam.Frag, 107:12]  
(b) Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ἐπιμένομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ [Rom.Frag D, 6:2:1]

Romans 6:3

(a) ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν [Rom.Frag D, 6:3:1]

Romans 6:4

(a) Συνετάφημεν γὰρ αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος [Cels, 2:69:18]  
(b) ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσαι. [John.Frag, 35:19]  
(c) συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὡςπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν. [Rom.Frag D, 6:4:2]  
(d) ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσῃ [Ps.Sel, 12:1613:50]

Romans 6:5

(a) εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα. [Rom.Frag A, 29:n1]  
(b) εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα. [Rom.Frag D, 6:5:1]

Romans 6:6

(a) τοῦτο γινώσκοντες, ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ· [Rom.Frag D, 6:6:1]

Romans 6:7

(a) ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας [Rom.Frag D, 6:7:1]

Romans 6:8

(a) εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ· [Rom.Frag A, 30:n1]

(b) εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ, [Rom.Frag D, 6:8:1]

Romans 6:9

(a) Χριστὸς δὲ ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει· θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει· [Cels, 2:16:54]

(b) Χριστὸς γὰρ ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει, θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει· [John.Com A, 13:8:48:11]

(c) Ἐγερθεὶς γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει· Οὐ μόνον δὲ Ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει· [Hera.Dial, 6:1]

(d) ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει, θάνατος γὰρ «αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει». [Matt.Com C, 12:4:33]

(e) εἰδότες ὅτι Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει· θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει· [Rom.Frag A, 30:n2]

(f) εἰδότες ὅτι Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει, θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει· [Rom.Frag D, 6:9:1]

Romans 6:10

(a) Ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ [Cels, 2:69:13]

(b) ὁ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ. [John.Com A, 1:9:58:7]

(c) ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· ὁ δὲ ζῆ, ζῆ τῷ θεῷ, [John.Com A, 13:8:48:12]

(d) ἀποθανὼν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· [Rom.Frag A, 27:12]

(e) ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· ὁ δὲ ζῆ, ζῆ τῷ θεῷ· [Rom.Frag A, 30:n3]

(f) ἀποθανὼν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· [Rom.Frag C, 222:11]

(g) ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· ὁ δὲ ζῆ, ζῆ τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag D, 6:11:1]

Romans 6:11

(a) οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν εἶναι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 30:n4]

(b) οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν εἶναι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ

τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. [Rom.Frag A, 31:19]

(c) οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 6:11:2]

Romans 6:12

(a) μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ἡμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτῆς. [Euches, 25:1:28]

(b) βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ἡμῶν σώματι [Euches, 25:3:6]

(c) Μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ἡμῶν σώματι [Jer.Hom A, 1:7:9]

(d) τῷ θνητῷ τούτῳ σώματι εἰς τὸ ὑπακούει τὴν ψυχὴν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ [Matt.Com C, 14:3:8]

(e) μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ. [Rom.Frag A, 31:n1]

(f) μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ [Rom.Frag D, 6:12:1]

Romans 6:13

(a) μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὄπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ· ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας, καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὄπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag A, 31:n2]

(b) μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὄπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὄπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ [Rom.Frag D, 6:13:1]

Romans 6:14

(a) ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει· οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλ' ὑπὸ χάριν. [Rom.Frag A, 31:n4]

(b) ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει· οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλ' ὑπὸ χάριν. [Rom.Frag D, 6:14:1]

Romans 6:15

(a) Τί οὖν; ἁμαρτήσωμεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐσμέν ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλ' ὑπὸ χάριν; μὴ γένοιτο. [Rom.Frag D, 6:15:1]

Romans 6:16

(a) οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δούλοι ἐστε οὐ ὑπακούετε, ἥτοι ἁμαρτίας ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην; [Rom.Frag D, 6:16:1]

Romans 6:17

(a) χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ ὅτι ἦτε δούλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδασχῆς [Rom.Frag D, 6:17:1]

Romans 6:18

(a) ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, [Rom.Frag

A, 33:16]

(b) ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. [Rom.Frag D, 6:18:1]

(c) ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῷ Θεῷ, [Ps.Sel, 12:1605:1]

Romans 6:19

(a) ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, οὕτως νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν. [Rom.Frag A, 32:n1]

(b) ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, οὕτω νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν. [Rom.Frag D, 6:19:1]

Romans 6:20

(a) ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. [Rom.Frag A, 32:n3]

(b) ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. [Rom.Frag D, 6:20:1]

Romans 6:21

(a) τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἶχετε τότε ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε; τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος. [Rom.Frag A, 33:n1]

(b) τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἶχετε τότε; ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε· τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος. [Rom.Frag D, 6:21:1]

(c) Τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἶχετε τότε, ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε; [Ps.Frag, 118:6:10]

Romans 6:22

(a) νυνὶ δὲ, ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον. [Rom.Frag A, 33:n2]

(b) νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον. [Rom.Frag D, 6:22:1]

(c) Νυνὶ ἐλευθερωθέντες μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, δηλονότι κατ' ἀρετὴν καὶ γνώσιν, ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον. [Ps.Frag, 118:91:14]

(d) Ἐξελευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῷ Θεῷ,» δηλονότι κατ' ἀρετὴν καὶ γνώσιν. Ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον. [Ps.Sel, 12:1605:3]

(e) Νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ (δηλονότι κατ' ἀρετὴν καὶ γνώσιν) ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον. [Prov.Exp, 17:177:15]

Romans 6:23

(a) τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν

Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 34:n1]

(b) γὰρ τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν [Rom.Frag C, 186:3]

(c) τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια τῆς ἀμαρτίας θάνατος, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 6:23:1]

## Chapter Seven

### Romans 7:1

(a) Ἦ ἀγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί—γινώσκουσιν γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ— ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐφ’ ὅσον χρόνον ζῆ; [John.Com A, 13:8:43:5]

(b) ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί, γινώσκουσι γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ, ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφ’ ὅσον χρόνον ζῆ; [Matt.Com C, 17:32:259]

(c) ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί, γινώσκουσι γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ, ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφ’ ὅσον χρόνον ζῆ; [Rom.Frag A, 35:n1]

(d) Ἦ ἀγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί, γινώσκουσι γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ, ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφ’ ὅσον χρόνον ζῆ; [Rom.Frag D, 7:1:1]

### Romans 7:2

(a) Ἦ γὰρ ὑπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ [John.Com A, 13:8:44:1]

(b) ἢ γὰρ ὑπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ [Matt.Com C, 12:4:13]

(c) ἢ γὰρ ὑπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ, κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός. [Rom.Frag A, 35:n2]

(d) ἢ γὰρ ὑπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ, κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός. [Rom.Frag D, 7:2:1]

### Romans 7:3

(a) Ἄρ’ οὖν ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός μοιχαλὶς χρηματίζει ἐὰν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ. [John.Com A, 13:8:46:2]

(b) Ἄρ’ οὖν ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός μοιχαλὶς χρηματίζει ἐὰν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ [Matt.Com C, 12:4:36]

(c) ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός μοιχαλὶς χρηματίζει ἐὰν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ, [Matt.Com C, 14:24:77]

(d) Ἄρα οὖν ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός μοιχαλὶς χρηματίζει ἐὰν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ. [Rom.Frag A, 35:n4]

(e) Ἄρ’ οὖν ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός μοιχαλὶς χρηματίζει ἐὰν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ. [Rom.Frag D, 7:3:1]

### Romans 7:4

(a) Ὡστε, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἐτέρῳ, τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ. [John.Com A, 13:8:47:5]



(b) ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἐτέρῳ, τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι, ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag D, 7:4:1]

#### Romans 7:5

(a) ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ. [Rom.Frag D, 7:5:1]

#### Romans 7:6

(a) νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα, ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος. [Rom.Frag A, 36:n1]

(b) νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα, ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος. [Rom.Frag D, 7:6:1]

#### Romans 7:7

(a) τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου· τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ἤδειν εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις. [Rom.Frag A, 37:n1]

(b) ἔλεγεν· Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις. [Rom.Frag C, 146:7]

(c) Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου· τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ἤδειν εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν· οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις. [Rom.Frag D, 7:7:1]

#### Romans 7:8

(a) Χωρὶς νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά [John.Com A, 2:15:106:2]

(b) ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν. [Rom.Frag A, 38:n1]

(c) ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν· χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά. [Rom.Frag D, 7:8:1]

#### Romans 7:9

(a) Ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν, ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον [Cels, 3:62:26]

(b) Ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἡ μὲν ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησε [John.Com A, 2:15:106:2]

(c) ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ· ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν, [Rom.Frag A, 39:n1]

(d) ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ· ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν, [Rom.Frag D, 7:9:1]

#### Romans 7:10

(a) ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον [Cels, 3:62:26]

(b) ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον, καὶ εὐρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἢ εἰς ζωὴν αὕτη εἰς θάνατον· [Rom.Frag A, 39:n2]

(c) ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον, καὶ εὐρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἢ εἰς ζωὴν, αὕτη εἰς θάνατον· [Rom.Frag D, 7:10:2]

#### Romans 7:11

(a) ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐξηπάτησέν με καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν. [Rom.Frag A, 39:n3]

(b) ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐξηπάτησέν με καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν [Rom.Frag C, 146:7]

(c) ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐξηπάτησέ με καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν. [Rom.Frag D, 7:12:1]

#### Romans 7:12

(a) Ὡστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἀγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή. [Cels, 7:20:32]

(b) ὁ νόμος ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἀγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή, [Matt.Com B, 11:14:65]

(c) ὥστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἀγία. [Rom.Frag A, 10:6]

(d) ὥστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἀγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή. [Rom.Frag D, 7:12:1]

#### Romans 7:13

(a) τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ γέγονε θάνατος; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον· ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς. [Rom.Frag A, 40:n1]

(b) Τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ ἐγένετο θάνατος; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλ' ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία, διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον, ἵνα γένηται καθ' [Rom.Frag D, 7:13:1]

#### Romans 7:14

(a) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστιν [Cels, 7:20:31]

(b) Οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστι. [Basil.Phil A, 9:2:10]

(c) οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστι, [Matt.Com B, 11:14:64]

(d) οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστιν· ἐγὼ δὲ σαρκικός εἶμι, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. [Rom.Frag A, 41:n1]

(e) οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστιν· ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινός εἶμι, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. [Rom.Frag D, 7:14:1]

#### Romans 7:15

(a) Οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω, ἀλλ' ὁ μισῶ τοῦτο ποιῶ· [John.Com A, 10:7:28:5]

(b) ὁ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι οὐ γινώσκω· οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω, ἀλλ' ὁ μισῶ τοῦτο ποιῶ. [Rom.Frag A, 42:n1]

(c) ὁ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι οὐ γινώσκω· οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω, ἀλλ' ὁ μισῶ τοῦτο ποιῶ. [Rom.Frag D, 7:15:1]

Romans 7:16

(a) εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω τοῦτο ποιῶ, σύμφημι τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι καλός. [Rom.Frag D, 7:17:1]

Romans 7:17

(a) νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ ἀλλ' ἢ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία.  
[Rom.Frag D, 7:17:1]

Romans 7:18

(a) οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοί, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, ἀγαθόν· τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειταιί μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὐ· [Rom.Frag D, 7:18:3]

Romans 7:19

(a) Οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω, ἀλλ' ὃ μισῶ τοῦτο ποιῶ. [John.Com A, 10:7:28:5]  
(b) οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω ποιῶ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλ' ὃ οὐ θέλω κακὸν τοῦτο πράσσω. [Rom.Frag D, 7:19:1]

Romans 7:20

(a) εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω ἐγὼ τοῦτο ποιῶ, οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ ἀλλ' ἢ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία. [Rom.Frag D, 7:20:1]

Romans 7:21

(a) εὕρισκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται. [Rom.Frag D, 7:21:1]

Romans 7:22

(a) Συνήδομαι τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον. [Hera.Dial, 11:22]  
(b) συνήδομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον. [Rom.Frag A, 43:n1]  
(c) συνήδομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, [Rom.Frag D, 7:22:1]

Romans 7:23

(a) βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου. [Rom.Frag A, 43:n2]  
(b) βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου. [Rom.Frag D, 7:23:1]

Romans 7:24

(a) Τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Cels, 7:50:26]  
(b) Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος, τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Cels, 8:54:36]

- (c) ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Mart, 3:8]
- (d) ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Jer.Hom B, 20:7:21]
- (e) ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Matt.Com C, 15:27:43]
- (f) ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Rom.Frag A, 44:n1]
- (g) Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Rom.Frag D, 7:24:1]
- (h) Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Ps.Frag, 37:7:5]
- (i) Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· [Ps.Sel, 12:1201:8]
- (j) Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος, τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Ps.Sel, 12:1201:21]
- (k) Τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Ps.Sel, 12:1593:4]
- (l) Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [John.Com B, 20:25:225:5]
- (m) Τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [John.Com B, 20:39:374:3]

#### Romans 7:25

- (a) εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 44:n2]
- (b) εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. Ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοί μου δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας. [Rom.Frag D, 7:25:2]

#### Chapter Eight

##### Romans 8:1

- (a) οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. [Rom.Frag D 8:1:1]

##### Romans 8:2

- (a) ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠλευθέρωσέν σε ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου. [Rom.Frag D, 8:2:1]

##### Romans 8:3

- (a) τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, [Rom.Frag A, 45:n1]
- (b) τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, [Rom.Frag D, 8:3:2]

##### Romans 8:4

- (a) ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα. [Rom.Frag A, 45:n3]
- (b) ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα. [Rom.Frag D, 8:4:1]

#### Romans 8:5

- (a) οἱ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. [Rom.Frag D, 8:5:1]

#### Romans 8:6

- (a) τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴν καὶ εἰρήνην. [Rom.Frag A, 46:15]
- (b) τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος, τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη [Rom.Frag D, 8:6:2]

#### Romans 8:7

- (a) τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται· οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται. [Lam.Frag, 27:27]
- (b) τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν [Rom.Frag A, 31:4]
- (c) τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν, τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται, οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται. [Rom.Frag A, 46:n1]
- (d) διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν· τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται, οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται. [Rom.Frag D, 8:7:1]
- (e) Τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς Θεόν· και, Οι εν σαρκι ζωντες Θεω αρεσαι ου δυνανται [Gen.Sel, 12:105:10]
- (f) τὸ φρόνημα αὐτῆς ἔχθρα ἐστὶν εἰς Θεόν, τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτασσομένης. [Ps.Sel, 12:1277:31]

#### Romans 8:8

- (a) Οἱ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύναται [Cels, 7:38:25]
- (b) οἱ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύναται, [John.Com A, 13:53:359:1]
- (c) οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύναται. [John.Com A, 13:53:360:4]
- (d) οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύναται. [Lam.Frag, 212:12]
- (e) οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύναται. [Matt.Com C, 13:2:199]
- (f) οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύναται. [Rom.Frag A, 46:n2]
- (g) οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύναται. [Rom.Frag D, 8:9:1]
- (h) οἱ γὰρ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες, Θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύναται. [Ps.Frag, 77:19-25:167]
- (i) Οἱ ἐν σαρκὶ ζῶντες Θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύναται. [Gen.Sel, 12:105:12]
- (j) Οἱ γὰρ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες Θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύναται. [Ps.Exc, 17:147:17]

#### Romans 8:9

- (a) Ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἶπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. [Cels, 7:45:4]
- (b) ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἶπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν αὐτοῖς, [John.Com A, 13:53:359:2]
- (c) ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἶπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν· [Matt.Com C, 13:2:200]

(d) ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἶπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.  
[Rom.Frag D, 8:9:1]

Romans 8:10

(a) εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν δι' ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην. [Rom.Frag D, 8:10:2]

Romans 8:11

(a) εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος τὸν Ἰησοῦν οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὁ ἐγείρας ἐκ νεκρῶν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ζωοποιήσῃ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:11:1]

Romans 8:12

(a) Ἄρ' οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ὀφειλέται ἐσμέν, οὐ τῇ σαρκὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν.  
[Rom.Frag D, 8:12:1]

Romans 8:13

(a) Εἰ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν· εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε, [Cels, 7:52:15]

(b) εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε [Eze.Hom, 337:32]

(c) εἰ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν· εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε [Rom.Frag D, 8:13:1]

Romans 8:14

(a) Ὅσοι πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσι θεοῦ. [Cels, 4:95:24]

(b) Ὅσοι πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν, [Cels, 6:70:1]

(c) ὅσοι πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσι θεοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 20:22:24]

(d) ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν· [Rom.Frag D, 8:14-15:1]

Romans 8:15

(a) Οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον, ἀλλ' ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας, ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· Ἄββὰ ὁ πατήρ. [Cels, 1:57:10]

(b) οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας εἰς φόβον ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας, ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· Ἄββὰ ὁ πατήρ· [Euches, 22:2:10]

(c) οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον, ἀλλ' ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας, ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· Ἄββὰ ὁ πατήρ. [Rom.Frag D, 8:15:2]

Romans 8:16

(a) αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμέν τέκνα θεοῦ,  
[Matt.Com C, 13:2:88]

(b) αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμέν τέκνα θεοῦ.  
[Rom.Frag D, 8:17:1]

Romans 8:17

(a) εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι· κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ, εἶπερ συμπάσχωμεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:17:1]

Romans 8:18

(a) Λογίζομαι γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. [Rom.Frag D, 8:18:1]

Romans 8:19

(a) Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἰῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. [Cels, 5:13:12]

(b) Ἡ ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἰῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται [Cels, 7:65:7]

(c) Ἡ τῆς κτίσεως ἀποκαταδοκία τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἰῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. [Cels, 8:5:13]

(d) τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἰῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. [John.Com A, 1:26:170:4]

(e) ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἰῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. [Rom.Frag D, 8:19:1]

Romans 8:20

(a) Τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἑκοῦσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι [Cels, 5:13:13]

(b) Τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη οὐχ ἑκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, [Cels, 7:50:14]

(c) Τῇ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἑκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, [Cels, 7:65:9]

(d) Τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἑκοῦσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, [Cels, 8:5:14]

(e) Τῇ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη οὐχ ἑκοῦσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα τῇ ἐλπίδι, [John.Com A, 1:17:99:2]

(f) τῇ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἑκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι. [John.Com A, 1:26:176:5]

(g) τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἑκοῦσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι [Rom.Frag D, 8:20:2]

Romans 8:21

(a) ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ. [Cels, 5:13:15]

(b) Ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ [Cels, 7:65:5]

(c) ἐλευθερωθήσεται πᾶσα ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς [Cels, 8:5:16]

(d) ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ, [John.Com A, 1:26:170:2]

(e) ἐλευθερωθήσομαι ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς [Mart, 7:28]

(f) ἐλευθερωθῆ ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τοῦ ἐχθροῦ εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ. [Mart, 13:27]

(g) ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ [Rom.Frag D, 8:21:1]

Romans 8:22

(a) οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν· [Rom.Frag D, 8:22:1]

Romans 8:23

(a) οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:23:1]

Romans 8:24

(a) ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει; [Rom.Frag A, 47:n1]

(b) Τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν· ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί ἐλπίζει; [Rom.Frag C, 212:4]

(c) τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν· ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τις καὶ ἐλπίζει; [Rom.Frag D, 8:24:1]

Romans 8:25

(a) ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει; [Rom.Frag A, 47:n2]

(b) Εἰ δὲ ὁ οὐ βλέπομεν ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα [Rom.Frag C, 212:6]

(c) εἰ δὲ ὁ οὐ βλέπομεν ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. [Rom.Frag D, 8:25:1]

Romans 8:26

(a) τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα, φησί, καθὸ δεῖ οὐκ οἶδαμεν, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις ὑπερεντυγχάνει [Euches, 14:5:4]

(b) ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμβάνεται ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν, τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξόμεθα καθ' ὃ δεῖ οὐκ οἶδαμεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις. [Rom.Frag A, 48:n1]

(c) ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν· τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῖ οὐκ οἶδαμεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει [Rom.Frag D, 8:26:1]

Romans 8:27

(a) ὁ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδε τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἀγίων. [Euches, 2:3:12]

(b) ὁ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδε τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν



έντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἀγίων· [Euches, 14:5:7]

(c) ὁ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδεν τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν έντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἀγίων. [Rom.Frag D, 8:27:1]

Romans 8:28 (this is probably Psalms)

(a) τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτὸν πάντα συνεργῶν εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ [Euches, 29:19:7]

(b) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. [Basil.Phil A, 25:1:30]

(c) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. [Basil.Phil A, 25:3:3]

(d) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. [Basil.Phil A, 25:3:11]

(e) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν, [Basil.Phil B, 25:1:31]

(f) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. [Basil.Phil B, 25:3:3]

(g) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. [Basil.Phil B, 25:3:3]

(h) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. [Basil.Phil B, 25:3:11]

(i) οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. [Rom.Frag A, 1:22]

(j) οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. [Rom.Frag A, 1:61]

(k) οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. [Rom.Frag A, 1:67]

(l) οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:28:1]

(m) Ἐπεὶ τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν ὁ Θεὸς, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. [Ps.Sel, 12:1157:30]

(n) πῶσιν τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, [John.Com B, 20:23:196:6]

Romans 8:29

(a) προέγνω ὁ θεὸς, τούτους καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνας τῆς δόξης τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. [Euches, 5:5:9]

(b) ὅτι οὓς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνας τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. [Basil.Phil A, 25:1:32]

(c) Οὓς γὰρ προέγνω, φησὶ, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνας τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 25:2:8]

(d) καὶ οὓς οὕτω προέγνω, προώρισεν συμμόρφους ἐσομένους τῆς εἰκόνας τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 25:2:14]

(e) προέγνω καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους ἐσομένους τῆς εἰκόνας τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, [Basil.Phil A, 25:2:27]

(f) Ὅτι οὓς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνας τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.

[Basil.Phil A, 25:3:7]

(g) ὅτι οὐς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς· [Basil.Phil B, 25:1:33]

(g) Οὐς γὰρ προέγνω, φησί, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. [Basil.Phil B, 25:2:8]

(g) προέγνω, προώρισεν συμμόρφους ἐσομένους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. [Basil.Phil B, 25:2:15]

(g) προέγνω καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους ἐσομένους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, [Basil.Phil B, 25:2:828]

(h) ὅτι οὐς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς· [Rom.Frag A, 1:24]

(i) οὐς γὰρ προέγνω, φησί, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. [Rom.Frag A, 1:32]

(j) προέγνω, προώρισεν συμμόρφους ἐσομένους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. [Rom.Frag A, 1:37]

(k) προέγνω καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους ἐσομένους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, [Rom.Frag A, 1:47]

(l) ὅτι οὐς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, [Rom.Frag A, 1:64]

(m) ὅτι οὐς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ [Rom.Frag D, 8:29:1]

(n) οὐς προέγνω, φησί, καὶ προώρισε· [Ps.Sel 12:1452:5]

Romans 8:30

(a) οὐς δὲ προώρισε, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσε· καὶ οὐς ἐκάλεσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὐς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασε. [Euches, 5:5:11]

(b) οὐς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν· καὶ οὐς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὐς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν. [Basil.Phil A, 25:1:35]

(c) ὅτι οὐς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς· [Basil.Phil B, 25:1:33]

(d) οὐς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν· καὶ οὐς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὐς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν. [Rom.Frag A, 1:25]

(e) οὐς δὲ προώρισε, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσε· καὶ οὐς ἐκάλεσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὐς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν [Rom.Frag D, 8:30:1]

(f) οὐς προέγνω, φησί, καὶ προώρισε· καὶ οὐς ἐκάλεσε, καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· [Ps.Sel, 12:1452:5]

Romans 8:31

(a) τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; εἰ ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ' ἡμῶν; [Rom.Frag A, 49:n1]

(b) Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; εἰ ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ' ἡμῶν; [Rom.Frag D, 8:31:1]

Romans 8:32

- (a) τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, [Lam.Frag, 151:18]
- (b) ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, [Matt.Com C, 13:8:42]
- (c) τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, [Matt.Com C, 13:9:45]
- (d) ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ χαρίζεται ἡμῖν [Rom.Frag A, 49:n2]
- (e) ὅς δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, [Rom.Frag D, 8:32:1]
- (f) Ὁ γε τοῦ ἰδίου Υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν. [Deut.Sel, 12:817:18]
- (g) Ὁς γε τοῦ ἰδίου Υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, [Luc.Schol, 17:348:56]

#### Romans 8:33

- (a) τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; θεὸς ὁ δικαίων· [Rom.Frag A, 50:n1]
- (b) τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; θεὸς ὁ δικαίων· [Rom.Frag D, 8:33:1]

#### Romans 8:34

- (a) τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; Χριστὸς ὁ ἀποθανών, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐγερθεὶς, ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:34:1]

#### Romans 8:35

- (a) Τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Θλίψις ἢ στενοχωρία ἢ διωγμὸς ἢ λιμὸς ἢ γυμνότης ἢ κίνδυνος ἢ μάχαιρα; [Cels, P:3:15]
- (b) τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ; θλίψις ἢ στενοχωρία ἢ διωγμὸς ἢ λιμὸς ἢ γυμνότης ἢ κίνδυνος ἢ μάχαιρα; [Rom.Frag D, 8:35:1]

#### Romans 8:36

- (a) Καθάπερ γέγραπται ὅτι ἔνεκεν σοῦ θανατούμεθα πᾶσαν τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρόβατα σφαγῆς. [Cels, P:3:18]
- (b) ὅτι ἔνεκα σοῦ θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρόβατα σφαγῆς. [Mart, 21:9]
- (c) ἔνεκέν σου θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, [Rom.Frag A, 52:9]
- (d) καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι ἔνεκεν σοῦ θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, [Rom.Frag D, 8:36:2]
- (e) Ὅτι ἔνεκά σου θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρόβατα σφαγῆς, [Ps.Sel, 12:1428:9]

#### Romans 8:37

- (a) Ἄλλ' ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερνικῶμεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς. [Cels, P:3:19]
- (b) Ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερνικῶμεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς, [Cels, P:4:5]
- (c) ἀλλ' ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερνικῶμεν. [Euches, 2:3:24]

(d) ἀλλ' ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερνικῶμεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς. [Rom.Frag A, 51:n1]

(e) ἀλλ' ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερνικῶμεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς. [Rom.Frag D, 8:37:1]

(f) Ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερνικῶμεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς, [Ps.Frag, 4:1:32]

#### Romans 8:38

(a) Πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωὴ, οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί, οὔτε ἐνεστώτα οὔτε μέλλοντα, οὔτε δυνάμεις [Cels, P:3:22]

(b) ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωὴ, οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί [Cels, P:4:9]

(c) πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωὴ οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί οὔτε δυνάμεις [Rom.Frag A, 52:n1]

(c) πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωὴ οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί οὔτε ἐνεστώτα οὔτε μέλλοντα. [Rom.Frag D, 8:38:1]

#### Romans 8:39

(a) οὔτε ὕψωμα, οὔτε βάθος οὔτε κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. [Cels, P:3:24]

(b) οὔτε ἐνεστώτα οὔτε μέλλοντα οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 52:n2]

(c) οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:39:1]

#### Chapter Nine

##### Romans 9:1

(a) συμμαρτυροῦσής μιν τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ [John.Com B, 20:37:338:2]

##### Romans 9:2

(a) Λύπη μοί ἐστι μεγάλη, καὶ ἀδιάληπτος ὁδύνη τῇ καρδίᾳ μου, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Ps.Sel, 12:1573:47]

##### Romans 9:3

(a) Εὐχόμεν αὐτὸς ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα. [1Cor.Com, 51:26]

##### Romans 9:4

(a) Ὦν ἡ υἰοθεσία καὶ δόξα καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ ἡ ἐπαγγελία, ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν. [Ps.Frag, 134:12-14:14]

Romans 9:5 None

Romans 9:6

(a) οὐδὲ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ. [Princ, 4:3:6:14]

(b) οὐδὲ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ. [Basil.Phil A, 1:22:16]

Romans 9:7 None

Romans 9:8

(a) οὐ γὰρ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ“ [Princ, 4:3:6:13]

(b) οὐ γὰρ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ. [Princ, 4:3:8:7]

(c) οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ [Mart, 38:4]

(d) Οὐ γὰρ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς, ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 1:22:16]

(e) Οὐ γὰρ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς, ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 1:24:8]

Romans 9:9-10 None

Romans 9:11

(a) μήπω γεννηθέντων μηδὲ πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ φαῦλον, ἵνα ἢ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ μένη, [John.Com A, 2:31:191:5]

(b) μήπω μήτε γεννηθέντων μήτε πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ φαῦλον, ἵνα ἢ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ μένη, [Euches, 5:4:2]

Romans 9:12

(a) οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος, ἐρρέθη ὅτι Ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι, [John.Com A, 2:31:191:6]

(b) οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος, λέγεται· ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάττονι, [Euches, 5:4:4]

Romans 9:13

(a) καθάπερ γέγραπται· Τὸν Ἰακώβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαὺ ἐμίσησα. [John.Com A, 2:31:191:6]

Romans 9:14

(a) Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; Μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ; Μὴ γένοιτο. [John.Com A, 2:31:191:9]

Romans 9:15 None

Romans 9:16

(a) οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος θεοῦ [Princ, 3:1:7:23]

(b) ἄρ' οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος θεοῦ [Princ, 3:1:18:1]

(c) οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος θεοῦ [Princ,

3:1:19:22]

(d) οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος θεοῦ. [Princ, 3:1:19:41]

(e) οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος θεοῦ [Princ, 3:1:19:42]

(f) Εἰς τὸ Οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος θεοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, P:C:69]

(g) Οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος θεοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 21:6:26]

(h) οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος εἶναι οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος θεοῦ. [Basil.Phil B, 26:7:48]

(i) οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος Θεοῦ. [Ps.Sel, 12:1161:33]

Romans 9:17

(a) τῆς γραφῆς λεγούσης τῷ Φαραώ· Εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῆ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ. [Basil.Phil A, 23:20:19]

(b) τῆς γραφῆς λεγούσης τῷ Φαραώ· Εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῆ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ. [Basil.Phil B, 23:20:21]

(c) Εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῆ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ. [Gen.Com, 12:84:13]

Romans 9:18

(a) ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ, ὃν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει. [Princ, 3:1:14:32]

(b) Ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ, ὃν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει. [Basil.Phil A, 21:13:37]

(c) ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ, ὃν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει, [Basil.Phil B, 27:1:19]

(d) ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ, ὃν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει, [Ex.Com, 12:265:7]

Romans 9:19

(a) ἐρεῖς μοι οὖν· τί ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν; [Princ, 3:1:21:3]

(b) ἐρεῖς μοι οὖν· τί ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν; [Basil.Phil A, 21:20:4]

(c) Ἐρεῖς οὖν μοι, τί ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν; [Basil.Phil B, 27:2:31]

(d) Ἐρεῖς οὖν μοι, τί ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν; [Ex.Com, 12:273:39]

Romans 9:20

(a) μενοῦνγε, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ; μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι· τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως; [Princ, 3:1:21:5]

(b) μενοῦνγε, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ; μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι· τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως; [Basil.Phil A, 21:20:5]

Romans 9:21

- (a) ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν; [Princ, 3:1:21:7]
- (b) ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν, [Princ, 3:1:24:7]
- (c) ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος, ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν; [Basil.Phil A, 21:20:7]
- (d) Ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν· [Basil.Phil A, 21:23:8]

Romans 9:22

- (a) κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, [Jer.Frag B, 31:1]
- (b) Εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατόν αὐτοῦ ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν· [Basil.Phil A, 27:10:20]
- (c) Εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατόν αὐτοῦ ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν· [Basil.Phil B, 27:10:20]
- (d) Εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν, καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατόν αὐτοῦ, ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν· [Ex.Com, 12:280:1]

Romans 9:23

- (a) ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους. [Jer.Frag B, 31:2]

Romans 9:24-25 None

Romans 9:26-29 These verses cannot be distinguished between the Old and New Testaments

Romans 9:30-32 None

Romans 9:33 This verse cannot be distinguished between the Old and New Testaments

Chapter Ten

Romans 10:1

- (a) Ἀδελφοί, ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας καὶ ἡ δέησις πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εἰς σωτηρίαν. μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅτι [Rom.Frag D, 10:1:1]

Romans 10:2

- (a) μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅτι ζῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν· [Rom.Frag D, 10:2:1]

Romans 10:3

(a) ἀγνοοῦντες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ζητοῦντες στήσαι, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν. [Rom.Frag D, 10:3:1]

Romans 10:4

(a) Τέλος νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην. [John.Frag, 57:14]

(b) τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. [Rom.Frag D, 10:4:1]

Romans 10:5

(a) Μωσῆς γὰρ γράφει ὅτι τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὁ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ. [Rom.Frag D, 10:5:1]

Romans 10:6

(a) ἢ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει· μὴ εἶπης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν· [Rom.Frag D, 10:6:1]

(b) Μὴ εἶπης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· Τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν [John.Com A, 1:37:269:6]

(c) Μὴ εἶπης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· Τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν· [John.Com B, 19:12:76:4]

Romans 10:7

(a) ἢ· Τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν. [John.Com A, 1:37:269:6]

(b) ἢ Τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν· [John.Com A, 2:15:111:7]

(c) ἢ· τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; τουτέστι Χριστὸν ἀναγαγεῖν. [Jer.Hom B, 18:2:59]

(d) ἢ· τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν. [Rom.Frag D, 10:7:1]

(e) ἢ· Τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν.[John.Com B, 19:12:76:4]

Romans 10:8

(a) Ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; Ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστι σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· [John.Com A, 1:37:269:6]

(b) ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; Ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστὶν σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου. [John.Com A, 2:15:111:8]

(c) ἐγγύς γὰρ τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστι σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματι ἡμῶν καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἡμῶν, [Euches, 25:1:4]

(d) ἐγγύς σου ἐστὶ τὸ ῥῆμα, καὶ περὶ τῶν κατωτάτω ἐγγύς σου ἐστὶ τὸ ῥῆμα· [Jer.Hom B, 18:2:63]

(e) ἀλλὰ τί λέγει; ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστὶν σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ



καρδία σου· [Rom.Frag D, 10:7:2]

(f) ἔστιν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει; ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· [Rom.Frag D, 10:9:1]

(g) Ἔστιν ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμα σφόδρα, ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσί σου ποιεῖν αὐτό. [Ps.Sel, 12:1661:7]

Romans 10:9

(a) ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσης ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστεύσης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ· [Rom.Frag D, 10:9:3]

Romans 10:10

(a) καρδία γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην [Mart, 5:28]

(b) καρδία γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν. [Rom.Frag D, 10:10:1]

(c) Καρδία πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν. [Ps.Frag, 48:4:3]

(d) Καρδία πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν. [Ps.Frag, 62:4:4]

(e) Καρδία πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν. [Ps.Sel, 12:1216:10]

Romans 10:11 - This verse cannot be distinguished between the Old and New Testaments

Romans 10:12

(a) οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν διαστολή Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἑλλήνος· ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς κύριος πάντων, πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς [Rom.Frag D, 10:12:1]

Romans 10:13 - This verse cannot be distinguished between the Old and New Testaments

Romans 10:14

(a) Πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν; πῶς δὲ πιστεύσωσιν οὐ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; πῶς δὲ ἀκούσονται χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος; [Rom.Frag D, 10:14:2]

Romans 10:15

(a) Πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν; πῶς δὲ πιστεύσωσιν οὐ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; πῶς δὲ ἀκούσονται χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος; πῶς δὲ κηρύξωσιν ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσιν; καθὼς γέγραπται· ὡς ὠραῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων ἀγαθά. [Rom.Frag D, 10:15:1]

Romans 10:16

(a) ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει· κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; [Rom.Frag D, 10:16:1]

Romans 10:17

(a) ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 10:17:1]

Romans 10:18

(a) ἀλλὰ λέγω, μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; μενοῦνγε· εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν [Rom.Frag D, 10:18:1]

Romans 10:19

(a) ἀλλὰ λέγω, μὴ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω; πρῶτος Μωσῆς λέγει· ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει, ἐπ' ἔθνει ἀσυνέτῳ παροργιῶ ὑμᾶς. [Rom.Frag D, 10:19:1]

Romans 10:20

(a) Ἰσοαίας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει· εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν. [Rom.Frag D, 10:20:1]

Romans 10:21

(a) πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει· ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα. [Rom.Frag D, 10:21:1]

Chapter Eleven

Romans 11:1

(a) Λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; μὴ γένοιτο· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλίτης εἰμί, ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν. [Rom.Frag D, 11:1:1]

Romans 11:2

(a) οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω. ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή, ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ; [Rom.Frag D, 11:2:1]

Romans 11:3

(a) κύριε, τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν, κἀγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου. [Rom.Frag D, 11:3:1]

Romans 11:4

(a) ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; κατέλειπον ἐμαυτῷ ἐπτακισχιλίους ἄνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ. [Rom.Frag D, 11:4:1]

Romans 11:5

(a) Ἄρ' οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος γέγονεν. [Jer.Hom A, 5:4:21]

(b) οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος γέγονεν. [Rom.Frag D, 11:5:1]

Romans 11:6

- (a) οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐστίν, ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκέτι γίνεται χάρις [Eph.Com, 17:22]
- (b) εἰ δὲ χάριτι, οὐκέτι ἐξ ἔργων, ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκέτι γίνεται χάρις. [Rom.Frag D, 11:6:1]

Romans 11:7

- (a) Τί οὖν; ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραήλ, τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν, ἡ δὲ ἐκλογή ἐπέτυχεν· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν, [Rom.Frag D, 11:7:1]

Romans 11:8

- (a) καθὼς γέγραπται· ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας. [Rom.Frag D, 11:8:1]

Romans 11:9

- (a) καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει· γεννηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς θήραν [Rom.Frag D, 11:9:1]

Romans 11:10 - This verse cannot be distinguished between the Old and New Testaments

Romans 11:11

- (a) παραπτώματι ἢ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσι [Cels, 2:78:6]
- (b) Τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἢ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς. [Jer.Hom A, 4:2:10]
- (c) τῷ αὐτῆς καὶ Ἰσραὴλ παραπτώματι γέγονεν ἢ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς [Lam.Frag, 42:4]
- (d) τῷ γὰρ ἐκείνων παραπτώματι ἢ σωτηρία ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς [Jer.Hom B, 13:1:42]
- (e) παραπτώματι γέγονεν ἢ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσι [Rom.Frag C, 124:10]
- (f) Λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἔπαισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἢ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς. [Rom.Frag D, 11:11:1]
- (g) Τῷ γὰρ ἐκείνων παραπτώματι σωτηρία γέγονεν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς [John.Com B, 28:12:93:3]

Romans 11:12

- (a) τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμος καὶ τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν [Cels, 6:80:22]
- (b) εἰ δὲ τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμος καὶ τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 11:12:1]

Romans 11:13

- (a) Ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος, τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω [Rom.Frag D, 11:13:1]

Romans 11:14

(a) εἴ πως παραζηλώσω μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ σώσω τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν. εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν [Rom.Frag D, 11:14:1]

Romans 11:15

(a) εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν καταλλαγὴ κόσμου, τίς ἡ πρόσληψις εἰ μὴ ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν; [Rom.Frag D, 11:15:1]

Romans 11:16

(a) εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα· καὶ εἰ ἡ ῥίζα ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι. [Rom.Frag D, 11:16:2]

Romans 11:17

(a) Εἰ δὲ τινες τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ δὲ ἀγριέλαιος ὢν ἐνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ συγκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης καὶ τῆς πίότητος τῆς ἐλαίας ἐγένου, [Rom.Frag D, 11:17:1]

Romans 11:18

(a) μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων· εἰ δὲ κατακαυχᾶσαι, οὐ σὺ τὴν ῥίζαν βαστάζεις ἀλλ' ἡ ῥίζα σέ. [Rom.Frag D, 11:18:1]

Romans 11:19

(a) ἐρείς οὖν· ἐξεκλάσθησαν κλάδοι ἵνα ἐγὼ ἐγκεντρισθῶ [Rom.Frag D, 11:19-20:1]

Romans 11:20

(a) καλῶς· τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἔστηκας. μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ· [Rom.Frag D, 11:20:2]

Romans 11:21

(a) Ἐἰ τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, πόσω πλέον οὐδὲ ἡμῶν φείσεται· [Jer.Hom A, 4:4:7]

(b) ἰδὲ οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτομία, ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότης θεοῦ, ἐὰν ἐπιμένῃς ἐπιμείνῃς τῇ χρηστότητι, ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ. [Rom.Frag D, 11:21:1]

Romans 11:22

(a) χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν θεοῦ [Jer.Hom A, 4:4:13]

(b) Ἴδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τὸ πρότερον ἔθνος καὶ πεσὸν ἀποτομία, ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ τὸ δεύτερον ἔθνος ἐπαγγελίαι καὶ χρηστότης, ἐὰν ἐπιμείνῃς τῇ χρηστότητι· ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ. [Jer.Hom B, 18:5:62]

(c) ἰδὲ οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτομία, ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότης θεοῦ, ἐὰν ἐπιμένῃς ἐπιμείνῃς τῇ χρηστότητι, ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ [Rom.Frag D, 11:22:1]

(d) χρηστότητος καὶ ἀποτομίας κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον, [Ps.Frag, 118:65,66:36]

Romans 11:23

(a) κάκεῖνοι δέ, ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιμένωσι τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἐγκεντρισθήσονται· δυνατὸς γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσαι αὐτούς. [Rom.Frag D, 11:23:1]

Romans 11:24

(a) εἰ γὰρ σὺ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐξεκόπτης ἀγριελαίου καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ἐνεκεντρίσθης εἰς καλλιέλαιον, πόσω μᾶλλον οὗτοι οἱ κατὰ φύσιν ἐγκεντρισθήσονται τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐλαίᾳ. [Rom.Frag D, 11:24:2]

Romans 11:25

(a) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθη [Cels, 6:80:24]

(b) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσελθεῖν, [John.Com A, 13:57:392:3]

(c) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθη, [Jer.Hom A, 4:6:27]

(d) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθη [Lam.Frag, 42:6]

(e) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθη, [Lam.Frag, 125:34]

(f) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθη, πᾶς ὁ Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Matt.Com C, 14:20:19]

(g) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθη, τότε πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Rom.Frag C, 190:8]

(h) Οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, ἵνα μὴ ᾗτε ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι, ὅτι πώρωσις ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθη, [Rom.Frag D, 11:25:3]

(i) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθη. [Matt.Schol, 17:297:5]

Romans 11:26

(a) τότε πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Jer.Hom A, 4:6:27]

(b) τότε πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Lam.Frag, 42:6]

(c) τότε πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Lam.Frag, 125:34]

(d) πᾶς ὁ Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Matt.Com C, 14:20:19]

(e) τότε πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Rom.Frag C, 190:8]

(f) καὶ οὕτω πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται, καθὼς γέγραπται· ἤξει ἐκ Σιών ὁ ρυόμενος, ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ. [Rom.Frag D, 11:26:1]

Romans 11:27 - This verse cannot be distinguished between the Old and New Testaments

Romans 11:28

(a) κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐχθροὶ δι' ὑμᾶς, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοὶ διὰ τοὺς πατέρας· ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα [Rom.Frag D, 11:28:1]

Romans 11:29

(a) ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλήσις τοῦ θεοῦ. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ποτε ἠπειθήσατε τῷ [Rom.Frag D, 11:29:1]

Romans 11:30

(a) ὥσπερ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ποτε ἠπειθήσατε τῷ θεῷ, νῦν δὲ ἠλεήθητε τῇ τούτων ἀπειθείᾳ, [Rom.Frag D, 11:31:1]

Romans 11:31

(a) οὕτως καὶ οὗτοι νῦν ἠπειθήσαν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθῶσιν. [Rom.Frag D, 11:31:2]

Romans 11:32

(a) συνέκλεισεν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθειαν ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσει. [Rom.Frag D, 11:32:1]

Romans 11:33-36 - This verse cannot be distinguished between the Old and New Testaments

Chapter Twelve

Romans 12:1

(a) Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν· [Rom.Frag D, 12:1:1]

(b) παραστήσατε τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ. [Ps.Frag, 80:3:24]

Romans 12:2

(a) Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν· [Rom.Frag D, 12:2:1]

Romans 12:3

(a) Λέγω γὰρ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν, μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, ἐκάστῳ ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέτρησε ἐμέρισε μέτρον πίστεως· [Rom.Frag D, 12:3:1]

Romans 12:4

(a) καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι μέλη πολλὰ ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πρᾶξιν, [Rom.Frag D, 12:4:1]

Romans 12:5

(a) οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἔσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, τὸ δὲ καθ' εἰς ἀλλήλων μέλη. [Rom.Frag D, 12:5:1]

Romans 12:6

(a) ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα, εἴτε προφητείαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως· [Rom.Frag D, 12:6:1]

Romans 12:7

(a) εἴτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ· εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ· [Rom.Frag D, 12:7:1]

Romans 12:8

(a) εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν, ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει· ὁ μεταδιδούς ἐν ἀπλότητι, ὁ προϊστάμενος ἐν σπουδῇ, ὁ ἐλεῶν ἐν ἰλαρότητι. [Rom.Frag D, 12:8:1]  
(b) Ὁ ἐλεῶν ἐν ἰλαρότητι [Ps.Sel, 12:1576:6]  
(c) Ὁ ἐλεῶν, ἐν ἰλαρότητι· [Prov.Exp, 17:217:39]

Romans 12:9

(a) ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος· ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ πονηρόν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ· τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς [Rom.Frag D, 12:9:1]

Romans 12:10

(a) τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι, τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι, τῇ σπουδῇ [Rom.Frag D, 12:10:1]

Romans 12:11

(a) τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι, τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί, τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες, τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες [Rom.Frag D, 12:11:1]

Romans 12:12

(a) τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες, τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες, τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες, [Rom.Frag D, 12:12:2]

Romans 12:13

(a) ταῖς χρεαίαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες, τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες. [Rom.Frag D, 12:13:1]

Romans 12:14

(a) Εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε [Cels, 8:38:8]  
(b) εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας, εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε. [Rom.Frag D, 12:14:1]  
(c) εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε. [Ps.Sel, 12:1568:43]

Romans 12:15

(a) χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. [Rom.Frag D, 12:15:1]

Romans 12:16

(a) μὴ ὑψηλοφρονούντες ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. [Matt.Com C, 15:26:44]

Romans 12:17-18 None

Romans 12:19

(a) Μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικούντες, ἀγαπητοί· ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ. [Ps.Frag, 37:16:7]

Romans 12:20

(a) ἐὰν οὖν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρός σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν· ἐὰν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. [Rom.Frag A, 53:n2]

Romans 12:21

(a) μὴ νικῶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ, ἀλλὰ νίκα ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν. [Rom.Frag A, 53:n3]  
(b) Νίκα ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν. [Job.Hom C, 17:72:19]

Chapter Thirteen

Romans 13:1

(a) Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω. Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν· [Cels, 8:65:11]

Romans 13:2

(a) ὥστε οἱ ἀνθεστηκότες τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ διαταγῇ ἀνθίστανται [Cels, 8:65:13]

Romans 13:3-6 None

Romans 13:7

(a) ἀπόδοτε πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς, τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν φόρον, τῷ τὸν φόβον τὸν φόβον, τῷ τὸ τέλος τὸ τέλος, τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμὴν· [Euches, 28:1:5]  
(b) πᾶσιν ἀποδίδους τὰς ὀφειλάς, τῷ τὸν φόβον τὸν φόβον, τῷ τὸ τέλος τὸ τέλος, τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν φόρον, τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμὴν [Jer.Hom B, 14:4:5]

Romans 13:8

(a) μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν. [Euches, 28:1:7]

Roman 13:9

(a) οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἕτερα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται, ἐν τῷ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς ἑαυτόν [Matt.Com C, 15:13:62]

(b) ἕτερα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται, τῷ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς ἑαυτόν [Matt.Com C, 15:14:45]



Romans 13:10-11 None

Romans 13:12

- (a) ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν [Matt.Com A, 238:8]
- (b) ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν [Matt.Com B, 11:6:46]
- (c) ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν [Aroc.Sch A, 18:4]
- (d) Ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα [ἤγγικε]ν [Pass, 126:7]

Romans 13:13

- (a) ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν. [Ps.Sel, 12:1605:42]
- (b) ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατοῦσιν, οὐ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, οὐ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις. [Ps.Sel, 12:1681:8]

Romans 13:14 None

Chapter Fourteen

Romans 14:1

- (a) Τὸν δ' ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει προσλαμβάνεσθε. [Cels, P:6:8]
- (b) τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει προσλαμβάνεσθε [Ps.Frag, 106:12:7]

Romans 14:2

- (a) Ὁς μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα, ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει [John.Com A, 13:33:209:3]
- (b) ὁς μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα, ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει [Euches, 27:5:8]
- (c) ὁ ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει [Matt.Com C, 12:31:57]

Romans 14:3-8 None

Romans 14:9

- (a) ἀπέθανεν Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα νεκρῶν κυριεύσῃ, καὶ ἀνέστη, ἵνα μὴ μόνον νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ. [Cels, 2:65:28]
- (b) Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη, ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ. [John.Com A, 6:35:177:3]
- (c) Εἰς τοῦτο Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη, ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ, [John.Com B, 20:25:228:3]

Romans 14:10

- (a) πάντες παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι [Euches, 28:5:14]
- (b) πάντες παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 14:10-11:1]

Romans 14:11

- (a) γέγραπται γάρ· ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag D, 14:11:1]

Romans 14:12

(a) ἄρα ἕκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει. [Rom.Frag D, 14:12:1]

Romans 14:13

(a) Μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον, τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον. [Rom.Frag D, 14:13:1]

Romans 14:14

(a) οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ· εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινόν. [Rom.Frag D, 14:14:2]

Romans 14:15

(a) Μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκείνον ἀπόλλυε, ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε [Cels, 8:28:20]  
(b) εἰ γὰρ διὰ βρῶμα ὁ ἀδελφός σου λυπεῖται, οὐκέτι κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖς. μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκείνον ἀπόλλυε, ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν. [Rom.Frag D, 14:15:1]

Romans 14:16

(a) μὴ βλασφημείσθω οὖν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν. [Rom.Frag D, 14:16-17:1]

Romans 14:17

(a) οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρώσις καὶ πόσις, ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ [Rom.Frag D, 14:16-17:1]

Romans 14:18

(a) ὁ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ δουλεύων τῷ Χριστῷ εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ καὶ δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. ἄρα οὖν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης [Rom.Frag D, 14:18:1]

Romans 14:19

(a) ἄρα οὖν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους. [Rom.Frag D, 14:19:1]

Romans 14:20

(a) μὴ ἔνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ. πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ, ἀλλὰ κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίοντι. [Rom.Frag D, 14:20:1]

Romans 14:21

(a) Καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον μηδὲ ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπτει [Cels, 8:28:18]  
(b) καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέας μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον μηδὲ ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπτει. [Rom.Frag D, 14:21:1]

Romans 14:22

(a) σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις; κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων

ἐαυτὸν ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζει. [Rom.Frag D, 14:22:1]

Romans 14:23

(a) Ὁ γὰρ διακρινόμενος, κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον, ἐὰν φάγη κατακέκριται, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως· πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν. [Matt.Com B, 11:12:55]

(b) Ὁ διακρινόμενος ἐὰν φάγη κατακέκριται ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, [1Cor.Com, 19:42]

(c) ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος ἐὰν φάγη κατακέκριται, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως· πᾶν δὲ τὸ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν. [Rom.Frag D, 14:23:2]

Chapter Fifteen

Romans 15:1

(a) Ὅφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ [Rom.Frag D, 15:1]

Romans 15:2

(a) ἕκαστος ἡμῶν τῷ πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν· [Rom.Frag D 15:2:1]

Romans 15:3

(a) καὶ γὰρ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἐαυτῷ ἤρρεσεν· ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται· οἱ ὄνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὄνειδιζόντων σε ἐπέπεσαν ἐπ' ἐμέ. [Rom.Frag D 15:3:1]

Romans 15:4

(a) ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη, ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν. [Rom.Frag D 15:4:1]

Romans 15:5

(a) ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως δῶη ὑμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, [Rom.Frag D 15:5:1]

Romans 15:6

(a) ἵνα ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι δοξάζητε τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Rom.Frag D 15:6:1]

Romans 15:7

(a) Διὸ προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ. [Rom.Frag D 15:7:1]

Romans 15:8

(a) λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γενέσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων, [Rom.Frag D 15:8:1]

Romans 15:9

(a) τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν, καθὼς γέγραπται. διὰ τοῦτο

έξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ. [Rom.Frag D 15:9:1]

Romans 15:10-12 - These verses cannot be distinguished between Old and New Testaments

Romans 15:13

(a) Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρώσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν, εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου. [Rom.Frag D, 15:13]

Romans 15:14

(a) Πέπεισμαι δέ, ἀδελφοὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοὶ ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης τῆς γνώσεως, δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους νουθετεῖν. [Rom.Frag D, 15:14]

Romans 15:15

(a) τολμηρότερον δὲ ὑμῖν ἔγραψα ἀπὸ μέρους, ὡς ἐπαναμνησκῶν ὑμᾶς διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ [Rom.Frag D, 15:15]

Romans 15:16

(a) εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱεουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. [Rom.Frag D, 15:16]

Romans 15:17

(a) ἔχω οὖν καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. [Rom.Frag D, 15:17]

Romans 15:18

(a) οὐ γὰρ τολμήσω τι λαλεῖν ὧν οὐ κατειργάσατο Χριστὸς δι' ἐμοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἐθνῶν, λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ, [Rom.Frag D, 15:18]

Romans 15:19

(a) ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναί τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Cels, 1:63:26]

(b) ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ, [John.Com A, 5:3:1:3]

(c) ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου· ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναί τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 15:19:1]

Romans 15:20

(a) φιλοτιμούμενον εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, [Cels, 1:63:27]

(b) φιλοτιμούμενος εὐαγγελίζεσθαι οὐχ ὅπου ὠνομάσθη Χριστός, ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ. [1Cor.Com, 15:12]

(c) οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμούμενον εὐαγγελίζεσθαι οὐχ ὅπου ὠνομάσθη Χριστός, ἵνα μὴ

ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ, [Rom.Frag D, 15:20:1]

Romans 15:21

(a) ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται· οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ ὄψονται καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασι συνήσουσι [Rom.Frag D, 15:21:1]

Romans 15:22

(a) διὸ καὶ ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς· [Rom.Frag D, 15:22:1]

Romans 15:23

(a) νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις, ἐπιποθίαν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν, [Rom.Frag D, 15:23:1]

Romans 15:24

(a) ὡς ἂν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν· ἐλπίζω γὰρ πορευόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι ἐκεῖ, ἐὰν ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπλησθῶ. [Rom.Frag D, 15:24:1]

Romans 15:25

(a) νυνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ διακονῶν τοῖς ἁγίοις. [Rom.Frag D, 15:25:1]

Romans 15:26

(a) εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. [Rom.Frag D, 15:26:1]

Romans 15:27

(a) εὐδόκησαν γὰρ, καὶ ὀφείλεται αὐτῶν εἶσιν· εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινωνήσαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργήσαι αὐτοῖς. [Rom.Frag D, 15:27:1]

Romans 15:28

(a) τοῦτο οὖν ἐπιτελέσας, καὶ σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον, ἀπελεύσομαι δι' ὑμῶν εἰς Σπανίαν· [Rom.Frag D, 15:28:1]

Romans 15:29

(a) οἶδα δὲ ὅτι ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ ἐλεύσομαι. [Rom.Frag D, 15:29:1]

Romans 15:30

(a) Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος, συναγωνίσασθαί μοι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, [Rom.Frag D, 15:30:1]

Romans 15:31

(a) ἵνα ῥυσθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ ἡ διακονία μου ἢ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ εὐπρόσδεκτος τοῖς ἀγίοις γένηται, [Rom.Frag D, 15:31:1]

Romans 15:32

(a) ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἐλθὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν. [Rom.Frag D, 15:32:1]

Chapter Sixteen

Romans 16:1-19 None

Romans 16:20

(-) συντριβόμενος ὁ σατανᾶς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας μου ἐν τάχει. [Jer.Frag B, 29:5]

(a) Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς συντρίψει τὸν σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. [Job.Hom B, 12:1048:37]

(b) Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς συντρίψει τὸν Σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. [Job.Hom C, 17:101:18]

Romans 16:21-24 None

Romans 16:25

(a) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστήριον, χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένον [Cels, 2:4:12]

(b) ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου, χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου [Cels, 3:61:11]

(c) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου [Princ, 4:1:7:37]

(d) Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, [John.Com A, 6:4:25:3]

(e) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου [John.Com A, 13:46:306:2]

(f) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου [Basil.Phil A, 1:7:43]

(g) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, [Basil.Phil A, 1:29:28]

(h) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, [Rom.Frag D, 16:25:2]

(i) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, [Ps.Sel, 12:1453:47]

Romans 16:26

(a) φανερωθὲν δὲ νῦν ἐν ταῖς προφητικαῖς [Cels, 2:4:12]

(b) φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν [Cels, 3:61:11]

(c) φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν [Princ, 4:1:7:37]

(d) Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου [John.Com A, 6:4:25:3]

(e) φανερωθὲν νῦν μυστήριον πεφανέρωται διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν καὶ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [John.Com A, 13:17:101:6]

(f) φανερωθέντος διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν [John.Com A, 13:46:306:2]

(g) φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν καὶ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας. ἀμήν. [Basil.Phil A, 1:7:43]

(h) φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ εἰς ὑποταγὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος [Rom.Frag D, 16:26:1]

Romans 16:27

(a) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου [Rom.Frag D, 16:25:2]

## APPENDIX 2 — ORIGEN'S CITATIONS OF 2 CORINTHIANS

2 Corinthians 1:1-4 None

2 Corinthians 1:5

(a) καθὼς περισσεύει τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ οὕτω διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ περισσεύει καὶ ἡ παράκλησις [Mart 42:1:1]

(b) καθὼς περισσεύει τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς, οὕτω περισσεύει καὶ ἡ παράκλησις ἡμῶν. [Mart 42:1:6]

2 Corinthians 1:6 None

2 Corinthians 1:7

(a) ὡς κοινωνοὶ ἐστε τῶν παθημάτων, οὕτως καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως. [Mart 42:1:11]

2 Corinthians 1:8

(a) οὐ θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, περὶ τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν τῆς γενομένης ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν κατὰ δύναμιν ἐβαρῆθημεν, ὥστε ἐξαπορηθῆναι ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν. [Eph.Com 14:40]

(b) Οὐ θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, [John.Com A 6:44:227:5]

2 Corinthians 1:9

(a) ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου ἐσχήκαμεν, ἵνα μὴ πεποιθότες ὦμεν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ ἐγείροντι τοὺς νεκρούς, [Eph.Com 14:43]

2 Corinthians 1:10

(a) ὃς ἐκ τηλικούτων θανάτων ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ρύεται, ἠλπίκαμεν γὰρ ὅτι καὶ ρύσεται. [Eph.Com 14:44]

(b) ὃς ἐκ τηλικούτων θανάτων ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ρύεται [Eph.Com 14:46]

2 Corinthians 1:11 None

2 Corinthians 1:12

(a) τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ καύχημα ἡμῶν, τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐν ἀγιότητι καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ θεοῦ ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. [Mart 21:3]

(b) Ἡ γὰρ καύχησις ἡμῶν, αὕτη ἐστίν, τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν. [Ps.Frag 118:122:8]

(c) Τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν. [Ps.Frag 118:152:4]

(d) Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ καύχημα ἡμῶν, τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν. [Ps.Frag 118:157:23]



2 Corinthians 1:13-24 None

Chapter Two

2 Corinthians 2:1 None

2 Corinthians 2:2

- (a) ἔστιν ὁ εὐφραίνων με εἰ μὴ ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἑμοῦ; [Jer.Frag B 70:16]
- (b) καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ εὐφραίνων με εἰ μὴ ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἑμοῦ; [Jer.Hom B 20:6:17]

2 Corinthians 2:3-6 None

2 Corinthians 2:7

- (a) ἵνα μὴ τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθῆ [John.Com A 28:4:26:9]
- (b) μήποτε τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθῆ ὁ τοιοῦτος, [Jer.Hom B 20:9:26]
- (c) τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ [Matt.Com A 248:4]
- (d) Μὴ πως τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθῆ ὁ τοιοῦτος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ. [Ps.Frag 38:11:12:29]
- (e) Μήποτε τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθῆ ὁ τοιοῦτος. [Ps.Sel 12:1313:20]
- (f) ἵνα μὴ τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθῆ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ, [John.Com B 28:4:26:8]

2 Corinthians 2:8

- (a) κυρώσατε εἰς αὐτὸν ἀγάπην [Jer.Hom B 20:9:26]

2 Corinthians 2:9-10 None

2 Corinthians 2:11

- (a) ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ, οὐ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ νοήματα ἀγνοοῦμεν. [Ps.Frag 118:95:6]
- (b) Οὐ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ νοήματα ἀγνοοῦμεν. [Ps.Sel 12:1605:52]

2 Corinthians 2:12-14 None

2 Corinthians 2:15

- (a) Χριστοῦ εὐωδία λέγει εἶναι τῷ θεῷ [Cels 1:48:37]
- (b) Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ θεῷ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις. [John.Com A 20:44:415:3]
- (c) Ἐὐωδία Χριστοῦ ἐσμὲν τῷ Θεῷ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, [Hera.Dial 18:17]
- (d) Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ Θεῷ [Cant.Frag 221:31]
- (e) Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις. [Ps.Frag 140:2:4]
- (f) Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ Θεῷ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ. [Gen.Sel 12:124:17]
- (g) Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις. [Ps.Sel 12:1665:9]

(h) Χριστοῦ, εὐωδία, ἐσμὲν τῷ Θεῷ. [Cant.Sch 17:264:47]

(i) Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ θεῷ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις. [John.Com B 20:44:415:3]

2 Corinthians 2:16

(a) οἷς μὲν ὄσμῃ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὄσμῃ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν.

[John.Com A 20:44:415:3]

(b) οἷς μὲν ὄσμῃ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὄσμῃ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν.'

[Hera.Dial 18:19]

(c) οἷς μὲν ὄσμῃ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν. [Cant.Frag 101:27]

(d) οἷς μὲν ὄσμῃ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν, [Cant.Sch 17:253:35]

(e) οἷς μὲν ὄσμῃ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὄσμῃ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν

[John.Com B 20:44:415:4]

2 Corinthians 2:17 None

Chapter Three

2 Corinthians 3:1-2 None

2 Corinthians 3:3

(a) οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίνοις [Rom.Frag C 204:9]

(b) Οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶ λιθίναις, ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶ καρδίας σαρκίνοις. [Ps.Sel 12:1673:41]

2 Corinthians 3:4 None

2 Corinthians 3:5

(a) Ἄλλ' ἡ ἰκανότης ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, [Cels 6:70:23]

2 Corinthians 3:6

(a) ὃς καὶ ἰκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης, οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος· τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτέννει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ [Cels 6:70:24]

(b) ὃς καὶ ἰκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης, [1Cor.Com 8:8]

2 Corinthians 3:7

(a) Εἰ δὲ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον ὡσέως διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τὴν καταργουμένην, [Cels 7:20:25]

(b) Εἰ δὲ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ, ὥστε μὴ ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον Μωσέως διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τὴν καταργουμένην. [John.Com A 32:27:336:3]

(c) εἰ δὲ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον Μωσέως

διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τὴν καταργουμένην, [Rom.Frag A 20:8]  
(d) Εἰ δὲ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον ὡς ἕως διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τὴν καταργουμένην [Rom.Frag C 174:12]  
(e) ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένα λίθοις [Matt.Com B 10:15:35]  
(g) μὴ δύνασθαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἀτενίσαι εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, [Ps.Sel 12:1165:1]

#### 2 Corinthians 3:8

(a) πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος ἔσται ἐν δόξῃ [Cels 7:20:28]  
(b) πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος ἔσται ἐν δόξῃ [John.Com A 32:27:336:6]

#### 2 Corinthians 3:9

(a) Εἰ γὰρ τῇ διακονίᾳ τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα, πολλῶ μᾶλλον περισσεύει ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης δόξῃ [John.Com A 32:27:336:7]

#### 2 Corinthians 3:10

(a) Καὶ γὰρ οὐ δεδόξασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει, ἕνεκεν τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης· εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργούμενον διὰ δόξης, πολλῶ μᾶλλον τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ. [John.Com A 32:27:336:9]  
(b) οὐ δεδόξασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει ἕνεκεν τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης [Matt.Com B 10:9:14]  
(c) δεδόξασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει πρότερον ἕνεκεν τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης [Matt.Com C 17:32:138]  
(d) Καὶ οὐ δεδόξασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει ὡς πρὸς σύγκρισιν τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης. [Rom.Frag C 176:3]

#### 2 Corinthians 3:11-12 None

#### 2 Corinthians 3:13

(a) κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον [Jer.Hom A 5:8:48]

#### 2 Corinthians 3:14 None

#### 2 Corinthians 3:15

(a) ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται Μωϋσῆς, κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν κεῖται [Cels 5:60:8]  
(b) ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται Μωϋσῆς [Cels 6:70:43]  
(c) εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ κεῖται [Jer.Hom A 5:8:7]

#### 2 Corinthians 3:16

(a) ἡνίκα ἂν ἐπιστρέψῃ τις πρὸς κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ γράμματι κάλυμμα· [Matt.Com B 10:14:72]  
(b) ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψῃ τις πρὸς τὸν κύριον [Cels 5:60:11]

- (c) ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψῃς πρὸς κύριον, τότε περιαιρεῖς τὸ κάλυμμα, [Jer.Hom A 5:9:4]
- (d) ἐὰν δὲ ἐπιστραφῇ πρὸς κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα· [Lam.Frag 116:9]
- (e) ἐὰν γὰρ τις ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς τὸν κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα· ἐ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν. [Matt.Com B 11:14:70]
- (f) ἡνίκα γὰρ ἐπιστρέψῃ τις πρὸς Κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα. [Ps.Frag 118:18:14]

#### 2 Corinthians 3:17

- (a) ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν [Matt.Com B 10:14:73]
- (b) ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν [Lam.Frag 116:10]
- (c) ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν [Matt.Com B 11:14:71]

#### 2 Corinthians 3:18

- (a) ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν ἐν τοῖς κεκρυμμένοις νοήμασι κατὰ τὰ γράμματα δόξαν τοῦ κυρίου [Cels 5:60:13]
- (b) ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμενοι ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν [Cels 7:38:8]
- (c) τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφοῦσθαι ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν [John.Com A 13:42:280:5]
- (d) Ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος. [John.Com A 32:27:336:12]
- (e) Ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα. [John.Com A 32:27:340:1]
- (f) ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφοῦνται. [John.Com A 32:28:357:6]
- (g) ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζομένους καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμενους ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν; [Euches 9:2:12]
- (h) ὁ Παῦλος λέγων· Ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμεθα. [Jer.Hom A 5:8:17]
- (i) ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμεθα [Lam.Frag 81:4]
- (j) ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι [Lam.Frag 116:12]
- (k) “Ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα.” [Hera.Dial I14:6]
- (l) ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος [Jer.Hom B 16:1:35]
- (m) ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτρίζεσθαι [Cant.Frag 231:26]
- (n) ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι [Matt.Com C 12:11:48]
- (o) ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ τις προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενος τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφῶται ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν. [Eph.Com 9:17]

(p) ἀνακεκαλυμμένω προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα. [Ps.Sel 12:1417:23]

(q) Ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένω προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν. [Ps.Sel 12:1681:3]

(r) κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα. [John.Com B 32:27:340:3]

(s) ἀνακεκαλυμμένω προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούνται. [John.Com B 32:28:357:6]

## Chapter Four

### 2 Corinthians 4:1-2

#### 2 Corinthians 4:3

(a) Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον. [John.Com A 32:27:337:1]

(b) Εἰ δὲ ἔστι κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον, [John.Frag 92:24]

(c) τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἔστι κεκαλυμμένον'. [Jer.Hom A 5:8:10]

#### 2 Corinthians 4:4

(-) ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ [Cels 6:5:9]

(a) ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, εἰς τὸ μὴ διαυγᾶσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τῆς δόξης τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ [John.Frag 92:25]

(-) φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ. [Basil.Phil A 15:7:9]

(b) εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι αὐτοῖς τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Matt.Com B 11:14:32]

(c) ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, εἰς τὸ μὴ καταυγᾶσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ [John.Com A 32:27:337:3]

### 2 Corinthians 4:5 None

#### 2 Corinthians 4:6

(a) ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν τὸν φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, [Cels 4:95:22]

(b) ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ [Cels 6:5:10]

(c) Ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμπει, ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [John.Com B 32:27:337:6]

- (d) ἔλαμψε γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ φῶς ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, πρὸς φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ. [Basil.Phil A 15:7:8]
- (e) εὐχόμεθα δὲ λάμψαι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν τὸν φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, [Basil.Phil A 20:22:21]
- (f) Ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψει, ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [John.Com B 32:27:338:1]

#### 2 Corinthians 4:7

- (a) ἔχομεν γὰρ θησαυρὸν ἐν ὄστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν, ἵνα λάμψη ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ μὴ νομισθῆ εἶναι ἐξ ἡμῶν [Princ 4:1:7:21]
- (b) ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὄστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν, ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ᾗ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν [John.Com A 4:2:1:5]
- (c) ἔχομεν τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὄστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν [Jer.Frag B 36:10]
- (d) ἔχομεν γὰρ τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὄστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν [Jer.Frag B 61:6]
- (e) ἔχομεν γὰρ θησαυρὸν ἐν ὄστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν, ἵνα λάμψη ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ [Basil.Phil A 1:7:25]
- (f) Ἐχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὄστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν, ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ᾗ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν· [Basil.Phil A 4:2:5]

#### 2 Corinthians 4:8

- (a) ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι· ὡς μηδὲ πώποτε οὐ θλιβόμενοι, ἀλλ' ὅτε θλιβόμενοι βοηθεῖα θεοῦ οὐ μὴ στενοχωρούμεθα, [Euches 30:1:12]
- (b) ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι. [Euches 30:1:18]
- (c) Ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι [Ps.Sel 12:1137:28]
- (d) Ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι. [Ps.Sel 12:1133:43]
- (e) θλιβόμενοι καὶ μὴ στενοχωρούμενοι [Ps.Sel 12:1232:27]
- (f) Ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι· [Ps.Sel 12:1596:34]

#### 2 Corinthians 4:9 None

#### 2 Corinthians 4:10

- (a) πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέρειν [Cels 7:38:20]
- (b) τὴν οὖν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι πάντοτε ἐνταῦθα περιφέρομεν [John.Com A 1:27:182:6]
- (c) τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πάντοτε ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες καὶ τὴν ζωὴν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ [John.Com A 1:31:227:8]
- (d) πάντοτε γὰρ τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι [Jer.Hom B 15:6:26]
- (e) πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι [Matt.Com C 13:16:9]
- (f) καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πάντοτε ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες [Rom.Frag C 216:15]
- (g) Πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες. [Ps.Frag 37:4:31]
- (h) πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ περιφέρειν ἡμᾶς, ἐρεῖ περὶ [Ps.Frag 74:4:11]

## 2 Corinthians 4:11-15 None

### 2 Corinthians 4:16

(a) Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ' ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα· [Hera.Dial 11:20]

### 2 Corinthians 4:17

(a) Τὸ γὰρ παραυτικά ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, [Cels 6:19:35]

(b) τὸ παραυτικά ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν [Mart 2:9]

(c) τὸ παραυτικά ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, [Mart 49:51]

(d) τὸ παραυτικά ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως καθ' ὑπερβολὴν· [Ps.Sel 12:1121:18]

### 2 Corinthians 4:18

(a) μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα· τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα πρόσκαιρα, τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰώνια. [Cels 6:19:37]

(b) Μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα [Cels 6:59:21]

(c) τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα [Cels 8:5:11]

(d) σκοπούντων ἡμῶν οὐ τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα. [Mart 49:52]

(e) τὰ βλεπόμενα καὶ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα, τὰ πρόσκαιρα καὶ τὰ αἰώνια, [Basil.Phil A 27:3:10]

(f) τὰ βλεπόμενα καὶ σωματικὰ ὡς πρόσκαιρα, φθάσαι δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα καὶ αἰώνια [Matt.Com B 11:5:8]

(g) τὰ βλεπόμενα πρόσκαιρα [Matt.Com C 13:1:55]

(h) καὶ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα, τὰ πρόσκαιρα, καὶ τὰ αἰώνια [Ex.Com 12:269:12]

## Chapter Five

### 2 Corinthians 5:1

(a) οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς [Cels 7:32:28]

### 2 Corinthians 5:2-3 None

### 2 Corinthians 5:4

(a) καταποθῆ τὸ θνητὸν ὑπὸ τῆς ζωῆς [Cels 5:19:40]

(b) ἐκδύσασθαι ἀλλ' ἐπενδύσασθαι [Cels 7:32:7]

(c) καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὄντες ἐν τῷ σκῆνει στενάζομεν βαρούμενοι, [Lam.Frag 10:30]

(d) Οἱ ὄντες ἐν τῷ σκῆνει στενάζομεν, [Ps.Sel 12:1176:26]

(e) Οἱ ὄντες ἐν τῷ σκῆνει στενάζομεν. [Ps.Sel 12:1201:11]

### 2 Corinthians 5:5

(a) Ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο θεός, ὁ δοὺς ἡμῖν τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος. [John.Com A 13:53:356:4]

## 2 Corinthians 5:6

- (a) Θαρροῦντες οὖν πάντοτε καὶ εἰδότες ὅτι ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι ἐκδημοῦμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου· [John.Com A 13:53:357:1]
- (b) Ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι ἐκδημοῦμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου [Cels 7:50:34]
- (c) ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι ἐκδημοῦμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου [Matt.Com C 14:12:92]

## 2 Corinthians 5:7

- (a) Διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν, οὐ διὰ εἴδους. [John.Com A 13:53:357:1]
- (b) Διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν οὐ διὰ εἴδους [John.Com A 13:53:356:2]
- (c) διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν οὐ διὰ εἴδους [John.Com A 13:53:357:3]
- (d) διὰ πίστεως περιπατοῦντος οὐ διὰ εἴδους. [John.Com A 13:53:359:6]

## 2 Corinthians 5:8

- (a) εὐδοκοῦμεν ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον [Cels 7:50:35]
- (b) θαρροῦντες «μᾶλλον εὐδοκοῦμεν ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον [John.Com A 13:53:357:5]
- (c) ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον, [John.Com A 13:53:358:3]
- (d) ἐκδημῆσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν Κύριον' [Hera.Dial 28:12]

## 2 Corinthians 5:9 None

## 2 Corinthians 5:10

- (a) τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς παραστήναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσῃται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος, πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον [Princ 3:1:21:26]
- (b) τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσῃται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον. [Euches 28:5:14]
- (c) τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς παραστήναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσῃται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον [Luke.Frag 228:8]
- (d) δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσῃται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον· [Basil.Phil A 21:20:31]
- (e) δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσῃται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον [Jer.Hom B 20:3:52]
- (f) τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς παραστήναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσῃται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον [Matt.Com C 12:30:58]
- (g) ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Matt.Com C 12:30:84]
- (h) ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσῃται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον [Matt.Com C 13:30:127]
- (i) τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς παραστήναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα



κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον· [Matt.Com C 14:8:56]

(j) δεῖ γὰρ τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον. [1Cor.Com 18:99]

(k) πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε κακόν. [1Cor.Com 27:46]

(l) Τῷ βήματι γὰρ αὐτοῦ φανερωθῆναι πάντας δεῖ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ ἴδια τοῦ σώματος, ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε κακόν. [Ps.Sel 12:1197:45]

## 2 Corinthians 5:11-15 None

### 2 Corinthians 5:16

(a) Εἰ καὶ Χριστόν ποτε κατὰ σάρκα ἐγνώκαμεν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν. [Cels 6:68:18]

(b) Εἰ καὶ Χριστόν ποτε κατὰ σάρκα ἐγνώκαμεν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν [Cels 7:39:13]

(c) Εἰ καὶ Χριστόν ποτε κατὰ σάρκα ἐγνώκαμεν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν [Matt.Com B 11:17:64]

(d) Εἰ γὰρ ἐγνώκαμεν, φησὶ, Χριστόν κατὰ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν. [Ps.Sel 12:1229:5]

(e) ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν· [Cant.Sch 17:277:1]

### 2 Corinthian 5:17

(a) τὰ γὰρ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθε [Matt.Com C 17:33:111]

(b) Ἴδου, γέγονε τὰ πάντα καινὰ, τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθον. [Ps.Frag 77:1:37]

(c) εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ καινὴ κτίσις. [Ps.Frag 101:19,20:5]

(d) Τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθε, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Ex.Sel 12:285:6]

(e) Εἴ τις γὰρ ἐν Χριστῷ καινὴ κτίσις, [Ps.Sel 12:1305:28]

## 2 Corinthians 5:18 None

### 2 Corinthians 5:19

(a) Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσειν ἑαυτῷ [John.Com A 1:4:21:4]

(b) θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσει ἑαυτῷ, [John.Com A 6:57:295:5]

(c) Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσειν ἑαυτῷ· [Basil.Phil A 14:2:27]

(d) Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσειν ἑαυτῷ. [Ps.Frag 5:8:4]

(e) ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσειν ἑαυτῷ. [Ps.Frag 131:8:6]

(f) Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσειν ἑαυτῷ, [Gen.Com 12:89:35]

(g) Θεὸς ἦν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσειν ἑαυτῷ. [Ps.Sel 12:1241:49]

(h) ὁ Θεὸς δὲ ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσειν ἑαυτῷ [Ps.Sel 12:1285:6]

(i) Ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσειν ἑαυτῷ [Pass 146:21]

2 Corinthians 5:20

(a) Ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ πρεσβεύομεν, ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος [Cels 8:1:6]

2 Corinthians 5:21

(a) τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησε [John.Com A 2:26:163:8]

(b) Τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ· [John.Com A 28:18:161:2]

(c) τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν»· [Jer.Hom A 10:1:33]

(d) τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐποίησε [Matt.Com A 127:14]

(e) μὴ γνόντα αὐτὸν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν [Matt.Com C 14:7:40]

(f) Τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ [John.Com B 28:18:161:2]

Chapter Six

2 Corinthians 6:1 None

2 Corinthians 6:2

(a) καιρῷ δεκτῷ ἐπήκουσά σου καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας ἐβοήθησά σοι.“ [Mart 42:12]

(b) ἴδου νῦν καιρὸς εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἴδου νῦν ἡμέρα σωτηρίας [Luke.Frag 100:1:35]

(c) καιρῷ δεκτῷ καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας [Matt.Com C 14:20:54]

2 Corinthians 6:3

(a) μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενὶ [Mart 42:22]

2 Corinthians 6:4

(a) ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι, ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ [Mart 42:24]

2 Corinthians 6:5

(a) ἐν πληγαῖς καὶ ἐν φυλακαῖς καὶ ἐν ἀκαταστασίαις καὶ ἐν κόποις καὶ ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις καὶ ἐν νηστείαις. [Mart 42:29]

2 Corinthians 6:7

(a) διὰ τῶν ὄπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ τῶν ἀριστερῶν [Mart 43:6]

2 Corinthians 6:8-9 None

2 Corinthians 6:10

(a) Ὡς πτωχοὶ, πολλοὺς δὲ πλουτίζοντες· [Ps.Sel 12:1201:8]

2 Corinthians 6:11

(a) Τὸ στόμα μου ἀνέωγε πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Κορίνθιοι. [Ps.Frag 118:131:6]

(b) Τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν ἀνέωγε πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Κορίνθιοι· [Ps.Sel 12:1640:49]

2 Corinthians 6:12

(a) Οὐ στενοχωρεῖσθε ἐν ἡμῖν, στενοχωρεῖσθε δὲ ἐν τοῖς σπλάγχνοις ὑμῶν.  
[Ps.Sel 12:1137:30]

(b) Στενοχωρεῖσθε ἐν τοῖς σπλάγχνοις ὑμῶν. [Ps.Sel 12:1596:39]

2 Corinthians 6:13 None

2 Corinthians 6:14

(a) μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνομία [Euches 25:3:2]

(b) Τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνομία; τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος;  
[Jer.Hom A 1:16:36]

(c) τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀδικίας ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος·  
[Ex.Hom 226:26]

(d) Τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνομία; [Ps.Frag 118:89:22]

(e) Τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνομία; [Ps.Sel 12:1604:35]

(f) τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνη πρὸς ἀδικίαν; [Prov.Exp 17:197:50]

2 Corinthians 6:15

(a) γὰρ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελίαρ [John.Com A 32:24:302:4]

(b) Τίς γὰρ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελίαρ; [John.Com A 32:30:382:4]

(c) συμφώνησις Χριστῷ πρὸς Βελίαρ [Euches 25:3:3]

2 Corinthians 6:16

(a) ἢ τίς συγκατάθεσις ναῶ Θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων· [Ex.Hom 226:28]

The mixture of Old Testament citations with the Greek New Testament in 6:16 - 6:18 have kept this study from looking at them directly as citations of the New Testament as their source is undistinguishable.

2 Corinthians 6:17-18 None

Chapter Seven

2 Corinthians 7:1-4 None

2 Corinthians 7:5

(a) ἔξωθεν μάχαι, ἔσωθεν φόβοι. [Ps.Frag 118:157:7]

2 Corinthians 7:6-9 None

2 Corinthians 7:10

(a) κατὰ θεὸν λύπην λυπούμενοι, μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον ἡμῖν ἐργαζομένην [John.Com A 10:17:102:2]

(b) τὴν κατὰ θεὸν λύπην μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον ἐργαζομένην

[John.Com A 28:4:26:5]

(c) ἡ γὰρ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν ἀμεταμέλητον εἰς σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεται

[Jer.Frag B 70:17]

(d) ἡ γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον κατεργάζεται.

[Ps.Frag 80:1:9]

(e) Ἡ γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον κατεργάζεται.

[Ps.Exc 17:149:15]

(f) κατὰ θεὸν λύπην μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον ἐργαζομένην,

[John.Com B 28:4:26:5]

2 Corinthians 7:11-16 None

Chapter Eight

2 Corinthians 8:1-8 None

2 Corinthians 8:9

(a) Δι' ἡμᾶς γὰρ ἐπώχευσεν ὁ Κύριος, πλούσιος ὢν, ἵν' ἡμεῖς τῇ ἐκείνου πτωχείᾳ πλουτίσωμεν. [Ps.Frag 13:6:3]

2 Corinthians 8:10-13 None

2 Corinthians 8:14

(a) Τὸ ὑμῶν περίσσευμα εἰς τὸ ἐκείνων ὑστέρημα, ἵνα καὶ τὸ ἐκείνων περίσσευμα γένηται εἰς τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα [John.Com A 32:22:284:10]

2 Corinthians 8:15-20 None

2 Corinthians 8:21

(-) προνοοῦ καλά, λέγων, ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων [Luke.Hom 2:16:4]

2 Corinthians 8:22-24 None

Chapter Nine

2 Corinthians 9:1-5 None

2 Corinthians 9:6

(a) Ὁ σπείρων φειδομένως φειδομένως καὶ θερίσει· καὶ ὁ σπείρων ἐπ' εὐλογίαις ἐπ' εὐλογίαις καὶ θερίσει. [John.Com A 13:44:295:20]

2 Corinthians 9:7-15 None

Chapter Ten

2 Corinthians 10:1-2 None

2 Corinthian 10:3

- (a) Ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ ζῶντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα, [Cels 5:64:26]
- (b) Ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ ζῶντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα, [Cels 7:46:13]
- (c) ἐν Παύλῳ τῷ λέγοντι ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ ζῶντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα· [1Cor.Com 16:54]

2 Corinthians 10:4

- (a) τὰ γὰρ ὄπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ πρὸς καθαίρεσιν ὀχυρωμάτων, λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες [Cels 5:64:27]
- (b) τὰ γὰρ ὄπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ [Cels 7:46:14]
- (c) τὰ γὰρ ὄπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ πρὸς καθαίρεσιν [1Cor.Com 16:55]
- (d) πρὸς καθαίρεσιν ὀχυρωμάτων, λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες [Prov.Com 13:25:1]

2 Corinthians 10:5

- (a) αἰχμαλωτίζοντες εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ [John.Com A 13:50:333:5]
- (b) πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ [Cels 5:1:29]
- (c) καὶ πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ [Cels 5:64:26]
- (d) ὕψωμα κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπαιρόμενον [Jer.Frag B 11:14]
- (e) πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ καθαιροῦντες [Jer.Frag B 27:5]
- (f) καὶ πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ. [1Cor.Com 16:56]
- (g) πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ. [Ps.Frag 36:35:7]
- (h) καὶ καθαιρούντων πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ. [Ps.Sel 12:1681:17]
- (i) καὶ πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ; [Prov.Com 13:25:2]
- (j) καὶ πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ. [Prov.Exp 17:216:32]

2 Corinthians 10:6

- (a) ἐν ἐτοιμίῳ ἔχοντες ἐκδικῆσαι πᾶσαν παρακοὴν [Jer.Frag B 27:4]
- (b) ἐτοιμῶς ἔχοντες ἐκδικεῖν πᾶσιν παρακοὴν, [Ps.Frag 103:18:19]

2 Corinthians 10:7-17 None

2 Corinthians 10:18

- (a) οὐχ ὁ αὐτὸν συνιστάνων, ἐκεῖνός ἐστι δόκιμος, ἀλλὰ ὃν ὁ κύριος συνίστησι [Mart 35:27]

Chapter Eleven

2 Corinthians 11:1 None

2 Corinthians 11:2

- (a) Ἠρμოსάμην ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ, παρθένον ἀγνήν παραστήσαι τῷ χριστῷ [John.Frag

45:22]

(b) Ἡρμოსάμην γὰρ ὑμᾶς τοὺς πάντας ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ παρθένον ἀγνήν παραστήσαι, τῷ κυρίῳ. [Basil.Phil A 8:3:14]

(c) τοὺς πάντας ὑμᾶς παρθένον ἀγνήν παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ [Matt.Com B 11:3:17]

(d) Ἡρμოსάμην γὰρ ὑμᾶς τοὺς πάντας ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ παρθένον ἀγνήν παραστήσαι τῷ Κυρίῳ. [Osee 13:828:43]

2 Corinthians 11:3-5 None

2 Corinthians 11:6

(a) εἰ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει· [1Cor.Com 22:2]

2 Corinthians 11:7

(a) ἢ ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησα ἑμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε [Matt.Com C 16:8:207]

2 Corinthians 11:8-13 None

2 Corinthians 11:14

(a) οὐ θαῦμα· αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ σατανᾶς μετασχηματίζεται εἰς ἄγγελον φωτός. [Engas 4:27]

2 Corinthians 11:15

(a) οὐ μέγα οὖν, εἰ καὶ οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ μετασχηματίζονται ὡς διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης [Engas 4:27]

2 Corinthians 11:16-22 None

2 Corinthians 11:23

(a) ἐν κόποις περισσοτέρως ἐν πληγαῖς περισσοτέρως ἐν φυλακαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις [Euches 29:4:4]

(b) ἐν κόποις περισσοτέρως [Jer.Hom A 11:4:28]

(c) ἐν κόποις ἔσται περισσοτέρως, ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσευόντως, ἐν πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις· [Basil.Phil A 25:4:31]

(d) ἐν κόποις περισσοτέρως, ἐν πληγαῖς περισσοτέρως, ἐν φυλακαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις [Jer.Hom B 14:14:28]

(e) ὅτι ἐν κόποις ἔσται περισσοτέρως, ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσευόντως, ἐν πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις· [Rom.Frag A 1:103]

2 Corinthians 11:24

(a) ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν λήψεται, τρὶς ῥαβδισθήσεται, ἅπαξ λιθασθήσεται· [Basil.Phil A 25:4:33]

(b) ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν λήψεται [Jer.Hom A 11:4:31]

(b) ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν λήψεται, [Rom.Frag A 1:105]

2 Corinthians 11:25

- (a) τρίς ἐρράβδίσθη, ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθη, τρίς ἐναυάγησε, νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκεν, [Euches 29:4:7]
- (b) τρίς ἐραβδίσθη, ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθη, τρίς ἐναυάγησα. [Jer.Hom A 11:4:31]
- (c) τρίς ράβδισθήσεται, ἅπαξ λιθασθήσεται. [Basil.Phil A 25:4:34]
- (d) τρίς ράβδισθήσεται, ἅπαξ λιθασθήσεται [Rom.Frag A 1:105]

2 Corinthians 11:26 None

2 Corinthians 11:27

- (a) ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ, καὶ ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις πολλάκις, ἐν λιμῷ καὶ δίψει, [Jer.Hom B 14:16:36]

2 Corinthians 11:28

- (a) ἡ μέριμνα πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. [Euches 11:2:13]

2 Corinthians 11:29

- (a) Τίς, γάρ φησιν, ἀσθενεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; [John.Com A 10:7:30:3]
- (b) τίς ἀσθενεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; τίς σκανδαλίζεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι; [Euches 11:2:13]
- (c) τίς ἀσθενεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; [Lam.Frag 54:4]
- (d) τίς ἀσθενεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; τίς σκανδαλίζεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι; [Matt.Com C 12:23:27]

2 Corinthians 11:30-32

2 Corinthians 11:33

- (a) Καὶ διὰ θυρίδος ἐν σαργάνῃ ἐχαλάσθη διὰ τοῦ τείχους, καὶ ἐξέφυγον. [Nave 12:820:38]

Chapter Twelve

2 Corinthians 12:1 None

2 Corinthians 12:2

- (a) Εἴτ' ἐν σώματι οὐκ οἶδα, εἴτ' ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν [Cels 1:48:71]
- (b) εἰς τρίτον οὐρανὸν [Mart 13:11]

2 Corinthians 12:3 None

2 Corinthians 12:4

- (a) ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι [Cels 6:6:16]
- (b) ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι [Cels 7:43:11]
- (c) τὰ ἄρρητα ῥήματα ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι [John.Com A 6:5:29:9]

- (d) ἄρρητα ῥήματα ουχι ἂ οὐκ ἐξὸν τινι λαλήσαι. [John.Com A 13:5:28:3]
- (e) ἄρρητα ῥήματα, οὐκ ἐξὸν φησὶν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [John.Com A 13:5:29:1]
- (f) ἠρπάγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον καὶ ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἂ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [John.Com A 13:10:58:3]
- (g) Ἦκουσα ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἂ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [John.Com A 13:48:316:16]
- (h) ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἂ μὴ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [Euches 1:1:19]
- (i) Ἦκουσα ἄρρητα ῥήματα ἂ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι. [Basil.Phil A 23:19:10]
- (j) ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἂ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [Matt.Com C 17:2:10]
- (k) Ἦκουσα ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἂ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι. [Gen.Com 12:81:31]
- (l) ἀρρήτων, ἂ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [John.Com B 20:34:304:2]

#### 2 Corinthians 12:5

- (a) Περὶ τοῦ τοιούτου καυχῆσομαι, ὑπὲρ δὲ ἑμαυτοῦ οὐ καυχῆσομαι. [John.Com A 10:7:28:9]

#### 2 Corinthians 12:6

- (a) λογίσηται ὑπὲρ ὃ βλέπει ἢ ἀκούει ἐξ αὐτοῦ, [John.Com A 6:30:157:5]
- (b) μή τις εἰς αὐτὸν λογίσηται ὑπὲρ ὃ βλέπει [Euches 2:1:16]

#### 2 Corinthians 12:7 None

#### 2 Corinthians 12:8

- (a) καὶ περὶ τούτου τρις τὸν κύριον παρεκάλεσεν, ἵνα ἀποσθῆ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ σατανᾶ [Jer.Hom B 12:8:29]

#### 2 Corinthians 12:9

- (a) ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου· ἡ γὰρ δύναμίς μου ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελειοῦται [Jer.Hom B 12:8:32]
- (b) Ἦδιστα οὖν καυχῆσομαι ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις μου, ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Jer.Hom A 11:4:25]

#### 2 Corinthians 12:10

- (a) ὅταν ἀσθενῶ, τότε δυνατός εἰμι [Luke.Frag 67a:1]
- (b) εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὑβρεσι καὶ ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διωγμοῖς καὶ στενοχωρίαις, ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ [Jer.Hom B 14:14:49]
- (c) Εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὑβρεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διωγμοῖς, ἐν στενοχωρίαις, [Ps.Frag 118:71:5]
- (d) Εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὑβρεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διωγμοῖς, ἐν στενοχωρίαις. [Ps.Sel 12:1601:7]

#### 2 Corinthians 12:11

- (a) Γέγονα ἄφρων· ὑμεῖς με ἠναγκάσατε. [1Cor.Com 18:36]



2 Corinthians 12:12-18 None

2 Corinthians 12:19

(a) Κατεναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν [Rom.Frag C 220:8]

2 Corinthians 12:20 None

2 Corinthians 12:21

(a) καὶ μὴ μετανοήσαντας ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ καὶ ἀκρασίᾳ, ἧ ἔπραξαν [Princ 3:1:21:17]

(b) καὶ μὴ μετανοήσαντας ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ καὶ ἀκρασίᾳ ἧ ἔπραξαν; [Basil.Phil A 21:20:19]

(c) Πενθεὶ δὲ καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτηκότων, καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, καὶ ἀνομίᾳ, καὶ ἀσεβείᾳ, ἧ ἔπραξαν [Ps.Sel 12:1480:51]

Chapter Thirteen

2 Corinthians 13:1-2 None

2 Corinthians 13:3

ἐπεὶ δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ, ὃς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀσθενεῖ ἀλλὰ δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν

(a) ε δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ [John.Com A 6:6:42:1]

(b) ε δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ [John.Com A 10:10:46:1]

(c) η δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ [John.Com A 28:7:54:13]

(d) ε δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ [Jer.Hom B 17:2:8]

(e) δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ κτλ [Ps.Frag 118:105:22]

(f) η δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ [Ps.Exc 17:132:30]

(g) η δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ [John.Com B 28:7:54:11]

2 Corinthians 13:4

(a) ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας [Jer.Hom B 14:9:2]

(b) ἐξ ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ ζῆ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ. [Jer.Hom B 15:5:31]

(c) ε γὰρ καὶ ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ ζῆ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ [Matt.Com B 10:22:34]

(d) καὶ ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ ζῆ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ [Rom.Frag B 5:13]

2 Corinthians 13:5-13 None

## APPENDIX 3 — ORIGEN'S CITATIONS OF GALATIANS

### Chapter 1

#### Galatians 1:1-2

#### Galatians 1:3

(a) Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, [Ps.Frag 134:12:10, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]

#### Galatians 1:4

(a) τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, ἐπήγαγεν· [Ps.Frag 134:12:10, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]

(b) τῷ δόντι ἑαυτὸν περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέλῃται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ καὶ ἐξέλῃται κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν [Orat 25:1:21, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]

(c) ὅπως ἐξέλῃται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ· καὶ ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρὸν ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραὶ εἰσιν. [1Cor.Com 87:18, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

(d) ὅπως ἐξέλῃται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ [Eph.Com 9:177, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]

(e) Ὅπως ἐξέλῃται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ. [Ps.Sel 12:1412:52, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

(f) ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ [Jer.Hom B 17:3:9, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]

(g) ἐξελόμενος ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ [Cels 5:32:22, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(h) ἐξελόμενος ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ [Basil.Phil A 22:11:11, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

#### Galatians 1:5

[This passage cannot be represented as a unique reading of Galatians as there are other readings in 2 Timothy 4:18, 1 Peter 4:11, and Revelation 7:12]

#### Galatians 1:6-7 None

#### Galatians 1:8

(a) ἵνα κὰν ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίσῃται, ἢ διδάξῃ ἡμᾶς παρ' ὃ ὁ Παῦλος ἐδίδαξεν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω, [Ps.Frag 68:14:9, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]

#### Galatians 1:9-14 None

#### Galatians 1:15

(a) Ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς, ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς μου, [Basil.Phil A 25:1:3, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(b) ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός, ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου [Rom.Frag A 1:2, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

Galatians 1:16

(a) ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί. [Basil.Phil A 25:1:3, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(b) ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί. [Rom.Com A 1:2, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

Galatians 1:17-18 None

Galatians 1:19

(a) Ἔτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου. [Matt.Com B 10:17:29, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.029]

(b) ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, [Cels 1:47:19, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 1:20-24 None

Chapter 2

Galatians 2:1-8 None

Galatians 2:9

(a) Καὶ γνόντες τὴν χάριν, φησὶν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι. [Ps.Sel 12:1533:52, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

(b) οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβῃ κοινωνίας, αὐτοὶ εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν [Cels 2:1:56, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(c) δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβῃ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν. [Matt.Com C 16:8:177, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

(d) δεξιὰς γὰρ ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβῃ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν. [1Cor.Com 15:43, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

(e) Δεξιὰς, γὰρ φησιν, ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβῃ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν. [John.Com B 32:17:208:2, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.079]

Galatians 2:10

(a) μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν [Matt.Com C 16:8:180, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

Galatians 2:11 None

Galatians 2:12

(a) συνεσθίειν, ἐλθόντος Ἰακώβου πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν, φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς. [Cels 2:1:50, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 2:13 None

Galatians 2:14

(a) Εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαΐζειν; [John.Com B 32:5:63:4, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.079]

Galatians 2:15 None

Galatians 2:16 (cannot be distinguished from Romans 3:20, therefore not included)

(a) ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ [Rom.Frag D 3:20:1, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.039]

Galatians 2:17-18 None

Galatians 2:19

(a) Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι [Cels 2:69:8, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(b) Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι [John.Com A 10:35:230:3, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]

(c) Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι [Matt.Com A 271:21, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.028]

(d) Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι [Matt.Com C 12:25:20, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

(e) Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι [John.Com B 20:12:92:3, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.079]

(f) Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι [1Cor.Com 30:5, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

Galatians 2:20

(a) Οὐκέτι ζῶ ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός [John.Com A 10:10:45:5, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]

(b) Ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [John.Com A 13:52:351:9, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]

(c) ζῶ οὐκέτι ἐγώ· καὶ νῦν δὲ φανήτω, εἰ ἄρα ντες ἑαυτῶν τὸν σταυρὸν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠκολουθήσαμεν· ὅπερ γέγονεν, εἰ ζῆ ἐν ἡμῖν Χριστός. [Mart 12:30, CPG 1475, TLG 2042.007]

(d) Ζῶ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός [John.Com B 20:12:93:1, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.079]

(e) ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [Matt.Com C 12:25:4, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

(f) ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [1Cor.Com 30:5, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

(g) ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [Eph.Com 19:51, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]

(h) Ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [Pass 94:24, CPG 1480, TLG 2042.118]

(i) ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [Rom.Frag A 41:3, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(j) Ζῶ γὰρ, φησὶν, οὐκέτι ἐγώ· ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [Ps.Sel 12:1525:3, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

Galatians 2:21 None

Chapter 3

Galatians 3:1

(a) ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν, ἐν οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρωμένος; [Ps.Frag 9:6:17, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]

Galatians 3:2-3 None

Galatians 3:4

(a) τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῆ. [Jer.Hom B 19:14:57, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]

Galatians 3:5-9 None

Galatians 3:10

(a) Ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν. [Deut.Adnot 17:36:5,15, CPG 1419, TLG 2042.070]

(b) ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶ, γέγραπται γὰρ ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει πᾶσι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά, [Rom.Frag A 36a:11, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(c) Ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶ, γέγραπται γὰρ ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει πᾶσι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά. [Basil.Phil A 9:1:14, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

Galatians 3:11-12 None

Galatians 3:13

(a) Χριστὸς γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα. [1Cor.Com 43:28, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

(b) ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα, [Rom.Frag C 192.1, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.038]

(c) ἀπὸ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα. [Cant.Sch 17.268.11, CPG 1433, TLG 2042.076]

(d) ἐξηγόρασεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου ὁ ἐν τῷ παθεῖν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα. [Matt.Com B 11:8:36, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.029]

Galatians 3:14-18 None

Galatians 3:19

(a) διαταγεῖς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. [Jer.Hom B 13.01.36, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]

(b) τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν ἐτέθη, ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται, διαταγεῖς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου· [Basil.Phil A 9:1:22, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(c) ὁ νόμος διαταγεῖς δι' ἀγγέλων [Matt.Com C 17:2:115, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

(d) ὁ νόμος γὰρ τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν ἐτέθη, ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται, διαταγεῖς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου· [Rom.Frag A 36a:17, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

#### Galatians 3:20-23 None

#### Galatians 3:24

(a) Ὡστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστὸν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν· [Basil.Phil A 9:1:25, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(b) ὥστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν· [Rom.Frag A 36a:19, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(c) ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν. [Rom.Frag A 10:5, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

#### Galatians 3:25

(a) ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἐσμεν. [Rom.Frag A 36a:19, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(b) ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἐσμεν. [Basil.Phil A 9:1:25, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

#### Galatians 3:26

(a) πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστὲ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. [Rom.Frag A 36a:19, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(b) πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστὲ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. [Basil.Phil A 9:1:26, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

#### Galatians 3:27-29

#### Chapter 4

#### Galatians 4:1

(a) ὁ κληρονόμος νήπιός ἐστιν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου, κύριος πάντων ὧν [Orat 22:2:5, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]

(b) κληρονόμος—ἢ νήπιος δὲ ὡς μηδὲν διαφέρων δούλου [Matt.Com C, 13:26:90, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]

(c) κληρονόμον παρὰ τὸν χρόνον ὃν νήπιός ἐστι. [Matt.Com C 15:35:70, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

#### Galatians 4:2

(a) ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους τυγχάνουσι καὶ οἰκονόμους [John.Com A 1:7:38:4, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]

- (b) ἀλλ' ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶ καὶ οἰκονόμους ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός [Orat 22:2:6, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]  
(c) ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους καὶ οἰκονόμους [Matt.Com C 15:35:70, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

Galatians 4:3 None

Galatians 4:4

- (a) ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. [Eph.Com 5:50, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]  
(b) γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικός [Cels 1:70:10, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 4:5 None

Galatians 4:6

- (a) καρδίας τῶν μακαρίων κράζον ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ [Orat 2:3:12, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]  
(b) ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις τῶν ἀγίων κράζειν, Ἀββὰ ὁ Πατήρ, [Ps.Sel 12:1124:38, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]  
(c) ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις τῶν ἀγίων κράζειν, Ἀββὰ ὁ Πατήρ, [Ps.Frag 12:1124:38, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]

Galatians 4:7-8 None

Galatians 4:9

- (a) Νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. [John.Frag 71:21, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.006]  
(b) Νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ [John.Com B 4:24:8, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.079]

Galatians 4:10

- (a) Ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτούς; [Cels 8:21:31, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]  
(b) ἡμέρας ἢ μῆνας ἢ καιροὺς ἢ ἐνιαυτούς [Orat 27:14:2, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]

Galatians 4:11

- (a) φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς μή πως εἰκῆ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς. [Cels 8:21:32, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 4:12-13 None

Galatians 4:14

- (a) τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπύσατε, [Eph.Com 14:32, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]

Galatians 4:15 None

Galatians 4:16

(a) ἔχθρὸς γὰρ γέγονε τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ἀληθεύων αὐτοῖς. [Jer.Hom B 14:13:12, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]

(b) ἔχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν. [Jer.Hom B 14:16:36, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]

(c) Ἐχθρὸς ὑμῖν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν. [Ps.Sel 12:1129:53, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

Galatians 4:17-18 None

Galatians 4:19

(a) ὠδινήσαντες μέχρι μορφωθῆ Χριστὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς [Jer.Frag B 10:4, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.010]

Galatians 4:20 None

Galatians 4:21

(a) λέγετέ μοι φησὶν οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; [Princ 4:2:6:28, CPG 1482, TLG 2042.002]

(b) Λέγετέ μοι, φησὶν, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; [Basil.Phil A 1:13:32, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(c) λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; [Rom.Frag A 36a:22, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(d) Λέγετέ μοι, φησὶν, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀναγινώσκετε, [Ps.Sel 12:1592:25, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

(e) Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; [Basil.Phil A 9:1:1-33, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(f) λέγετέ μοι οἱ τὸν νόμον ἀναγινώσκοντες τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε, [Rom.Frag A 10:5, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(g) Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ τὸν νόμον ἀναγινώσκοντες, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε [Cels 2:3:7, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(h) Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ τὸν νόμον ἀναγινώσκοντες, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε [Cels 4:44:25, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 4:22

(a) γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρης. [Princ 4:2:6:28, CPG 1482, TLG 2042.002]

(b) γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρης. [Basil.Phil A 1:13:34, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(c) γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρης. [Basil.Phil A 9:1:30, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(d) γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἓνα ἐκ



τῆς ἐλευθέρας. [Rom.Frag A 36a:22, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(e) γέγραπται γάρ, Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν [Rom.Frag A 10:9, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(f) Γέγραπται γάρ, ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. [Ps.Sel 12:1592:25, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

(g) Γέγραπται γάρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχε, [Cels 2:3:7, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(h) Γέγραπται γάρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. [Cels 4:44:25, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(i) Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας, [Matt.Com C 17:34:71, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

#### Galatians 4:23

(a) ὁ ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, εἰς τὸ δυνηθῆναι μετὰ τοῦτον γεννηθῆναι τὸν τῆς ἐλευθέρας καὶ τὸν διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. [Jer.Hom A 05:15:11, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]

(b) ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας [Princ 4:2:6, CPG 1482, TLG 2042.002]

(c) ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. [Basil.Phil A 1:13:32, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(d) ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. [Basil.Phil A 9:1:32, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(e) ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. [Rom.Frag A 36a:22, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(f) καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας [Matt.Com C 17:34:75, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

(g) Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. [Cels 4:44:27, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001] [see 4:22]

#### Galatians 4:24

(a) αὐτὰ ἐστὶν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὐτὰ γὰρ εἰσι δύο διαθηκαὶ καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Princ 4:2:6, CPG 1482, TLG 2042.002]

(b) αὐτὰ ἐστὶν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὐτὰ γὰρ εἰσὶν δύο διαθηκαὶ, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Basil.Phil A 1:13:32, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(c) Αὐτὰ ἐστὶν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὐτὰ γὰρ εἰσι δύο διαθηκαὶ, μία μὲν ἀπο οὐρανοῦ, εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα, ἡτις ἐστὶν Ἀγὰρ. [Cels 4:44:27, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(d) ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα [Cels 2:3:8, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(e) ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα [Matt.Com B 10:14:42, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.029]

(f) ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα, καὶ αὐτὰ γὰρ εἰσι δύο διαθηκαὶ. [1Cor.Com 35:28, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

## Galatians 4:25 None

### Galatians 4:26

- (a) Ἡ δὲ ἄνω, φησίν, Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἣτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Cels 4:44:31, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]
- (b) Ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἣτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Princ 4:3:8:9, CPG 1482, TLG 2042.002]
- (c) Ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἣτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν, ὡς γέγραπται καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Jer.Hom A 5:13:11, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]
- (d) Ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἣτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Basil.Phil A 1:24:10, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]
- (e) ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα, [Matt.Com B 11:17:42, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.029]
- (f) Ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἣτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Matt.Com C 16:15:25, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]
- (g) Ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἣτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Ps.Frag 44:9:58, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]
- (h) Ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ὡς ἐλευθέρα, [Ps.Frag 75:3:25, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]
- (i) Ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἣτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Ps.Frag 118:100:18, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]
- (j) Ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν· ἣτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν. [Ps.Frag 130:2:15, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]
- (k) Ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἣτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Ps.Sel 12:1649:18, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

### Galatians 4:27

- (a) Πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μάλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα. [Jer.Hom A 3:2:21, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]
- (b) Εὐφράνθητι στείρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουσα, ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον ἢ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα, ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μάλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα. [Jer.Hom A 9.3.10, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]

## Galatians 4:28-31 None

## Chapter 5

### Galatians 5:1 None

### Galatians 5:2

- (a) Ὅτι ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσει. [Cels 5:48:34, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]
- (b) ὅτι Ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει [Rom.Frag C 190:14, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.038]

## Galatians 5:3 None

Galatians 5:4

(a) ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε· [Rom.Frag A 10:5, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(b) οιτινες εν νομῳ δικαιουσθε της χαριτος εξεπεσατε, [Rom.Frag A 10:14, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(c) Οἵτινες γάρ, φησὶν, ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσετε.[Ps.Exc 17:144:32, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.074]

Galatians 5:5-7 None

Galatians 5:8

(a) Ἡ πεισμονὴ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς. [Cels 6:57:16, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 5:9

(a) Μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ [John.Com A 6:34:2, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]

(b) μικρὰ γὰρ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ [Jer.Frag B 22:23, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.010]

(c) μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. [Jer.Frag B 64:7, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.010]

(d) μικρὰ γάρ φησι ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. [Luke.Frag 107:14, CPG 1451, TLG 2042.017]

(e) μικρὰ ζύμη; ὅλον τὸ φύραμα τοῦτο οὐ ζυμοῖ; [1Cor.Com 26:48, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

Galatians 5:10-13 None

Galatians 5:14

(a) πεπληρωκέναι τὴν ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς ἑαυτὸν [Matt.Com C 15:14:41, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

(b) τὴν ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς ἑαυτὸν [Matt.Com C 15:14:70, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030] [see context (a)]

Galatians 5:15

(a) Εἰ δὲ ἀλλήλους δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε, βλέπετε μὴ ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων ἀναλωθῆτε. [Eze.Frag 13:784:31, CPG 1442, TLG 2042.062]

Galatians 5:16

(a) πνεύματι περιπατεῖν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς [John.Com A 18:109:5, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]

Galatians 5:17

(a) ἡ σὰρξ ἐπεθύμει κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος οὐδὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκὸς, [Jer.Hom A 11:2:11, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]

(b) Ἡ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός, [Cels 8:23:18, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(c) ἡ μὲν σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός. [Matt.Com C 14:3:13, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

(d) σάρκα ἐπιθυμοῦσαν κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος [Cels 3:28:40, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 5:18 None

Galatians 5:19

(a) Φανερά δέ ἐστι τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, [Ps.Sel 12:1132:37, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

(b) Φανερά δέ ἐστι τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, ὁ ἱερός Ἀπόστολός φησιν, ἅτινά ἐστι μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι, ἀσέλγεια, εἰδωλολατρεῖαι, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Ps.Sel 12:1277:23, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

(c) ἅτινα ἦν πορνεία καὶ ἀκαθαρσία. [Eph.Com 25:69, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]

(d) τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός» οἷς ἔθαλλεν ἡ σὰρξ, οὐκέτι πορνεία, οὐκέτι ἀκαθαρσία, οὐκ ἀσέλγεια, [Jer.Hom A 11:2:7, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]

(e) φανερά δέ ἐστι τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, ἅτινά ἐστι πορνεία καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, [Eph.Com 25:69, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]

Galatians 5:20

(a) εἰδωλολατρία, οὐ φαρμακεία καὶ τὰ λοιπά. [Jer.Hom A 11:2:7, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]

Galatians 5:21 None

Galatians 5:22

(a) ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστίν· ἀγάπη, χαρά, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις, [Luke.Frag 112:3, CPG 1451, TLG 2042.017]

(b) καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος, καὶ ἡ χαρὰ καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη καὶ ἡ μακροθυμία καὶ τὰ λοιπά. [Matt.Com C 16:27:35, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

(c) ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστίν ἀγάπη, χαρά, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις, [1Cor.Com 11:48, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

(d) ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστίν ἀγάπη χαρὰ εἰρήνη καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Eph.Com 25:57, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]

(e) ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστίν ἀγάπη, χάρα, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, πίστις, [Ps.Frag 106:37:11, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]

(f) Ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστὶ χαρὰ, εἰρήνη, ἀγάπη, μακροθυμία, κ. τ. ἐ. [Ps.Sel 12:1460:7, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

(g) Ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστὶ χαρὰ, ἀγάπη, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Ps.Sel 12:1504:34, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

(h) ἀγάπη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ καὶ μακροθυμία, χρηστότης τε καὶ ἀγαθωσύνη καὶ πίστις [Basil.Phil A 26:1:25, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(i) ἀγάπης, χαρᾶς, εἰρήνης, μακροθυμίας, χρηστότητος, ἀγαθωσύνης, πίστεως, ἐγκρατείας [Jer.Frag B, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.010]

Galatians 5:23

- (a) πραότης, ἐγκράτεια [Luke.Hom 22:137:6, CPG 1451, TLG 2042.016]
- (b) πραύτης καὶ ἐγκράτεια· [Basil.Phil A 26:1:25, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]
- (c) πραότης, ἐγκράτεια· [Luke.Frag 112:5, CPG 1451, TLG 2042.017]
- (d) πραότης, ἐγκράτεια [Matt.Com C 16:29:20, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]
- (e) πραότης, ἐγκράτεια· [1Cor.Com 11:49, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

Galatians 5:24 None

Galatians 5:25

- (a) Εἰ πνεύματι ζῶμεν, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν· [Cels 7:52:17, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 5:26 None

Chapter 6

Galatians 6:1-6

Galatians 6:7

- (a) Ὁ γὰρ ἐὰν σπεῖρη ἄνθρωπος, τοῦτο καὶ θερίσει· [John.Com A 13:43:288:4, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]
- (b) Ὅτι ὁ ἐὰν σπεῖρη ἄνθρωπος, ἐκεῖνο καὶ θερίσει. [Ps.Exc 17:120:30, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.074]
- (c) μὴ πλανᾶσθε, θεὸς οὐ μκκτηρίζεται. [Jer.Hom B 20:3:32, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]

Galatians 6:8

- (a) σπείρας εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἀλλὰ εἰς τὴν σάρκα, θερίσει μὲν τὴν φθορὰν, [Orat 19:2:25, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]
- (b) ὅτι ὁ σπειρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθορὰν· ὁ δὲ σπειρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. [John.Com A 13:43:288:6, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]
- (c) σπείρομεν οὐδὲν εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἀλλὰ πάντα εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα μὴ θερίσωμεν φθορὰν ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴν αἰώνιον· [Jer.Hom A 11.2.21, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]

Galatians 6:9-13 None

Galatians 6:14

- (a) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται καγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ, [Cels 2:69:9, CPG 1476,

TLG 2042.001]

(b) Ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κἀγὼ κόσμῳ. [Cels 5:64:23, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(c) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἔμοι κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ. [Jer.Hom A 11:4:20, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]

(d) ἔμοι κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κἀγὼ κόσμῳ [Jer.Hom B 18:2:47, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]

(e) ἔμοι μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἔμοι κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ. [Matt.Com C 12:25:21, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

(f) ἔμοι κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ [Matt.Com C 13:21:28, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

(g) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ [1Cor.Com 6:15, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

(h) Εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἔμοι κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ. [1Cor.Com 6:17, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

(i) ἔμοι δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἔμοι κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ. [Rom.Frag A 17:6, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(j) Εμοι ο κοσμος εσταυρωθη, καγω τω κοσμω. [Ps.Frag 118:120:3, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]

(k) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μου Ἰησοῦ δι' οὗ ἔμοι κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ. [Rom.Frag C 166:12, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.038]

(l) Ἐμοὶ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἔμοι κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ κόσμῳ, [John.Com B 19:21:139:7, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.079]

(m) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἔμοι κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ κόσμῳ [John.Com B 28:19:166:4, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.079]

(n) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἔμοι κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ κόσμῳ. [Pass 106:16, CPG 1480, TLG 2042.118]

Galatians 6:15-18 None