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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.
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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). 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. The earliest Christian movements grew out of Jewish oral culture and employed memory-based learning methods. The high cost of

---


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 6th and 7th 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.\(^3\) 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.”\(^4\) 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.\(^5\) Fee then states that there are three broader problems: "reflecting

---


\(^4\) Fee and Mullen, "The Use of the Greek Fathers," 351.

\(^5\) 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."\(^6\) 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.”\(^7\) 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.”\(^8\) 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.\(^9\) 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.\(^10\) This demands that the textual study of the Church Fathers is a

\(^{6}\) Ibid.
\(^{8}\) Ibid.
\(^{9}\) “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.
\(^{10}\) “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.” 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.

Therefore, the opportunity and difficulty the citations afford are equally powerful.

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.

Griesbach also carried out investigations of patristic citations in the 18th century.

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.


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\textsuperscript{16} in general and in regard to Origen’s text, specifically.\textsuperscript{17} A recent wave of PhD and Master’s theses on the subject has also brought new investigations into the conversation.\textsuperscript{18} Historically, investigations on Origen’s text are generally limited to the Gospels.\textsuperscript{19} 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 \textit{New Testament in the Greek Fathers (NTGF) series.}\textsuperscript{20} The scope of this thesis is a response in content and methodology with regard to the remaining task

\textsuperscript{16} A list of the most recent projects known by the International Greek New Testament Project is given at http://www.igntp.org/patristic.html.

\textsuperscript{17} 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 \textit{Instrumenta Patristica VIII} (Steenbrugge: Abbey of St Peter, 1971, and its supplement in 1982.


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.” 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.

Fee defined his own criteria in the following way:

“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

21 Fee and Mullen, “The Use of the Greek Fathers,” 191-207.
22 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.
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.24 Indeed, many other scholars have adopted this categorization over the last 40 years.25 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

24 Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, The Text of the Fourth Gospel, 22.
25 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.26

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.27 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

26 “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.
27 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". 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. 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.” 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

---

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.\textsuperscript{31}

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.”\textsuperscript{32} 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.\textsuperscript{33} 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

\textsuperscript{31} “...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, \textit{The Greek New Testament} (New York: American Bible Society, 1966), xxx; Suggs, “The Use of Patristic Evidence,” 139-47; Osburn, \textit{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).


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.\textsuperscript{34} 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.”\textsuperscript{35}

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 \textit{Editio Critica Maior}.\textsuperscript{36} 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.”\textsuperscript{37} This means that the Initial Text is somewhere chronologically after an original text and before an archetype of all extant manuscripts.\textsuperscript{38} 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

---

\textsuperscript{34} Parker, \textit{The Living Text}, 200.
\textsuperscript{35} Epp, “A Continuing Interlude,” 176.
\textsuperscript{38} 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.  

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. 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.

The Editio Critica Maior (ECM), which has been adopted in the Nestle-Aland 28th 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

---

adopted the text of NA28 as the Initial Text. 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.” 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...” 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.” 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

---

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.\textsuperscript{46} 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.\textsuperscript{47}

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.\textsuperscript{48}

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


\textsuperscript{48} “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? 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, (2) biblical text was cited freely from memory, (3) or subject to alteration in the subsequent copying process. Given the nature of the transmission and copying process

---


51 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.\textsuperscript{52}

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.\textsuperscript{53} 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

\textsuperscript{52} “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, \emph{The Test of the New Testament}, 127.

\textsuperscript{53} 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 \emph{Studies in Stemmatology} (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.54 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.

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.\(^5\) 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.\(^6\) For the latter, TLG is used as the source for finding the citations within Origen’s works.\(^7\)

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.\(^8\) 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

---

\(^5\) *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 entirely online at http://www.biblindex.mom.fr.

\(^6\) See Fee’s guidelines in §1.3.

\(^7\) 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.”

\(^8\)
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 “αδὲλφ-” + “ἐκκλησ-” + “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 Ἐπείτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν. The first search will
consist of the words 1-3: “Ἐπείτα” + “διὰ” + “δεκατεσσάρων” (all within a 7 word span, in any
order). The following search will consist of “διὰ” + “δεκατεσσάρων” + “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. Conversely, many commonly used words in sentences are not helpful in a

59 “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). 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:

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.
60 Fee and Mullen, “The Use of the Greek Fathers,” 358.
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 ἄν τῷ ἐκεῖνος καρποῦς ἐν αὐτοῖς which is listed as a citation for 1:13 which reads in the NA, οὐ θέλω δὲ ύμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ύμᾶς, καὶ ἐκκελύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεύρου, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ύμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐθνεσίν.

(2) Homily 12,13 contains the reading ο δὲ ἀκούων τῆς περιτομῆς κεκρυμμένως ἐν κρύπτω περιτομήθησεται, which is noted as related to 2:29 which reads in the NA, ἀλλ’ ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἰουδαίος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι, οὐ ὁ ἑπαγορος 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 ο θεός ἱλασμόν περὶ τῶν αμαρτίων ἡμῶν. Despite the overlap of προέθετο ο θεός which is in Romans 3:25, the nouns ἱλασμόν περὶ τῶν αμαρτίων ἡμῶν hints at 1 Jn 2:2, 4:10. Despite some overlap in content, it matched more with non-Paoline works, which warranted its removal from the citation list.

(4) Homily 14,11 contains the reading ἐτι ὄντων αμαρτώλων ἡμῶν Χριστός ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν which is footnoted in BP as Romans 5:6.

(5) Homily 7,3 contains the reading τὸ σῶμα τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας 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 εκείνων παραπτώματι η σωτήρια ἠμὼν γέγονεν εἰς το παραζηλώσαι αυτούς 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 ἠμὼν 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 σημεία 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.\(^{62}\) However, critical editions are reconstructions based on the various extant manuscripts. On some level, critical editions are hypothetical and might not

---

represent the authorial writings of the patristic authors. Considering that Origen’s earliest manuscripts are from the 7th 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. This search also relied heavily on *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (CPG), a multi-volume series, to identify the

---

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.65

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.


65 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.” 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. 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.

67 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. 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

---

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. 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

69 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 13th century Codex Vaticanus Graecus 386, which has a fairly straightforward genealogy of its descendants. 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. 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

70 Parisinus Graecus 616, Membranaceus, 12th century, fol. 20r-344v; Venetus Marcianus 45, Chartaceus, 14th century, fol 338; Codex Bessarionis fol. 6r-311r; Venetus Marcianus 44, Chartaceus, fol 224, 15th century; Codex Bessarionis, fol 14r-234v; Parisinus Graecus 945 Regius, Chartaceus, fol. 326, 14th century, fol 48r-314v; Basileensis A III 9, Chartaceus, fol. 472, 16h century, fol. 144r-452r; Parisinus Graecus 293 (Iolianus = belonging to Claude Joly in 1666), Chartaceus, 16th century, fol 1r-304r.
71 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.  

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

---

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.\textsuperscript{73}

However, citation chains do not always contain a verbatim reproduction of a biblical text.\textsuperscript{74} 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

\textsuperscript{73} Fee, “Greek Patristic Citations,” 260; Metzger and Ehrman, \textit{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.

found in commentaries. 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. 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. 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*

---


76 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.

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.\textsuperscript{78} Or Rom.Frag is also in the margin of a 13\textsuperscript{th} 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.\textsuperscript{79}

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

\textsuperscript{78} “...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 XVI (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), 143-44.

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

The 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. 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.

---

80 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.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affinity of Romans Readings in Secondary Sources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identical to NA/RP⁸¹</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>71.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

---

⁸¹ 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).
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

---

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant Readings of Romans in Primary Sources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>82.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 ἔπιστολῆς 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 φησίν 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.84

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.


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 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 Catenae. 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.
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 εἶναι. 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* 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 ἑστιν 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 εἰρήνης 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* 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,
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.

_Prin_, 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

_Prin_ 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 _Prin_ 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 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* 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* 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.
Apoch.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 ἀόρατα.

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

Chapter One
Romans 1:1
Παῦλος δοῦλος 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. l249

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

85 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 πρόσευχων μου, δεόμενος εἰ πως ἢδη ποτὲ εὐσεβήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρός ὑμᾶς

----------------------

ἡδη ποτὲ 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 ἢδη ποτὲ 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 ἰδέειν ὑμᾶς, ἵνα τι μεταδῷ 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 ύμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ύμᾶς, καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἀχρι τοῦ δεύρο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ύμῖν καθώς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν.

----------------------
καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἀχρι τοῦ δεύρο Or(ab) NA RP ] omit Or(c)

Or(c) omits the phrase καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἀχρι τοῦ δεύρο 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
"Ελλησίν τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοίς τε καὶ ἀνοίτοις 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 Cels. 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. Cels 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 ἀλλ' ἄλλα θεοῦ ἂν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρώτον 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 ἁσέβειαν καὶ ἁδικίαν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τήν ἁλήθειαν ἐν ἁδικίᾳ κατεχόντῶν
* γάρ Or(cd) NA RP ] omit Or(ab)

The omission of γάρ 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 γάρ in Or(a) appears to be an accommodation to context which Or(b) reproduces.

Romans 1:19
διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερὸν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ θεός γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἔφανέρωσεν
* θεός γάρ Or(abcdf) NA 01 02 03 04 06 08 012 ] γάρ 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 καθοράται, ἢ τε ἀίδιας 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 θεου 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
διὸτι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὕχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ηὐχαρίστησαν, ἀλλ’ ἐμπαίωθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἢ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία.

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

Romans 1:22
φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν
----------------------

Origen, NA, and RP are identical. Or(abcd) 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 ἠλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὀμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἄνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἐρπετῶν
----------------------

Or(abceghij) NA RP ἠλλαξαντο Or(d) 018 6. 630., αλλαφαντες Or(f) θεοῦ τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Or(f) ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ Or(abcdghij) NA RP omit Or(j) εἰκόνος Or(abcdedefghi) NA RP

Or(df) have participial forms of the verb for ἠλλαξαν (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 αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός 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 φησίν ὁ Παύλος as an introductory marker. Origen is consistent in his citations with NA and RP.

Romans 1:27
ὁμοίως τε καὶ οἱ ἄρσενες ἄφεντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρήσιν τῆς θηλείας ἔξεκαύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὄρεξιν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσειν τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ἢ ἔδει τῆς πλάνης αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀπολαμβάνοντες
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 εἴ, ὦ ἀνθρώπει πᾶς ὁ κρίνων· ἐν ὦ γὰρ κρίνεις τὸν ἐτερον, 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
.getElementsBy thes ploutou thes xristotethos autou kai thes anochis kai thes makrothetaias katafroveneis, angnow oti to xriston tou theou eis metanoian se agei;

tou theou Or(dh) ] autou Or(abcefgijkl) NA RP

Or(dh) both read tou theou, which disagrees with the reading found in NA and RP (autou). 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 ἁμετανόητον ** καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρίσιας τοῦ θεοῦ
----------------------
δὲ Or(abcdflmn) NA RP ] omit Or(hjk)
*σου Or(abcdflkmno) NA RP ] omit Or(hi)
**σου Or(o), αὐτοῦ Or(ch) ] omit Or(abdfjklmn) NA RP
καὶ Or(bcfgimno) 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 δὲ 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(bcdfhn) have introductory markers.

RP has καὶ before δικαιοκρίσιας against the reading of NA. The conjunction is present in Or(bcfgimno). 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 ἔξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθούσιν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἁδικίᾳ ὀργῇ καὶ θυμός

The reading ὀργή καὶ θυμός is in Or(abd), though the RP reading θυμός 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 τῷ ἀγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρώτον καὶ Ἔλληνι

δὲ Or(abd) NA RP ] omit Or(c)
Or(c) omits the post-positive δὲ, against the other two citations and NA/RP. This reading is a lemma.\textsuperscript{86} 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 ἠμαρτον, ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολούνται, καὶ ὁσοὶ ἐν νόμῳ ἠμαρτον, 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 ἀκροσταί * νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ᾽ οἱ ποιηταί ** 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

\textsuperscript{86} See page 47 in reference to lemmata.
ὅταν γὰρ ἐθνὶ τὰ μὴ νόμον ἐχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιώσιν, οὕτοι νόμον μὴ ἐχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσίν νόμος.

δὲ Or(bf) ] Or(acdg) NA RP
ποιώσιν Or(abdegh) ] ποιὴ Or(c) RP

Or(bf) have the post-positive δὲ instead of γὰρ. 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 τοιούτοι instead of οὕτοι 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 ποιῇ. 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 εὐαγγέλιον 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
ὁς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τοῦ θεοῦ ἀτιμάζεις
------------------------
omit Or(b) ὃ τὸν θεόν 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, * πάς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης, καθὼς γέγραπται: ὅπως ἄν δικαιωθής ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσεις ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαι σε

*omit Or(ac) NA RP ] ἐστίν Or(b)

Or(b) has ἐστίν 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 ἐστίν is an adaptation of the grammatical structure of the verse in Origen. Origen adds the verb ἐστίν 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
εἶ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην συνίστησιν, τί ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἁδικος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἔπιφέρων τὴν ὀργὴν; κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω

*omit Or(c) NA RP ] Or(b)
Or(b) does not have the article (ο) 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 κἀγὼ ως ἀμαρτωλός 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 ὦκ ἔστιν δίκαιος σοῦ ὀδὲ εἰς
----------------------
ὅτι Or(bc) NA RP ἀποκρίνεται 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 ἔξελικαν ἁμα ἡχρεώθησαν. οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἔως ἐνός.

Romans 3:12
ο 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
οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὁς ὁ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ

Romans 3:19
δὲ Or(c) NA RP ] γάρ Or(a)

Or(a) is in Rom.Frag A that reads γάρ instead of δὲ. 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

Nυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται μαρτυρομένη 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

dικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν 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 γάρ ἡμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ

γάρ Or(acd) NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Or(b) does not have the post-positive γάρ, 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
οὖν προέθετο ὁ θεός ἡλιστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι εἰς ἐνδείξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγομένων ἀμαρτημάτων

---

diὰ πίστεως Or(abcde) 01 04 06 010 012 0219. 104. 365. 1505. 1506. 1881. ] diὰ 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 ἡλιστήριον δὲ, respectively, instead of the fuller εἰς ἐνδείξιν 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 δικαιούσθαι πίστει ἀνθρώπων 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)
dικαιούσθαι πίστει Or(bc) NA ] πίστει δικαιούσθαι 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

ἠ ἑυδαιμονὴν ὁ θεὸς μόνον; οὐχὶ καὶ ἔθνων; ναι καὶ ἔθνων
----------------------

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 εἰς ὁ θεῶς ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομήν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως
----------------------

ὁ Or(bc) NA RP 06 656.] omit Or(a)
eἶπερ Or(a) NA 01 02 03 04 06c 6. 81. 365. 1506. 1739.] ἐπείπερ Or(b) RP 01c 06 010 012 020 025 044 33. 104. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1881. 2464.
dικαιώσει 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 επείπερ, 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 εἰπὲρ is probably Origen’s authorial citation text with επείπὲρ which has been changed in Or(b) since.

Romans 3:31
νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ νόμον ἴστάνομεν

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. ]
eὐρηκέναι 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
εἴ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἐργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἤχει καύχημα, ἀλλ’ οὐ πρὸς θεόν

omit Or(b) NA ] τὸν Or(a) RP
Or(a) corresponds to the RP reading with τὸν at the end of the verse.

Romans 4:3-7
Origen, NA, and RP are identical.
Romans 4:8
μακάριος ἀνήρ οὖν οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν.

*οὖ Or(b) NA ῦ Or(a) RP
Rom.Frag A, again, corresponds to the RP reading against NA.

Romans 4:9
Ὦ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν; λέγομεν γάρ· ἐλογίσθη τῷ Άβραάμ 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 οὗκ, and ἢ καὶ is replaced by ἀλλ. 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 διʿ ἀκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογίσθηναι [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. πὴν 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 πὴν. 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 καὶ but read εἰς instead of τὴν or omit. This second reading τὴν is in a very small number of manuscripts. 06 and 365. read καὶ but omit τὴν.

Conversely, manuscripts 03 044 81 630. 2464. have the opposite reading (omit καὶ, has τὴν).

Romans 4:12
καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς τοῖς σῶκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν τοῖς ἵχνειν τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ

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 γάρ διὰ νόμου ἡ ἑπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι * κόσμου, ἀλλὰ διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως

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 τούτο ἐκ πίστεως, ἣν κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαιὰν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι, οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὡς ἔστιν πατήρ 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 ἡδη νεκρωμένον, ἐκατονταετῆς που ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας Σάρρας

Or(b) reads ἑαυτοῦ, 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 οὐ 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
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 δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεισιν, * εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ύπομονὴν κατεργάζεται

καυχώμεθα Or(f) NA RP ] καυχώμενοι 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
"Ετι γάρ Χριστός ὄντων ἡμῶν ἁγιενῶν ἔτι κατὰ καρόν ὑπὲρ ἁσβῶν ἀπέθανεν

οmit 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 ἁγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἐτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν

οmit Or(cd) NA RP | omit Or(a)
ὄντων ἁμαρτωλῶν Or(b) | ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων Or(acd) NA RP

Or(a) omits the post-positive δὲ 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 δὲ, has the entire verse, which is a grammatical adjustment. Or(c) is a full citation, which includes δὲ. Or(b) transposes ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων to ὄντων ἁμαρτωλῶν. 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 γάρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλῷ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες σωθῆσομεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ.

οmit Or(ab) NA RP | ὄντες ἐχθροὶ Or(c)
Or(c) transposes ἐχθροίς 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
ἀρχὴ γὰρ νόμου ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀμαρτία δὲ σῦκ ἔλλογεῖται μή ὄντος νόμου
----------------------
*omit Or(ef) NA RP ] ἦ Or(f)
δὲ Or(de) NA RP ] γὰρ Or(af), omit Or(bc)

Or(f) has the article before ἀμαρτία. 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 δὲ. 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
ἄλλη ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἁδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἀμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὑμοίωματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἁδὰμ δός 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’ ἐνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος τὸ δῶρημα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἐνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα.

----------------------
dὲ 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 ἐνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς, πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ τήν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς 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
*μὴ γένοιτο. οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ;*

*omit Or(b) NA RP ἐν Or(b) NA RP ] omit Or(a)*

Or(a) has ἐν 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 βαπτισμοῦ εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὡσπερ ἤγερθη 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 Χριστός * ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει, θάνατος ** αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει

*omit Or(ef) NA RP ] δὲ Or(a), γάρ Or(bc)
**omit ] γάρ Or(d)

Or(abc) have a post-positive after Χριστός. Or(a) has δὲ 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

ὁ γάρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· ὁ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ 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
οὐτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζοσθε ἐαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

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

Romans 6:12
Μὴ σοῦν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ υμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ

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 ἐν. 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 αὐτῇ. 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 ἁμαρτίας ἐδούλωθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνη

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 ἁμαρτίας δούλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον

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· χωρίς γάρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά

γάρ Or(c) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

Or(a) omits γάρ after χωρίς, 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 ἐξών χωρίς νόμου ποτέ, ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν

omit Or(acd) NA RP ] μέν Or(b)
Or(b) reads μὲν 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 δὲ 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
ὡςτε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἁγιος καὶ ἡ ἐντολή ἁγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή
------------------------
μὲν Or(acd) NA RP omit Or(b)

Or(b) omits μὲν 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
Οиδαμεν γαρ οτι ο νομος πνευματικς έστιν, εγω δε σαρκινος ειμι πεπραμενος υπο την άμαρτιαν
------------------------
γαρ NA RP Or(bcd) 01 03 04 010 012 ] δε Or(a) 02 06 020

Or(a) reads δε against γαρ 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 δε 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
συνηδομαι γαρ τφ νομω του θεου κατα τον έσω άνθρωπων
------------------------
γαρ Or(bc) NA RP ] omit Or(a)

Or(a) omits the post-positive γαρ 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
βλεπω δε έτερων νομων εν τοις μελεσιν μου αντιστρατευομενον τω νομω του
νοσης μου και αιχμαλωτιζοντα με εν τω νομω της αμαρτιας τω δοντι εν τοις
μελεσιν μου
------------------------
εν NA ] omit Or(a) RP

Rom.Frag A is omits εν 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. Ἅρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοὶ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας.

----------------------

χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ NA 01 044 33. 81. 104. 365. 1506., χάρις τῷ θεῷ 03, ἡ χάρις δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ 06, ἡ χάρις κυρίου 010 012 ἐυχαριστῶ 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 εὐχαριστῶ 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
dιότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν, τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται, οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται

----------------------

omit Or(cdf) NA RP ] γάρ Or(be)

Or(be) adds γάρ 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 ἐστιν.

Romans 8:8
οἶ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται
------------------------
δὲ Or(def) NA RP ] omit Or(abi), μὲν γὰρ Or(c), γὰρ 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-postive δέ. Or(abi) are lacunose, Or(hj) read γὰρ, and Or(c) reads μὲν γὰρ. Origen adjusts the post-positive to implement the citational text in his own writings in acceptable grammar.

Romans 8:9
'Ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἔστε ἐν σαρκὶ ἄλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. εἰ δὲ τις πνεύμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὕτως οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ
------------------------
δὲ 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 ύμῖν 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 ζήτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν· εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατούτε, 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 ἀγονται, οὗτοι οὐὶ 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 υἱοὶ and θεοὶ. 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 υἱοθεσίας ἐν ὧν κράζομεν· αββα 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 ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται
----------------------
γὰρ Or(ae) NA RP ] omit Or(b) ἀποκαραδοκία Or(c) NA RP ] ἀποκαραδοκία 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 ἀποκαραδοκία 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 ἢ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, σὺν ἔκοισα 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
ότι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθῆσεται * ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ

---------------
πᾶσα Or(c) ] omit Or(abcdefg) NA RP

Or(c) reads πᾶσα after ἐλευθερωθῆσεται. 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 ἑλπίζῃ ἐσώθημεν· ἑλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἑλπίς· ὃ γὰρ βλέπει τίς ἑλπίζει;

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

Or(b) reads τι ἑλπίζει, which is different from NA (ἑλπίζει), and RP (τι καὶ ἑλπίζει). 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 ἁσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν· τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεὶ σῶκ οἴδαμεν, ἄλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις.

--------------------

tight 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 τῳ 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
Οἴδαμέν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπώσιν τὸν θεόν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἁγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὐσίν

--------------------

tὸν θεόν Or(bcdefghijklm) NA RP ] αὐτόν Or(a) omit Or(abcefghik) 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 εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς

----------------------

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

omit Or(abcfgkl) NA RP ] ἐσομένους Or(deij)

Or(a) has two additions in comparison to the NA/RP text. After προέγνω, there is ὁ θεός, τούτους. Later in the reading τῆς δόξης is after τῆς εἰκόνος. 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(cd) 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 ἐσομένος 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 εσομένοος. 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
ὁς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτῶν, πώς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται
----------------------
pαντῶν Or(abcefg) NA RP ] omit Or(d)

Or(d) lacks the πάντων before παρέδωκεν and omits τὰ πάντα, while transposing ἡμῖν and χαρίσεται. 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 γάρ ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωή 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 ὑψωμα οὔτε βάθος οὔτε τις κτίσις έτέρα δυνάστεαι 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
Ἄληθείαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, σοὶ ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεως 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
ηὐχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθημα εῖναι αὐτός ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδέλφων μου
tῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα
----------------------
ἀνάθημα εῖναι αὐτός ἐγὼ NA | αὐτός ἀνάθημα εἶναι Or(a), αὐτός ἐγὼ ἀνάθημα
eῖναι RP

Origen reads αὐτός ἀνάθημα εἶναι, against both NA (ἀνάθημα εἶναι αὐτός ἐγὼ) and RP (αὐτός ἐγὼ ἀνάθημα εῖναι). Though Or(a) reflects the transposition of RP, in only reads αὐτός with no γάρ 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
οἵτινές εἰσίν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὃν ἡ υιοθεσία 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 ἀδιαθήκαι 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' ἦστιν, οὗ * τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταύτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ ἄλλα τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα
-------------------------
*omit Or(c) NA RP ] γάρ Or(abde)

Or(abde) have the post-positive γάρ after οὗ. 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 γάρ γεννηθέντων μὴδὲ πραξάντων τι ἁγαθὸν ἢ φαύλον, ἵνα ἢ κατ’ ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ μένη
-------------------------
γάρ NA RP, μήτε Or(b) ] omit Or(a)
φαύλον Or(ab) NA 01 02 03 04 06 23 57 67 69 81 365 630 945 1506 1739 1881 1908. ] κακὸν 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 μήτω 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 φαύλον 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 φαύλον, 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 ἃ 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 φαύλον vs κακόν
(9:11) and with καθάπερ vs καθώς. Again, except this time in Euches, Origen represents the reading of φαύλον and the omission of αὕτη. 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
ἀρα οὖν οὕ τοῦ θέλοντος οὔδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος άλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεῶντος θεού
--------------------
omit Or(abcddefgi) 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
Ἐρείς μοι οὖν· τί οὖν ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν;
--------------------
mοι 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, μενοὖν γε σὺ τίς εἰ ὁ ἀνταπκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ; μὴ ἔρει τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι—τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως;

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

The beginning of the verse has several readings. Both Or(ab) read μὲνοὖν γε ὦ ἄνθρωπε with RP against NA (ὦ ἄνθρωπε μὲνοὖν). 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 μὲνοὖν. Princ normally does not show accommodation to later readings. Or(b) has copied Or(a).

Romans 9:21
ἡ οὖκ ἔχει ἔξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκέυος 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
tέλος γάρ νόμου Χριστός εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι
----------------------
γάρ 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

\[ \text{ἀλλὰ τί λέγει; ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥήμα ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδία σου, τούτῳ ἐστὶν τὸ ῥήμα τῆς πίστεως ὁ κηρύσσομεν.} \]

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

\[ \text{καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὀμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν} \]

\[ \text{γὰρ Or(ab) NA RP ἠ omit Or(cde)} \]

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

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, ὦκετί ἐξ ἑργῶν, ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις ὦκετι γίνεται χάρις

----------------------
omit NA RP ] ἐστιν Or(a)

Or(a) adds the verb ἐστιν 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, μή ἐπταίσαν ἵνα πέσωσιν; μή γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτοὺς

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 θεός τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, μή πως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται

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

идε ουν χρηστότητα και ἁποτομίαν θεου· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἁποτομία, ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότητι θεου, ἐὰν ἑπιμένης τῇ χρηστότητι, ἐπει καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ.

χρηστότης θεου Or(c) NA ] χρηστότη καὶ ἀποτομία RP

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

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 Ἰσραήλ σωθήσεται, καθὼς γέγραπται· ἥξει ἐκ Σιὼν ὁ ρυόμενος, ἀποστρέψει ἁσβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ.

ομιτ Or(abcdef) NA RP ] ὁ Or(d)

Or(d) has the article before Ἰσραήλ, 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 σὺν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτίρμων τοῦ θεοῦ παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαι ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν.
----------------------
ἀγιαν 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 ἄλληλους φρονοῦντες, μὴ τὰ ύψηλὰ φρονοῦντες ἄλλα τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ’ ἑαυτοῖς.

----------------------
τὰ NA RP ] omit Or(a)
Or(a) omits the particle before ύψηλὰ 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 ἐχθρός σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν· ἐὰν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν· τούτο 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 ἐξουσίας ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσόμεθα. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ύπο θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὕσαι ύπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν.

----------------------
ὑπὸ Or(a) NA 01 02 03 06 010 012 0285. 6. 81. 365. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881. ] ἐξουσία ύπο 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
ὡςτε ὁ ἀντιτασσόμενος τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ διαταγῇ ἀνθέστηκεν, οἱ δὲ ἀνθεστηκότες ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λήμψονται.

----------------------
ἀντιστασόμενος NA RP ] ἀνθέστηκοτες Or(a)
ἀνθέστηκεν NA RP ] ανθίστανται 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 φόρον τὸν φόβον, τῷ τὴν τιμήν τὴν τιμήν
*omit Or(a) NA 01 02 03 06 ] οὖν RP 01c 06c 08 010 012 020 025
**omit Or(a) NA RP ] ἀποδίδους Or(b)
tῷ τὸ τέλος τὸ τέλος before Or(b) NA RP ] after Or(a)

Or(b) inserts ἀποδίδους 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 ἀποδίδους, 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
Mηδὲν μὴ δὲν ὀφείλετε εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν· ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν

----------------------

ὀφείλετε ἵματον 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
tὸ γὰρ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, καὶ εἰ τις ἑτέρα 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)
tῷ 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. ὡς 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 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 κόμοις καὶ μέθαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἄσελγείαις, μὴ ἔριδι καὶ ζῆλῳ
----------------------
μὴ NA RP ] oū Or(b)

Or(b) has a different conjugation of the verb (περίπατοοὐσιν) as well as oū 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 ἁσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει προσλαμβάνεσθε, μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν
----------------------
δὲ Or(a) NA RP ] omit Or(b)

Unlike NA and RP, which have the post-positive δὲ, 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
----------------------
δὲ Or(ab) NA RP ] omit Or(c)

Or(c) omits δὲ, 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
derivation 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 τούτο γὰρ Χριστός * ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἐζησεν, ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζωντῶν
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.
ἐζησεν NA 02 03 04 365. 1506. 1739. 1881. ] ἀνέστη Or(bc) RP 010 012 629. ]
ἀνέστη καὶ ἐζησεν 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 Ἰησούς 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 απέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη. The NA text lacks καὶ ἀνέστη. Origen lacks καὶ ἔζησεν.

Romans 14:10
Sigma de tie krineis ton adelphon sou; he kai sou tie exouthevneis ton adelphon sou; pantes gar paraasthseomeba ti bema to theou
-----------------------
gar NA RP ] omit Or(ab)

Or(a) omits gar 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 φάγῃ κατακέρται, ὡτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως· πάν δὲ ὁ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἀμαρτία ἐστίν.

----------------------

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

NA and RP read δὲ, 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.


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

φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν κατ' ἐπιταγήν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος, μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃ ὢν δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, 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]· ὡστε με ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ 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, αγιου 02 06 010 012 33. 81. 104. 365. 630 1739. 1881. καὶ κύκλῳ Or(cd) NA RP ] omit Or(a), καὶ Or(b)

NA and RP read Ἰερουσαλημ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι against Or(a) Ἰερουσαλημ καὶ μέχρι, and Or(b), Ἰερουσαλημ 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 ύπὸ τοὺς πόδας ύμῶν ἐν τάχει. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἰησοῦ μεθ' ύμων.
τής εἰρήνης NA RP ] omit Or(ab)

Or(ab) are omissive, NA and RP read τής 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 αἰωνίως σεσημημένου,

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.87

Romans 16:26

φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν κατ’ ἐπιταγήν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνώρισθέντος

δὲ Or(abcdgh) NA RP ] omit Or(ef)
omit Or(vcdfgh) NA RP ] ἐν ταῖς προφητικαῖς φωναῖς Or(a), νῦν μοστήριον πεφανέρωται Or(e)

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 δέ, 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant Readings of 2 Corinthians in Secondary Sources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Readings of 2 Corinthians in Secondary Sources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identical to NA/RP&lt;sup&gt;88&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant Readings of 2 Corinthians in Primary Works</th>
<th>116</th>
<th>66.28 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27.43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Readings of 2 Corinthians in Primary Works</th>
<th>170</th>
<th>49.28%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identical to NA/RP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>33.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA, against RP</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.\(^8^9\)

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

\(^{8^9}\) 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).  

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

---

90 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 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 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
ὁτι 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)
dιὰ 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 ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν βεβαια ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν εἰδότες ὅτι ὡς κοινωνοὶ ἐστε τῶν παθημάτων, οὕτως καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως.

ὡς κοινωνοί Or(a) NA 01 02 03 04 06 6. ὡσπερ κοινωνοί 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 ὡσπερ 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 γάρ θέλομεν ύμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδέλφοι, ὑπὲρ τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν τῆς γενομένης ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζήν.

-------------------------
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
κατά δύναμιν ἐβαρηθημέν Or(a) NA ] περί Or(a) 01 02 04 06 010 012 025 0209. 6.
33. 69. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1505. 1908., ἐβαρηθημέν 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
θέλομεν, Origen reads θέλω. The editions read ὑπὲρ and Origen reads περί. NA and
RP read ὑπὲρ again and Origen reads κατά. 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
ἐβαρῆθημέν [Or(a), NA] to ἐβαρῆθημέν 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 ἐαυτοῖς τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου ἐσχήκαμεν, ἢν μὴ πεποιθότες
ὡμεν ἐφ’ ἐαυτοῖς ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ ἐγείροντι τοὺς νεκροὺς
--------------------------------
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
"δός ἐκ τηλικούτου θανάτου ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ρύσεται, εἰς ὑπνίκαμεν ὅτι καὶ ἔτι ρύσεται"

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 θανάτων in NA and RP. The only evidence in the NA apparatus supports Origen's reading (P46 and 630). Origen's reading is preferred.91 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 ρυεται. NA reads ρύσεται. Origen and RP read ρυεται. The support for Origen's reading of ρυεται 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 ὅν in reading

---

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 ἱμεται. On the other hand 630 reads ὑπέρ, omits ἡμῖν, and supports Origen's τηλικούτου θανάτων, and καὶ ῥυεται. Likewise, manuscript 1505 supports περί, and καὶ ῥυεται. 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 ἔστιν, 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, περισσότερως δὲ πρὸς ύμᾶς.

--------------------------------
καύχησις Or(b) NA RP ] καύχημα Or(ad)
αὕτη ἔστιν Or(b) NA RP ] omit Or(a)
tοῦ 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 preluded with an identifying introduction,
that names Paul as the citations source. Or(a), also begins with τοῦτο γάρ ἐστί, which then omits αὕτη 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 γάρ ἐγὼ λυπώ ύμᾶς, καὶ τίς * ὁ εὐφραίνων με εἰ μή ὁ λυποῦμένος ἐξ ἐμοῦ;

*omit NA 01 02 03 04 81 ] ἐστιν 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 ἐστιν by NA. Or(a) has an introductory formula naming Paul. ἐστιν (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
ὡςτε τούναντίον μάλλον ύμᾶς χαρίσασθαι καὶ παρακαλέσαι, μή πως τῇ περισσοτέρα λύπῃ καταποθῇ 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 κυρώσαι 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 ἁγνοοῦμεν.

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 ἐσμέν τῷ θεῷ ἐν τοῖς σφηξομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις,

Χριστοῦ εὐωδία Or(abdefghi) NA RP ] εὐωδία Χριστοῦ Or(c)
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 παντὶ τόπῳ. This longer reading is also reflected in Or(cfi). Or(c) has a transposition that reads εὐωδία 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 παντὶ 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.

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 ὀσμῆ 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 ἐστὶ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονθεῖσα ύφ᾽ ἡμῶν, ἐγγεγραμμένη
οὐ μέλανι ἀλλὰ πνεύματι θεοῦ ᾿ζόντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξίν λιθίναις ἀλλ᾽ ἐν πλαξίν
καρδίαις σαρκίναις.

-------------------------
πλαξίν καρδίαις σαρκίναις Or(a) NA RP] πλαξίν καρδίαις σαρκίναις 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 πλαξίν καρδίαις σαρκίναις in agreement with RP and NA. Or(b),
πλαξίν καρδίαις σαρκίναις, 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.92

2 Corinthians 3:5

οὐχ ὅτι ἂφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν ἰκανοὶ ἐσμὲν λογίσασθαι τι ὡς ἐξ ἑαυτῶν, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ ἰκανότης
ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ,

-------------------------
92 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 509.
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
δς κι Ἰκᾶνωσεν ἡμᾶς δικόνους καὶ νής διαθήκης, οὗ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος· τὸ γάρ γράμμα ἀποκτέννει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἔχονται.

There is one unit of variation between the text in NA and RP, the spelling of the verb ἀποκτέννει. Origen and NA both read ἀποκτέννει, while RP has ἀποκτέννει. 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 ἀποκτέννει. 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, ὡστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον Μωϋσέως διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τὴν κατάργουμένην,

ἐν RP ] omit Or(abced) 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 ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος ἔσται ἐν δόξῃ;
-------------------------

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 γάρ τῇ διακονίᾳ τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον περισσεύει ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης δόξῃ.
-------------------------
*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 εἰνέκεν 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 conflations 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 καθάτερ Μωϋσῆς ἔτι θείως κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ 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’ ἐως σήμερον ἴνικα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται Μωϋσῆς, κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κεῖται.

ἀν 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 ἂν 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 ἔαν ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς κύριον, περιαρεῖται 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 idiosyncrasies 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 ἐστιν· ὦ 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 ἀνακεκαλυμμένως προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτήν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος.

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(abcfgijmnoprs) 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 κατοπτριζόμενοι. Origen reads this in Or(bdefklnpqrs) but also has κατοπτριζόμεθα in Or(hi), κατοπτριζομένος in Or(o) and κατοπτρίζεσθαι in Or(m). The reading of κατοπτριζόμεθα 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. καὶ, 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 ἁπλολυμένοις ἐστίν 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 θεός τοῦ αἰώνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τά νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι * τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς ἔστιν 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., καταυγάσαι 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.] αὐτοί 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 ἀὐγάσαι (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 θεός ὁ εἰπών· ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψει, ὃς ἐλαμπήσεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πρόσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 
--------------------------------
tῆς 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. 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
"Εχομέν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκεῦσιν, ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν·

-------------------------
τὸν Or(bcdf) NA RP ] omit Or(a)
tοῦτον Or(bcdf) ] omit Or(ae)

---

93 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 510.
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 δὲ 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’ οὗ 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 περιφεροντες, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν φανερωθῇ.

-------------------------
*omit Or(abcdefg) ] 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 περιφεροντες, 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 ἔγκακομέν, ἀλλ′ εἰ καὶ ὁ ἐξω ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπος διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ′ ὁ ἐξω ἡμῶν ἀνακαίνουται ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα.

-------------------------
There are two units of variation between NA and RP. Origen is present in one of these variants, in which he reads εσω ήμων, which agrees with the NA text. The witnesses for ἔσωθεν are 018 020 629. 1241. The witnesses for ἔσωθεν ήμων 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 παρατίκα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ήμων καθ’ ύπερβολὴν εἰς ύπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ήμῖν,

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 ήμῶν is listed and supported by Or(d) P46 03. The presence of ήμῶν 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 ήμῶν in Or(d) could indicate a whole adoption of a later reading in the witnesses that have ήμῶν 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 ήμῶν 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
Οἴδαμεν γάρ ὅτι ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τού σκήνους κατάλυθη, οίκοδομήν ἐκ θεοῦ ἔχομέν, 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 σκήνει στενάζομεν βαροῦμεν, ἐφ’ ὦ ὦ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι ἀλλ’ ἐπενδύσασθαι, ἵνα καταποθῇ τὸ θνητὸν υπὸ 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
θαρρούντες οὖν πάντοτε καὶ εἶδοτες ὅτι ἐνδημούντες 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
θαρρούμεν δὲ καὶ εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον ἐκδημήσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημήσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον.

θαρρούντες Or(b) 01 0243. 6. 33. 81. 630. 1739. 1881. ] θαρρούμεν 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 Celis. 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 εὐδοκούμεν 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
tοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ δὲ ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἐκαστὸς τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἀ ἐπιραξέν, εἶτε ἀγαθὸν εἶτε φαύλον

---------------------------------
φανερωθῆναι Or(jkl) NA RP παραστήν αἱ Or(acfi)
δεῖ Or(acdefk) NA RP omit Or(j)
πρὸς Or(abcdedefghijk) NA RP omit Or(l)
φαύλον Or(abcdedefghij) 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 φαύλον vs RP's κακόν at the end of the verse.

Several variants in Origen are present, such as a frequent use of the verb παραστῆναι instead of φανερωθῆναι in Or(jkl). The apparatus of NA does not list this variant. Or(l) has the reading of ίδια as opposed to διὰ. The NA apparatus lists the following witnesses in favour of ίδια: 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 πρός 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 πρός over Origen's readings is clear as all but one has been affected.

2 Corinthians 5:16

"Ὡστε ἡμείς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἶδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα· εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκἐτι γινώσκομεν.

----------------------------------

eἰ καὶ Or(abc) NA P46 01 03 06 0225. 0243. 33. 326. 1739. 1881. l249. ] καὶ eἰ 010 012, εἰ δὲ 018, εἰ δὲ καὶ RP 01c 04c 06c 020 025 044 81. 104. 365. 630. 1739. 1241. 1505. 2464. Χριστόν ποτὲ κατὰ σάρκα εγνωκαμὲν 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 δὲ (RP). None of Origen's citations have δὲ though Or(d) reads γὰρ. Despite having an introductory marker from "Paul", Or(c) and Or(ab) transpose the verb εγνωκαμέν and Χριστόν. Or(d) reads ἐγνώκαμεν first but brings Χριστόν forward as well. This reading Χριστόν ποτὲ 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 Cels 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 the these phrases. These citations probably reflect Origen's authorial citational text.

2 Corinthians 5:17

hores ἐὰν τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις· τὰ ἁρχαία παρῆλθεν, ίδοὺ 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

hores ὁτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν * Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων έαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς.

*omit Or(abcdefhi) 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 ὡς ὁτι 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

'Ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν ως 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 οὖν 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, ἣν ἡμείς 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 ἁμαρτιάν. 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 σοι καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας ἐβοήθησά σοι ἰδοὺ νῦν καιρός ὑπόσδεκτος, 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 προσκοπὴν, ἵνα μὴ μωμηθῇ 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 ἑαυτούς ως θεοῦ διάκονοι, ἐν ύπομονῇ πολλῇ, ἐν θλίψεις, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν στενοχωρίαις

186
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
ἐν πληγαῖς, ἐν φυλακαῖς, ἐν ἀκαταστασίαις, ἐν κόποις, ἐν ἄγρυπνιαις, ἐν 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 καὶ 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
ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας, ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ· διὰ τῶν ὑπλων 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, ώς πτωχοὶ πολλοῦς δὲ πλουτίζοντες, ώς 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 ἀνέψυχεν πρὸς ύμᾶς, Κορίνθιοι, ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτυνται:

-------------------------
ἡμῶν Or(b) NA RP 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

-------------------------
δὲ Or(a) NA RP ὑμῶν ὑμῶν ὑμῶν 01 03 0243. 1881. 2464.

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 ἐτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις· τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἁνομία, ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος;

-------------------------
ἀνομία Or(abde) NA RP ἃδικία 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 ἁνομία to ἃδικία in Or(cf). Or(ade) 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
tίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελιάρ, ἢ τίς μερίς πιστῷ μετὰ ἀπίστου

Χριστοῦ Or(ab) NA P46 01 03 04 025 0243. 33. 326. 1739. 1881. ] Χριστῷ 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 δὲ 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 Χριστῷ (RP 06 010 012 018 020 044 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464.). Or(ab) both read Χριστοῦ. Or(c) has Χριστῷ. 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
tίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις ναῷ θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων; ἡμεῖς γάρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἐσμέν ζώντος, καθὼς εἴπεν ὁ θεός ὅτι ἔνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω καὶ ἐσομαι αὐτῶν θεός καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐσονταί 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 ἠλθόντων ἡμῶν εἰς Μακεδονίαν οὐδεμίαν ἐσχηκεν ἁνεσιν ἢ σάρξ ἡμῶν ἀλλ’ ἐν πάντι θλιβόμενοι· ἐξωθὲν μάχαι, ἐσωθὲν 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
ἡ γὰρ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἁμεταμέλητον ἐργάζεται· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη θάνατον κατεργάζεται.

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 katergazetai.

Chapter Eight
2 Corinthians 8:9
γινώσκετε γάρ τὴν χάριν τοῦ κυρίου ἣμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι δι’ ὑμᾶς ἐπιώχευσεν πλούσιος ὡν, ἵνα ὑμεῖς τῇ ἐκείνῳ πτωχείᾳ 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.⁹⁴ This is probably his authorial citational text.

2 Corinthians 8:14
ἐν τῇ νῦν καἰρῷ τὸ ὑμῶν περίσσευμα εἰς τὸ ἐκεῖνων ύστερημα, ἵνα καὶ τὸ ἐκεῖνων περίσσευμα γένηται εἰς τὸ ὑμῶν ύστερημα, ὡς γένηται ἴσότης
-------------------------------
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’ εὐλογίας ἐπ’ εὐλογίας καὶ θερίσει.

⁹⁴ Metzger, Textual Commentary, 514.
Origen, NA, and RP are identical

Chapter 10
2 Corinthians 10:3
Ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες ὑμῖν κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα,

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
tὰ γὰρ ὄπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν ὑμῖν σαρκικὰ ἄλλα δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ πρὸς καθαίρεσιν ὀχυρωμάτων, λογισμοῦς καθαροῦντες

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 ὑψωμα ἔπαιρόμενον 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 ἐπαρόμενον. 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 ἔτοιμῳ ἔχοντες ἐκδικήσαι πᾶσαν παρακοήν, ὅταν πληρωθῇ ύμῶν ἡ ύπακοή.
--------------------------

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 ἐαυτὸν συνιστάνων, ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν δόκιμος, ἀλλ’ ὦν ὁ κύριος συνίστησαι
--------------------------

συνιστάνων NA P46 01 03 06 010 012 015 l0121. 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
ζηλῶ γάρ ύμᾶς θεοῦ ζηλω, ἡμισσαμήν γάρ ύμᾶς * ἐνί 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 ἰδιωτῆς τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ’ οὐ τῇ γνώσει, ἀλλ’ ἐν παντὶ φανερώσαντες ἐν πάσιν εἰς ύμᾶς.

···

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
"Η ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησα ἐμαυτόν ταπεινών ἵνα ύμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε, ὅτι δωρεάν τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγέλιον εὐηγγελισάμην ύμῖν;
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 θαύμα· αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ σατανᾶς μετασχηματίζεται εἰς ἄγγελον φωτός.

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. 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 ώς διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης· ὄν 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 εἰσίν; 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 ἐν 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
ʻὙπὸ Ἰουδαίων πεντάκις τεσσεράκοντα 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
τρίς ἔρραβδίσθην, ἀπαξ ἐλιθάσθην, τρίς ἐναυάγησα, νυχθῆμερον 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 μόχθω, ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις πολλάκις, ἐν λιμῷ καὶ δίψει, ἐν νηστείαις πολλάκις, ἐν ψυχεὶ καὶ γυμνότητι.
-------------------------
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 παρεκτῶν ἡ ἐπίστασίς μοι ἡ καθ' ἡμέραν, ἡ μέριμνα πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησίων
-------------------------

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 σαργάνη 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 ἀνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, εἶτε ἐν σώματι οὐκ οἶδα, εἶτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν, ἀρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐως 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 ἠρώτησεν Ἐἰς τὸν παράδεισον καὶ ἢκουσεν ἄρρητα ρήματα ἢ οὐκ ἔξων ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι.

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 ἢ οὐκ for οὐκ in Or(f), and the substitution of ἢ οὐκ for ἢ 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 τοιούτου καυχῆσομαι, ὑπὲρ δὲ ἐμαυτοῦ 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, ἀλῆθειαν γὰρ ἐρῶ· φείδομαι δέ, μὴ τις εἰς ἐμὲ λογίσηται ὑπὲρ δ ἀνέπτει με ἡ ἀκούει [τι] ἐξ ἐμοῦ
-------------------------------

Origen, NA, and RP are identical.

2 Corinthians 12:8
ὑπὲρ τούτου τρίς τὸν κύριον παρεκάλεσα ἵνα ἀποστῇ 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 εἰρήκεν μοι· ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου, ἡ γὰρ δύναμις ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖται. Ἡδίστα ὤν 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. ]
teleioútau Or(a) RP 01c 06c 018 020 025 044 0243. 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. ]
teleítai 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 (τελείται). 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 τελείται are the original hands of many of the witnesses for the alternate reading τελείται 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
dιὸ εὔδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείας, ἐν ὑβρεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διωγμοῖς **καὶ στενοχωρίαις, ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ· ὅταν γὰρ ἀσθενῶ, τότε δυνατὸς εἰμί.
--------------------
*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 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 ἀφρων, * ὑμεῖς με ἡναγκάσατε. ἐγὼ γὰρ ὄφειλον ὑφ’ ὑμῶν συνίστασθαι. οὐδὲν γὰρ υστέρησα τῶν υπερλίαν ἀποστόλων εἰ καὶ οὐδὲν εἰμι.

*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 υμῖν ἀπολογούμεθα. κατέναντι θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν· τὰ δὲ πάντα, ἁγαπητοί, ὑπὲρ τῆς υμῶν 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 ταπεινώθη, μὲν ὁ θεός μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ πενθήσω

πολλούς τῶν προσμαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ

πορνείᾳ καὶ ἀσελγείᾳ ἂν ἔπραξαν.

-------------------------

ἀκαθαρσία καὶ πορνείᾳ NA RP, ἀμαρτία καὶ ἀνομία Or(c) ἀσελγείᾳ καὶ ἀκρασίᾳ

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 ὑπὸ 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 ζῇ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ. καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς

ἀσθενοῦμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ ζῆσομεν 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

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant Readings of Galatians in Secondary Sources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Readings of Galatians in Secondary Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identical to NA/RP(^{95})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

---

\(^{95}\) 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant Readings of Galatians in Primary Works</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Readings of Galatians in Primary Works</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identical&lt;sup&gt;96&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>99.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, φησίν... (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 at Church Father uses such devices consistently (which Origen doesn’t) and that a Church Fathers 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 οὖ 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 ὧδινήσοντες to ὧδίνω (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), Παύλῳ 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 fives 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* 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 ύμιν 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).97

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
tοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὡς ἡμᾶς ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰὼνος τοῦ ἑνεστῶτος πανηγυροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός ἡμῶν

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>Or(b)</th>
<th>Or(a)</th>
<th>P46</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>015</th>
<th>0278</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>630</th>
<th>1175</th>
<th>1505</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>2464</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὑπέρ</td>
<td>Or(a)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>P51</td>
<td>01(2)</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>0278</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>81.</td>
<td>326.</td>
<td>630.</td>
<td>1175.</td>
<td>1505.</td>
<td>2464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περὶ</td>
<td>Or(b)</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>P46</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>044</td>
<td>69.</td>
<td>104.</td>
<td>1739.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁμαρτιῶν</td>
<td>Or(a)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>ἀμαρτωλῶν</td>
<td>Or(b).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐξέληται</td>
<td>Or(bcdh)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>ἐξελόμενος</td>
<td>Or(gi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀιώνος</td>
<td>τοῦ</td>
<td>Or(bcdef)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>P46</td>
<td>P51</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>81.</td>
<td>326.</td>
<td>630.</td>
<td>1241.</td>
<td>1739.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἑνεστῶτος</td>
<td>αἰώνος</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>01c</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>044</td>
<td>0278.</td>
<td>69.</td>
<td>104.</td>
<td>365.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 ὑπέρ. Or(a) reads ὑπέρ in correspondence to NA, while Or(b) reads περὶ. This variant is found in the apparatus of NA Tisch Treg and VS. περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν appears in the LXX (8x) and reflects a Johannine usage. ὑπέρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν is strictly Pauline appearing twice in his corpus, once in LXX. Origen contains both readings but significantly uses περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν more
frequently (15x) instead of ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (2x). It appears περὶ is the earlier reading yet ὑπὲρ reflects Pauline usage as would be expected here in Galatians.98 Origen’s reading of ὑπὲρ 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 πρός Γαλάτας. Or(e) also reads καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος 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 ἀπὸ 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 περὶ.

98 Burton, “Critical and Exegetical Commentary”, 13 states “Intrinsic probability is in favour of ὑπὲρ, for though Paul uses both prepositions with both meanings, “concerning” and “on behalf of”, he employs περὶ much more commonly in the former sense and ὑπὲρ 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 εὐαγγελίζηται ύμῖν παρʼ ὁ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ύμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἢστω.

--------------------
eὐαγγελίζηται NA RP 020 6. 33. 69. 945. 010 012 044 ] εὐαγγελίσηται Or(a) 01 02 010 012 81. 104. 326. 1241., εὐαγγελίζηται 018 025 0278. 365. 614. 1505. 1881. 1908. 2464.
ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ NA RP ] ύμῖν εὐαγγελίζηται P51 03 015 630. 1175. 1739., ἣν κἂν Or(a) ]

Or(a) is marked with ἣ διδάξῃ ἡμᾶς παρʼ ὁ Παύλος 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 ἢστω. 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
dοκούντες στύλοι εἶναι, δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρναβᾶ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἥμεῖς
eῖς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν.

----------------------
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.
dέ Or(cde) NA RP] omit Or(b)
1425. 1611. 1739.
dέ Or(cde) NA RP] omit Or(b)

Or(b) is intermittent, omitting ἵνα ἥμεῖς μὲν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη and δέ, as well as
substituting the reading of ἐμοί 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 ἐπιστολῆ 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(bcode) 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

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 εἰδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾶ ἐμπρόσθεν πάντων· εἰ δὲ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζησ, πῶς τὰ ἑθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαῖες;

καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆσ NA 01 02 03 04 015 025 044 0278. 6. 8. 33. 69. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. ] καὶ οὐχὶ 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).99

Galatians 2:17-18
No citations

Galatians 2:19
ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω. Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι.

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 ἐγὼ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοί Χριστός· ὦ δὲ νῦν ζῷ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῷ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπησαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.

The first variant is an omission of the post-positive δὲ 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 ἐγὼ in Or(a). The third is another omission of δὲ 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 γὰρ 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
"Ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ύμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν *, οίς κατ’ ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ** ἔσταυρωμένος;

*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 ἐπετίμα. 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 ἔξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν· γέγραπται γὰρ ὦτι ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς ὄψακ ἐμμένει * πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιήσαι αὐτά.

-------------------------
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 κατάρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ύπερ ἡμῶν κατάρα, ὅτι γέγραπται· ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμένος ἐπὶ ξύλου

-------------

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 Παύλος 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 οὐ ἔλθη τὸ σπέρμα ὃ ἐπήγγελται, διαταγεὶς δι᾽ ἄγγελων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου.

Or(d) shows the explanatory nature of using citations for argumentations (γάρ).

Origen is often different from both NA and RP (ἔτεθη). 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 δὲ, ἐφ′ ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος * νήπιοις ἐστίν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου κύριος πάντων ὥν

κληρονόμος Or(ab) NA RP ] κληρονόμον Or(c)
*omit Or(a) NA RP ] η Or(b), παρά 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

\[ \text{ἄλλῳ ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἔστιν καὶ οἰκονόμους ἁχρὶ τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρὸς} \]

\[ \text{ἔστιν Or(b) NA RP ἃ} \]

\[ \text{τυγχάνουσι Or(a), omit Or(c)} \]

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

\[ \text{Ὅτι δὲ ἔστε υἱοί, ἐξαιρέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κραζόν· αββα ὁ πατήρ} \]

\[ \text{ἡμῶν NA, τῶν ἀγίων Or(b), τῶν μακαρίων Or(a), ὑμῶν RP κραζόν Or(a) NA RP ἃ} \]

NA reads ήμων, 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.\textsuperscript{100} 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

\begin{verbatim}
νῦν δὲ γνώντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενή καὶ πωχά στοιχεία ὁίς πάλιν ἀνώθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε;
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{100} 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)

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 ἔξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἄγγελον θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν

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 06 010 012 6. 33. ] ὑμήν τὸν Or(a) 04 6. 69. 1739. 1881., μου τὸν RP 04 06c 08 018 020 025 044 365. 630. 1175. 1505. 1908., μου P46, τὸν 0278. 81. 104. 326. 1241. 2464. 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. τὸν 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 ύμων after πειρασμόν).

Galatians 4:15
No citations

Galatians 4:16
 ámbë ἐχθρὸς ύμων γέγονα ἀληθεύων ύμῖν;

-------------------------
 ύμων Or(b) NA RP ) γάρ Or(a), ύμῖν Or(c)
 γέγονα Or(bc) NA RP ) γέγονε Or(a)
 omit Or(bc) NA RP ) τοῖς ἀκούουσιν Or(a)
 ύμῖν 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 ύμων 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, οὖς πάλιν ὤδινω μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν.

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, οί υπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε;

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.
Or(d) has introductory material including Παύλος πεποίηκεν ἐν τῇ πρός Γαλάτας ἐπιστολή 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 πρός Γαλάτας φάσκῃ. When compared to the readings found in NA and RP there are two differences. In the first unit of variation Origen reads τὸν 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 Ἀβραάμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἕνα ἐκ τῆς ἑλευθέρας.

Galatians 4:23

οτι Or(abcdfgh) 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
ἂλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἑλευθέρας δι' ἐπαγγελίας.

μὲν Or(abcdefg) 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
dι' 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

Or(bdgjkl) NA RP ] omit Or(cehi)
*omits Or(abcdghil) 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(abcddefghik) 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

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).
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
"Ιδὲ ἦγὼ Παύλος λέγω ύμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν περιτέμνῃσθε, Χριστὸς ύμᾶς οὐδὲν ὕφελθε."

-------------------------
ύμᾶς οὐδὲν Or(b) NA RP ] οὐδὲν ύμᾶς Or(a)

NA and RP read ύμᾶς οὐδὲν whereas Origen reads οὐδὲν ύμᾶς. 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 * ζυμοῖ.

*omit Or(abcd) NA RP τούτο οὐ Or(e)

Origen's citations of 5:9 are very consistent, other than Or(e) which adds τούτο 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 ἑνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

Or(a), NA and RP all have different readings for πληρῶ. 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 δὲ, πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς ὃ μὴ τελέσῃτε.

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.
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
ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλους ἀντίκειται, ἵνα μὴ ἢ ἐάν θέλητε ταῦτα ποιήτε.  

-------------------------
γάρ NA RP ] μὲν Or(c), omit Or(ab)
omit Or(bc) NA RP ] οὐδὲ Or(a)
δὲ 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 δὲ of the verse and makes up for the loss with the addition of οὐδὲ. Other than that, Origen is rather consistent.

Galatians 5:18
No citations

Galatians 5:19
φανερὰ δὲ ἐστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, ἀτινά ἐστιν πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια,  

-------------------------
Or(b) shows some affinity to RP against NA with μοῖχεια, 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, ἑχθραί, ἑρισ, ζῆλος, θυμοί, ἐριθεῖαι, διχοστασίαι, αἱρέσεις,
------------------------
eἰδωλολατρία Or(a) NA ] ειδωλολάτρεια 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 πνεύματος ἐστιν ἀγάπη χαρά εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία χρηστότης ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις
------------------------
omit Or(acdfg) NA RP ] γάρ Or(e)
ἐστιν ἀγάπη NA RP Or(acde) ] ἐστιν Or(fg), καὶ ἢ Or(b)
ἀγάπη χαρά εἰρήνη Or(acde) NA RP ] καὶ ἢ χαρά καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἢ Or(b), χαρά εἰρήνη ἀγάπη Or(f), χαρά, ἀγάπη, εἰρήνη Or(g)
χρηστότης, 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 ἢ 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 χαρά. 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
πραυτής ἐγκράτεια· κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἦστιν νόμος

πραυτής Or(b) NA 01 02 03 04 6. 31. 80. 118. 1908. ] πραυτής 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 στοιχώμεν

ζῶμεν πνεύματi NA RP ] πνεύματι ζῶμεν Or(a)

The NA and RP both read ζῶμεν πνεύματi 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 πνεύματi 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 ζωήν αἰώνιον

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

'Εμοί δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχάσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἑσταύρωται κάγω * κόσμῳ.

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 (τὸ) favors the omission. All major early uncial 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:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>1Cor.Com Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 possible show areas of authorial citations text in Origen.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 has 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John.Frag is a probably good representation of Origen's authorial citations in all three epistles considering the free readings and identical readings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.\(^{101}\) 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.

\(^{101}\) "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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Cels Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Euches Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 24</th>
<th><em>Jer.Hom A</em> Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistle</td>
<td>Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 25</th>
<th><em>Jer.Hom B</em> Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistle</td>
<td>Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 26</th>
<th><em>John.Com A</em> Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistle</td>
<td>Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matt.Com A Readings</th>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matt.Com B Readings</th>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matt.Com C Readings</th>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 32</th>
<th>Pass Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistle</td>
<td>Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 33</th>
<th>Princ Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistle</td>
<td>Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.Com Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen.Com Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no evidence of later changes to the Byzantine text in Gen.Com in its citations of Romans and 2 Corinthians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen.Sel Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no evidence of later changes to the Byzantine text in *Gen.Sel* in its citations of Romans and 2 Corinthians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 41</th>
<th>Hera.Dial Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistle</td>
<td>Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 42</th>
<th>Rom.Frag B Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistle</td>
<td>Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_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. 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

---

102 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.\textsuperscript{103} Below, the nature of how all of Origen’s citations

\textsuperscript{103} 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. 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. 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.


5.2.1. The Overall Textual Affinity of Romans Citations

Table 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affinity of Variant Citations of Romans in Secondary Sources</th>
<th>Affinity of Variant Citations of Romans in Primary Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>123 53.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>57 24.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>51 22.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Affinity of All Romans Citations in Secondary Sources</th>
<th>Weighted Affinity of All Citations of Romans in Primary Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identical to NA/RP</td>
<td>586 71.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>123 15.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>57 6.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>51 6.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>817 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

106 See page 50 in ch. 2 concerning the “weighting” of readings.

107 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 to 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 |
|------------------|------------------|
| **Affinity of Variant Citations of 2 Corinthians in Secondary Sources** | **Affinity of Variant Citations of 2 Corinthians in Primary Sources** |
| Against Both | 38 | 71.70% |
| With NA against, RP | 8 | 15.09% |
| With RP, against NA | 7 | 13.21% |
| Total | 53 | 100% |
| Weighted Affinity of All 2 Corinthians Citations in Secondary Sources | Weighted Affinity of All Citations of 2 Corinthians in Primary Sources |
| Identical to NA/RP | 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% |

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.\textsuperscript{108} 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

\textsuperscript{108} 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 \textit{Ps.Sel} and \textit{Ps.Frag}. They both have two units of variation in which they correspond to the RP text against the NA text. \textit{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. \textit{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 \textit{Gen.Com, Prov.Com, Ex.Sel, Gen.Sel} or \textit{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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affinity of Variant Citations of Galatians in Secondary Sources</th>
<th>Affinity of Variant Citations of Galatians in Primary Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>Against Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.24%</td>
<td>61.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>25.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Affinity of All Galatians Citations in Secondary Sources</th>
<th>Weighted Affinity of All Citations of Galatians in Primary Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identical to NA/RP</td>
<td>Identical to NA/RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>37.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>Against Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.39%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>16.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.109

---

109 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. Nor does the theory that his biblical exemplars changed over his career due to his various geographical placements. 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:

110 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.

111 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.
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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
τοὺς δὲ ἔξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσιν * τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἁδικίᾳ ὀργῇ καὶ θυμὸς

----------------------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Affinity of Secondary Sources</th>
<th>Overall Affinity of Primary Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identical to NA/RP</td>
<td>48-71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>15-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>7-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>6-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identical to NA/RP</td>
<td>37-57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Both</td>
<td>34-38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NA against, RP</td>
<td>5-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With RP, against NA</td>
<td>2-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.\(^\text{112}\) 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\(^{nd}\) or early-third centuries were either unlike the textual traditions as they are found in critical editions today or Origen simply cites freely.\(^\text{113}\)

Romans 9:19

Ἐρείς μοι οὖν· τί οὖν ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἄνθεστηκεν;

\(^\text{112}\) see Or(c) for this verse, Appendix #1


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
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
tοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπέρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὥσπερ ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἑνεστῶτος πανημοῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν

--------------------
tῷ δόντι [Or(b)] τοῦ δόντος NA RP
ὑπέρ [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 ἑνεστῶτος [Or(bcdef)] NA P46. 51(vid) 01* 02 03 6. 33. 81. 326. 630. 1241. 1739. 1881. ] ἑνεστῶτος 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 ἑνεστῶτος. As has been seen in the previous chapters, Origen often reads περὶ where NA reads ὑπέρ (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 ἑνεστῶτος 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

Ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν, * οίς κατ’ ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς
προεγράφη ** ἐσταυρωμένος;

*ἐν Or(a) ] omit NA 01 02 03 06 010 012 6. 33. 81. 630. 1739., τῇ ἀλήθεια μὴ
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 μὴ 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, ἀδέλφοι, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεύρο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθώς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐθνεσίν
----------------------
καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεύρο Or(ab) NA RP ] omit Or(c)

Or(c), Rom.Frag B, omits the phrase καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεύρο, 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
"Ελλησόν τε* καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοίς τε** καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὁφειλέτης 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

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

----------------------

γὰρ Or(bd) 6. 67. 1908. ] omit Or(cd), μὲν ὅτι 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

ὅν προέθετο ὁ θεός ἱλασθήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγογονότων ἁμαρτημάτων  

----------------------

diὰ 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 διά 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 σημείον ἔλαβεν περιτομής 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.
tὴν 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 ἐνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς, πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσειάν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς ᾿Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ

----------------------------------------
ἐν Or(ab) 1739. 1881 ἐν τῷ τοῦ NA RP 01 03 04 018 020 025
τῆς δωρεᾶς Or(a) NA RP ] omit Or(b) 03
‘Ησοῦ Χριστοῦ Or(a) NA RP ] Χριστοῦ ‘Ησοῦ 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 ᾿Ιησοῦ 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
cαρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἀγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον

The citations from Ps.Frag, Ps.Sel, and Prov.Exp all contain the phrase δῆλον ὅτι κατ’
ἀρετὴν καὶ γνώσιν, 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 ἀγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν

υἱοὶ εἰσιν θεοῦ Or(ac) 03 010 012 ὑιοὶ 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 υψώμα οὔτε βάθος οὔτε τις κτίσις έτέρα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγάπης 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 ἔξ ἐργων 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 ἔτερα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαίονται [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
ὁς ἐκ τηλικούτων θανάτων ἐφρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ρύσεται, εἰς ὅν ἠλπίκαμεν ὅτι καὶ ἔτι ρύσεται
-------------------------
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 ῶρύσεται NA P46 01 03 04 025 0209. 33. 81. 365. 1175. ] ρύσεται 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 ρύσεται. 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 παρατίκαι ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ᾧ 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 εὐδοκοῦμεν 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 θαρροῦμεν. Again, Origen would is 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
τούς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθήναι δεῖ ἐμπρόσθεν τοῦ βῆματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσῃ τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἄπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον.

-------------------------
φαῦλον Or(abcddefghij) NA 01 04 048. 0243. 33. 81. 326. 365. 630. 1739. 1881. ]
kακόν 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 κακὸν 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.
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 in not in the critical edition of NA, Tisch, VS or Treg. This suggests an authorial Origen citation, and quite possibly his biblical text.

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,

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 ςδντες, 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 τοῦτο τρὶς τὸν κύριον παρεκάλεσα ἵνα ἀποστῇ ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ.

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 ἀνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου
----------------------
γὰρ NA 01 02 06 010 012 044 81. 365. 630. 1506. 1739. 1881. 1908. ] oūn 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 γὰρ. 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 σημείον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς οφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστία, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστεύοντων 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. 360. 1506. 1739. 1881. 2464. τῆν 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, 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 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 καὶ but read ἔις instead of τὴν. This second reading of τὴν is in a very small number of manuscripts. 06 and 365. read καὶ but omit τὴν.

Conversely, B 044 81 630. 2464. have the opposite reading (omit καὶ, include τὴν).

Romans 8:24

τὶ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν· ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐλπίς· ὡ 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 (ἔλπιζει), 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 καὶ. 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 ἀνταπκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ; μὴ ἔρει τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι· τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως;

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, ἀδέλφοι, ὑπὲρ τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν τῆς γενομένης ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, ὧτι καθ’ ύπερβολὴν ὑπὲρ δύναμιν ἐβαρήθημεν ἡστε ἔξαπορθῆκαι ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν·

θέλω γὰρ ὁρ(a) 018 ὁρ γὰρ θελομέν NA RP
περὶ ὁρ(a) 01 02 04 06 010 012 025 0209. 6. 33. 69. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1505. 1908. ] ὑπὲρ 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., ἐργαζόμενη 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’ ὃ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἔλευθέρας δι’ ἐπαγγελίας.

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 διά 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 πρόσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος.

There are several differing forms of the verb μεταμορφούμαι 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 μεταμορφούμαι, the rest of the citations are very consistent considering that there are 19 different citations, many of which are from different works of Origen.
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).

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 καὶ 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.114 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.115 The fluctuation of Origen’s agreements with either NA or RP is

---


115 “...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 Publishing 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.\textsuperscript{116} 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,\textsuperscript{117} and that most readings at the epistle-level are either fluid or identical to both NA and RP,\textsuperscript{118} 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.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{116} The Papyrus Cairo 88748, found in 1941 near Tura is the earliest document of a writing by Origen.
\textsuperscript{117} See Table 36.
\textsuperscript{118} See Table 33-35.
\textsuperscript{119} “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, \textit{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.¹²⁰

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

---

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 6th 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. 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?

121 Amy M. Donaldson, "Explicit References to New Testament Variant Readings Among Greek and Latin
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.\(^\text{122}\)

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 \textit{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

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. Alas, the supposed textual critic Origen, through his voluminous citations, fails to provide that which the 21st 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

---

123 Metzger and Ehrman, *The Test 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. Fee agrees "critical reconstructions, especially of the biblical text of the early Greek Fathers,

124 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.\footnote{Fee, “Use of the Greek Fathers,” 191-207.} 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.\footnote{Ibid, 364.} 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.\footnote{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 decent from the original text." Fee “P75, P66, and Origen,” 272.} 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.\footnote{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.\footnote{Stanley concludes that when conflations occur in Strabo, pseudo-Longinus, Heraclitus and Plutarch, they are rarely due to lapse of memory and are very intentional, cf. Christopher D. Stanley, \textit{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.} The awareness of variant readings and attempts to reconcile differing text-forms is apparent in the patristic writings.\footnote{Donaldson, "Explicit References", 2009; Metzger, "Explicit References in the Works of Origen," 78-95.} 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.\footnote{Aristotle, “On Memory and Reminiscence” in \textit{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.} 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.\footnote{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.} 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.
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. 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
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133 “...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. 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. 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 αἰώνας” 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.

134 Various categories such as “allusion,” “adaptation,” or “citation” cf. Fee, “Text of John in Origen and Cyril,” 362.
135 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.¹³⁶ 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

¹³⁶ 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.\textsuperscript{137} However, a dominant trend in relation to the value of Greek patristic citations is based on a methodology that all citations of a

---

\textsuperscript{137} "...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, \textit{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, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{138} 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.\textsuperscript{139} 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.\textsuperscript{140} 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

\textsuperscript{138} “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.

\textsuperscript{139} 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."

\textsuperscript{140} 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).
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.\footnote{B. D. Ehrman, G. D. Fee, & M. W. Holmes, \textit{The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen} (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); Darrell D. Hannah, \textit{The Text of I Corinthians in the Writings of Origen} (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).} 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.\footnote{Metzger and Ehrman, \textit{The Test 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.”} The data in this study suggests that the text of many of the citations found
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.\textsuperscript{143} 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.\textsuperscript{144} 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.\textsuperscript{145} 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 Testament.

\textsuperscript{143} 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?"

\textsuperscript{144} "Up to A.D. 150 the quotations in extant ecclesiastical writers, though important in their bearing on the questions of the date and acceptation of the New Testament Scriptures, are of little value for purely textual purposes." G. Kenyon, Handbook, 249.

\textsuperscript{145} 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 Test 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 146 and the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing at the University of Birmingham 147 are making such resources more accessible through projects such as the New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room 148 and the New Testament Transcripts Prototype. 149

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

146 http://egora.uni-muenster.de/intf/
147 http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/research/activity/itsee/index.aspx
148 http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/
149 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. 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.

150 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.”
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APPENDIX 1 – ORIGEN’S CITATIONS OF ROMANS

Chapter One
Romans 1:1
(a) Παύλος δούλος, φησί, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κλητός ἀπόστολος, ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγελίον θεοῦ [John.Com A 2:10:70:2]
(b) δούλον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κλητόν ἀπόστολον Παύλον [Basil.Phil A 25:1:29]
(c) τὸν δούλον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κλητόν ἀπόστολον Παύλον [Rom.Frag A 1:22]
(d) Παύλος δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ κλητός ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [Rom.Frag B 2:7]
(e) Παύλος δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κλητός ἀπόστολος ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγελίον θεοῦ [Rom.Frag D 1:1:1]
(f) Παύλος δούλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κλητός ἀπόστολος, ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγελίον θεοῦ [John.Com B 19:5:31:2]

Romans 1:2
(a) ὁ προφητεύειλατο διά τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις [John.Com A 2:10:70:4]
(b) ὁ προφητεύειλατο διά τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις [John.Com B 19:5:31:3]
(c) ὁ προφητεύειλατο διά τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις [Rom.Frag D, 1:3:1]

Romans 1:3
(a) περὶ τοῦ γενόμενου αὐτοῦ, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβίδ κατὰ σάρκα [John.Com A 2:10:70:6]
(b) Τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβίδ κατὰ σάρκα [John.Com A 10:5:22:3]
(c) ὁ δὲ γενόμενος ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ κατὰ σάρκα [Mart 35:15]
(d) Τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ κατὰ σάρκα [Rom.Frag C 182:8]
(e) περὶ τοῦ γενομένου αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ κατὰ σάρκα [Rom.Frag D 1:3:1]
(g) γενόμενος ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβίδ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα [John.Com B 32:25:323:1]

Romans 1:4
(a) τοῦ ὀρισθέντος αὐτοῦ θεου ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεύμα ἀγιωσύνης ἐς ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν [John.Com A 2:10:70:6]
(b) τοῦ ὀρισθέντος αὐτοῦ θεου ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεύμα ἀγιωσύνης ἐς ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν [Rom.Frag D 1:4:1]
(c) τοῦ ὀρισθέντος αὐτοῦ θεου ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεύμα ἀγιωσύνης ἐς ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, [John.Com B 19:5:31:6]
Romans 1:5
(a) δι’ οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν εἰς ὑπακοήν πίστεως ἐν πάσι τοῖς ἐθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὄνόματος αὐτοῦ. [John.Com A 2:10:70:8]
(b) δι’ οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν εἰς ὑπακοήν πίστεως ἐν πάσι τοῖς ἐθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὄνόματος αὐτοῦ [Rom.Frag D 1:5:1]
(c) δι’ οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν εἰς ὑπακοήν πίστεως ἐν πάσι τοῖς ἐθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὄνόματος αὐτοῦ [John.Com B 19:5:31:7]

Romans 1:6
(a) ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [Rom.Frag D 1:6:1]
(b) ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [John.Com B 19:5:31:8]

Romans 1:7
(a) πᾶς τοῖς οὓσιν ἐν Ὀρθὴν ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς θεοῦ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρός ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [Rom.Frag D 1:7:1]
(b) πᾶς τοῖς οὓσιν ἐν Ὀρθὴν ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς θεοῦ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρός 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 εὐχαιριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν, ὥστε ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ [Rom.Frag D 1:8:2]

Romans 1:9
(a) μάρτυς γάρ μου ἐστίν ὁ θεὸς ὃς λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀδιάλειπτος μενείαν ὑμῶν ποιούμαι [Rom.Frag A, 2:n1]
(b) μάρτυς γάρ μου ἐστίν ὁ θεὸς, ὃς λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀδιάλειπτως μενείαν ὑμῶν ποιούμαι [Rom.Frag D 1:9:1]

Romans 1:10
(a) πάντωτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου δεόμενος εἰπὼς ἢδη ποτὲ εὐσωφθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς [Rom.Frag A 2:n2]
(b) πάντωτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, δεόμενος εἰ πως ἢδη ποτὲ εὐσωφθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς [Rom.Frag D 1:10:1]
(c) εὐσωφθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς [Rom.Frag B 7:2]

Romans 1:11
(a) ἵνα τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα υμῖν πνευματικὸν εἰς τὸ στηρίξθηναι υμᾶς [Rom.Frag A, 3:n1]
(b) ἐπιποθῶ γάρ ἰδεῖν υμᾶς, ἵνα τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα υμῖν πνευματικὸν εἰς τὸ στηρίξθηναι υμᾶς [Rom.Frag D, 1:12:1]
(c) Ἰνα μεταδῷ ύμῖν χάρισμα πνευματικόν εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ύμᾶς, φησίν ὁ Ἄπόστολος [Ps.Sel, 12:1317:28]

Romans 1:12
(a) τότε δὲ ἔστι συμπαρακληθῆναι ἐν ύμιν διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως ύμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ [Rom.Frag A, 3:n2]
(b) τότε δὲ ἔστι συμπαρακληθῆναι ἐν ύμιν διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως ύμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ [Rom.Frag D, 1:12:2]

Romans 1:13
(a) οὐ θέλω δὲ ύμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προερήμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ύμᾶς καὶ ἑκατοντάδες ἁρχή τοῦ δεύτερο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπόν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ύμῖν καθώς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐθνείσαι [Rom.Frag A, 4:n1]
(b) οὐθῇ δὲ ύμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προερήμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ύμᾶς καὶ ἑκατοντάδες ἁρχή τοῦ δεύτερο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπόν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ύμῖν καθώς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐθνείσαι [Rom.Frag D, 1:13:1]
(c) πολλάκις προερήμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ύμᾶς, ἵνα τινὰ καρπόν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ύμῖν καθώς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐθνείσαι [Rom.Frag B, 10:6]

Romans 1:14
(a) Ἐλλησὶ καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς καὶ ἀνοίητοις [Cels, 2:13:63]
(b) Ἐλλησὶ καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς καὶ ἀνοίητοις [Cels, 3:54:6]
(c) Ἐλλησὶ καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς καὶ ἀνοίητοις [Basil.Phil A, 18:24:7]
(d) Ἐλλησὶ τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἄνοιῆτοις ὁφειλέτης εἰμὶ [Matt.Com C, 15:7:56]
(e) Ἐλλησὶ τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἄνοιῆτοις ὁφειλέτης εἰμὶ [1Cor.Com, 43:47]
(f) Ἐλλησὶ τε καὶ βαρβάροις· σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἄνοιῆτοις ὁφειλέτης εἰμὶ [Rom.Frag A, 4:n3]
(g) Ἐλλησὶ τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἄνοιῆτοις ὁφειλέτης εἰμί [Rom.Frag B, 10:8]
(h) Ἐλλησὶ τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἄνοιῆτοις ὁφειλέτης εἰμί· [Rom.Frag D, 1:14]

Romans 1:15
(a) οὕτως τὸ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ύμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ἑρωμῇ εὐαγγελίσασθαι. [Rom.Frag D, 1:15:1]

Romans 1:16
(a) οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ πρῶτον καὶ Ἐλλησὶ· [Rom.Frag D, 1:16:1]
(b) Οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον· δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν
παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι [Ps.Sel, 12:1596:54]

Romans 1:17
(a) Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλυπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται· ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζησεται. [Rom.Frag D, 1:17:1]
(b) Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλυπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. [Ps.Frag, Psalm 97:2:7]
(c) Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλυπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν [Ps.Frag, Psalm 118:40:14]
(d) Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλυπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. [Ps.Sel, 12:1557:1]

Romans 1:18
(a) Ἀποκαλυπτεται ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ` οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἁσβείαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἁνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀληθείαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων [Cels, 6:3:13]
(b) Αποκαλυπτεται ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ` οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἁσβείαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἁνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀληθείαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων [Basil.Phil A, 15:5:16]
(c) Ἀποκαλυπτεται γὰρ ὀργή θεοῦ ἀπ` οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἁσβείαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἁνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀληθείαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων [Rom.Frag A, 5:11]
(d) Ἀποκαλυπτεται γὰρ ὀργή θεοῦ ἀπ` οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἁσβείαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἁνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀληθείαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων· [Rom.Frag D, 1:18:1]

Romans 1:19
(a) Ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφανέρωσεν [Cels, 3:47:24]
(b) Ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐφανέρωσεν [Cels, 4:30:60]
(c) διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερὸν ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφανέρωσεν [Cels, 6:3:15]
(d) διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερὸν ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφανέρωσε [Basil.Phil A, 15:5:18]
(e) διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερὸν ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐφανέρωσεν [Rom.Frag D, 1:19:1]
(f) Ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφανέρωσεν [Basil.Phil A, 18:18:25]

Romans 1:20
(a) Ὁ ἀόρατος τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθοράται, ἢ τε ἁδίκος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ ἀναπολογήτους [Cels, 3:47:26]
(b) Ὁ γὰρ ἀόρατος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθοράται, ἢ τε ἁδίκος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ ἀναπολογήτους [Cels, 6:3:17]
(c) ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοομένων [Cels, 6:20:23]
(d) Ὁ γὰρ ἀόρατος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθοράται [Cels, 6:59:22]
(e) Ὁ γὰρ ἀόρατος τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθοράται·
Romans 1:21
(a) ὁτι γνόντες τὸν θεόν οὐχ ὡς θεόν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ήχυριστήσαν [Cels, 3:47:22]
(b) διότι γνόντες τὸν θεόν οὐχ ὡς θεόν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ήχυριστήσαν. [Cels, 3:47:29]
(c) ὡς θεόν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ήχυριστήσαν ἀλλ’ ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν [Cels, 4:30:62]
(d) διότι γνόντες τὸν θεόν οὐχ ὡς θεόν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ήχυριστήσαν, ἀλλ’ ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἢ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία. [Cels, 6:3:19]
(e) γνόντες τὸν θεόν οὐχ ὡς θεόν ἐδόξασαν ἢ εὐχριστήσαν, ἀλλ’ ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη μετὰ τὸ τηλικοῦτο φῶς τῆς περὶ ἦν ἐφανέρωσα αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς γνώσεως ἢ ἐπιγενέμη ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία [Cels, 7:47:5]
(f) διότι γνόντες τὸν θεόν οὐχ ὡς θεόν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ήχυριστήσαν, ἀλλ’ ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἢ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία [Basil.Phil A, 15:5:23]
(g) ὅτι Γνόντες τὸν θεόν οὐχ ὡς θεόν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ήχυριστήσαν. [Basil.Phil A, 18:18:21]
(h) διότι γνόντες τὸν θεόν οὐχ ὡς θεόν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ήχυριστήσαν. [Basil.Phil A, 18:18:29]
(i) διότι γνόντες τὸν θεόν οὐχ ὡς θεόν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ήχυριστήσαν, 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]
Romans 1:23
(a) καὶ ἠλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὀμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἑρπετῶν. [Cels, 3:73:24]
(b) καὶ ἠλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὀμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἑρπετῶν. [Cels, 4:30:64]
(c) καὶ ἠλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὀμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἑρπετῶν. [Cels, 6:3:23]

Romans 1:24
(a) ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδίων αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν [Cels, 5:32:14]
(b) ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδίων αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν [Cels, 7:47:15]
(c) διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδίων αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς [Euches, 29:12:5]
(d) ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδίων τους προημαρτηκότας τι εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, [Euches, 29:12:19]
(e) ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδίων 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 καρδίων αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν [Basil.Phil A, 22:11:3]
(h) Διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδίων αὐτῶν εἰς
Romans 1:25
(a) τὴν ἀλληλεIGNORE
(b) οἴτινες μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλληλε.IGNORE
(c) οἴτινες μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλληλε.IGNORE

Romans 1:26
(a) διὰ τούτο παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας· ἀἱ τε γὰρ θηλεἰᾳ αὐτῶν μετήλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρήσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν [Euches, 29:12:7]
(b) διὰ τούτο παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας· ἀἱ τε γὰρ θηλεἰᾳ αὐτῶν μετήλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρήσιν 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 ἄρρενες ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρήσιν τῆς θηλείας ἑξεκαύθησαν [Euches, 29:12:9]
(b) ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρρενες ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρήσιν τῆς θηλείας ἑξεκαύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἄρρενες ἄρρενες ἐν ἀρρεσίᾳ τὴν ἀσχήμοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν [Rom.Frag D, 1:27:1]

Romans 1:28
(a) καὶ καθὼς ὅπε ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα [Euches, 29:12:11]
(b) Καὶ καθὼς ὅπε ἐδοκίμασαν 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 ἀδίκῳ πονηρίᾳ πλεονεξίᾳ κακίᾳ, μεστοὺς φθόνου φόνου ἔριδος δόλου κακοποιείας, ψυχορρίτας [Rom.Frag D, 1:29:1]

Romans 1:30
(a) καταλάλους, θεοστυγεῖς, ψυχορρίτας, ψυχοφήνους, ἀλαζόνας, ἐφευρετάς κακῶν, γονεύσιν 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) οἴτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνώντες, ὅτι οἱ τα τοιαύτα πράσοντες 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 ἀναπολογήτους εἰ, ὃ ἀνθρωπε πάς ὁ κρίνων· ἐν ὃ γὰρ κρίνεις τὸν ἑτέρων, σεαυτόν κατακρίνεις· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσεις ὁ κρίνων. [Rom.Frag D, 2:1:1]
(b) Ἐν ὃ γὰρ κρίματοι κρίνεις τὸν ἑτέρων, σεαυτόν κατακρίνεις· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράττεις ὁ κρίνων. [Eze.Frag, 13:796:18]

Romans 2:2
(a) οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἔστι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐπὶ τοὺς τὰ τοιαύτα πράσσοντας. [Rom.Frag D, 2:3:2]

Romans 2:3
(a) λογίζῃ δὲ τούτῳ, ὃ ἀνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων τοὺς τὰ τοιαύτα πράσσοντας καὶ ποιῶν αὐτά, ὅτι σὺ ἐκφεύξῃ τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ; [Rom.Frag D, 2:3:1]

Romans 2:4
(a) "Ἱ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἄγνων ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν σε ἄγει; [Cels, 4:72:19]
(b) ἡ τοῦ πλούτου γὰρ φησὶ τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἄγνων ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν σε ἄγει; [Princ, 3:1:6:34]
(c) ἡ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἄγνων ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν σε ἄγει; [Princ, 3:1:11:22]
(d) τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονήσαντες [Jer.Frag B, 52:4]
(e) "Ἡ τοῦ πλούτου γὰρ, φησί, τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἄγνων ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν σε ἄγει; [Basil.Phil A, 21:5:38]
(f) "Ἡ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἄγνων ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν σε ἄγει; [Basil.Phil A, 21:10:25]
(g) "Ἡ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἄγνων ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν σε ἄγει; [Basil.Phil A, 27:10:13]
(h) τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖν [Jer.Hom B, 20:4:24]
(i) τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας [Matt.Com C, 15:11:62]
(j) ἡ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἄγνων ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν σε ἄγει; [Rom.Frag D, 2:4:1]
(κ) Ὁ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς; καὶ τὰ ἔξης. [Ps.Frag, 36:21:19]  
(λ) Ὁ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἄγνων ὅτι τὸ χρηστόν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν σε ἄγει; [Ex.Com, 12:277:45]  

Romans 2:5  
(a) Κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρίσιας τοῦ Θεοῦ. [Cels, 4:72:22]  
(b) κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρίσιας τοῦ Θεοῦ [Princ, 3:1:6:36]  
(c) κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρίσιας τοῦ Θεοῦ. [Princ, 3:1:11:22]  
(d) Κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς. [John.Frag, 51:8]  
(e) ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς. [Jer.Frag B, 52:5]  
(f) κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρίσιας τοῦ Θεοῦ, [Basil.Phil A, 21:5:40]  
(g) κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρίσιας τοῦ Θεοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 21:10:27]  
(h) κατὰ τὴν σκληρότητά καὶ ἀμετανόητον αὐτοῦ καρδίαν θησαυρίζοντος ἑαυτῷ ὀργήν [Basil.Phil A, 21:10:32]  
(ι) ὀργήν ἐν ἡμερᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρίσια τοῦ Θεοῦ [Jer.Hom B, 20:4:24]  
(λ) κατὰ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμεταμέλητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς [Rom.Frag A, 5:7]  
(μ) κατὰ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμεταμέλητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρίσιας τοῦ Θεοῦ, [Rom.Frag D, 2:5:1]  
(ν) δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου, καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς, καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως, καὶ δικαιοσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ, [Ex.Com, 12:277:47]  
(ο) Κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον σου καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρίσιας Θεοῦ. [Prov.Exp, 17:193:1]  
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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) δς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατά τά ἔργα αὐτοῦ· [Princ, 3:1:6:39]
(b) δς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατά τά ἔργα αὐτοῦ· [Basil.Phal A, 21:5:40]
(c) δς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατά τά ἔργα αὐτοῦ· [Rom.Frag D, 2:5:1]
(d) δς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατά τά ἔργα αὐτοῦ. [Ex.Com, 12:277:47]

Romans 2:7
(a) τοῖς μὲν καθ᾿ ὑπομονὴν ἔργον ἀγαθόν δόξαν καὶ τιμήν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσί, ὡς αἰώνιον [Princ, 3:1:6:39]
(b) τοῖς μὲν καθ᾿ ὑπομονὴν ἔργον ἀγαθόν δόξαν καὶ τιμήν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι ὡς αἰώνιον· [Basil.Phal A, 21:5:44]
(c) τοῖς μὲν καθ᾿ ὑπομονὴν ἔργον ἀγαθόν δόξαν καὶ τιμήν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι ὡς αἰώνιον· [Rom.Frag A, 6:n1]
(d) τοῖς μὲν καθ᾿ ὑπομονὴν ἔργον ἀγαθόν δόξαν καὶ τιμήν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι ὡς αἰώνιον· [Rom.Frag D, 2:7:2]

Romans 2:8
(a) τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθούσι μὲν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, ὀργή καὶ θυμός, [Princ, 3:1:6:39]
(b) τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθούσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ ὀργή καὶ θυμός [Basil.Phal A, 21:5:4]
(c) τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθούσι μὲν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ θυμός καὶ ὀργή [[Rom.Frag A, 6:n2]
(d) τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθούσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, ὀργή καὶ θυμός. [Rom.Frag D, 2:8:1]

Romans 2:9
(a) θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία ἐπὶ πάσαν σωφρότητα τοῦ κατεργαζόμενον τὸ πάντα, Ἰουδαίου τοῦ πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνος· [Princ, 3:1:6:41]
(b) θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία, ἐπὶ πάσαν σωφρότητα τοῦ κατεργαζόμενον τὸ πάντα, Ἰουδαίου τοῦ πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνος· [Basil.Phal A, 21:5:47]
(c) θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία ἐπὶ πάσαν σωφρότητα τοῦ κατεργαζόμενον τὸ πάντα Ἰουδαίου τοῦ πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνος. [Rom.Frag A, 6:n3]
(d) θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία ἐπὶ πάσαν σωφρότητα τοῦ κατεργαζόμενον τὸ πάντα, Ἰουδαίου τοῦ πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνος· [Rom.Frag D, 2:8:1]

Romans 2:10
(a) δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμή καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζόμενῳ τὸ ἀγαθὸν, Ἰουδαίῳ τοῦ πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι· [Princ, 3:1:6:43]
(b) δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμή καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζόμενῳ τὸ ἀγαθὸν, Ἰουδαίῳ τοῦ πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι· [Basil.Phal A, 21:5:49]
(c) δόξα καὶ τιμή καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζόμενῳ τὸ ἀγαθὸν, Ἰουδαίῳ τοῦ πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι· [Rom.Frag A, 7:n1]
(d) δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τῷ ἁγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι. [Rom.Frag D, 2:10:1]

Romans 2:11
(a) οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag A, 7:n1]
(b) οὐ γὰρ ἔστι προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag D, 2:10:1]

Romans 2:12
(a) ὁσοὶ γὰρ ἄνομῳς ἡμαρτον ἄνομως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται· καὶ ὁσοὶ ἐν νόμῳ ἡμαρτον διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται. [Rom.Frag A, 8:n1]
(b) ὁσοὶ γὰρ ἄνομῳς ἡμαρτον, ἄνομως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται· καὶ ὁσοὶ ἐν νόμῳ ἡμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται. [Rom.Frag D, 2:12:2]
(c) ὁσοὶ γὰρ ἐν νόμῳ ἡμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται. [Ps.Frag, 9:9:8]

Romans 2:13
(a) οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαται τοῦ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ’ οἱ ποιηται τοῦ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται. [Rom.Frag A, 8:n1]
(b) οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαται νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ’ οἱ ποιηται νόμου δικαιωθήσονται. [Rom.Frag D, 2:13:1]
(c) Οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταί τῶν δικαιώματων τοῦ θεοῦ δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ’ οἱ ποιηται αὐτῶν. [Ps.Sel, 12:1592:6]
(d) Οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαται τοῦ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλ’ οἱ ποιηται τοῦ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται. [Prov.Exp, 17:220:45]

Romans 2:14
(a) Ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὕτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες έαυτοῖς εἰσί νόμος. [Basil.Phil A, 9:2:16]
(b) όταν δὲ ἔθην τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οἱ τοιούτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες έαυτοῖς εἰσί νόμος. [Matt.Com C, 17:16:31]
(c) όταν γὰρ ἔθην τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῆ καὶ τὰ ἔξης. [Rom.Frag A, 10:7]
(d) όταν γὰρ ἔθην τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὕτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες έαυτοῖς εἰσί νόμος. [Rom.Frag A, 36a:37]
(e) ἔθην τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν [Rom.Frag C, 136:3]
(f) όταν δὲ ἔθην τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα [Rom.Frag C, 208:8]
(g) όταν γὰρ ἔθην τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὕτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες έαυτοῖς εἰσί νόμος. [Rom.Frag D, 2:14:1]
(h) Ὅταν ἔθην τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, [Gen.Sel, 12:105:31]
(i) ἔθην τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα, καὶ φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν. [Gen.Sel, 12:121:29]
Romans 2:15
(a) οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυροúσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως. [Basil.Phil A, 9:2:17]
(b) μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγοροῦντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογομένων [Jer.Hom B, 16:10:33]
(c) οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυροúσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως [Matt.Com C, 17:16:34]
(d) συμμαρτυροúσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως καὶ μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγοροῦντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογομένων [Rom.Frag A, 9:n1]
(e) οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυροúσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως. [Rom.Frag A, 36a:38]
(f) οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυροúσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως καὶ μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγοροῦντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογομένων [Rom.Frag D, 2:15:1]

Romans 2:16
(a) ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε κρίνει ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Rom.Frag A, 9:n2]
(b) ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε κρίνει ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 2:16:1]

Romans 2:17
(a) ἵδε σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἑπονομάζῃ καὶ ἑπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ καὶ καυχάσαι ἐν θεῷ [Rom.Frag D, 2:17:2]

Romans 2:18
(a) καὶ γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα καὶ δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα κατηχομένος εκ τοῦ νόμου [Rom.Frag D, 2:18:1]

Romans 2:19
(a) πέποιθας τε σεαυτὸν ὅθηγον 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 ἁλθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ· [Rom.Frag D, 2:20:1]

Romans 2:21
(a) ὁ οὖν διδάσκαλον ἐσεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσκεις; ὁ κηρύσσων μὴ κλέπτειν κλέπτεις; [Rom.Frag A, 10:n1]
(b) ὁ οὖν διδάσκαλον ἐσεαυτὸν 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 εἶδωλα ἱεροσυλεῖς;
[Rom.Frag A, 10:n2]
(b) ὁ λέγοντας μὴ μοιχεύειν μοιχεύεις; ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἶδωλα 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 ἑθνεσι καθὼς
γέγραπται: [Rom.Frag A, 10:n3]
(b) τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι’ ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἑθνεσιν, καθὼς
γέγραπται. [Rom.Frag D, 2:24:1]

Romans 2:25
(a) περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὁφελεῖ, ἐὰν νόμον πράσσης· ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ἢς, ἢ
περιτομὴ σου ἀκροβυσσία γέγονεν. [Rom.Frag A, 10:n5]
(b) περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὁφελεῖ ἐὰν νόμον πράσσης· ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ἢς, ἢ
περιτομὴ σου ἀκροβυσσία γέγονεν. [Rom.Frag D, 2:25:1]

Romans 2:26
(a) ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυσσία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσῃ, οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυσσία
αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθῆσεται; [Rom.Frag D, 2:26:1]

Romans 2:27
(a) καὶ κρίνετ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυσσία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα σὲ τὸν διὰ γράμματος
καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου. [Rom.Frag D, 2:27:1]

Romans 2:28
(a) ὃ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖος ἐστίν, οὐδὲ ἢ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομῆ·
[Princ, 4:3:6:15]
(b) ὃ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖος ἐστίν, οὐδὲ ἢ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομῆ·
(c) ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖος ἦστιν, οὐδὲ ἢ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομῇ. [Jer.Hom B, 12:13:12]
(d) οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖος ἦστιν, οὐδὲ ἢ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομῇ. [Rom.Frag D, 2:28:1]

Romans 2:29
(a) ἀλλʼ ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γράμματι. [Princ, 4:3:6:16]
(b) ἀλλʼ ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γράμματι. [Basil.Phil A, 1:22:19]
(c) ἀλλʼ ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι, οὐ ἐπαινοῦσιν οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἄλλʼ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 2:29:1]

Chapter Three
Romans 3:1
(a) τί οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου, ἢ τίς ἢ ωφέλεια τῆς περιτομῆς; [Rom.Frag A, 11:n1]
(b) Τί οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου, ἢ τίς ἢ ωφέλεια 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 ἡπιστήσαν τινες; μή ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταργήσει; [Rom.Frag A, 11:n3]
(b) τί γὰρ; εἰ ἡπιστήσαν 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 ἀνθρώπως ψεύστης· καθὼς γέγραπται· ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε. [Rom.Frag A, 12:n1]
(b) ὁ θεός ἀληθῆς ἦστιν, πᾶς δὲ ἀνθρώπως ψεύστης [Rom.Frag C, 164:3]
(c) μὴ γένοιτο· γινέσθω δὲ ὁ θεός ἀληθῆς, πᾶς δὲ ἀνθρώπως 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 δικαίωσύνην συνίστησιν. [Rom.Frag C, 124:2]
(b) Μὴ ἀδικος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; κατὰ ἀνθρωπον λέγω. [Rom.Frag C, 126:10]
(c) εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν Θεοῦ δικαίωσύνην συνίστησιν, τί ἐρούμεν; μὴ ἀδικος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; κατὰ ἀνθρωπον λέγω. [Rom.Frag D, 3:5:1]

Romans 3:6
(a) μὴ γένοιτο· ἐπεὶ πῶς κρίνει 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 κάγω ώς ἀμαρτωλός κρίνομαι; [Rom.Frag D, 3:7:2]

Romans 3:8
(a) καί μὴ καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα καὶ καθὼς φασιν ἡμᾶς τινες λέγειν ὅτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακὰ ἐνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθὰ; ὡν τὸ κρίμα ἐνδικὸν ἐστιν. [Rom.Frag D, 3:8:1]

Romans 3:9
(a) τὶ οὖν· προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως· προητιασάμεθα γὰρ Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἐλλήνας πάντας ὑφ’ ἀμαρτίαν εἶναι [Rom.Frag A, 13:n1]
(b) Τι οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως· προητιασάμεθα γὰρ Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἐλλήνας υφ’ ἀμαρτίαν 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 ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἰς· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n2]
(b) Καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἰς· [Rom.Frag C, 130:14]
(c) καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἰς· [Rom.Frag D, 3:10:1]

Romans 3:11
(a) οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνιών· οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n3]
(b) Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνιών, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν Θεόν [Rom.Frag C, 132:4]
(c) οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνιών, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν· [Rom.Frag D, 3:11:1]

Romans 3:12
(a) πάντες ἐξέκλιναν ἀμα ἡχρειώθησαν· οὐκ ἔστιν ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἑως ἑνός· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n3]
(b) Οὐκ ἔστι ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἑως ἑνός [Rom.Frag C, 132:15]
(c) πάντες ἐξέκλιναν, ἀμα ἡχρειώθησαν· οὐκ ἔστι ποιῶν χρηστότητα ἑως ἑνός.
Romans 3:13
(a) τάφος ἀνεφηγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν· ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιούσαν· ἕδος ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χείλη αὐτῶν· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n4]
(b) τάφος ἀνεφηγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιούσαν, ἕδος ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χείλη αὐτῶν· [Rom.Frag D, 3:13:1]

Romans 3:14
(a) ὥν τὸ στόμα ἀράς καὶ πικρίας γέμει· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n6]
(b) ὁ ὄμν τὸ στόμα ἀράς καὶ πικρίας γέμει [Rom.Frag C, 132:20]
(c) ὥν τὸ στόμα ἀράς καὶ πικρίας γέμει· [Rom.Frag D, 3:14:1]

Romans 3:15
(a) ὃδείς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n6]
(b) ὁ ὃδείς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα [Rom.Frag C, 134:2]
(c) ὃδείς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα, [Rom.Frag D, 3:15:1]

Romans 3:16
(a) σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὀδοῖς αὐτῶν [Rom.Frag A, 13:n7]
(b) Σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὀδοῖς αὐτῶν [Rom.Frag C, 134:5]
(c) σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὀδοῖς αὐτῶν [Rom.Frag D, 3:16:1]

Romans 3:17
(a) καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἐγνωσάν· [Rom.Frag A, 13:n7]
(b) ὁ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἐγνωσάν, [Rom.Frag C, 134:7]
(c) καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἐγνωσάν. [Rom.Frag D, 3:17:1]

Romans 3:18
(a) οὐκ ἐστὶν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 13:n8]
(b) Οὐκ ἐστίν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. [Rom.Frag C, 134:8]
(c) οὐκ ἐστίν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 3:18:1]

Romans 3:19
(a) οἴδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ· [Rom.Frag A, 14:n1]
(b) ᾧ ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ. [Rom.Frag C, 144:4]
(c) οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ· [Rom.Frag D, 3:19:1]

Romans 3:20
(a) διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὔτι δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· διά γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἀμαρτίας [Rom.Frag A 14:n2]
(b) διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὔτι δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· διά γὰρ
νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας. [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 υπὸ τοῦ
νόμου καί τῶν προφητῶν· [Rom.Frag A, 15:n1]
(c) νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, καὶ ἐν τῷ μαρτυρουμένῃ
υπὸ τοῦ νόμου καί 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
Μαρτυρουμένῃ υπὸ τοῦ νόμου καί τῶν προφητῶν· [Rom.Frag C, 152:6]
(f) Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένῃ υπὸ τοῦ
νόμου καί 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 πιστεῦοντας. [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 ἡμαρτον καὶ ύστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ [Rom.Frag A, 16:n1]
(b) πάντες ἡμαρτον καὶ ύστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, [Rom.Frag C, 168:5]
(c) πάντες γὰρ ἡμαρτον καὶ ύστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, [Rom.Frag D, 3:23:1]
(d) Πάντες γὰρ ἡμαρτον καὶ ύστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, [John.Com B,
20:36:335:7]

Romans 3:24
(a) δικαιούμενοι δωρεάν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι· διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ
Ἰησοῦ [Rom.Frag A, 16:n2]
(b) δικαιούμενοι δωρεάν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι [Rom.Frag C, 168:6]
(c) δικαιούμενοι δωρεάν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ
Ἰησοῦ· [Rom.Frag D, 3:24:1]

Romans 3:25
(a) "Ὅν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἵλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αἰματι αὐτοῦ, [John.Com A,
1:22:139:4
(b) "Ὅν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἵλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αἰματι [John.Com A,
1:33:240:11]
(c) "Ὅν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἵλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως· [John.Com A, 1:33:240:11]
(d) προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἵλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἰματι [Matt.Com C,
12:21:15]
(e) ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἵλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ αἰματί, ἵλαστήριον
dε διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν γεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων [Rom.Frag C, 162:5]
(f) ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἵλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ αἰματι, εἰς ἐνδειξιν
τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων
[Rom.Frag D, 3:25:1]

Romans 3:26
(a) ἐν τῇ ἂνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, πρὸς τὴν ἐνδειξίαν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 3:26:2]

Romans 3:27
(a) ποὺ οὖν ἢ καύχησις; ἔξεκλείσθη· διὰ ποίου νόμου; τῶν ἔργων; οὐχί· ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως. [Rom.Frag A, 17:n1]
(b) Ποῦ οὖν ἢ καύχησις; ἔξεκλείσθη· διὰ ποίου νόμου; τῶν ἔργων; οὐχί, ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως. [Rom.Frag D, 3:27:1]

Romans 3:28
(a) λογιζόμεθα οὖν πίστει δικαιούσθαι ἀνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. [Rom.Frag A, 18:n1]
(b) λογιζόμεθα δικαιούσθαι πίστει ἀνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. [Rom.Frag C, 164:16]
(c) λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιούσθαι πίστει ἀνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. [Rom.Frag D, 3:28:1]

Romans 3:29
(a) γὰρ Ἰουδαίων μόνον ὁ θεός ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐθνῶν. [Matt.Com B, 11:18:63]
(b) ἦ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεός μόνον; οὐχί δὲ καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναὶ, καὶ ἐθνῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 19:n1]
(c) ἦ Ἰουδαίων ὁ Θεός μόνον; οὐχί καὶ ἐθνῶν; [Rom.Frag C, 168:8]
(d) ἦ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεός μόνον; οὐχί καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν, [Rom.Frag D, 3:29:1]

Romans 3:30
(b) ἐπείπερ εἰς ὁ θεός ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. [Rom.Frag A, 19:n1]
(c) ἦ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεός μόνον; οὐχί καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν, εἴπερ εἰς ὁ θεός ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. [Rom.Frag D, 3:30:1]

Romans 3:31
(b) νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ νόμον ἵστανομεν. [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 οὐν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; Μὴ γένοιτο. [Rom.Frag C, 178:4]

(e) νόμον οὐν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ νόμον ἵσταμεν. [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 ἑλκιώθη, 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; ἐπίστευε δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. [Rom.Frag A, 21:n2]
(b) τί γὰρ ἡ γραφή λέγει; ἐπίστευεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. [Rom.Frag D, 4:3:1]

Romans 4:4
(a) τῷ δὲ ἐργαζόμενῳ ὁ μισθός 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 ἐργαζόμενῳ ὁ μισθός οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα· [Rom.Frag D, 4:4:1]

Romans 4:5
(a) τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζόμενῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἁσβεθ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. [Rom.Frag A, 22:n2]
(b) τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζόμενῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἁσβεθ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, [Rom.Frag D, 4:5:2]

Romans 4:6
(a) καθάπερ καὶ Δαυείδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρίς ἔργων· [Rom.Frag A, 23:n1]
(b) καθάπερ καὶ Δαυείδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρίς ἔργων· [Rom.Frag D, 4:6:1]

Romans 4:7
(a) μακάριοι ὃν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι, καὶ ὃν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· [Rom.Frag A, 23:n2]
(b) μακάριοι ὃν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὃν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· [Rom.Frag D, 4:7:1]
Romans 4:8
(a) μακάριος ἀνήρ ὃς οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν. [Rom.Frag A, 23:n1]
(b) μακάριος ἀνήρ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν. [Rom.Frag D, 4:6:1]

Romans 4:9
(a) ὁ μακαρισμός οὐν οὗτος, ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἁκροβυστίαν; λέγομεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην. [Rom.Frag A, 23:n4]
(b) ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ Δαυίδ μακαρισμός οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν ἁκροβυστίαν [Rom.Frag C, 188:8]
(c) ὁ μακαρισμός οὐν οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἁκροβυστίαν; [Rom.Frag D, 4:9:1]

Romans 4:10
(a) πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; ἐν περιτομῇ ὄντι, ἢ ἐν ἁκροβυστίᾳ; οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ ἀλλ’ ἐν ἁκροβυστίᾳ; [Rom.Frag A, 24:n2]
(b) Πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; [Rom.Frag C, 188:16]
(c) πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; ἐν περιτομῇ ὄντι ἢ ἐν ἁκροβυστίᾳ; οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ ἀλλ’ ἐν ἁκροβυστίᾳ. [Rom.Frag D, 4:10:1]

Romans 4:11
(a) καὶ σημεῖον ἐλαβεν περιτομῆς, σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἁκροβυστίᾳ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστεύων· δι’ ἁκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν δικαιοσύνην. [Rom.Frag A, 24:n2]
(b) καὶ σημεῖον ἐλαβεν περιτομῆς σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἁκροβυστίᾳ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστεύων· δι’ ἁκροβυστίας, 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 στοιχεύοι στοῖς ἔχεσθαι τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἁκροβυστίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ. [Rom.Frag A, 24:n2]
(b) καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχεύοι στοῖς ἔχεσθαι τῆς ἐν ἁκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ. [Rom.Frag D, 4:12:2]

Romans 4:13
(b) Οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμον 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 ἡ πίστις [Rom.Frag A, 25:16]
(b) Εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, κεκένωται ἡ πίστις [Rom.Frag C, 202:12]
(c) εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, κεκένωται ἡ πίστις καὶ κατήργηται ἡ ἐπαγγελία [Rom.Frag D, 4:15:1]

Romans 4:15
(a) ὁ γὰρ νόμος ὅργην κατεργάζεται· οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι νόμος οὐδὲ παράβασις. [Rom.Frag A, 25:n1]
(b) ὁ γὰρ νόμος ὅργην κατεργάζεται· οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις. [Rom.Frag D, 4:15:1]

Romans 4:16
(a) διὰ τούτο ἐκ πίστεως ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαιὰν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ στέρματι· οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὃς ἐστι πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 25:n2]
(b) ἐκ πίστεως καὶ τῷ κατὰ χάριν τὸ βεβαιὰν [Rom.Frag C, 206:22]
(c) Διὰ τούτο ἐκ πίστεως, ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαιὰν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ στέρματι, οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὃς ἐστι πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν [Rom.Frag D, 4:16:1]

Romans 4:17
(a) καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε· κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσε θεοῦ τοῦ ζωοποιοῦντος τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ καλοῦντος τά μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. [Rom.Frag A, 25:n5]
(b) καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε, κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ τοῦ ζωοποιοῦντος τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ καλοῦντος τά μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα· [Rom.Frag D, 4:17:2]

Romans 4:18
(a) ὃς 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) ὃς 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 ἀσωτὸ σῶμα ἢ ἐκ νεκρωμένον, ἐκατόντασθι τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας Σάρρας· [Rom.Frag A, 26:n3]
(b) καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ ἀσωτῇ πίστει κατενόησεν τὸ ἀσωτὸ σῶμα ἢ ἐκ νεκρωμένον, ἐκατόντασθι τῷ σπέρματι ὑπάρχων, [Rom.Frag C, 216:21]
(c) καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει κατενόησε τὸ ἀσωτὸ σῶμα νεκρωμένον, ἐκατόντασθι τῷ σπέρματι ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας 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 ποιήσαι· [Rom.Frag A, 26:n6]
(b) καὶ πληροφορηθεὶς ὅτι ὁ ἐπήγγελται δυνατός ἐστι καὶ ποιήσαι. [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) ὡς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 27:n3]
(b) Ἡγέρθη γὰρ διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν [Rom.Frag C, 222:14]
(c) ὡς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 4:25:1]

Chapter Five
Romans 5:1
(a) Δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν 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' οὐ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν τῇ πίστει εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ἥ 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 θλίψεις καὶ εἰδώς ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται καὶ ὑπομένων. [Basil.Phil A, 25:4:36]
(d) καυχώμενος ἐν ταῖς θλίψεις καὶ εἰδώς 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 δοκίμη, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα [John.Com A, 1:26:176:2]
(b) ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκίμη, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα· ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς 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 δοκίμη, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα [Ps.Frag, 137:7:4]
(e) ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκίμη· ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα· [Ps.Sel, 12:1520:20]
(f) ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκίμη, 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 ἀγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν [Rom.Frag A, 28:n1]
(b) ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς 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) ἦτι γάρ Χριστὸς ὅτων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν· [Rom.Frag A, 28:n2]
(b) ἦτι γάρ Χριστὸς ὅτων 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 ἁγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾶ ἀποθανεῖν· [Rom.Frag A, 28:n3]

Romans 5:8
(a) Συνίστησι τὴν ἕαυτο ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἔτι ἀμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν [Cels, 4:28:28]
(b) ἔτι ὄντων ἀμαρτωλῶν ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν. [Jer.Hom B, 14:11:12]
(c) συνίστησι δὲ τὴν ἑαυτο ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός ὅτι ἔτι ἄμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν· [Rom.Frag A, 28:n4]
(d) συνίστησι δὲ τὴν ἑαυτο ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός ὅτι ἔτι ἄμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν. [Rom.Frag D, 5:8:1]

Romans 5:9
(a) πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον δικαιωθέντες γῦν ἐν τῷ αἴματι αὐτοῦ σωθησόμεθα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς. [Rom.Frag A, 28:n6]
(b) πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον δικαιωθέντες γῦν ἐν τῷ αἴματι αὐτοῦ σωθησόμεθα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς. [Rom.Frag D, 5:8:1]

Romans 5:10
(a) πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον δικαιωθέντες γῦν ἐν τῷ αἴματι αὐτοῦ σωθησόμεθα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς. [Rom.Frag D, 5:8:2]
(b) Εἰ γάρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες, φησίν ὁ Παῦλος, κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ· [Prov.Exp, 17:188:39]
(c) Οἵ ποτε ὄντες ἐχθροὶ, κατηλλάγησαν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ· [Prov.Exp, 17:193:48]

Romans 5:11
(a) οὗ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχῶμενοι 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 τούτῳ ὡσπερ δι’ ἐνός ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ’ ω πάντες ἡμαρτον· [Rom.Frag D, 5:12:1]
(c) δι’ ἐνός ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος· καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ’ ω πάντες ἡμαρτον [John.Com B, 20:42:388:3]
Romans 5:13
(b) ἀμαρτία οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου [Basil.Phil A, 9:2:24]
(c) ἀμαρτία οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου [Rom.Frag A, 36a:43]
(d) ἀμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου [Rom.Frag C, 136:1]
(e) ἀρχὴ γὰρ νόμου ἀμαρτία ἢν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου [Rom.Frag D, 5:13:1]

Romans 5:14
(a) ἀλλ’ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Αδάμ μέχρι Μωσέως ς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοίωματι τῆς παραβάσεως Αδάμ, ὡς ἐστίν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος [Rom.Frag D, 5:14:1]

Romans 5:15
(a) Ἀλλ’ οὐχ ως το παράπτωμα, οὔτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα· εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ή δωρεά ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἐνός ἀνθρώπου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσαν. [Rom.Frag D, 5:15:2]
(b) οὐχ ως το παράπτωμα, οὔτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα [John.Com B, 20:42:390:1]

Romans 5:16
(a) καὶ οὐχ ως δι’ ἐνός ἀμαρτήσαντος τὸ δώρημα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἐνός εἰς κατάριμα, 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, πολλῷ 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 ἐνός παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἐνός, πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσι διὰ τοῦ ἐνός Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. [John.Com B, 20:39:364:9]

Romans 5:18
(a) Ὁρ’ οὖν ως δι’ ἐνός παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα, οὔτως καὶ δι’ ἐνός δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς·
Romans 5:19
(a) ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοής τοῦ ἐνὸς ἁνθρώπου ἀμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοὶ, οὐτώς καὶ διὰ τῆς υπακοής τοῦ ἐνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοὶ.

Romans 5:20
(a) νόμος δὲ παρεισήλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα· οὐ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἀμαρτία, ύπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις.

Romans 5:21
(a) ἅπαν, οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς υπακοής τοῦ ἄνθρωπου ἁμαρτὶκατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, ὁ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἁμαρτία, ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτὶκατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί.

Chapter Six
Romans 6:1
(a) Τί οὖν ἐρόομεν; ἐπιμένομεν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ.

Romans 6:2
(a) οἵτινες δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν αὐτῇ. [Lam.Frag, 107:12]
(b) Τί οὖν ἐρόομεν; ἐπιμένομεν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ.

Romans 6:3
(a) ἡ ἁμαρτία ἔσται ὡς Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβπατίσθης. [Rom.Frag D, 6:3:1]

Romans 6:4
(a) Συνετάφημεν γὰρ αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος. [Cels, 2:69:18]
(b) ἐν καίνοτητι ζωῆς περιπατήσαμεν. [John.Frag, 35:19]
(c) συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἡγέρθη Ἱησοῦς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καίνοτητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν. [Rom.Frag D, 6:4:2]
(d) ἐν καίνοτητι ζωῆς περιπατήσης. [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) 'Τὸ ίόγο γινώσκοντες, ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπος συνεσταυρωθή, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σώμα 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) Χριστός δὲ ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνῄσκει· θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει· [Cels, 2:16:54]
(b) Χριστός γὰρ ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνῄσκει, θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει· [John.Com A, 13:8:48:11]
(c) 'Χριστὸς γὰρ ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνῄσκει.' Οὐ μόνον δὲ 'Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνῄσκει' [Hera.Dial, 6:1]
(d) ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνῄσκει, θάνατος γὰρ «αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει». [Matt.Com C, 12:4:33]
(e) εἰδότες ὅτι Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνῄσκει· θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει· [Rom.Frag A, 30:n2]
(f) εἰδότες ὅτι Χριστός ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνῄσκει, θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει. [Rom.Frag D, 6:9:1]

Romans 6:10
(a) ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ [Cels, 2:69:13]
(b) ὁ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ. [John.Com A, 1:9:58:7]
(c) ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· ὁ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ 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 ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ· [Rom.Frag A, 30:n3]
(f) ἀποθανὼν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· [Rom.Frag C, 222:11]
(g) ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· ὁ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag D, 6:11:1]

Romans 6:11
(a) οὔτως καὶ ύμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν εἰναι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag A, 30:n4]
(b) οὔτως καὶ ύμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν εἰναι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ
Romans 6:18

τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσσου. [Rom.Frag A, 31:19]

(c) οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτούς εἰναι νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσσου. [Rom.Frag D, 6:11:2]

Romans 6:12

(a) μηδὲ οὖν βασιλεύετω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ υπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτῆς. [Euches, 25:1:28]
(b) βασιλεύετω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν σώματι [Euches, 25:3:6]
(c) Μὴ οὖν βασιλεύετω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν σώματι [Jer.Hom A, 1:7:9]
(d) τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ σώματι εἰς τὸ υπακούειν τὴν ψυχὴν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ [Matt.Com C, 14:3:8]
(e) μηδὲ οὖν βασιλεύετω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ υπακούειν αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ. [Rom.Frag A, 31:n1]
(f) μηδὲ οὖν βασιλεύετω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ υπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ [Rom.Frag D, 6:12:1]

Romans 6:13

(a) μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη υμῶν ὅπλα ἁδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ· ἄλλα παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας, καὶ τὰ μέλη υμῶν ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag A, 31:n2]
(b) μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη υμῶν ὅπλα ἁδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ· ἄλλα παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας καὶ τὰ μέλη υμῶν ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ [Rom.Frag D, 6:13:1]

Romans 6:14

(a) ἁμαρτία γὰρ υμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει· οὐ γὰρ ἔστε ύπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν. [Rom.Frag A, 31:n4]
(b) ἁμαρτία γὰρ υμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει· οὐ γὰρ ἔστε ύπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ υπὸ χάριν. [Rom.Frag D, 6:14:1]

Romans 6:15

(a) Τί οὖν; ἁμαρτήσωμεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐσμέν ύπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ χάριν; μὴ γένοιτο. [Rom.Frag D, 6:15:1]

Romans 6:16

(a) οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ὑπαρέχεσθε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δούλοι έστε οὖ υπακούετε, ἠτοί ἁμαρτίας ἡ ὑπακοή εἰς δικαιοσύνην; [Rom.Frag D, 6:16:1]

Romans 6:17

(a) χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ ὅτι ἔδωκαί τίς ἁμαρτίαις, ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὁν παρεδόθητε τῶν διδαχῆς [Rom.Frag D, 6:17:1]

Romans 6:18

(a) ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδούλωθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνη, [Rom.Frag
Romans 6:19
(a) ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ύμων δούλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ἁνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἁνομίαν, οὔτως νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ύμων δούλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγίασμόν· [Rom.Frag D, 6:19:1]
(b) ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἁνομίαν τῆς σαρκὸς ύμων ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ύμων δούλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἁνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἁνομίαν, οὔτω νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ύμων δούλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγίασμόν. [Rom.Frag D, 6:19:1]

Romans 6:20
(a) ὅτε γὰρ δούλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐλευθεροὶ ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. [Rom.Frag A, 32:n3]
(b) ὅτε γὰρ δούλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐλευθεροὶ ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. [Rom.Frag D, 6:20:1]

Romans 6:21
(a) τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε ἐφ’ οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε; τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος· [Rom.Frag A, 33:n1]
(b) τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε; ἐφ’ οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε· τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος. [Rom.Frag D, 6:21:1]
(c) Τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε 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 ύμῶν εἰς ἁγίασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ψῆναι αἰώνιον. [Rom.Frag A, 33:n2]
(b) νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ύμῶν εἰς ἁγίασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ψῆναι 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 ύμῶν εἰς ἁγίασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ψῆναι αἰώνιον. [Ps.Frag, 118:91:14]
(d) Εξελευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῷ Θεῷ,» δηλονότι κατ’ ἀρετὴν καὶ γνώσιν. Ἐξελευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῷ Θεῷ, δηλονότι κατ’ ἀρετὴν καὶ γνώσιν. [Ps.Sel, 12:1605:3]
(e) Νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ δηλονότι κατ’ ἀρετὴν καὶ γνώσιν) ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ύμῶν εἰς ἁγίασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ψῆναι αἰώνιον· [Prov.Exp, 17:177:15]

Romans 6:23
(a) τὰ γὰρ ὅψιναι τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν
Chapter Seven
Romans 7:1
(a) "Ἡ ἁγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί—γινώσκουσιν γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ—ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐφ’ ὅσον χρόνον ζῆ; [John.Com A, 13:8:43:5]
(b) ἢ ἁγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί, γινώσκουσι γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ, ὥστε ἀποθανατικόν ἄνθρωπον ἐπηράγητα [Rom.Frag C, 186:3]
(c) τὰ γὰρ ὄντια τῆς ἀμαρτίας θάνατος, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ζωῆς ἀιῶνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 6:23:1]

Romans 7:2
(a) Ὁ γὰρ ὑπάνδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζωντινῷ ἄνδρᾳ δεδεται νόμων [John.Com A, 13:8:44:1]
(b) Ὁ γὰρ ὑπάνδρος γυνή τῷ ζωντινῷ ἄνδρᾳ δεδεται νόμων [Matt.Com C, 12:4:13]
(c) Ὁ γὰρ ὑπάνδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζωντινῷ ἄνδρᾳ δεδεται νόμων: ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἄνηρ, κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἄνδρος. [Rom.Frag A, 35:n2]
(d) Ὁ γὰρ ὑπάνδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζωντινῷ ἄνδρᾳ δεδεται νόμων: ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἄνηρ, κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἄνδρος. [Rom.Frag D, 7:2:1]

Romans 7:3
(a) Ἄρτι οὖν ζωντινὸς τοῦ ἄνδρος μοιχαλίς χρηματίζει εὰν γένηται ἄνδρῃ ἐτέρῳ· εάν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἄνηρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἰναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα γενομένην ἄνδρῃ ἐτέρῳ. [John.Com A, 13:8:46:2]
(b) Ἄρτι οὖν ζωντινὸς τοῦ ἄνδρος μοιχαλίς χρηματίζει εὰν γένηται ἄνδρῳ ἐτέρῳ [Matt.Com C, 12:4:36]
(c) ζωντινὸς τοῦ ἄνδρος μοιχαλίς χρηματίζει εὰν γένηται ἄνδρῳ ἐτέρῳ, [Matt.Com C, 14:24:77]
(d) Ἄρτι οὖν ζωντινὸς τοῦ ἄνδρος μοιχαλίς χρηματίζει εὰν γένηται ἄνδρῳ ἐτέρῳ· εὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἄνηρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἰναι αὐτήν μοιχαλίδα γενομένην ἄνδρῳ ἐτέρῳ. [Rom.Frag A, 35:n4]
(e) Ἄρτι οὖν ζωντινὸς τοῦ ἄνδρος μοιχαλίς χρηματίζει εὰν γένηται ἄνδρῳ ἐτέρῳ· εὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἄνηρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἰναι αὐτήν μοιχαλίδα γενομένην ἄνδρῳ ἐτέρῳ. [Rom.Frag D, 7:3:1]

Romans 7:4
Romans 7:5
(a) ὢστε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηγείτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἠμῶν εἰς τὸ καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag D, 7:5:1]

Romans 7:6
(a) νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθάνοντες ἐν ὕ κατειχόμεθα, ὢστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος. [Rom.Frag A, 36:n1]
(b) νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθάνοντες ἐν ὕ κατειχόμεθα, ὢστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος. [Rom.Frag D, 7:6:1]

Romans 7:7
(a) τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; οὐ νόμος ἁμαρτία; μὴ γένοιτο· ἄλλα τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου· τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμήσαι 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; οὐ νόμος ἁμαρτία; μὴ γένοιτο· ἄλλα τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου· τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμήσαι 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 πάσαν ἐπιθυμίαν. [Rom.Frag A, 38:n1]
(c) ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πάσαν ἐπιθυμίαν· χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά. [Rom.Frag D, 7:8:1]

Romans 7:9
(a) Ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν, ἐγώ 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 ἐξων χωρὶς νόμου ποιεῖ· ἐλθοῦσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν, [Rom.Frag A, 39:n1]
(d) ἐγὼ δὲ ἐξων χωρὶς νόμου ποιεῖ· ἐλθοῦσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν, [Rom.Frag D, 7:9:1]

Romans 7:10
(a) ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον [Cels, 3:62:26]
(b) ἔγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον, καὶ εὐρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἢ εἰς ζωὴν αὕτη εἰς θάνατον. [Rom.Frag A, 39:n2]
(c) ἔγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον, καὶ εὐρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἢ εἰς ζωὴν, αὕτη εἰς θάνατον. [Rom.Frag D, 7:10:2]

Romans 7:11
(a) ἢ γὰρ ἁμαρτία ἠφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐξηπάτησέν με καὶ δι’ αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν. [Rom.Frag A, 39:n3]
(b) ἠφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐξηπάτησέν με καὶ δι’ αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν. [Rom.Frag C, 146:7]
(c) ἢ γὰρ ἁμαρτία ἠφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐξηπάτησέ με καὶ δι’ αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν. [Rom.Frag D, 7:12:1]

Romans 7:12
(a) Ὅστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἁγίος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαιά καὶ ἀγαθή. [Cels, 7:20:32]
(b) ὁ νόμος ἁγίος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαιά καὶ ἀγαθή, [Matt.Com B, 11:14:65]
(c) ὡστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἁγίος καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία. [Rom.Frag A, 10:6]
(d) ὡστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἁγίος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαιά καὶ ἀγαθή. [Rom.Frag D, 7:12:1]

Romans 7:13
(a) τὸ οὖν ἁγαθὸν ἔμοι γέγονε θάνατος; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἵνα φανὴ ἁμαρτία διὰ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον· ἵνα γένηται καθ’ ύπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς. [Rom.Frag A, 40:n1]
(b) Τὸ οὖν ἁγαθὸν ἔμοι ἐγένετο θάνατος; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλ’ ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἵνα φανὴ ἁμαρτία, διὰ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον, ἵνα γένηται καθ’ [Rom.Frag D, 7:13:1]

Romans 7:14
(a) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικὸς ἐστίν [Cels, 7:20:31]
(b) Οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικὸς ἐστι. [Basil.Phil A, 9:2:10]
(c) οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικὸς ἐστι. [Matt.Com B, 11:14:64]
(d) οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικὸς ἐστιν· ἐγὼ δὲ σαρκικὸς εἰμι, πεπραμένος ύπο τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. [Rom.Frag A, 41:n1]
(e) οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικὸς ἐστιν· ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινος εἰμι, πεπραμένος ύπο 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· ὁ γὰρ ὁ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω, ἀλλ’ ὁ μισῶ τοῦτο ποιῶ. [Rom.Frag D, 7:15:1]
Romans 7:16
(a) εἰ δὲ οὐ θέλω τούτο ποιώ, σύμφημι τῷ νόμῳ ὑπὲρ καλὸς. [Rom.Frag D, 7:17:1]

Romans 7:17
(a) νυνὶ δὲ συνήδομαι εγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτῷ ἀλλ' ἡ οἰκούσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀμαρτία. [Rom.D, 7:17:1]

Romans 7:18
(a) οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ οἴκει ἐν ἐμοί, τούτ' ἐστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, ἀγαθόν· τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειται μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὐ· [Rom.Frag D, 7:18:3]

Romans 7:19
(a) Οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω τούτο πράσσω, ἀλλ' ὁ μισῶ τούτο ποιῶ· [John.Com A, 10:7:28:5]
(b) οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω ποιῶ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλ' ὁ οὐ θέλω κακὸν τούτο πράσσω. [Rom.Frag D, 7:19:1]

Romans 7:20
(a) εἰ δὲ ὁ θέλω ἐγὼ τούτο ποιῶ, συνήδομαι εγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτῷ ἀλλ' ἡ
οἰκούσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀμαρτία. [Rom.Frag D, 7:20:1]

Romans 7:21
(a) εὐρύσκω ἁρὰ τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν, 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 ἐτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου ἀντισταθεῖσιν νῦν τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ
νοὸς μου καὶ αἵμαλωτίζοντας με τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἀμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί
μου. [Rom.Frag A, 43:n2]
(b) βλέπω δὲ ἐτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου ἀντισταθεῖσιν νῦν τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ
νοὸς μου καὶ αἵμαλωτίζοντας με τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἀμαρτίας 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 ἀνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Mart, 3:8]
(d) ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἀνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Jer.Hom B, 20:7:21]
(e) ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἀνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Matt.Com C, 15:27:43]
(f) ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἀνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Rom.Frag A, 44:n1]
(g) Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἀνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Rom.Frag D, 7:24:1]
(h) Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἀνθρωπος· τίς με ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; [Ps.Frag, 37:7:5]
(i) Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἀνθρωπος· [Ps.Sel, 12:1201:8]
(j) Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἀνθρωπος· 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]
(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. Ἀρας οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοὶ μου δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἀμαρτίας. [Rom.Frag D, 7:25:2]

Chapter Eight
Romans 8:1
(a) οὐδέν ἀρα 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 ἀμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου. [Rom.Frag D, 8:2:1]

Romans 8:3
(a) τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ὧν ἦσθενε διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ὑδὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας κατέκρινε τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, [Rom.Frag A, 45:n1]
(b) τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ὧν ἦσθενε διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ὑδὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας κατέκρινε τὴν ἀμαρτίαν 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 ἄλλα κατὰ πνεῦμα. [Rom.Frag A, 45:n3]
(b) ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἄλλα κατὰ πνεῦμα. [Rom.Frag D, 8:4:1]

Romans 8:5
(a) οἱ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα οντες τὰ τῆς σαρκός 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· καὶ, Οἴ οι σαρκὶ ζωντες Θεω αρεσαι ου δυνανται [Gen.Sel, 12:105:10]
(f) τὸ φρόνημα αὐτῆς ἔχθρα ἐστίν εἰς θεόν, τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτασσομένης. [Ps.Sel, 12:1277:31]

Romans 8:8
(a) Οἴ οἱ σαρκὶ οντες θεω ἀρεσαι ου δυνανται [Cels, 7:38:25]
(b) οἱ οἱ σαρκὶ οντες θεω ἀρεσαι ου δυνανται, [John.Com A, 13:53:359:1]
(d) οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ οντες θεω ἀρεσαι ου δυνανται: [Lam.Frag, 212:12]
(f) οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ οντες θεω ἀρεσαι ου δυνανται. [Rom.Frag A, 46:n2]
(g) οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ οντες θεω ἀρεσαι ου δυνανται. [Rom.Frag D, 8:9:1]
(h) οἱ γὰρ ἐν σαρκὶ οντες, θεω ἀρεσαι ου δυνανται. [Ps.Frag, 77:19-25:167]
(i) Οἴ οἱ σαρκὶ ζωντες Θεω ἀρεσαι ου δυνανται. [Gen.Sel, 12:105:12]
(j) Οἴ γὰρ ἐν σαρκὶ οντες Θεω ἀρεσαι ου δυνανται. [Ps.Exc, 17:147:17]

Romans 8:9
(a) Ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ’ ἐν πνεύματι, εἰπέρ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεὶ ἐν ύμῖν. [Cels, 7:45:4]
(c) ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ’ ἐν πνεύματι, εἰπέρ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεὶ ἐν ύμῖν. [Matt.Com C, 13:2:200]
(d) ύμείς δὲ οὐκ ἔστε ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ’ ἐν πνεύματι, εἰπερ πνεύμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ύμῖν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:9:1]

Romans 8:10
(a) εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ύμῖν, 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 ύμῖν, ὁ ἐγείρας ἐκ νεκρῶν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ζωοποιήσει τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ύμῶν διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐν ύμῖν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:11:1]

Romans 8:12
(a) "Αρ’ οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ὁφειλέται ἐσμέν, ού τῇ σαρκὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζήν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:12:1]

Romans 8:13
(a) Εἰ κατὰ σάρκα ζήτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνῄσκειν· εἰ δὲ πνεῦματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε, [Cels, 7:52:15]
(b) εἰ δὲ πνεῦματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε [Eze.Hom, 337:32]
(c) εἰ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ζήτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνῄσκειν· εἰ δὲ πνεῦματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε [Rom.Frag D, 8:13:1]

Romans 8:14
(a) "Οσοὶ πνεῦματι θεοῦ ἁγονται, οὕτωι υἱοὶ εἰσι θεοῦ. [Cels, 4:95:24]
(b) "Οσοὶ πνεῦματι θεοῦ ἁγονται, οὕτωι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν, [Cels, 6:70:1]
(c) ὅσοι πνεῦματι θεοῦ ἁγονται, οὕτωι υἱοὶ εἰσι θεοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 20:22:24]
(d) ὅσοι γὰρ πνεῦματι θεοῦ ἁγονται, οὕτωι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν· [Rom.Frag D, 8:14-15:1]

Romans 8:15
(a) Οὐ γὰρ ἔλαβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον, ἀλλ’ ἔλαβετε πνεῦμα οἰσθεσίας, ἐν ψε κράζομεν· Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. [Cels, 1:57:10]
(b) οὐ γὰρ ἔλαβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας εἰς φόβον ἀλλὰ ἔλαβετε πνεῦμα οἰσθεσίας, ἐν ψε κράζομεν· Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ“. [Euches, 22:2:10]
(c) οὐ γὰρ ἔλαβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον, ἀλλ’ ἔλαβετε πνεῦμα οἰσθεσίας, ἐν ψε κράζομεν· Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. [Rom.Frag D, 8:15:2]

Romans 8:16
(a) αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ήμῶν ὅτι ἐσμέν τέκνα θεοῦ, [Matt.Com C, 13:2:88]
(b) αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ήμῶν ὅτι ἐσμέν τέκνα θεοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 8:17:1]
Romans 8:17
(a) εἷς δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι: κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ, εἰπερ συμπάσχωμεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:17:1]

Romans 8:18
(a) Λογίζομαι γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ ἠξία τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. [Rom.Frag D, 8:18:1]

Romans 8:19
(a) Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. [Cels, 5:13:12]
(b) Ἡ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται [Cels, 7:65:7]
(c) Ἡ τῆς κτίσεως ἀποκαραδοκία τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. [Cels, 8:5:13]
(e) ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. [Rom.Frag D, 8:19:1]

Romans 8:20
(a) Τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὖχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι [Cels, 5:13:13]
(b) Τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη οὖχ ἐκούσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, [Cels, 7:50:14]
(c) Τῇ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὖχ ἐκούσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, [Cels, 7:65:9]
(d) Τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὖχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, [Cels, 8:5:14]
(e) Τῇ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη οὖχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα τῇ ἐλπίδι, [John.Com A, 1:17:99:2]
(f) τῇ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὖχ ἐκούσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι. [John.Com A, 1:26:176:5]
(g) τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὖχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι [Rom.Frag D, 8:20:2]

Romans 8:21
(a) ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθῆσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς θορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ. [Cels, 5:13:15]
(b) Ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθῆσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς θορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ [Cels, 7:65:5]
(c) ἐλευθερωθῆσεται πᾶσα ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς θορᾶς [Cels, 8:5:16]
(d) ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς θορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ, [John.Com A, 1:26:170:2]
(e) ἐλευθερωθήσομαι ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς θορᾶς [Mart, 7:28]
Romans 8:22
(a) οἴδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἀχρὶ τοῦ νῦν·
[Rom.Frag D, 8:22:1]

Romans 8:23
(a) οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῷ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἡχοντες ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν ύιόθεσιν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:23:1]

Romans 8:24
(a) ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπὶς· ὅ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει; [Rom.Frag A, 47:n1]
(b) Τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν· ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπὶς· ὅ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί ἐλπίζει; [Rom.Frag C, 212:4]
(c) τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν· ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπὶς· ὅ γὰρ βλέπει τις καὶ ἐλπίζει; [Rom.Frag D, 8:24:1]

Romans 8:25
(a) ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπὶς· ὅ 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, καθό δεὶ οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις ύπερεντυγχάνει [Euches, 14:5:4]
(b) ωσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμβάνεται ταῖς ἁσθενείαις ἡμῶν, τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθ’ ὃ δεὶ οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ύπερεντυγχάνει ύπέρ ἡμῶν στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις. [Rom.Frag A, 48:n1]
(c) ωσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἁσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν· τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθό δεὶ οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ύπερεντυγχάνει [Rom.Frag D, 8:26:1]

Romans 8:27
(a) οὖ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδε τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ύπέρ ἄγιων. [Euches, 2:3:12]
(b) οὖ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδε τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν
έντυγχανεί ύπερ ἄγιων": [Euches, 14:5:7]
(c) ὁ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδεν τι τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ύπερ ἄγιων. [Rom.Frag D, 8:27:1]

Romans 8:28 (this is probably Psalms)
(a) τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτὸν πάντα συνεργῶν εἰς ἄγαθὸν, τοῖς κατὰ [Euches, 29:19:7]
(b) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὕσιν; [Basil.Phil A, 25:1:30]
(c) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὕσιν. [Basil.Phil A, 25:3:3]
(d) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν. [Basil.Phil A, 25:3:11]
(e) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὕσιν, [Basil.Phil B, 25:1:31]
(f) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὕσιν. [Basil.Phil B, 25:3:3]
(g) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὕσιν. [Basil.Phil B, 25:3:3]
(h) Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν. [Basil.Phil B, 25:3:11]
(i) οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὕσιν; [Rom.Frag A, 1:22]
(j) οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὕσιν. [Rom.Frag A, 1:61]
(k) οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν. [Rom.Frag A, 1:67]
(l) οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὐσιν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:28:1]
(m) Ἐπεί τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἄγαθὸν ὁ Θεὸς, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὐσιν. [Ps.Sel, 12:1157:30]

Romans 8:29
(a) προέγνω ὁ θεὸς, τούτου καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τῆς δόξης τοῦ ὦν αὐτοῦ. [Euches, 5:5:9]
(b) ὅτι οὐς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ ὦν αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς; [Basil.Phil A, 25:1:32]
(c) Οὐς γὰρ προέγνω, φησὶ, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ ὦν αὐτοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 25:2:8]
(d) καὶ οὕς οὕτω προέγνω, προώρισεν συμμόρφους ἐσομένους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ ὦν αὐτοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 25:2:14]
(e) προέγνω καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους ἐσομένους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ ὦν αὐτοῦ, [Basil.Phil A, 25:2:27]
(f) ὃτι οὕς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ ὦν αὐτοῦ.
Romans 8:30
(a) οὐς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν· καὶ οὕς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὐς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασε. [Euches, 5:5:11]
(b) οὐς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν· καὶ οὕς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὐς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν. [Basil.Phil A, 25:1:35]
(c) ὁ τοῦτον προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν, καὶ οὕς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν. [Rom.Frag A, 1:25]
(d) οὐς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν· καὶ οὕς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:30:1]

Romans 8:31
(a) τί οὖν ἔρούμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; εἰ ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ’ ἡμῶν; [Rom.Frag A, 49:n1]
(b) Τί οὖν ἔρούμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; εἰ ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ’ ἡμῶν; [Rom.Frag D, 8:31:1]

Romans 8:32
(a) τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἑφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν,
[Lam.Frag, 151:18]
(b) ὃς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἑφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν,
(c) τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἑφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν,
(d) ὃς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἑφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν,
[Lam.Frag, 49:n2]
(e) ὃς δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἑφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν,
[Rom.Frag D, 8:32:1]
(f) ὃς γε τοῦ ἰδίου Υἱοῦ οὐκ ἑφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν.
[Deut.Sel, 12:817:18]
(g) ὃς γε τοῦ ἰδίου Υἱοῦ οὐκ ἑφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν,
[Luc.Schol, 17:348:56]

Romans 8:33
(a) τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; θεοῦ ὁ δικαιών· [Rom.Frag A, 50:n1]
(b) τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; θεοῦ ὁ δικαιών· [Rom.Frag D, 8:33:1]

Romans 8:34
(a) τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; Χριστὸς ὁ ἀποθανόν, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐγερθεῖς, ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 8:34:1]

Romans 8:35
(a) Τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει από τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Θλίψις ἡ στενοχωρία ἡ διωγμός ἡ λυμός ἡ γυμνότης ἡ κίνδυνος ἡ μάχαιρα; [Cels, P:3:15]
(b) τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσῃ από τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ; θλίψις ἡ στενοχωρία ἡ διωγμός ἡ λυμός ἡ γυμνότης ἡ κίνδυνος ἡ μάχαιρα; [Rom.Frag D, 8:35:1]

Romans 8:36
(a) Καθάπερ γέγραπται ὅτι ἔνεκεν σοι θανατούμεθα πάσαν τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐλογίσθησαν ως πρόβατα σφαγῆς. [Cels, P:3:18]
(b) ὅτι ἔνεκα σοι θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐλογίσθησαν ως πρόβατα σφαγῆς. [Mart, 21:9]
(c) ἔνεκέν σοι θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, [Rom.Frag A, 52:9]
(d) καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι ἔνεκεν σοι θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, [Rom.Frag D, 8:36:2]
(e) Ὅτι ἔνεκά σοι θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐλογίσθησαν ως πρόβατα σφαγῆς. [Ps.Sel, 12:1428:9]

Romans 8:37
(a) Ἀλλ' 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]
Romans 8:38
(a) Πέπεισμα γάρ ὁτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωή, οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί, οὔτε ἐνεστώτα οὔτε μέλλοντα, οὔτε δυνάμεις [Cels, P:3:22]
(b) ὁτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωή, οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί [Cels, P:4:9]
(c) πέπεισμα γάρ ὁτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωή οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί οὔτε δυνάμεις [Rom.Frag A, 52:n1]
(c) πέπεισμα γάρ ὁτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωή οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί οὔτε ἐνεστώτα οὔτε μέλλοντα. [Rom.Frag D, 8:38:1]

Romans 8:39
(a) οὔτε ὕψωμα, οὔτε βάθος οὔτε κτίσις ἓτερα 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 ἓτερα 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 ἓτερα 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) συμμαρτυρούσησθε̇μιν τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ [John.Com B, 20:37:338:2]

Romans 9:2
(a) Λύπη μοι ἐστὶ μεγάλη, καὶ ἀδιάληπτος ὁ δύνα τῇ καρδίᾳ μου, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. [Ps.Sel, 12:1573:47]

Romans 9:3
(a) Εὐχόμεν αὐτός ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα. [1Cor.Com, 51:26]

Romans 9:4
(a) Ἄν ἡ υιοθεσία καὶ δόξα καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ ἡ ἐπαγγελία, ἐξ ὑπὸ ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν. [Ps.Frag, 134:12-14:14]
Romans 9:5 None

Romans 9:6
(a) οὐδὲ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ. [Princ, 4:3:6:14]
(b) οὐδὲ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ. [Basil.Phil A, 1:22:16]

Romans 9:7 None

Romans 9:8
(a) οὐ γάρ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ." [Princ, 4:3:6:13]
(b) οὐ γάρ 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 γάρ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς, ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 1:22:16]
(e) Οὐ γάρ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς, ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ. [Basil.Phil A, 1:24:8]

Romans 9:9-10 None

Romans 9:11
(b) μήπω μήτε γεννηθέντων μήτε πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ φαύλον, ἵνα ἢ κατ’ ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ μένη, [Euches, 5:4:2]

Romans 9:12
(b) οὐκ ἐξ ἐργῶν ἀλλὰ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος, λέγεται· ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάττωνι, [Euches, 5:4:4]

Romans 9:13

Romans 9:14
(a) Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; Μὴ ἄδικία 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,
Romans 9:17
(a) τῆς γραφῆς λεγούσης τῷ Φαραώ· Εἷς αὐτὸ τούτο εξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ὑπὸ σοῦ τὴν δύναμίν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγέλη τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ. [Basil.Phil A, 23:20:19]
(b) τῆς γραφῆς λεγούσης τῷ Φαραώ· Εἷς αὐτὸ τούτο εξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ὑπὸ σοῦ τὴν δύναμίν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγέλη τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ. [Basil.Phil B, 23:20:21]
(c) Εἷς αὐτὸ τούτο εξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ὑπὸ σοῦ τὴν δύναμίν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγέλη τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ. [Gen.Com, 12:84:13]

Romans 9:18
(a) οὖν θέλει ἔλεει, ὅν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει. [Princ, 3:1:14:32]
(b) Ὄν θέλει ἔλεει, ὅν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει. [Basil.Phil A, 21:13:37]
(c) οὖν θέλει ἔλεει, ὅν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει. [Basil.Phil B, 27:1:19]
(d) οὖν θέλει ἔλεει, ὅν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει, [Ex.Com, 12:265:7]

Romans 9:19
(a) ἔρεις μοι οὖν· τί ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν; [Princ, 3:1:21:3]
(b) ἔρεις μοι οὖν· τί ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν; [Basil.Phil A, 21:20:4]
(c) ἔρεις οὖν μοι, τί ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν; [Basil.Phil B, 27:2:31]
(d) ἔρεις οὖν μοι, Τί ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκε; [Ex.Com, 12:273:39]

Romans 9:20
(a) μενοῦνε, ὅ ἀνθρωπε, σύ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ; μὴ ἔρει τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι· τί με ἐποίησας οὔτως; [Princ, 3:1:21:5]
(b) μενοῦνε, ὅ ἀνθρωπε, σύ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ; μὴ ἔρει τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι· τί με ἐποίησας οὔτως; [Basil.Phil A, 21:20:5]
Romans 9:21
(a) ἡ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεύς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὁ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεύος ὁ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν; [Princ, 3:1:21:7]
(b) ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ κεραμεύς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὁ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεύος ὁ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν, [Princ, 3:1:24:7]
(c) ἡ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεύς τοῦ πηλοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὁ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεύος, ὁ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν; [Basil.Phill A, 21:20:7]
(d) Ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ κεραμεύς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὁ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεύος ὁ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν· [Basil.Phill A, 21:23:8]

Romans 9:22
(a) κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, [Jer.Frag B, 31:1]
(b) Εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργήν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ ἠνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύῃ ὀργής κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν· [Basil.Phill A, 27:10:20]
(c) Εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργήν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ ἠνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύῃ ὀργής κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν· [Basil.Phill B, 27:10:20]
(d) Εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ Θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργήν, καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ, ἠνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύῃ ὀργής κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν· [Ex.Com, 12:280:1]

Romans 9:23
(a) ἴνα 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, ἢ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας καὶ ἢ 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 ἐχουσιν, ἀλλ’ οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν· [Rom.Frag D, 10:2:1]
Romans 10:3
(a) ἀνγοούντες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ζητοῦντες στήσαι, τῇ δικαιοσύνη 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 ἀνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ. [Rom.Frag D, 10:5:1]

Romans 10:6
(a) ἢ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνης οὕτως λέγει· μὴ εἰπής ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τούτῳ ἔστιν Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν. [Rom.Frag D, 10:6:1]
(b) Μὴ εἰπής ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· Τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τούτῳ ἔστι Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν [John.Com A, 1:37:269:6]
(c) Μὴ εἰπής ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· Τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τούτῳ ἔστι Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν. [John.Com B, 19:12:76:4]

Romans 10:7
(b) ἢ· Τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἁβυσσον; τούτῳ ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν. [John.Com A, 2:15:111:7]
(c) ἢ· τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἁβυσσον; τούτῳ ἔστι Χριστὸν ἀναγαγεῖν. [Jer.Hom B, 18:2:59]
(d) ἢ· τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἁβυσσον; τούτῳ ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν. [Rom.Frag D, 10:7:1]
(e) ἢ· Τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἁβυσσον; τούτῳ ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν.[John.Com B, 19:12:76:4]

Romans 10:8
(b) Ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή· Ἑγγύς σου τὸ ρήμα ἔστιν σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου. [John.Com A, 2:15:111:8]
(c) Ἑγγύς γὰρ τὸ ρήμα ἔστι σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί ἡμῶν καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἡμῶν, [Euches, 25:1:4]
(d) Ἑγγύς σου ἔστι τὸ ρήμα, καὶ περὶ τῶν κατωτάτω ἑγγύς σου ἔστι τὸ ρήμα. [Jer.Hom B, 18:2:63]
(e) Ἀλλὰ τί λέγει; Ἑγγύς σου τὸ ρήμα ἔστιν σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ
Romans 10:9
(a) ὅτι ἐὰν ὀμολογήσης ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ θεός αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ. [Rom.Frag D, 10:9:3]
Romans 10:17
(a) ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐx ἀκοής, ἢ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ρήματος Χριστοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 10:17:1]

Romans 10:18
(a) ἄλλα λέγω, μὴ οὐκ ἦκουσαν; μενούνγε· εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἔξηλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν [Rom.Frag D, 10:18:1]

Romans 10:19
(a) ἄλλα λέγω, μὴ Ἰσραήλ οὐκ ἔγνως; πρῶτος Μωσῆς λέγει· ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω ύμᾶς ἐπ’ οὐκ ἔθνει, ἐπ’ ἔθνει ἁσυνήτω παροργιῶ ύμᾶς. [Rom.Frag D, 10:19:1]

Romans 10:20
(a) Ἥσαῖας δὲ ἄποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει· εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν. [Rom.Frag D, 10:20:1]

Chapter Eleven
Romans 11:1
(a) Λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; μὴ γένοιτο· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραήλ ὕποπτος εἰμὶ, 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 Ἡλία τί λέγει ἡ γραφή, ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; [Rom.Frag D, 11:2:1]

Romans 11:3
(a) κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, τὰ θυσιαστηρία σου κατέσκαψαν, καγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου. [Rom.Frag D, 11:3:1]

Romans 11:4
(a) ἄλλα τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; κατέλειπον ἐμαυτῷ ἐπτακισχιλίους ἀνδρας, οἴτινες οὐκ ἔκαψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ. [Rom.Frag D, 11:4:1]

Romans 11:5
(a) Ἀρ’ 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 ἔξ ἐργῶν ἑστίν, ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκέτι γίνεται χάρις [Eph.Com, 17:22]
(b) εἰ δὲ χάριτι, οὐκέτι ἔξ ἐργῶν, ἐπεἰ ἡ χάρις οὐκέτι γίνεται χάρις. [Rom.Frag D, 11:6:1]

Romans 11:7
(a) Τί οὖν; ὁ ἐπίζητεὶ Ἰσραήλ, τοῦτο οὐκ ἔπετυχεν, ἢ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν, [Rom.Frag D, 11:7:1]

Romans 11:8
(a) καθὼς γέγραπται· ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεύμα κατανύξεως, ὁφθαλμοὺς τοῦ 
μῆ βλέπων καὶ ώτα τοῦ μῆ ἁκούειν, ἐως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας. [Rom.Frag D, 11:8:1]

Romans 11:9
(a) καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει· γενηθήτω 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 ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσι [Cels, 2:78:6]
(b) Τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτοὺς. 
[Jer.Hom A, 4:2:10]
(c) τῷ αὐτῆς καὶ Ἰσραήλ παραπτώματι γέγονεν ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ 
παραζηλώσαι αὐτοὺς [Lam.Frag, 42:4]
(d) τῷ γὰρ ἐκεῖνων παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι 
(e) παραπτώματι γέγονεν ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσι [Rom.Frag C, 124:10]
(f) Λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἐπαίσχαι ἵνα πέσωσιν; μὴ γένοιτο· ἄλλα τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ 
σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτοὺς. [Rom.Frag D, 11:11:1]
(g) Τῷ γὰρ ἐκεῖνων παραπτώματι σωτηρία γέγονεν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εἰς τὸ 
παραζηλώσαι αὐτοὺς [John.Com B, 28:12:93:3]

Romans 11:12
(a) τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμου καὶ τὸ ἡττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἔθνων 
[Cels, 6:80:22]
(b) εἰ δὲ τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμου καὶ τὸ ἡττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος 
ἔθνων, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν. [Rom.Frag D, 11:12:1]

Romans 11:13
(a) Ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. ἕφ’ ὅσον μὲν εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἔθνων ἀπόστολος, τὴν 
diakonían μου δοξάζω [Rom.Frag D, 11:13:1]
Romans 11:14
(a) εἰ πως παραζηλώσω μου τήν σάρκα καὶ σώσω τινάς ἐξ αὐτῶν. εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολή αὐτῶν [Rom.Frag D, 11:14:1]

Romans 11:15
(a) εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολή αὐτῶν καταλαγῇ 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 ρίζα ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι. [Rom.Frag D, 11:16:2]

Romans 11:17
(a) Εἰ δὲ τινες τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ δὲ ἀγριέλαιος ὡν ἐνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ συγκοινωνός τῆς ρίζης καὶ τῆς πιότητος τῆς ἑλλαίας ἐγένου, [Rom.Frag D, 11:17:1]

Romans 11:18
(a) μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων· εἰ δὲ κατακαυχᾶσαι, σὺ σὺ τὴν ρίζαν βαστάζεις ἀλλ’ ἡ ρίζα σέ. [Rom.Frag D, 11:18:1]

Romans 11:19
(a) ἑρεῖς 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 ψυχλοφρόνει, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ· [Rom.Frag D, 11:20:2]

Romans 11:21
(a) Ἐι τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, πόσῳ πλέον οὐδὲ ἦμων φείσεται’. [Jer.Hom A, 4:4:7]
(b) ἢδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτομία, ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότης θεοῦ, ἐὰν ἑπιμένης ἑπιμείνης 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) ἢδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τὸ πρῶτον ἔθνος καὶ πεσόν ἀποτομία, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον ἔθνος ἐπαγγελίαι καὶ χρηστότης, ἐὰν ἑπιμένης τῇ χρηστότητι· ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ. [Jer.Hom B, 18:5:62]
(c) ἢδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτομία, ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότης θεοῦ, ἐὰν ἑπιμενησἀπιμείνης τῇ χρηστότητι, ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ [Rom.Frag D, 11:22:1]
(d) χρηστότητος και ἀποτομίας κατά τὸν ἀπόστολον, [Ps.Frag, 118:65,66:36]

Romans 11:23
(a) κάκεινοι δέ, ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιμένως τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἐγκεντρισθήσονται· δυνατὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσαι αὐτούς. [Rom.Frag D, 11:23:1]

Romans 11:24
(a) εἰ γὰρ σὺ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐξεκόπης ἀγριελαίου καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ἐνεκεντρίσθης εἰς καλλιέλαιον, πόσῳ μᾶλλον οὗτοι οἱ κατὰ φύσιν ἐγκεντρισθήσονται τῇ ἓδι ἑλαίᾳ. [Rom.Frag D, 11:24:2]

Romans 11:25
(a) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἑθνῶν εἰσέλθη [Cels, 6:80:24]
(b) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἑθνῶν εἰσέλθειν, [John.Com A, 13:57:392:3]
(c) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἑθνῶν εἰσέλθη, [Jer.Hom A, 4:6:27]
(d) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἑθνῶν εἰσέλθη [Lam.Frag, 42:6]
(e) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἑθνῶν εἰσέλθη, [Lam.Frag, 125:34]

(f) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἑθνῶν εἰσέλθη, πᾶς ὁ Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Matt.Com C, 14:20:19]
(g) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἑθνῶν εἰσέλθη, τότε πᾶς ὁ Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Rom.Frag C, 190:8]
(h) Οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἄγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, ἵνα μὴ ἔτε ἐαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι, ὃτι πῶρως ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν ἄχρις οὐ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἑθνῶν εἰσέλθη. [Rom.Frag D, 11:25:3]
(i) τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἑθνῶν εἰσέλθη. [Matt.Schol, 17:297:5]

Romans 11:26
(a) τότε πᾶς ὁ Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Jer.Hom A, 4:6:27]
(b) τότε πᾶς ὁ Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Lam.Frag, 42:6]
(c) τότε πᾶς ὁ Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Lam.Frag, 125:34]
(d) πᾶς ὁ Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Matt.Com C, 14:20:19]
(e) τότε πᾶς ὁ Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται [Rom.Frag C, 190:8]
(f) καὶ οὕτω πᾶς ὁ Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται, καθὼς γέγραπται· ἤξει ἐκ Σιὼν ὁ ρύομενος, ἀποστρέψει ἀσβεσίας 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 ἔχθροι δι’ ὑμᾶς, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοὶ διὰ τούς πατέρας· ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα [Rom.Frag D, 11:28:1]
Romans 11:29
(a) ἀμεταμέλητα γάρ τα χαρίσματα καὶ ή κλήσις τοῦ θεοῦ. ὥσπερ γάρ ύμεις ποτε ἡπειθήσατε τῷ [Rom.Frag D, 11:29:1]

Romans 11:30
(a) ὥσπερ γάρ ύμεις ποτε ἡπειθήσατε τῷ θεῷ, νῦν δὲ ἡλεήθητε τῇ τούτων ἀπειθείᾳ. [Rom.Frag D, 11:31:1]

Romans 11:31
(a) οὕτως καὶ οὕτωι νῦν ἡπειθήσαν τῷ ύμετέρῳ ἐλέει ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθῶσιν. [Rom.Frag D, 11:31:2]

Romans 11:32
(a) συνέκλεισεν ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπείθειαν ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ. [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 ύμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ύμῶν θυσίαν ζώσαν ἄγιαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὕμων· [Rom.Frag D, 12:1:1]
(b) παραστήσατε τὰ σώματα ύμῶν θυσίαν ζώσαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ. [Ps.Frag, 80:3:24]

Romans 12:2
(a) Παρακαλῶ οὖν ύμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, παραστήσαι τά σώματα ύμῶν θυσίαν ζώσαν ἄγιαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὕμων· [Rom.Frag D, 12:2:1]

Romans 12:3
(a) Λέγω γάρ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ύμῖν, μὴ ύπερφρονεῖν παρ’ ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, ἐκάστῳ ως ὁ θεὸς ἐμέτρησε ἐμέρισε μέτρον πίστεως· [Rom.Frag D, 12:3:1]

Romans 12:4
(a) καθάπερ γάρ ἐν ἐνι σώματι μέλη πολλὰ ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πράξειν, [Rom.Frag D, 12:4:1]

Romans 12:5
(a) οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἐσμέν 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) εἶτε ὁ παρακάλων, ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει· ὁ μεταδίδους ἐν ἀπλότητι, ὁ προϊστάμενος ἐν σπουδῇ, ὁ ἐλεῶν ἐν ἱλαρότητι. [Rom.Frag D, 12:8:1]
(b) Ὁ ἐλεῶν ἐν ἱλαρότητι [Ps.Sel, 12:1576:6]
(c) Ὁ ἐλεῶν, ἐν ἱλαρότητι· [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 προηγοῦμενοι, τῇ σπουδῇ [Rom.Frag D, 12:10:1]

Romans 12:11
(a) τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγοῦμενοι, τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὁκνηροί, 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 χρείαις τῶν ἀγίων κοινωνοῦντες, τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες. [Rom.Frag D, 12:13:1]

Romans 12:14
(a) Εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταράσθε [Cels, 8:38:8]
(b) εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας, εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταράσθε. [Rom.Frag D, 12:14:1]
(c) εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταράσθε. [Ps.Sel, 12:1568:43]

Romans 12:15
(a) χαίρειν μετὰ χαίροντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. [Rom.Frag D, 12:15:1]
Romans 12:16
(a) μὴ ύψηλοφρονοῦντες ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. [Matt.Com C, 15:26:44]

Romans 12:17-18 None

Romans 12:19
(a) Μὴ ἐαυτοῦς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπητοὶ· ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ. [Ps.Frag, 37:16:7]

Romans 12:20
(a) εὰν οὖν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν· εὰν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. [Rom.Frag A, 53:n2]

Romans 12:21
(a) μὴ νικὼ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ, ἀλλὰ νίκα, ἀγαπητοί· ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ. [Rom.Frag A, 53:n3]  
(b) Νίκα ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακὸν. [Job.Hom C, 17:72:19]

Chapter Thirteen
Romans 13:1
(a) Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίας ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω. Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὐσίαι ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν· [Cels, 8:65:11]

Romans 13:2
(a) Ἡ πάσης ἀνθρεστηκότης τὴς ἐξουσία τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ διαταγῇ ἀνθίστανται [Cels, 8:65:13]

Romans 13:7-6 None

Romans 13:7
(a) ἀπόδοτε πάσι τὰς ὀφειλάς, τῷ τῶν φόρον τῶν φόρον, τῷ τῶν 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
(b) ἐτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαίοιται, τῷ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ως ἑαυτόν [Matt.Com C, 15:14:45]
Romans 13:10-11 None

Romans 13:12
(a) ἡ νῦς προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἡγιγεν [Matt.Com A, 238:8]
(b) ἡ νῦς προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἡγιγεν [Matt.Com B, 11:6:46]
(c) ἡ νῦς προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἡγιγεν [Apoc.Sch A, 18:4]
(d) Ἡ νῦς προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα [ἡγιγεν] [Pass, 126:7]

Romans 13:13
(a) ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν. [Ps.Sel, 12:1605:42]
(b) ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατούσιν, οὐ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, οὐ κοίταις καὶ ἁσελγείαις. [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) ὡς μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα, ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει [Euches, 27:5:8]
(c) ο ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει [Matt.Com C, 12:31:57]

Romans 14:3-8 None

Romans 14:9
(a) ἀπέθανεν Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα νεκρῶν κυριεύῃ, καὶ ἀνέστη, ἵνα μὴ μόνον νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ ζωντων κυριεύῃ. [Cels, 2:65:28]
(b) Εἰς τούτο γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη, ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζωντων κυριεύῃ. [John.Com A, 6:35:177:3]
(c) Εἰς τούτο Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη, ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζωντων κυριεύῃ, [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 γὰρ: ζῶ ἐγὼ, λέγει κύριος, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ, καὶ πάσα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ. [Rom.Frag D, 14:11:1]
Romans 14:12
(a) ἀρα ἐκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ ἐαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει. [Rom.Frag D, 14:12:1]

Romans 14:13
(a) Μηκέτι οὐν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν· ἀλλὰ τούτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον, τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον. [Rom.Frag D, 14:13:1]

Romans 14:14
(a) οἴδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ ἣς οὐδέν κοινὸν δι’ ἐαυτοῦ· εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκεῖνῳ κοινόν. [Rom.Frag D, 14:14:2]

Romans 14:15
(a) ἀρα ὑπὲρ τοῦ βρώματος πρὸς τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον. [Cels, 8:28:20]
(b) εἴ γὰρ ἐν τῷ βρώματι ὁ ἀδελφός σου λυπέται, ὡς κρίνατε μᾶλλον, τὸ μὴ βρώματι σου ἐκεῖνῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον. [Rom.Frag D, 14:15:1]

Romans 14:16
(a) Μὴ βλασφημείσθω ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 14:16-17:1]

Romans 14:17
(a) οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρώσις καὶ πόσις, ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρά [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. ἀρα οὐν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης [Rom.Frag D, 14:18:1]

Romans 14:19
(a) ἀρα οὐν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους. [Rom.Frag D, 14:19:1]

Romans 14:20
(a) μὴ ἐνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἐργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. πάντα μὲν καθαρά, ἀλλὰ κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἔσθιοντι. [Rom.Frag D, 14:20:1]

Romans 14:21
(a) Καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον μηδὲ ἐν ψ ω ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπτει [Cels, 8:28:18]
(b) καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέας μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον μηδὲ ἐν ψ ω 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 ὑ δοκιμάζει. [Rom.Frag D, 14:22:1]

Romans 14:23
(a) Ὅ γὰρ διακρινόμενος, κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον, ἐὰν φάγῃ κατακέκριται, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως· πάν δὲ ὅ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν. [Matt.Com B, 11:12:55]
(b) Ὅ διακρινόμενος ἐὰν φάγῃ κατακέκριται ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, [1Cor.Com, 19:42]
(c) Ὅ δὲ διακρινόμενος ἐὰν φάγῃ κατακέκριται, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως· πάν δὲ τὸ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν. [Rom.Frag D, 14:23:2]

Chapter Fifteen
Romans 15:1
(a) Ὅφείλομεν δὲ ἕμεις οἱ [Rom.Frag D, 15:1]

Romans 15:2
(a) ἐκαστὸς ἡμῶν τῷ πλησίον ἄρεσκέτω εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν· [Rom.Frag D 15:2:1]

Romans 15:3
(a) καὶ γὰρ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἐαυτῷ ἠρεσεν· ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται· οἱ ὁνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὁνειδιζόντων σε ἐπέτεσαν ἐπὶ ἐμέ. [Rom.Frag D 15:3:1]

Romans 15:4
(a) ὡσα γὰρ προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη, ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἐχωμεν. [Rom.Frag D 15:4:1]

Romans 15:5
(a) ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως δόθη ὑμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, [Rom.Frag D 15:5:1]

Romans 15:6
(a) ἢν 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 βεβαιώσαι τᾶς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων, [Rom.Frag D 15:8:1]

Romans 15:9
(a) τὰ δὲ ἔθνη υπὲρ ἑλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεὸν, καθὼς γέγραπται· διὰ τοῦτο
Romans 15:10-12 - These verses cannot be distinguished between Old and New Testaments

Romans 15:13
(a) 'Ο δὲ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρώσαι ύμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν, εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ύμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου. [Rom.Frag D, 15:13]

Romans 15:14
(a) Πέπεισμαι δὲ, ἀδελφοί καὶ αὐτῶς ἔγω περὶ ύμῶν, ὃτι καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοὶ ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης τῆς γνώσεως, δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους νουθετεῖν. [Rom.Frag D, 15:14]

Romans 15:15
(a) τολμηρότερον δὲ ύμῖν ἔγραψα ἀπό μέρους, ὡς ἐπαναμιμνήσκων ύμᾶς διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ [Rom.Frag D, 15:15]

Romans 15:16
(a) εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργόν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνων εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. [Rom.Frag D, 15:16]

Romans 15:17
(a) ἐχῶ οὖν καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν· [Rom.Frag D, 15:17]

Romans 15:18
(a) οὐ γὰρ τολμῆσαι τι λαλεῖν ὑν οὐ κατειργάσατο Χριστὸς δι᾽ ἐμοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἔθνων, λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ, [Rom.Frag D, 15:18]

Romans 15:19
(a) ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Cels, 1:63:26]
(b) ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ, [John.Com A, 5:3:1:3]
(c) ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου· ὡστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Rom.Frag D, 15:19:1]

Romans 15:20
(a) φιλοτιμούμενον εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, [Cels, 1:63:27]
(b) φιλοτιμούμενος εὐαγγελίζεσθαι οὕς ὑπὸ ὑνομάσθῃ Χριστὸς, ἵνα μὴ ἔπῃ ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ. [1Cor.Com, 15:12]
(c) οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμούμενον εὐαγγελίζεσθαι οὕς ὑπὸ ὑνομάσθῃ Χριστὸς, ἵνα μὴ
ἐπὶ ἄλλοτριον θεμέλιον οἴκοδομῶ, [Rom.Frag D, 15:20:1]

Romans 15:21  
(a) ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται· οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ ὁφονται καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασι συνήσουσι [Rom.Frag D, 15:21:1]

Romans 15:22  
(a) διὸ καὶ ἐνεκποτόμην τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ ἐλθεὶν πρὸς ύμᾶς· [Rom.Frag D, 15:22:1]

Romans 15:23  
(a) νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις, ἑπιποθίαν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ ἐλθεὶν πρὸς ύμᾶς ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν, [Rom.Frag D, 15:23:1]

Romans 15:24  
(a) ὡς ἄν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν· ἐλπίζω γὰρ πορευόμενος θέασασθαι ύμᾶς καὶ ύφ᾽ ύμῶν προσεμφθηναι ἐκεῖ, ἐὰν ύμῶν πρῶτον ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπλησθ. [Rom.Frag D, 15:24:1]

Romans 15:25  
(a) νυνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ διακονῶν τῶν ἀγίων. [Rom.Frag D, 15:25:1]

Romans 15:26  
(a) εὐδοκήσαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαία κοινωνίαν τινὰ συνήσασθαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἄγιων τῶν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ. [Rom.Frag D, 15:26:1]

Romans 15:27  
(a) εὐδοκήσαν γὰρ, καὶ ὁφειλέται αὐτῶν εἰσίν· εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινώθησαν τὰ ἔθη, ὁφείλουσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς. [Rom.Frag D, 15:27:1]

Romans 15:28  
(a) τοῦτο οὖν ἐπιτελέσας, καὶ σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τούτον, ἀπελεύσομαι δι᾽ ύμῶν εἰς Σπανίαν· [Rom.Frag D, 15:28:1]

Romans 15:29  
(a) οἶδα δὲ ὅτι ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ύμᾶς ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ ἐλεύσομαι. [Rom.Frag D, 15:29:1]

Romans 15:30  
(a) Παρακαλῶ δὲ ύμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος, συναγωνίσασθαι μοι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ύπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, [Rom.Frag D, 15:30:1]
Romans 15:31
(a) ἵνα μυθόω ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθοῦντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καί ἡ διακονία μου ἡ εἰς Ἴερουσαλὴμ ἐὑπρόσδεκτος τοῖς ἀγίοις γένηται, [Rom.Frag D, 15:31:1]

Romans 15:32
(a) ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἐλθῶν 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) Ο ὁ δὲ Θεός συντρίψει τὸν σατανᾶ ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. [Job.Hom B, 12:10:48:37]
(b) Ο ὁ δὲ Θεός συντρίψαι τὸν Σατανᾶ ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. [Job.Hom C, 17:101:18]

Romans 16:21-24 None

Romans 16:25
(a) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστήριον, χρόνων αἰῶνοις σεσημημένον [Cels, 2:4:12]
(b) ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου, χρόνων αἰῶνοις σεσημημένου [Cels, 3:61:11]
(c) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνων αἰῶνοις σεσημημένου [Princ, 4:1:7:37]
(d) Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίζει κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνων αἰῶνοις σεσημημένου, [John.Com A, 6:4:25:3]
(f) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνων αἰῶνοις σεσημημένου [Basil.Phil A, 1:7:43]
(g) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνων αἰῶνοις σεσημημένου, [Basil.Phil A, 1:29:28]
(h) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνων αἰῶνοις σεσημημένου, [Rom.Frag D, 16:25:2]
(i) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνων αἰῶνοις σεσημημένου, [Ps.Sel, 12:1453:47]

Romans 16:26
(a) φανερωθὲν δὲ νῦν ἐν ταῖς προφητικαῖς [Cels, 2:4:12]
(b) φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τὰ γράφων προφητικῶν [Cels, 3:61:11]
(c) φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τὰ γράφων προφητικῶν [Princ, 4:1:7:37]
(d) Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίζει κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνων αἰῶνοις σεσημημένου [John.Com A, 6:4:25:3]
(g) φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν καὶ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ὥς ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας. ἀμήν. [Basil.Phil A, 1:7:43]

(h) φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διά 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 Ασίᾳ, ὅτι καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν κατὰ δύναμιν ἐβαρήθημεν, ἦστε 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 ἐαυτοῖς τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου ἐσχήκαμεν, ἵνα μὴ πεποιθότες ὑμὶν ἐφ’ ἐαυτοῖς ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ ἐγείροντι τούς νεκρούς, [Eph.Com 14:43]

2 Corinthians 1:10
(a) ὃς ἐκ τηλικούτων θανάτων ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ρύεται, ἥλπικαμεν 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 ἐστι 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 ἐστι 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) ἐστιν ὁ εὐφραίνων με εἰ μὴ ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἔμοι; [Jer.Frag B 70:16]
(b) καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ εὐφραίνων με εἰ μὴ ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἔμοι; [Jer.Hom B 20:6:17]

2 Corinthians 2:3-6 None

2 Corinthians 2:7
(a) ἵνα μὴ τῇ περισσοτέρα λύπη καταποθῇ [John.Com A 28:4:26:9]
(b) μὴποτε τῇ περισσοτέρα λύπη καταποθῇ ὁ τοιοῦτος, [Jer.Hom B 20:9:26]
(c) τῇ περισσοτέρα λύπη [Matt.Com A 248:4]
(d) Μή πως τῇ περισσοτέρα λύπη καταποθῇ ὁ τοιοῦτος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ. [Ps.Frag 38:11:12:29]
(e) Μήποτε τῇ περισσοτέρα λύπη καταποθῇ [Ps.Sel 12:1313:20]
(f) Μήποτε τῇ περισσοτέρα λύπη καταποθῇ υπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ. [Ps.Sel 12:1605:52]

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 πλεονεκθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ, οὐ γὰρ αὑτοῦ τὰ νοῆμα ἀγνοοοῦμεν. [Ps.Frag 118:95:6]
(b) Οὐ γὰρ αὑτοῦ τὰ νοῆμα ἀγνοοοῦμεν. [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 ἐσμέν τῷ Θεῷ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις. [John.Com A 20:44:415:3]
(c) Ἐὐωδία Χριστοῦ ἐσμέν τῷ Θεῷ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, [Hera.Dial 18:17]
(d) Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμέν τῷ Θεῷ [Cant.Frag 221:31]
(e) Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμέν ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις. [Ps.Frag 140:2:4]
(f) Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμέν τῷ Θεῷ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ. [Gen.Sel 12:124:17]
(g) Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμέν 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) οἶς μὲν ὁσμὴ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἶς δὲ ὁσμὴ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωήν. [John.Com A 20:44:415:3]
(b) οἶς μὲν ὁσμὴ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἶς δὲ ὁσμὴ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωήν.’ [Hera.Dial 18:19]
(c) οἶς μὲν ὁσμὴ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἶς δὲ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωήν. [Cant.Frag 101:27]
(d) οἶς μὲν ὁσμή ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἶς δὲ ζωῆς εἰς ζωήν. [Cant.Sch 17:253:35]

2 Corinthians 2:17 None

Chapter Three
2 Corinthians 3:1-2 None

2 Corinthians 3:3
(a) οὐκ ἐν πλαξίνι λιθίναις ἀλλ’ ἐν πλαξίνι καρδίαις σαρκίαις [Rom.Frag C 204:9]
(b) Οὐκ ἐν πλαξί λιθίναις, ἀλλ’ ἐν πλαξί καρδίας σαρκίαις. [Ps.Sel 12:1673:41]

2 Corinthians 3:4 None

2 Corinthians 3:5
(a) Ἀλλ’ ἡ ἱκανότης ἣμῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, [Cels 6:70:23]

2 Corinthians 3:6
(a) ὃς καὶ ἱκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης, οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος· τὸ γάρ γράμμα ἀποκτέννει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ὑστοποιεῖ [Cels 6:70:24]
(b) ὃς καὶ ἱκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης, [1Cor.Com 8:8]

2 Corinthians 3:7
(a) Εἰ δὲ η διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ, ὡστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἀνενίασε τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον ωσέως διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τὴν καταργομένην, [Cels 7:20:25]
(b) Εἰ δὲ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ, ὡστε μὴ ἀνενίασα τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον Μωσέως διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τὴν καταργομένην. [John.Com A 32:27:336:3]
(c) εἰ δὲ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ ὡστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἀνενίασαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ 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 ἐντευτπωμένη λίθοις ἐγενήθη ἐν
doξῇ ὡστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον ὑσσεός διὰ
tὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τὴν καταργουμένην [Rom.Frag C 174:12]
(e) ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντευτπωμένα λίθοις [Matt.Com B 10:15:35]
(g) μὴ δύνασθαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ 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

2 Corinthians 3:9
(a) Εἰ γὰρ τῇ διακονίᾳ τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον περισσεύει ἡ

2 Corinthians 3:10
(a) Καὶ γὰρ οὗ δεδόχασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει, ἕνεκεν τῆς
ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης· εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργοῦμενον διὰ δόξης, πολλῷ μᾶλλον τὸ
(b) οὗ δεδόχασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει ένεκεν τῆς
(c) δεδόχασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει πρότερον ένεκεν τῆς
(d) Καὶ οὗ δεδόχασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει ώς πρὸς σύγκρισιν
tῆς υπερβαλλούσης 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 ἐν ἀναγινώσκεται Μωϋσῆς, κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν κεῖται [Cels 5:60:8]
(b) ἡνίκα ἐν ἀναγινώσκεται Μωϋσῆς [Cels 6:70:43]
(c) εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ κεῖται [Jer.Hom A 5:8:7]

2 Corinthians 3:16
(a) ἡνίκα ἐν ἑπιστρέψῃ τις πρὸς κύριον, περιαρεῖται τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ γράμματι κάλυμμα·
(b) ἐὰν ἑπιστρέψῃ τις πρὸς τὸν κύριον [Cels 5:60:11]
(c) ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψῃς πρὸς κύριον, τότε περιαρεῖς τὸ κάλυμμα. [Jer.Hom A 5:9:4]
(d) ἐὰν δὲ ἐπιστραφῇ πρὸς κύριον, περιαρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα. [Lam.Frag 116:9]
(e) ἐὰν γὰρ τις ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς τὸν κύριον, περιαρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα· ἐ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν. [Matt.Com B 11:14:70]
(f) ἥνικα γὰρ ἐπιστρέψει τις πρὸς Κύριον, περιαρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα. [Ps.Frag 118:18:14]

2 Corinthians 3:17
(a) ο δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστιν [Matt.Com B 10:14:73]
(b) ο δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστιν [Lam.Frag 116:10]
(c) ο δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα 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 μεταμορφοῦμενοι ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν [Cels 7:38:8]
(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]
(g) ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοις καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφοῦμενοις ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν; [Euches 9:2:12]
(h) ὁ Παύλος 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 14:6]
(l) Ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφοῦμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος Κύριος [Jer.Hom B 16:1:35]
(m) ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατεξέθεσθαι [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 μεταμορφώταί ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν. [Eph.Com 9:17]
(p) ἀνακεκαλυμμένως προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτήν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα.[Ps.Sel 12:1417:23]
(q) Ἦμεις δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένως προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτήν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν.[Ps.Sel 12:1681:3]

Chapter Four
2 Corinthians 4:1-2

2 Corinthians 4:3
(a) Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον· [John.Com A 32:27:337:1]
(b) Εἰ δὲ ἐστὶ κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἐστίν κεκαλυμμένον, [John.Frag 92:24]
(c) τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶ κεκαλυμμένον’. [Jer.Hom A 5:8:10]

2 Corinthians 4:4
(-) ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμόν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ [Cels 6:5:9]
(a) ἐν οἷς ὁ θεός τοῦ αἰώνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, εἰς τὸ μὴ διαυγάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τῆς δόξης τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ χριστοῦ, ὁς ἐστὶν 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 θεός τοῦ αἰώνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, εἰς τὸ μὴ καταυγάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ χριστοῦ, ὁς ἐστὶν 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 φωτισμόν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ [Cels 6:5:10]
2 Corinthians 4:7
(a) έχομεν γάρ θησαυρόν ἐν όστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν, ἵνα λάμψῃ ή ύπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ μὴ νομισθῇ εἶναι ἕξ ἡμῶν [Princ 4:1:7:21]
(b) έχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τούτον ἐν όστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν, ἵνα ἡ ύπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ἦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν [John.Com A 4:2:1:5]
(c) έχομεν τὸν θησαυρὸν τούτον ἐν όστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν [Jer.Frag B 36:10]
(d) έχομεν γάρ τὸν θησαυρὸν τούτον ἐν όστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν [Jer.Frag B 61:6]
(e) έχομεν γάρ θησαυρόν ἐν όστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν, ἵνα λάμψῃ ή ύπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ [Basil.Phil A 1:7:25]
(f) “Έχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τούτον ἐν όστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν, ἵνα ἡ ύπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ἦ 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’ οτε θλιβόμενοι βοηθεῖα θεοῦ οὐ μὴ στενοχωρούμεθα [Euch 30:1:12]
(b) ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, ἀλλ’ οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι. [Euch 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 στενοχωροῦμενοι [Ps.Sel 12:1232:27]
(f) Ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, ἀλλ’ οὐ στενοχωροῦμενοι. [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]
(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) Ei γὰρ καί ὁ ἐξω ήμῶν ἀνθρωπος διαφείρεται, ἀλλ’ ὁ ἐξω ήμῶν ἀνακαίνονται ἡμέρα καὶ ήμέρα. [Hera.Dial 11:20]

2 Corinthians 4:17
(a) Τὸ γὰρ παρατύπα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ήμῶν καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ήμῖν, [Cels 6:19:35]
(b) τὸ παρατύπα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ήμῶν [Mart 2:9]
(c) τὸ παρατύπα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ήμῶν καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ήμῖν, [Mart 49:51]
(d) τὸ παρατύπα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν. [Ps.Sel 12:1121:18]

2 Corinthians 4:18
(a) μή σκοπούντων ήμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα, τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα πρόσκαιρα, τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰώνια. [Cels 6:19:37]
(b) Μὴ σκοπούντων ήμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα [Cels 6:59:21]
(c) τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα [Cels 8:5:11]
(d) σκοπούντων ήμῶν 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 ἄχειροποιήτον αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς [Cels 7:32:28]

2 Corinthians 5:2-3 None

2 Corinthians 5:4
(a) καταποθή 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
2 Corinthians 5:6
(a) Ῥαρραύντες 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]

2 Corinthians 5:8
(a) εὐθυκοῦμεν ἐκδημήσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημήσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον [Cels 7:50:35]
(c) ἐκδημήσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημήσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον, [John.Com A 13:53:358:3]
(d) ἐκδημήσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημήσαι πρὸς τὸν Κύριον’ [Hera.Dial 28:12]

2 Corinthians 5:9 None

2 Corinthians 5:10
(a) τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς παραστήναι δεῖ ἐμπρόσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἐκαστὸς τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος, πρὸς ἅ ἐπραξέν, εἴτε ἄγαθὸν εἴτε φαύλον [Princ 3:1:21:26]
(b) τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἐκαστὸς τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ᾧ ἐπραξέν, εἴτε ἄγαθὸν εἴτε φαύλον. [Euches 28:5:14]
(c) τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς παραστήναι δεῖ ἐμπρόσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἐκαστὸς τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ᾧ ἐπραξέν εἴτε ἄγαθὸν εἴτε φαύλον [Luke.Frag 228:8]
(d) δεῖ ἐμπρόσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἐκαστὸς τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ᾧ ἐπραξέν, εἴτε ἄγαθὸν εἴτε φαύλον. [Basil.Phil A 21:20:31]
(e) δεῖ ἐμπρόσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἐκαστὸς τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ᾧ ἐπραξέν, εἴτε ἄγαθὸν εἴτε φαύλον [Jer.Hom B 20:3:52]
(f) τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς παραστήναι δεῖ ἐμπρόσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἐκαστὸς τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ᾧ ἐπραξέν, εἴτε ἄγαθὸν εἴτε φαύλον [Matt.Com C 12:30:58]
(g) ἐμπρόσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Matt.Com C 12:30:84]
(h) ἐμπρόσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἐκαστὸς τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ᾧ ἐπραξέν, εἴτε ἄγαθὸν εἴτε φαύλον [Matt.Com C 13:30:127]
(i) τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς παραστήναι δεῖ ἐμπρόσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα
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 Corinthians 5:17

(a) τὰ γὰρ ἀρχαὶ παρῆλθε [Matt.Com C 17:33:111]
(b) Ἐδο, γέγονε τὰ πάντα καινὰ, τὰ ἀρχαὶ παρῆλθον. [Ps.Frag 77:1:37]
(c) εἰ τις ἐν Χριστῷ καὶ τὴ κτίσις. [Ps.Frag 101:19,20:5]
(d) Τὰ ἀρχαὶ παρῆλθε, καὶ τὰ ἔξης. [Ex.Sel 12:285:6]
(e) ΕἬ τις γὰρ ἐν Χριστῷ καινὴ κτίσις, [Ps.Sel 12:1305:28]

2 Corinthians 5:18 None

2 Corinthians 5:19

(b) Θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσει ἔαυτῷ, [John.Com A 6:57:295:5]
(c) Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἔαυτῷ. [Basil.Phil A 14:2:27]
(d) Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἔαυτῷ. [Ps.Frag 5:8:4]
(e) ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἔαυτῷ. [Ps.Frag 131:8:6]
(f) Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἔαυτῷ, [Gen.Com 12:89:35]
(g) Θεὸς ἦν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσον ἔαυτῷ. [Ps.Sel 12:1241:49]
(h) ο Θεὸς δὲ ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἔαυτῷ [Ps.Sel 12:1285:6]
(i) ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἔαυτῷ [Pass 146:21]
2 Corinthians 5:20
(a) Υπὲρ Χριστοῦ πρεσβεύομεν, ώς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος [Cels 8:1:6]

2 Corinthians 5:21
(a) τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἀμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησε [John.Com A 2:26:163:8]
(b) Τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἀμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα
(c) τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἀμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησε [Matt.Com A 127:14]
(d) μὴ γνόντα αὐτὸν ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα 

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) ίδοὺ νῦν καιρὸς εὐπρόσδεκτος, ίδοὺ 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 ὑπὸ 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 ἀνέψυξε πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Κορίνθιοι. [Ps.Frag 118:131:6]
(b) Τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν ἀνέψυξε πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Κορίνθιοι. [Ps.Sel 12:1640:49]
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 7:11-16 None

Chapter Eight
2 Corinthians 8:1-8 None

2 Corinthians 8:9
(a) Δι’ ἡμᾶς γὰρ ἐπτώχευσεν 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 ὑμὸν περίσσεμα εἰς τὸ ἐκείνων ύστέρημα, ἵνα καὶ τὸ ἐκείνων περίσσεμα γένηται εἰς τὸ ὑμὸν ύστερημα [John.Com A 32:22:284:10]

2 Corinthians 8:15-20 None

2 Corinthians 8:21

2 Corinthians 8:22-24 None

Chapter Nine
2 Corinthians 9:1-5 None

2 Corinthians 9:6

2 Corinthians 9:7-15 None

Chapter Ten
2 Corinthians 10:1-2 None
2 Corinthians 10:3
(a) Ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ ἐντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα, [Cels 5:64:26]
(b) Ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ ἐντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα, [Cels 7:46:13]
(c) ἐν Παύλῳ τῷ λέγοντι ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ ἐντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα· [1Cor.Com 16:54]

2 Corinthians 10:4
(a) τὰ γὰρ ὅπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ πρὸς καθαίρειν όχυρωμάτων, λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες [Cels 5:64:27]
(b) τὰ γὰρ ὅπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ [Cels 7:46:14]
(c) τὰ γὰρ ὅπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ πρὸς καθαίρειν [1Cor.Com 16:55]
(d) πρὸς καθαίρειν όχυρωμάτων, λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες [Prov.Com 13:25:1]

2 Corinthians 10:5
(b) πᾶν ψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ [Cels 5:1:29]
(c) καὶ πᾶν ψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ [Cels 5:64:26]
(d) ψωμα κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπαιρόμενον [Jer.Frag B 11:14]
(e) πᾶν ψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ καθαιροῦντες [Jer.Frag B 27:5]
(f) καὶ πᾶν ψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ. [1Cor.Com 16:56]
(g) πᾶν ψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ. [Ps.Frag 36:35:7]
(h) καὶ καθαιροῦντες πᾶν ψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ. [Ps.Sel 12:1681:17]
(i) καὶ πᾶν ψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ; [Prov.Com 13:25:2]
(j) καὶ πᾶν ψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ. [Prov.Exp 17:216:32]

2 Corinthians 10:6
(a) ἐν ἐτοίμῳ ἡχοντες ἐκδικήσαι πάσαν παρακοήν [Jer.Frag B 27:4]
(b) ἐτοίμως ἡχοντες ἐκδικεῖν πάσιν παρακοήν, [Ps.Frag 103:18:19]

2 Corinthians 10:7-17 None

2 Corinthians 10:18
(a) οὐχ ὁ αὐτὸν συνιστάνων, ἐκεῖνος ἐστι δόκιμος, ἀλλὰ ὁ θεος συνιστήσει [Mart 35:27]

Chapter Eleven
2 Corinthians 11:1 None

2 Corinthians 11:2
(a) Ἡρμοσάμην ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἀνδρί, παρθένων ἁγνῶν παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ [John.Frag
(b) Ἡρμοσάμην γὰρ ὑμᾶς τοὺς πάντας ἐνι ἀνδρὶ παρθένον ἀγνὴν παραστῆσαι, τῷ Κυρίῳ. [Basil.Phil A 8:3:14]
(c) τοὺς πάντας ὑμᾶς παρθένον ἀγνὴν παραστῆσαι τῷ Χριστῷ [Matt.Com B 11:3:17]
(d) Ἡρμοσάμην γὰρ ὑμᾶς τοὺς πάντας ἐνι ἀνδρὶ παρθένον ἀγνὴν παραστῆσαι τῷ Κυρίῳ. [Osee 13:828:43]

2 Corinthians 11:3-5 None

2 Corinthians 11:6
(a) εἰ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ άλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει; [1Cor.Com 22:2]

2 Corinthians 11:7
(a) ἢ ἀμαρτιὰν ἐποίησα ἐμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν ἴνα ὑμεῖς ψωθῆτε [Matt.Com C 16:8:207]

2 Corinthians 11:8-13 None

2 Corinthians 11:14
(a) οὐθαύμα· 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 περισσότερως ἐν πληγαῖς περισσότερως ἐν φυλακαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις [Euches 29:4:4]
(b) ἐν κόποις περισσότερως [Jer.Hom A 11:4:28]
(c) ἐν κόποις ἔσται περισσότερως, ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσευόντως, ἐν πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις [Basil.Phil A 25:4:31]
(d) ἐν κόποις περισσότερως, ἐν πληγαῖς περισσότερως, ἐν φυλακαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις [Jer.Hom B 14:14:28]
(e) ὅτι ἐν κόποις ἔσται περισσότερως, ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσευόντως, ἐν πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις; [Rom.Frag A 1:103]

2 Corinthians 11:24
(a) ὑπὸ ἱουδαῖων πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν λήπτεται, τρὶς ραβδισθῆσεται, ἅταξ λιθασθῆσεται; [Basil.Phil A 25:4:33]
(b) ὑπὸ ἱουδαίων πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν λήπτεται [Jer.Hom A 11:4:31]
(b) ὑπὸ ἱουδαίων πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν λήπτεται, [Rom.Frag A 1:105]
2 Corinthians 11:25
(a) τρὶς ἐρραβδίσθη, ἀπαξ ἐλιθάσθη, τρὶς ἐναὐάγησε, νυκθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκεν, [Euches 29:4:7]
(b) τρὶς ἐραβδίσθη, ἀπαξ ἐλιθάσθη, τρὶς ἐναὐάγησα. [Jer.Hom A 11:4:31]
(c) τρὶς ῥαβδισθῆσαι, ἀπαξ λιθασθῆσαι: [Basil.Phil A 25:4:34]
(d) τρὶς ῥαβδισθῆσαι, ἀπαξ λιθασθῆσαι [Rom.Frag A 1:105]

2 Corinthians 11:26 None

2 Corinthians 11:27
(a) ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχῳ, καὶ ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις πολλάκις, ἐν λιμῷ καὶ δίψῃ, [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 ἔχαλάσθην 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 οὐρανόν [Mart 13:11]

2 Corinthians 12:3 None

2 Corinthians 12:4
(a) ἤκουσεν ἅρρητα ρήματα, ἀ οὐκ ἔξον ἀνθρώπω ψυλῆσαι [Cels 6:6:16]
(b) ἤνθρωπω ψυλῆσαι, ἀ οὐκ ἔξον ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι [Cels 7:43:11]
(c) τὰ ἅρρητα ρήματα ἀ οὐκ ἔξον ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι [John.Com A 6:5:29:9]
(d) ἀρρήτα ρήματα ουχι ἡ οὐκ ἔξον τινι λαλήσαι. [John.Com A 13:5:28:3]
(e) ἀρρήτα ρήματα, οὐκ ἔξον φησίν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [John.Com A 13:5:29:1]
(f) ἦρμανγε εἰς τὸν παράδεισον καὶ ήκουσεν ἀρρήτα ρήματα, ἡ οὐκ ἔξον ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [John.Com A 13:10:58:3]
(g) Ἡκουσα ἀρρήτα ρήματα, ἡ οὐκ ἔξον ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [John.Com A 13:48:316:16]
(h) ἀρρήτα ρήματα, ἡ μὴ εξόν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [Euches 1:1:19]
(i) Ἡκουσα ἀρρήτα ρήματα ἡ οὐκ ἔξον ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι. [Basil.Phil A 23:19:10]
(j) ἀρρήτα ρήματα, ἡ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [Matt.Com C 17:2:10]
(l) ἀρρήτων, ἡ οὐκ ἔξον ἀνθρώπῳ λαλήσαι [John.Com B 20:34:304:2]

2 Corinthians 12:5
(a) Περὶ τοῦ τοιοῦτοι καυχήσομαι, ύπὲρ δὲ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ καυχήσομαι. [John.Com A 10:7:28:9]

2 Corinthians 12:6
(a) λογίσηται ύπὲρ ὁ βλέπει ἡ ἀκούει ἐξ αὐτοῦ, [John.Com A 6:30:157:5]
(b) μὴ τις εἰς αὐτὸν λογίσηται ύπὲρ ὁ βλέπει [Euches 2:1:16]

2 Corinthians 12:7 None

2 Corinthians 12:8
(a) καὶ περὶ τοῦτο τρίς τὸν κύριον παρεκάλεσεν, ἵνα ἀποστῆ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ σατανᾶ [Jer.Hom B 12:8:29]

2 Corinthians 12:9
(a) ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου· ἡ γὰρ δύναμις μου ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελειοῦται [Jer.Hom B 12:8:32]
(b) Ἡ ἡδίστα οὖν καυχήσομαι ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις μου, ἵνα ἑπισκηνώσῃ 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 ὑβρεσὶ καὶ ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διώγμοις καὶ στενοχωρίαις, ύπὲρ Χριστοῦ [Jer.Hom B 14:14:49]
(c) Εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὑβρεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διώγμοις, ἐν στενοχωρίαις. [Ps.Frag 118:71:5]
(d) Εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὑβρεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διώγμοις, ἐν στενοχωρίαις. [Ps.Sel 12:1601:7]

2 Corinthians 12:11
(a) Γέγονα ἀφρων· ύμεῖς με ἡναγκάσατε· [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 ἁμαρτίᾳ καὶ ἀκρασίᾳ, ἢ ἐπηράξαν [Princ 3:1:21:17]
(b) καὶ μὴ μετανοήσαντας ἐπὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ καὶ ἀκρασίᾳ ἢ ἐπηράξαν; [Basil.Phil A 21:20:19]
(c) Πενθεὶ δὲ καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτηκότων, καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, καὶ ἀνομίᾳ, καὶ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἢ ἐπηράξαν [Ps.Sel 12:1480:51]

Chapter Thirteen
2 Corinthians 13:1-2 None

2 Corinthians 13:3
ἐπεὶ δοκιμήν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ, δὲ εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἁγιοῦσα ἀλλὰ δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν
(b) ε δοκιμήν ζητείτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ [John.Com A 10:10:46:1]
(c) η δοκιμήν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ [John.Com A 28:7:54:13]
(d) ε δοκιμήν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ [Jer.Hom B 17:2:8]
(e) δοκιμήν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ κτλ. [Ps.Frag 118:105:22]
(f) η δοκιμήν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ [Ps.Exc 17:132:30]
(g) η δοκιμήν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ [John.Com B 28:7:54:11]

2 Corinthians 13:4
(a) ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἁγιοῦσας [Jer.Hom B 14:9:2]
(b) ἐξ ἁγιοῦσας, ἀλλὰ ἢ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ, [Jer.Hom B 15:5:31]
(c) ε γὰρ καὶ ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἁγιοῦσας, ἀλλὰ ζη ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ [Matt.Com B 10:22:34]
(d) καὶ ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἁγιοῦσας, ἀλλὰ ζη ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ [Rom.Frag B 5:13]

2 Corinthians 13:5-13 None
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, ὡς ἔξελθαι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἑνεστώτως πονηροῦ καὶ ἔξελθαι κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν [Orat 25:1:21, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]
(c) ὡς ἔξελθαι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἑνεστώτως πονηροῦ· καὶ ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρὸν ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραὶ εἰσίν. [1Cor.Com 87:18, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]
(d) ὡς ἔξελθαι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἑνεστώτως πονηροῦ [Eph.Com 9:177, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]
(e) ὡς ἔξελθαι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἑνεστώτως πονηροῦ [Ps.Sel 12:1412:52, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]
(f) ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἑνεστώτως πονηροῦ [Jer.Hom B 17:3:9, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]
(g) ἔξελομενος ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἑνεστώτως πονηροῦ [Cels 5:32:22, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]
(h) ἔξελομενος ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἑνεστώτως 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 reading in 2 Timothy 4:18, 1 Peter 4:11, and Revelation 7:12]

Galatians 1:6-7 None

Galatians 1:8
(a) Ἰνα κἀν ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίσηται, ἡ διὰ δὲ ἡμᾶς παρ’ ὁ Παύλος ἐδίδαξεν, ἀνάθεμα ἐστώ, [Ps.Frag 68:14:9, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]

Galatians 1:9-14 None

Galatians 1:15
(a) Ὁτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός, ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς μου, [Basil.Phil A 25:1:3, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]
Galatians 1:16
(a) ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἐμοί. [Basil.Phil A 25:1:3, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]
(b) ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἐμοί. [Rom.Com A 1:2, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

Galatians 1:17-18 None

Galatians 1:19
(a) Ἅτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἄδελφόν τοῦ κυρίου. [Matt.Com B 10:17:29, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.029]
(b) ἄδελφον τοῦ κυρίου, [Cels 1:47:19, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

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

Galatians 2:15 None

Galatians 2:16 (cannot be distinguished from Romans 3:20, therefore not included)
(a) ἔξ ἐργῶν νόμου οὐ δικαιώθησται πᾶσα σάρξ [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 συνεσταύρωται [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 ἦν ἐγὼ, ἦν ἐμοὶ Χριστός [John.Com A 10:10:45:5, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]
(b) Ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἦν, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [John.Com A 13:52:351:9, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]
(c) ζῶ οὐκέτι ἦν· καὶ νῦν δὲ φανήτω, εἰ ἀραντες ἑαυτῶν τὸν σταυρὸν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐκκολουθήσαμεν· ὁπερ γέγονεν, εἰ ζῆ ἐν ἡμῖν Χριστός. [Mart 12:30, CPG 1475, TLG 2042.007]
(d) Ζῶ οὐκέτι ἦν, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [John.Com B 20:12:93:1, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.079]
(f) ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἦν, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [1Cor.Com 30:5, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]
(g) ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἦν, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [Eph.Com 19:51, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]
(h) Ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἦν, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [Pass 94:24, CPG 1480, TLG 2042.118]
(i) ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἦν, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. [Rom.Frag A 41:3, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]
(j) Ζῶ γὰρ, φησίν, οὐκέτι ἦν· 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) Ὑμῶν 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) τοσά τα ἐπάθετε εἰκή. [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 εἰσίν, υπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν. [Deut.Adnot 17:36:5,15, CPG 1419, TLG 2042.070]

(b) Ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν υπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν, γέγραπται γάρ· ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς ὧν ἐμένει πάσι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ ὠνομοῦ τοῦ ποιήσαι αὐτά, [Rom.Frag A 36a:11, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(c) Ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν υπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν, γέγραπται γάρ· ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς ὧν ἐμένει πάσι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιήσαι 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 υπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα. [1Cor.Com 43:28, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

(b) ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας γενόμενος υπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα, [Rom.Frag C 192.1, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.038]

(c) ἀπὸ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γενόμενος υπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα: [Cant.Sch 17.268.11, CPG 1433, TLG 2042.076]

(d) ἐξηγόρασεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου ὁ ἐν τῷ παθεῖν υπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος υπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα. [Matt.Com B 11:8:36, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.029]

Galatians 3:14-18 None

Galatians 3:19
(a) διαταγεὶς δι’ ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. [Jer.Hom B 13.01.36, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]
(b) τῶν παραβάσεων χαρίν ἐτέθη, ἀρχι oū ἔλθη τὸ σπέρμα ὧ ἐπήγγελται, διαταγεῖς δι’ ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρί 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 γάρ τῶν παραβάσεων χαρίν ἐτέθη, ἀρχι oū ἔλθη τὸ σπέρμα ὧ ἐπήγγελται, διαταγεῖς δι’ ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρί μεσίτου. [Rom.Frag A 36a:17, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

Galatians 3:20-23 None

Galatians 3:24
(a) Ὅστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγός ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν. [Basil.Phil A 9:1:25, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]
(b) Ὅστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγός ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν. [Rom.Frag A 36a:19, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]
(c) ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγός ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν. [Rom.Frag A 10:5, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

Galatians 3:25
(a) Ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγὸν ἐσμέν. [Rom.Frag A 36a:19, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]
(b) Ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγὸν ἐσμέν. [Basil.Phil A 9:1:25, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

Galatians 3:26
(a) πάντες γὰρ υἱὸι θεοῦ ἐστὲ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. [Rom.Frag A 36a:19, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]
(b) πάντες γὰρ υἱὸι 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 νήπιος ἐστιν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου, κύριος πάντων ὡν [Orat 22:2:5, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]
(b) κληρονόμος — ἡ νήπιος δὲ ὡς μηδὲν διαφέρων δούλου [Matt.Com C, 13:26:90, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]
(c) κληρονόμον παρὰ τὸν χρόνον ὃν νήπιος ἐστι. [Matt.Com C 15:35:70, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

Galatians 4:2
(a) υπὸ ἐπιτρόπους τυγχάνουσι καὶ οἰκονόμους [John.Com A 1:7:38:4, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]
(b) ἀλλ' ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶ καὶ οἰκονόμους ἁχρὶ τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρὸς [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 ἤλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. [Eph.Com 5:50, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]
(b) γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικὸς [Cels 1:70:10, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 4:5 None

Galatians 4:6
(a) καρδίας τῶν μακαρίων κράζων ἄββα ὁ πατήρ [Orat 2:3:12, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]
(b) ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις τῶν ἄγιων κράζειν, Ἀββᾶ ὁ Πατήρ, [Ps.Sel 12:1124:38, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]
(c) ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις τῶν ἄγιων κράζειν, Ἀββᾶ 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) Ἦμερας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μήνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτοὺς; [Cels 8:21:31, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]
(b) Ἦμερας ἢ μήνας ἢ καιροὺς ἢ ἐνιαυτοὺς [Orat 27:14:2, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]

Galatians 4:11
(a) φοβούμαι ὑμᾶς μή πως εἰκῆ κεκοπάκα εἰς ὑμᾶς. [Cels 8:21:32, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 4:12-13 None

Galatians 4:14
(a) τὸν πείρασμόν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἔξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε, [Eph.Com 14:32, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]
Galatians 4:15 None

Galatians 4:16
(a) ἐχθρός γὰρ γέγονε τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ἀληθεύων αὐτοῖς. [Jer.Hom B 14:13:12, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]
(b) ἐχθρός ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν. [Jer.Hom B 14:16:36, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]
(c) Ἐχθρός ὑμῖν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν· [Ps.Sel 12:1129:53, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

Galatians 4:17-18 None

Galatians 4:19
(a) ὡδινήσαντες μέχρι μορφωθῆ Χριστός ἐν αὐτοῖς [Jer.Frag B 10:4, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.010]

Galatians 4:20 None

Galatians 4:21
(a) λέγετε μοι φησίν οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἴναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; [Princ 4:2:6:28, CPG 1482, TLG 2042.002]
(b) Λέγετε μοι, φησίν, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἴναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; [Basil.Phil A 1:13:32, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]
(c) λέγετε μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἴναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; [Rom.Frag A 36a:22, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]
(d) Λέγετε μοι, φησίν, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἴναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀναγινώσκετε, [Ps.Sel 12:1592:25, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]
(e) Λέγετε μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἴναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; [Basil.Phil A 9:1:1-33, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]
(f) λέγετε μοι οἱ τὸν νόμον ἀναγινώσκοντες τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε, [Rom.Frag A 10:5, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]
(g) Λέγετε μοι, οἱ τὸν νόμον ἀναγινώσκοντες, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε [Cels 2:3:7, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]
(h) Λέγετε 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 ἔχειν, ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἕνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. [Princ 4:2:6:28, CPG 1482, TLG 2042.002]
(b) γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔχειν, ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἕνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. [Basil.Phil A 1:13:34, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]
(c) γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔχειν, ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἕνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. [Basil.Phil A 9:1:30, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]
(d) γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔχειν, ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἕνα ἐκ
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τῆς ἔλευθέρας. [Rom.Frag A 36a:22, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(ε) γέγραπται γάρ, Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν [Rom.Frag A 10:9, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(θ) Γέγραπται γάρ, ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἦν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, καὶ ἦν ἐκ τῆς ἔλευθέρας. [Ps.Sel 12:1592:25, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

(γ) Γέγραπται γάρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχε, [Cels 2:3:7, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(h) Γέγραπται γάρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἦν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἦν ἐκ τῆς ἔλευθέρας. [Cels 4:44:25, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(γ) Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἦν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἦν ἐκ τῆς ἔλευθέρας. [Matt.Com C 17:34:71, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

Galatians 4:23

(a) ὁ ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, εἰς τὸ δυνηθῆναι μετὰ τούτον γεγέννηται τόν τῆς ἔλευθέρας καὶ τόν διά τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. [Jer.Hom A 05:15:11, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]

(b) ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατά σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἔλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας [Princ 4:2:6, CPG 1482, TLG 2042.002]

(c) ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατά σάρκα γεγένηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἔλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. [Basil.Phil A 1:13:32, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(d) ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατά σάρκα γεγένηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἔλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. [Basil.Phil A 9:1:32, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]

(e) ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατά σάρκα γεγένηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἔλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. [Rom.Frag A 36a:22, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]

(f) καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατά σάρκα γεγένηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἔλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας [Matt.Com C 17:34:75, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]

(g) ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατά σάρκα γεγένηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἔλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. [Cels 4:44:27, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001] [see 4:22]

Galatians 4:24

(a) ἀτινα ἐστίν ἄλληγορομένα: αυτάι γαρ εἰς δυο διαθηκαί καὶ τά ἐξῆς. [Princ 4:2:6, CPG 1482, TLG 2042.002]


(c) ἀτινα ἐστίν ἄλληγορομένα: αυταί γαρ εἰς δυο διαθηκαί, μια μεν ἀπο ὅρους Σίνα, εἰς δουλεῖαν γεγνώσα, ἡτις ἐστίν Ἁγαρ. [Cels 4:44:27, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(d) ἀτινα ἐστίν ἄλληγορομένα [Cels 2:3:8, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

(e) ἀτινα ἐστίν ἄλληγορομένα [Matt.Com B 10:14:42, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.029]

(f) ἀτινα ἐστίν ἄλληγορομένα, καὶ αὐταί γαρ εἰς δυο διαθηκαί: [1Cor.Com 35:28, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]
Galatians 4:25
None

Galatians 4:26
(a) 'Ἡ δὲ ἄνω, φησίν, ἱεροσαλήμ ἑλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἡτίς ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Cels 4:44:31, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]
(b) ἡ ἄνω ἱεροσαλήμ ἑλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἡτίς ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Princ 4:3:8:9, CPG 1482, TLG 2042.002]
(c) 'Ἡ δὲ ἄνω ἱεροσαλήμ ἑλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἡτίς ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν, ὡς γέγραπται καί τὰ ἤξης. [Jer.Hom A 5:13:11, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]
(d) 'Ἡ δὲ ἄνω ἱεροσαλήμ ἑλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἡτίς ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Basil.Phil A 1:24:10, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]
(e) ἡ ἄνω ἱεροσαλήμ ἑλευθέρα, [Matt.Com B 11:17:42, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.029]
(f) ἡ ἄνω ἱεροσαλήμ ἑλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἡτίς ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Matt.Com C 16:15:25, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]
(g) 'Ἡ δὲ ἄνω ἱεροσαλήμ ἑλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἡτίς ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Ps.Frag 44:9:58, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]
(h) ἡ ἄνω ἱεροσαλήμ ἑλευθέρα, [Ps.Frag 75:3:25, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]
(i) ἡ ἄνω ἱεροσαλήμ ἑλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἡτίς ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν. [Ps.Frag 118:100:18, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]
(j) 'Ἡ δὲ ἄνω ἱεροσαλήμ ἑλευθέρα ἐστίν· ἡτίς ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν. [Ps.Frag 130:2:15, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]
(k) 'Ὡ δὲ ἄνω ἱεροσαλήμ ἑλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἡτίς ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν, καί τὰ ἤξης. [Ps.Sel 12:1649:18, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]

Galatians 4:27
(a) Πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἡ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα. [Jer.Hom A 3:2:21, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]
(b) Εὐφράνθητι στείρα ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα, ῥήξον καὶ βόησον ἡ οὐκ ὦδίνουσα, ὡς πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἡ 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 ὕφελθε. [Cels 5:48:34, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]
(b) Ὡτι Ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς οὐδὲν ὕφελθε [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) οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε, [Rom.Frag A 10:14, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]
(c) Οἵτινες γὰρ, φησίν, ἐν νόμῳ δικαιούσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσετε.[Ps.Exc 17:144:32, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.074]

Galatians 5:5-7 None

Galatians 5:8
(a) Ἡ πεισμονὴ σύκ 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 γάρ 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 φησὶ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. [Luke.Frag 107:14, CPG 1451, TLG 2042.017]
(e) μικρὰ ζύμη; ὅλον τὸ φύραμα τοῦτο ὦ ζυμοῖ; [1Cor.Com 26:48, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]

Galatians 5:10-13 None

Galatians 5:14
(a) πεπληρωκέναι τὴν ἀγαπήσεις τῶν πλησίον σου ὡς ἑαυτόν [Matt.Com C 15:14:41, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]
(b) τὴν ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς ἑαυτόν [Matt.Com C 15:14:70, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030] [see context (a)]

Galatians 5:15
(a) Εἶ 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 σαρκός [John.Com A 18:109:5, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]

Galatians 5:17
(a) ἡ σάρξ ἐπεθύμει κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος οὐδὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός, [Jer.Hom A 11:2:11, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]
(b) 'H sárξ épiθumeî kàtâ tòu pneûmatoς, tô dè pneûma kàtâ tîs sárkôs, [Cels 8:23:18, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]
(c) hè mèn sárξ èpißumeî kàtâ tòu pneûmatoς, tô dè pneûma kàtâ tîs sárkôs. [Matt.Com C 14:3:13, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]
(d) sárka èpißumóusan kàtâ tòu pneûmatoς [Cels 3:28:40, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 5:18 None

Galatians 5:19
(a) Fanevâ dè èsti tà ërga tîs sárkôs, [Ps.Sel 12:1132:37, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]
(b) Fanevâ dè èsti tà ërga tîs sárkôs, ó ierôs Aπóstolôs fîsîn, àtînà èsti mûiçheïa, pòrnavìa, àsèlgeïa, èidwolâtrêïa, kài tà èßhês. [Ps.Sel 12:1277:23, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]
(c) àtînà ën pórnavìa kài àkâtharôià. [Eph.Com 25:69, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]
(d) tâ ërga tîs sárkôs· oîc èßalhèn ën sárξ, óukètì porneïâ, oûkètî àkâtharôià, ouk àsèlgeïa, [Jer.Hom A 11:2:7, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]
(e) fanevâ dè èsti tà ërga tîs sárkôs, àtînà èsti porneïâ kài tà èßhês, [Eph.Com 25:69, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]

Galatians 5:20
(a) èidwolâtrîa, ou fârmakêia kài tâ lóipà. [Jer.Hom A 11:2:7, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]

Galatians 5:21 None

Galatians 5:22
(a) ò kàrrpòs tòu pneûmátòs èstîn· àgâpê, xârâ, eîrîhê, màkrêtîmîà, xhrîstôtîh, àgàðwosûnê, pîstîs, [Luke.Frag 112:3, CPG 1451, TLG 2042.017]
(b) kàrrpòs tòu pneûmátòs, kài ò xârâ kài ò eîrhê kài ò màkrêtîmîa kài tà lóipà. [Matt.Com C 16:27:35, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]
(c) ò dè kàrrpòs tòu pneûmátòs èstîn àgâpê, xârâ, eîrîhê, màkrêtîmîa, xhrîstôtîh, àgàðwosûnê, pîstîs, [1Cor.Com 11:48, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]
(d) ò dè kàrrpòs tòu pneûmátòs èstîn àgâpê xârâ eîrîhê kài tà èßhês. [Eph.Com 25:57, CPG 1460, TLG 2042.035]
(e) ò gàr kàrrpòs tòu pneûmátòs èstîn àgâpê, xârâ, eîrîhê, Màkrêtîmîa, pîstîs, [Ps.Frag 106:37:11, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]
(f) 'Ó kàrrpòs tòu pneûmátòs èstî xârâ, eîrîhê, àgàpê, màkrêtîmîa, k. t. ë. [Ps.Sel 12:1460:7, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]
(g) 'Ó dè kàrrpòs tòu pneûmátòs èstî xârâ, àgâpê, eîrîhê, màkrêtîmîa, kài tà èßhês. [Ps.Sel 12:1504:34, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.058]
(h) àgâpê kài eîrîhê kài xârâ kài màkrêtîmîa, xhrîstôtîh tê kài àgàðwosûnê kài pîstîs [Basil.Phil.A 26:1:25, CPG 1502, TLG 2042.019]
(i) ἁγάπης, χαρᾶς, εἰρήνης, μακροθυμίας, χρηστότητος, ἁγαθωσύνης, πίστεως, ἐγκρατείας [Jer.Frag B, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.010]

Galatians 5:23
(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 2042.030]
(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 ζώμεν, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχώμεν· [Cels 7:52:17, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]

Galatians 5:26 None

Chapter 6

Galatians 6:1-6

(a) ὁ γὰρ ἐὰν σπειρῇ ἀνθρώπως, τοῦτο καὶ θερίσει· [John.Com A 13:43:288:4, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]
(b) Ὅτι δὲ ἐὰν σπειρῇ ἀνθρώπως, ἐκεῖνο καὶ θερίσει. [Ps.Exc 17:120:30, CPG 1425, TLG 2042.074]
(c) μὴ πλανᾶσθε, θεός ὁ μῦκτηρίζεται. [Jer.Hom A 11.2.21, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]

Galatians 6:8
(a) σπείρας εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἄλλα εἰς τὴν σάρκα, θερίσει μὲν τὴν φθορὰν, [Orat 19:2:25, CPG 1477, TLG 2042.008]
(b) οτι ο σπειρων εἰς τὴν σαρκα εκ της σαρκος θερισει φθοραν· ο δὲ σπειρων εἰς τὸ πνευμα καὶ εκ του πνευματος θερισει ζωην αιωνιον. [John.Com A 13:43:288:6, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.005]
(c) σπειρων οὐδὲν εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἄλλα πάντα εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα μὴ θερίσωμεν φθοράν ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ἄλλ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ζωῆν 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 κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ. [Cels 2:69:9, CPG 1476,
Τοιχογραφία 2042.001]
(b) Ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κάγω κόσμῳ. [Cels 5:64:23, CPG 1476, TLG 2042.001]
(c) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχάσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἦσοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κάγω τῷ κόσμῳ. [Jer.Hom A 11:4:20, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.009]
(d) Ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κάγω κόσμῳ [Jer.Hom B 18:2:47, CPG 1438, TLG 2042.021]
(e) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχάσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἦσοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κάγω τῷ κόσμῳ. [Matt.Com C 12:25:21, CPG 1450, TLG 2042.030]
(g) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχάσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ [1Cor.Com 6:15, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]
(h) Εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἦσοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κάγω τῷ κόσμῳ. [1Cor.Com 6:17, CPG 1458, TLG 2042.034]
(i) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχάσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἦσοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κάγω τῷ κόσμῳ. [Rom.Frag A 17:6, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.036]
(j) Ἐμοὶ ο χοςμος ἐσταυρωθη, καγω τω κοσμω. [Ps.Frag 118:120:3, CPG 1426, TLG 2042.044]
(k) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχάσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μου Ἦσοῦ δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κάγω τῷ κόσμῳ. [Rom.Frag C 166:12, CPG 1457, TLG 2042.038]
(m) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχάσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου Ἦσοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κάγω κόσμῳ [John.Com B 28:19:166:4, CPG 1453, TLG 2042.079]
(n) Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχάσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἦσοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κάγω κόσμῳ. [Pass 106:16, CPG 1480, TLG 2042.118]

Galatians 6:15-18 None