

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

THE GOSPELS-TEXT OF ATHANASIUS

by

Gerassimos Zervopoulos

(Diploma, Supreme School of Political Science, Greece, 1947)

Submitted in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy

1955

Approved
by

First Reader *Edwin P. Booth, per S. P. S.*
PROFESSOR OF HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Second Reader *[Signature]*
PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	iv
Purpose	
Statement of the Problem	
Literature	
 <u>PART A</u>	
I. THE PERSONALITY AND WORK OF ATHANASIOUS..	1
1. Civil life and Education	3
2. Priestly Ministry	5
a) Deacon	5
b) Bishop	6
II. STRUGGLES AND PERSECUTIONS	7
1. Melitius - Melitianism	7
2. Arius - Arianism	9
3. The Nicene Council	16
4. The Dogmatic Victories and Defeats..	21
5. The Death of Athanasius	36
6. The Measure of the Man	36
III. ATHANASIOUS' THEOLOGY	38
1. On the Trinity	38
2. On the God-Head	39
3. On the Son	40
4. On the Holy Spirit	41

	Page
5. On Human Redemption	41
6. On the Scriptures	42
IV. ATHANASIUS AS A CHRISTIAN AUTHOR	43
The Quality of Athanasius' Writings ..	43
The Athanasian Literary Works	45
 <u>PART B</u>	
V. TEXTS AND THEORIES	50
1. The Neutral Text	50
2. The Western Text	66
3. The Caesarean Text	74
SPECIFIC INTRODUCTION	78
VI. THE GOSPEL-TEXT OF ATHANASIUS	85
1. Matthew	85
2. Mark	177
3. Luke	108
4. John	120
VII. COLLATION	140
1. Matthew	140
2. Mark	183
3. Luke	152
4. John	159
VIII. EVALUATION OF ATHANASIUS' TEXT	188
IX. CONCLUSION	197
X. BIBLIOGRAPHY	199
ABSTRACT	

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of the present study is focused on the investigation of the text of the four Gospels as used by Athanasius.

Textual critics of the New Testament, in the past one hundred years, have merely said that Athanasius used the so-called "Neutral Text", but the evidence for such a statement has not yet been given. It is, therefore, important for us to discover whether this Father actually used the "Neutral Text" or any other type of text.

According to Westcott and Hort, the Scriptural passages found in the writings of the early (before the fifth century) Church Fathers, if authentic, offer a significant help to textual criticism:

"The value of the Patristic quotations", Hort says "is two fold: For the history of the whole text, it certifies two or more alternative readings as simultaneously known at a definite time or locality and for the settlement of the text in a given passage, it usually enables the reading adopted by the writer to be known with a higher degree of certainty than is attainable in a majority of cases by means of ordinary quotations"¹

It is obvious, therefore, that critical editions of the Scriptural quotations of the early Fathers would

1 Westcott, B.F., and Hort, F., The New Testament in the Original Greek, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1892, Vol. II, 87.

throw much light on the peculiar and complicated problems faced by New Testament scholars. A considerable amount of work in this direction has already been accomplished and several useful conclusions have been drawn.

The principal subject of my thesis is based on Migne's "Patrologia"¹ which up to this day is the most complete available source of Athanasius's printed writings.²

The reason I wrote a brief account on Athanasius' life, work, and theology is that I believe these factors created some particular conditions which are relevant to the purpose of the present study.

The Gospel quotations from Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John found in all Athanasius' authentic writings were collected and analyzed, and the type of the Athanasian Gospel-Text was determined.

1 Vols. XXV-XXVIII.

2 I took further steps and consulted additional sources to obtain the highest accuracy possible. These sources are numbered one by one in the "Specific Introduction".

P A R T A

I. THE PERSONALITY AND WORK
OF ATHANASIOUS

In his time, Athanasius was a controversial figure. His followers hailed him the ascetic, the pious Christian, the worthy bishop,¹ as the defender of the sound doctrines of the Church. His opponents, on the Arian side, called him a murderer, a firebrand, a notorious character, an unworthy clergyman who ascended the Episcopal See in an irregular and scandalous way.² Impartial history records Athanasius as a great protagonist who, in a certain period when one of the most crucial controversies arose in the Christian Church,³ struggled courageously to advocate two fundamental principles: one was the spiritual liberty against the encroachment of the State, and the other was the Unity of the Godhead, including the Divinity of the Son.

Harnack⁴ compares Athanasius' situation with that in which Luther found himself when facing the Medieval

-
- 1 Athanasius, "Ἀπολογητικὸς κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν", 6. Πάντα δὲ τὰ βέλτιστα, σπουδαῖον, εὐλαβῆ, Χριστιανὸν, ἕνα τῶν ἀσκητῶν, ἀληθῶς ἐπίσκοπον ὀνομάζοντες.
- 2 Ibid. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τελετὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ὀλίγων τινῶν Ἀθανασίου μνήμην ποιουμένων, ἐξ ἧ ἑπτὰ ἐπισκόπων λάθρα καὶ ἐν παραβύστῳ χειροτονοῦσιν αὐτόν.
- 3 Gwatkin and Whitney, (The Cambridge Medieval History, New York, Macmillan Co. 1936, p.108) say there are four great controversies which have done so much to shape the growth of Christian thought: Gnosticism, Arianism, The Reformation and Our modern times.
- 4 Harnack, A., History of Dogma, English transl., 1896-98, by Neil Buchanan, Little Brown and Co., Boston, Vol. III, p. 140.

Church and Scholasticism. With the prejudices and passions of every order of men from the monk to the Emperor, this great man stood firm in his determination to bring his important task to a successful outcome. And he did. Neither the threats of the Emperor nor the intrigues of his colleagues could stop him.¹ It was this tremendous courage he demonstrated and the deep devotion he had to his faith that ascribed to his name the title of "immortal." He is already known as a man ready to sacrifice everything, even his own life, for a cause which he believed to be noble and Christian.

1 Duchesne, (Histoire Ancienne de l'Église; Paris, 1910, Tom. II, p. 168), says: "Athanasius eut, contre lui l'empire et sa police les consiles, l'épiscopat; la partie était encore égale tant qu'un homme restait debout."

1. CIVIL LIFE AND EDUCATION

Although we are not certain about the exact date of the birth of Athanasius, several pieces of information taken from historical sources enable us to fix it around the year 297 A.D.¹ In all probability, his birth place was the city of Alexandria. We know nothing about his family but from the sort of education that was given him, it may be assumed that his parents were of a good social class. The evidences we have from his writings show that the mind and heart of the child were influenced by the best liberal learning the city of Alexandria could offer in those days.

"He had been well educated, was versed in grammar and rhetoric, and already when he came to man's estate and before he attained the bishopric, he gave proof to those conversing with him of being a man of wisdom and intellectuality"²

In some of his literary works, he refers to classical Greek authorities. Homer, Plato, Demosthenes, Aristotle seem to be very familiar to him.³ Athanasius, therefore, was Greek by birth and education. A study of his works reveals the philosophic insight

1 See for further explanation in: Gwatkin, H. Studies of Arianism, Cambridge, Deighton, Bell and Co. 1882. note in p.67.

2 Sozomen, History., in The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd series, Vol.II, New York, The Christial Lit. Co. 1890, p.270.

3 Gwatkin, H., Op.Cit., p.49.

and the simplicity of his expression that is combined with beautiful oratorical schemes — a literary mood so characteristic to most of the noted Greek scholars of the past.

Tradition throws more light upon the childhood of Athanasius by telling us that he had a predisposition for the priesthood even from his early life. Several traditional stories on this matter are handed to us by the historian Sozomen.¹ From these stories, which do not have first hand historical basis, we learn that the boy used to play with other children of the same age by imitating the performance of the ceremonies of the Church and that many children who had not been initiated had been baptised by Athanasius.

" Ὑποκρινάμενοι δὲ ἐν τῇ παιδίᾳ τὰ τῶν ἱερέων οἱ παῖδες, Ἀθανάσιον μὲν ἐπίσκοπον δευθὲν χειροτονοῦσιν αὐτοὶ δὲ, εἰς πρεσβυτέρους ὡσπερ καὶ διακόνους ἀφορισθέντες, προσήγον αὐτῷ παῖδας ἑτέρους ἀσφραγίστους ἔτι τῷ θεῷ βαπτίσματι ὥστε ὑπ' αὐτοῦ βαπτισθῆναι." ²

The same traditional information goes on by telling us that one day Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria, witnessed such a childish ceremony and, becoming very interested in it, he called the children

1 Socrates II:17, (1.15) credits Rafinus as the source of this traditional account.

2 Migne, J.P., Patrologia, Vol. XXV., p.CLXXXVII.

for explanation. Having learned from them that Athanasius was the central figure in the ceremonies by imitating the bishop, Alexander ¹

"...took Athanasius and the other children who had playfully acted as presbyters and deacons, to their own relations under God as a witness that they might be brought up for the Church, and for the leadership in which they had imitated. Not long after, he took Athanasius as his stable companion and secretary." ²

2. PRIESTLY MINISTRY

a.) Deacon.

Thus, the pious and intelligent youngster was brought up under the supervision of the ecclesiastical authorities and the close protection of his bishop. The day came when Athanasius was ordained Deacon although he was under age for the ordination, τὴν ἡλικίαν πρόσηβος ὄν. The young Deacon was on very familiar terms with Bishop Alexander and, because of his rare virtues and abilities, much honored by him. His fame as an able defender of the traditional doctrines started with the Nicene Synod.³ Athanasius accompanied Bishop Alexander to this important meeting of Christendom as his secretary. He did not take a large part in the proceedings of the Council but debating behind-the-scenes he demonstrated his remark-

1 Alexander succeeded Achillas as Bishop of Alexandria. (Socrates, I.16)

2 Sozomen, II.17.

3 See page 16.

able personality and his intensive theological knowledge. Since that time Athanasius was to his Arian opponents the notorious and dangerous clergyman; to his Orthodox followers, the courageous soldier of Christ and the defender of the piety and sound doctrines - ὁ στερρὸς ἀπλίτης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ τῶν ὀρθῶν δογμάτων καὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας προασπιστής.¹

b) Bishop.

Bishop Alexander dies in 328 A.D.² leaving Athanasius as his successor. He took over the See on June 8 of the same year. Speaking about the succession, Sozomen says: "I am convinced that it was by divine appointment that it succeeded to the high priesthood."³ Whether Athanasius was appointed for the high priesthood by Divine will or not, the truth is that he was perhaps the only man fitted to face the crucial circumstances in his age. Duchesne praises the rare virtues of the man by saying:

1. Migne: Vol.25, p.CLXXXVII.

2 Athanasius, in his "Ἀπολογία κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν" (59), dates Alexander's death five months after the Council of Nicaea; the same with Theodoret, (1.26). In the opinion of the scholars, this must be a chronological mistake. Cureton, W., The Festal Letters of Athanasius, London: Madden and Co. 1848, supports the date, April 14, 328 A.D., as it is indicated in the above Letters, to be the accurate one; p. xxxviii.

3 Sozomen.ii.17.

"Outre des qualités du pasteur accompli, Dieu lui avait donné un esprit clair, un oeil bien ouvert sur la tradition Chrétienne, sur les evenements, sur les hommes, et avec cela un caracteur hautement indomptable tempéré par une parfaite bonne grâce." ¹

II. STRUGGLES AND PERSECUTION

1. Melitius — Melitianism

Athanasius took the reins of the Alexandrian See when the whole of Christendom was stirred up by doctrinal controversies and ecclesiastical schisms. The center of these controversies happened to be Egypt and especially Alexandria itself.

The first schismatic party to appear was that of the Melitians, —Μελιτιανοί —, thus named after, Μελίτιος, their leader. ² The Melitian schism came into being because of circumstances created by the persecution against the Christians under the Emperor Diocletian. During that fierce persecution the episcopal office of Alexandria had been occupied by Peter who, because of his devotion to the faith, had suffered martyrdom. ³ Before Peter's death, Melitius, a certain

¹ Op. Cit., p. 168.

² Καὶ ἀντὶ Χριστιανῶν "Μελιτιανοὶ" μέχρι νῦν οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος ὀνομαζονται. Ἀπολ. κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν, 59.

³ Πέτρος παρ' ἡμῖν πρὸ μὲν τοῦ διαγμοῦ γέγονεν ἐπίσκοπος ἐν δὲ τῷ διαγμῷ καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν. Ἀπολ. κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν, 59.

bishop of Nicopolis in Upper Egypt, was accused of denying the faith and sacrificing to idols.¹

Peter deposed Melitius. This happened in 306 A.D.² Now the ejected bishop and his followers separated themselves from the official Church and started to disturb and attack the See of Alexandria.³ After Peter's martyrdom, the schismatic Melitians transferred their abuses to his successor, Achillas, and then to Alexander, Achillas' successor.⁴

Although the Melitian schism was one of the items discussed and settled by the Nicene Council, the Melitians did not cease protesting and disturbing the Church because they felt that the decision taken by this Council was not satisfactory to their cause. They too, therefore, continued their accusations against Athanasius, Alexander's successor.⁵

1 Socrates, 1.6

2 Theod. note, p. 46

3 Μελίτιος οὐ πρὸς ἑτέραν σύνοδον κατέφυγεν, οὐδὲ ἐσπούδασεν ἀπολογήσασθαι τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα σχίσμα δὲ πεποίηκεν. (Ἀπολ. κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν, 59.)

4 Ibid. 11.

5 Ibid. 19.

2.) Arius — Arianism

Melitianism, was a schismatic movement which, no doubt, brought a considerable damage to the unity of the Catholic Church, especially in Egypt. Nevertheless, this menace was not as serious as that launched by Arianism. In contrast to the Melitian schism, the motivations which raised the Arian controversy were purely doctrinal, or as Gwatkin puts it more accurately: "Arianism, began its career as a theory of Christianity, partly as an Eastern reaction of philosophy against a gospel of the Son of God."¹

This particular dispute, which was to shake very dangerously the foundations of the traditional Church, started when bishop Alexander,

"in the fearless exercise of his functions for the government of the Church, attempted one day in the presence of the presbytery and the rest of the clergy to explain with perhaps too philosophical minuteness, that great theological mystery, — the Unity of the Holy Trinity."²

In making his explanation on this significant theological subject, Alexander supported the doctrine of the conservative theology of the East, namely, the

1 Gwatkin, H.M., Arian Controversy, New York, Longmans, 1889., p.1.

2 Socrates, 1.6

complete divinity of Christ and His unbeginning genesis from the Father, "ἀναρχος γέννησις παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς. "1

A certain Arius² who, at that time, was one of the presbyters under Alexander's jurisdiction, challenged the opinions of his bishop by answering that,

"If the Father begat the Son, he that was begotten had a beginning of existence; and from this it is evident that there was a time when the Son was not. It therefore necessary follows, that he had subsistence from nothing."³

These remarks became the spark which later produced all over Christendom a tremendous Christological dispute known to history as "The Arian Controversy."

Arius, was an earnest and pious presbyter of the Alexandrian Church. Duchesne gives us the following description of the man:⁴

"C'était un homme âgé, grand, maigre, de regard triste et d'aspect mortifié. On le savait ascète, et cela se voyait à son costume une courte tunique sans manches, sur laquelle il jettait une sorte d'écharpe en guise de manteau. Sa parole était douce, ses discours insinuants. Les vierges sacrées, fort nombreuses à Alexandrie, l'avait en grande estime; dans les hauts clerges il comptait des partisans déterminés."

1 Harnack, op.cit., p.23.

2 "Ἀρειοσιτῆς" Athanasius names Arius' adherents, "Ἀρειομανιτῆς"

3 Socrates, 1.6

4 Duchesne, Op. Cit., Vol. II., p. 126.

The author of Arianism had studied in the Antiochean school at the feet of Lucian,¹ the greatest critic of those days, who suffered martyrdom in Antioch. It was from there that Arius brought his Christological system which could be summarized as follows:

a. The subsistences of the Trinity are not united together nor do they possess equal glories. The one Divine subsistence is more glorious than the other in their glories unto immensity.

" Ἦγουν Τριάς ἐστὶ δόξαις οὐχ ὁμοίαις· ἀνεπίμικτοι, ἑαυταῖς εἰσὶν αἱ ὑποστάσεις αὐτῶν μία τῆς ἄλλης ἐνδοξοτέρα δόξαις ἐπ' ἀπειρον"²

b. Only God Himself is incomprehensible by all men. None is equal with Him; none is like Him. God alone is without beginning. He is eternal, and foreign from the Son in essence.

" Αὐτός γοῦν ὁ Θεὸς καθὼς ἐστίν, ἄρρητος ἅπασιν ὑπάρχει. Ἴσον, οὐδέ ὁμοιον, οὐχ ὁμόδοξον, ἔχει, μόνος οὗτος... Ἴδιον οὐδὲν ἔχει τοῦ Θεοῦ καθ' ὑπόστασιν... Ἐένος τοῦ Υἱοῦ κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ Πατὴρ ὅτι ἄναρχος ὑπάρχει."³

1 Loofs Friedrich., Dogmengeschichte; Halle, Verlag von Max Niemeyer, 1906; p. 234. Several noted scholars differ in the opinion as to whether Arianism actually came from the Antiochean School.

2 Athanasius., " Περὶ Συνόδων ", 15.

3 Ibid., 15.

c. The Son-Logos is a beginning of the things originated. God made Him Son by adoption. The Son-Logos is not equal in essence with God because He is a creature and came into being out of nothing. There was a time when the Son-Logos did not exist and He was not before His creation. Therefore, as a creature, the Son does not see or know God.

" Ἀρχὴν τὸν Υἱὸν ἔθηκε τῶν γεννητῶν ὁ ἄναρχος καὶ ἠνεγκεν εἰς Υἱὸν ἑαυτῷ τόνδε τεκνοποιήσας. Ἴδιον οὐδέν ἔχει τοῦ Θεοῦ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἰδιότητος. Καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, ἔξ οὐκ ὄντων γέγονε, καὶ ἦν ποτὲ, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γένηται. Ἰ. Πητῶς δὲ λέξω πῶς τῷ Υἱῷ ὁράται ὁ ἀόρατος."

d. The Spirit is also a creature, one among the other spiritual beings who serve God. However, the Spirit is superior to the other angels only in degree. Therefore, God existed as a monad (μονάς), before the existence of the Dyad (δυάς); i.e. of the Son-Logos and the Spirit.

"... λεγόντων αὐτῶν τῶν Ἀριομανιτῶν μὴ μόνον κτίσμα ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν λειτουργικῶν πνευμάτων ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι, καὶ βαθμῶ μόνον αὐτῷ διαφέρειν τῶν ἀγγέλων."²

These Arian opinions very soon raised a wide discussion among the clergymen in Alexandria. Although they were found to attack the traditional faith, yet the high clergy was divided into two parties. The

1 Athanasius., Ibid. 15,

2 Athanasius., "Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Σεραπίωνα", 1.

one party agreed with Bishop Alexander and advocated the absolute divinity of Christ; while the other embraced the teachings of Arius, i.e., that Christ has only a relative and secondary divinity.

This schism in the Alexandrian Church produced a serious situation all over Egypt and Bishop Alexander decided to eject Arius and his adherents. To make his decision more official, Alexander asked for the approval of the whole Egyptian Episcopate. He addressed a letter "To the ministers of the Catholic Church everywhere":

"... we then the bishops of Egypt and Lybia, being assembled together to the number of nearly a hundred have anathematized Arius for his shameless avowal of these heresies together with all such as have countenanced them; endeavoring to blend falsehood with truth, and that which is impious with what is sacred." ¹

The excommunicated Arius, together with his chief supporters, quit Egypt and went to Caesarea in Palestine leaving behind him ecclesiastical disorder and agitation.

Little by little, the controversy was brought to every section of the Eastern Christendom. The Bishops of both parties started exchanging letters in order to convince one another about their Christological opinions. Arius himself sent a letter to his

¹ Socrates, 1.6.

opponent, Alexander, exposing in it his faith.¹
 Polemic pamphlets circulated among the people;
 several songs were sung for the occasion.

"So notorious did the scandal of these proceedings become that the sacred matters of inspired teaching were exposed to the most shameful ridicule in the very theaters of the unbelievers."²

At the time when Arianism was causing these dangerous troubles and divisions in the Eastern Churches, the political conditions in the Empire developed rapidly. Constantine defeated his last rival, Licinius,³ and ascended the Roman throne as the sole monarch reigning over the East and the West. The political program of the new Emperor very soon became clear. He purposed to establish a new, strong State, a new Religion, and a new policy for a lasting peace.

Before taking over the throne, Constantine put himself on the side of the persecuted Christian Church and supported her cause fervently. Then, as Emperor, he declared himself openly as the protector of the Christian faith. The all-out support of the Emperor was for the long-suffering Christians a triumphal victory, the most important since her establishment. Constantine restored the property of the victims of the persecutions, appointed anew ousted clergymen, and did his

1 Athanasius " Περὶ Συνοδῶν ", 16

2 Eusebius, The life of Constantine ., 1.16.

3 Battle of Chrysopolis, 18 or 20 Sept. 323 A.D.

best to propagate all over his vast dominions the worship of the one true God.

"By the grateful zeal of the Christians the deliverer of the Church has been decorated with every attribute of a hero and even of a saint." ¹

Whether Constantine followed this policy by reason of being a real Christian raises a big question. We could rather say that his main concern was to use the Christian faith as the peaceful weapon for the effective unity of his Empire. Thus the Church became an "alter ego" of the State and for the first time she started playing a role of political significance.

This close connection between State and Church meant that every division in the Church was actually a threat to the unity of the State. It was not strange, therefore, that Constantine became directly interested in the Arian controversy.

To appease both Alexander and Arius, the Emperor intervened as a moderator by sending to them a letter in which he expressed the wish:

"...to consign this disorder to silence that if possible the evil might be confined..."²

The letter was brought to them by a man named Hosius, a certain bishop of Cordova, whom Constantine held in high respect.

1 Gibbon, Edward., The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire . The Modern Library; Vol. I, p. 560. ...

2 Socrates, 1.7.

3. The Nicene Council

This conciliatory step failed to produce any solution to the case. The gulf between Arius and Alexander was so deep that the Emperor had to plan more effective measures to secure peace. Thus he decided to summon a general Council — Οἰκουμενικὴ Σύνοδος — in which clergymen-representatives from all over Christendom would participate, to arrange peaceably their doctrinal differences. The place of the meeting was to be Nicaea in Bithynia.

In the spring of the year 325 A.D. the prelates of the Church, answering the imperial invitation, started moving to Nicaea using every means of transportation.

" Now when they were all assembled, it appears evident that the proceeding was the work of God, inasmuch as men who had been most widely separated, not merely in sentiment but also personally, and by difference of country, place, and nation were here brought together and comprised within the walls of a single city, forming as it were a vast garland of priests, composed of a variety of the choicest flowers" ¹

In this historic meeting, several noted personalities were present, some of them known for their learning, others for their pious life, and others for their heroic resistance during the last bloody persecution. Outstanding among them all was Eusebius of Caesarea, the famous scholar and historian. ² Arius

¹ Eusebius, The Life of Constantine, III.7.

² He was the man selected to address the Emperor in the Council's opening session.

was there in person, too. He was ready to defend his case, together with his chief supporter Eusebius of Nicomedia and many others.

The official sources do not agree as to the number of the gathered members. The above mentioned Eusebius tells that there were more than 250.¹ Constantine gives us the number 300,² as do Athanasius³ and others.

The presence of the Emperor himself ascribed to the Council a unique solemnity. He addressed the Council by emphasizing his main concern, that is, peace.

"... begin from this moment to discard the causes of that disunion which has existed among you, and remove the perplexities of controversy by embracing the principles of peace..."⁴

After the welcome speeches, the assembly took over its main task. Among the subjects under discussion, Arianism, of course, held the first place. The Council wanted to know whether or not Arius had been justly excommunicated by the bishop, Alexander. Arius and his friends were called to express their doctrinal views. They did it openly and frankly to the astonishment of the assembly which was shocked in hearing that "the Son was created out of nothing; that He was a creature,"

1 Eusebius, The life of Constantine. III.8.

2 Socrates, I.9.

3 Athanasius: " Τριακόσιοι πλείον ἢ ἕλαττον ",
(ad Monachos, 65)

4 Eusebius, op.cit., III.8.

and the other strange ideas concerning the Holy Trinity. The Council rejected the Arian teachings and confirmed the excommunication of the leaders of the new heresy.

After the Arian Creed had been rejected, Eusebius of Caesarea, representing the majority party, presented to the assembly the Creed of his own Church. It was a good sounding confession covering the disputed doctrinal points with no theological pedantry. The assembly amended this Eusebian Creed and adopted it by inserting the terms, "begotten, not made" $\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, and "of one essence with the Father"— $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omega$ $\Pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\iota}$: two expressions which, from then on, became the fuel of a tremendous conflict.

The next principal subject was that of Melitianism. As already noted, Meletius and his followers caused a schism in the Egyptian Church and were responsible for many troubles; nevertheless, because of the mood of appeasement existing among the members of the Council, this particular case was considered less serious than Arianism, and the decision was taken to allow the Melitians to continue performing their ecclesiastical duties but under the direct supervision and control of the Alexandrian See.

The controversial subject of Easter was also brought before the assembly and it was decided that this great Christian feast should be observed on a fixed

day every year.¹

Besides all these significant settlements, the Council adopted twenty canons dealing with several unfixed ecclesiastical matters and closed its historic work after the members had signed the decisions taken.

In order to make these decisions officially known, the Council sent a Synodical letter "to the Church of Alexandria and to the brethren in Lybia and Pentapolis" saying:

" In the first place, the impious doctrines of Arius were investigated before our most religious emperor Constantine; and his impiety was unanimously anathematized, as well as the blasphemous language and views which he had propounded... It was decided by the holy Council, that Melitius should be treated with clemency... He was permitted to remain in his own city, but was divested of all power whether of nomination or of ordination Those who had received ordination at his hands were to submit to a more religious re-ordination... According to your prayers the celebration of the most Holy Paschal feast was unanimously rectified so that our brethren of the East ... will whenceforth celebrate it with you..."²

Every one would think that all the controversial matters had been removed by the Council and that Christen-

1 This controversy was raised between Asia Minor and Rome as to whether the Easter feast should be observed on Sunday in every year, a view practiced by Rome and Alexandria, or on the 14th of the lunar month Nisan of the Jews, on whatever day of the week that might happen to fall, an opinion supported by the Churches in Asia Minor. The decision of the Council agreed with Rome.

2 The emperor also sent similar letters to the Bishops who were not able to attend the Council. (See: Euseb. The Life of Constantine , III.21 ff.)

dom, from then on, would live in peace. Yet, this did not happen. The Council's decisions were not the end but just the beginning of the conflict which, in the next fifty years, actually shook the foundations of the traditional Church.

Eusebius, the afore-mentioned bishop of Nicomedia had already taken the initiative to fight Arius' battles.¹ He took part in the general Council and worked fervently to convert his fellow-bishops to Arianism. He did not prevail and more than that, he, with Arius, was compelled to sign the decisions so unfavorable to their party. Nevertheless, Eusebius was not the type of man who would respect his promises.² Soon after the assembly had closed its work, Eusebius set himself to undermine the authority of the Nicene Council by asserting that Arius' opinions had been misunderstood, and also that the term consubstantial " ὁμοούσιον " should be denounced.

The Emperor issued an edict by which Eusebius, Arius and their followers were sent into exile.³ This was not for long though, because during their banishment

1 He had written to Arius, " καλῶς φρονῶν εὐχου πάντα οὕτως φρονεῖν " Περὶ Συνόδων, 17.

2 Athanasius, ('Απολ.κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν), reveals that Eusebius grasped illegally the See of Nicomedia; " Ἐν Βηρυττῶ μὲν ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, Βηρυττὸν δὲ ἀφείς εἰς Νικομήδειαν ἦλθε, τὴν μὲν παρὰ νόμον ἀφείς εἰς ἣν δὲ παρὰ νόμον ἐπιβαίνων... "

3 Among them were: Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon and others.

the Arian leaders were excused by the Emperor after signing a statement in which they declared that their doctrinal sentiments had been changed.¹

4. The dogmatic victories and defeats of Athanasius

As we mentioned above, Bishop Alexander died in 328 A.D. leaving the responsibilities of the Alexandrian See in the able hands of his successor, Athanasius.² This significant development offered to Eusebius and the other Arians a new opportunity for action. They objected to the ordination of Athanasius "partly as a person unworthy of the prelacy, and partly because he had been elected by disqualified persons".³ No doubt, the purpose of this objection was to bring Arius and his ideas back to Alexandria and they were feeling unable to do it while Athanasius, the strong defender of the Nicene faith, was the bishop in that city.

To strengthen his party all the more, Eusebius sought an alliance with the Melitians who continued to make troubles in the Church because they believed that their case had not been examined properly in the Nicene Council.

The most effective weapon used by the Eusebians at that critical moment was a certain Arian presbyter

1 Socrates, I.8. The development of the events proved that this declaration was written by the Arians with the purpose to mislead the Emperor.

2 Alexander held the office from 312-328 A.D.

3 Socrates, I.22.

who happened to be the private confessor of Constantia, the Emperor's sister. This presbyter was asked by Eusebius and the others to convince Constantia that Arius' case had not been justly examined by the Council and that the common report against him was untrue. This move proved to be a skillful one because Constantia, having full confidence in her confessor's words asked the Emperor to change his behavior towards Arius. Constantine did so by sending a letter to Arius inviting him to Constantinople so that, " when you have experienced our clemency and regard for you, you may return to your own country."¹ To make certain of the Emperor's promised clemency, Arius presented to him a recantation in which he pretended to have accepted the Nicene Creed. Constantine felt satisfied by the recantation and sent him back to Alexandria to be admitted into the Church.

The controversy changed its course when Athanasius, as the Bishop of Alexandria, refused to receive Arius. Athanasius' attitude became known to the Emperor who addressed him a menacing letter in which he warned:

"...ἔχων τοίνυν τῆς ἐμῆς βουλήσεως τὸ γνῶρισμα ἅπασιν τοῖς βουλομένοις εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν εἰσελθεῖν ἀκάλυτον παράσχου τὴν εἴσοδον· ἔαν γὰρ γνῶ ὡς κεκόληκας τινὰς αὐτῶν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μεταποιουμένους, ἢ ἀπείρξας τῆς εἰσόδου

1 Socrates, I.25.

ἀποστέλω παραυτίκα τὸν καὶ καθαιρήσαντα σε ἐξ
ἐμῆς κελευσεως καὶ τὸν τόπον μεταστήσονται...¹

Disregarding the threats, Athanasius answered the Emperor, " μηδεμίαν εἶναι κοινωνίαν τῇ Χριστομάχῳ αἰρέσει πρὸς τὴν Καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. " ²

In the meantime, the Eusebian party together with the Melitians accused Athanasius before the Emperor of being an oppressive tyrant, of violating the treaty which had been ratified in the Nicene Council, of having whipped or imprisoned six of their bishops, of having conspired against the Emperor, and other serious crimes.³

A synod was summoned at Caesarea and Athanasius was invited to be present to defend himself. The Alexandrian Bishop refused to appear, knowing that the whole story was but a conspiracy of his enemies. When the Synod was transferred to Tyre, (335 A.D.) Athanasius' appearance was secured by orders from the Emperor. He went to Tyre together with about 50 bishops from Egypt. This time he was not accused of heresy but of Episcopal tyranny, of cruelty and sexual uncleanness.⁴ Finding himself facing extremely hostile and

1 Athanasius, Ἀπολογία κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν ,59.

2 Ibid.

3 Sozomen, II.22.

4 Ibid. 25.

slandrous opposition and even before the Synod closed its work, Athanasius fled from Tyre to Constantinople in order to complain to the Emperor about what he had suffered at Tyre and to ask him to examine the decrees of the Council.

On discovering the flight of Athanasius to Constantinople, the Synod condemned him and voted for his deposition. The Emperor, not knowing anything about the decisions of the Synod, addressed a letter to the members asking them to rush to Jerusalem for the dedication of New Jerusalem (the magnificent Church which was built upon the place where his mother, Helena, had found the genuine Cross of Christ).¹

In Jerusalem, the Council renewed the decisions taken at Tyre but, in the meantime Constantine, after his meeting with Athanasius, sent a letter to the members of the Council, "I command you," wrote the Emperor, "that you all come here without delay in order that we may receive an exact account of your transactions."²

This interference of the Emperor frightened some of the bishops who rushed back to their Sees. Eusebius, however, with some others went to Constantinople, this time to accuse Athanasius of having threatened to divert the corn supplied to Constantinople from

1 Socrates, I.17.

2 Sozomen, II.27.

Alexandria. The serious charges between the opposite parties confused the Emperor, who felt unable to find any other solution to secure peace than to banish Athanasius into Gaul. This happened in 336 A.D.

The banishment of Athanasius marked a great victory for the Eusebian party. By using all kinds of plots and intrigues against the Alexandrian Bishop, Eusebius succeeded not only in putting him out of the scene but also in breaking his alliance with the Emperor.

Thus, Eusebius of Nicomedia became the master of the situation. Athanasius' deposition from his See meant that the door of the Alexandrian Church was now wide open for Arianism. With the Emperor's consent, Arius would be accepted into communion and sent to Alexandria, but on the eve of his communion, Arius died suddenly. Athanasius explained the death of Arius as a judgment of God.¹

The event was an unfortunate blow to the Arian party. Their plans and struggles to restore Arius, although successful, failed suddenly in this unexpected way. Yet Eusebius did not give up. Heading his party, he continued working for the accomplishment of his purpose which was to destroy the Nicene Creed by attacking Athanasius, who at that time was the strong-

1 ".... ὁ Κύριος κριτῆς γενομένου ἐβράβευσε κατὰ τῶν ἀδικούντων"

est defender of the "ὁμοούσιον".¹

Another meaningful incident which followed was the death of the Emperor. This happened on May 22, 337 A.D.² After a fatal sickness, he "left his mortal remains to his fellow mortals and carrying into fellowship with God that part of his leaving which was capable of understanding and loving him."³

With the death of Constantine, the Empire was divided among his three sons. The youngest one, Constantine II, ruled Gaul; Constantius received Syria; to the third brother, Constans, was given Italy and Illyricum.⁴ Under these new circumstances, consideration was given anew to the Arian controversy. Constantine II took the initiative to bring the deposed Athanasius back to his Alexandrian See. For that purpose, he persuaded his brother Constantius, the Caesar of the East, to approve the return of Athanasius and sent a letter — τῷ λαῷ τῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας πόλεως Ἀλεξανδρίας — telling the Alexandrians that:

" Athanasius, the expositor of the venerated law was sent for a while unto Gaul lest he should sustain some irreparable injury from the perverseness of his blood thirsty adversaries... And since our sovereign, my

1 "... ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἀρειομανιτῶν ἀσεβεία λυττώσα, ἵν' ἐκποδῶν μὲν οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι γένωνται, μετ' ἀδείας δὲ λοιπὸν ἅ βούλονται κηρύττωσιν οἱ προσταταὶ τῆς ἀσεβείας. Ἀπολ. κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν, 5.

2 Gwatkin, H.M., Arian controversy, p. 61.

3 Eusebius, The life of Constantine, IV. 68.

4 Gibbon., op.cit., p. 571.

father, Constantine Augustus of blessed memory was prevented by death for accomplishing his purpose of restoring this bishop to his See.., I have deemed it proper to carry his wishes into effect..."¹

Taking courage by this letter, Athanasius went to Alexandria (Nov. 337 A.D.), receiving a big welcome from the people of that city.²

The return of Athanasius to his home Church did not calm the quarrel. Eusebius, whose influence at that time was increasing among the Eastern Churches, put his machinations to work again. Not long after, Constantine II was dead. During a war against his brother Constans, he was slain by his own generals. The Roman Empire was divided between the two surviving brothers, Constans receiving the West, Constantius the East.³

A second decisive blow against Athanasius came when the bishops of the Eastern Churches were invited by the Emperor Constantius to Antioch for the dedication of a Church constructed in that city. The Eusebians took this opportunity and formed a Council in order to bring a new set of accusations against Athanasius, including his having condemned the

1 Socrates, II.5.

2 "... χαρά και εὐθυμία, και δρόμος τῶν λαῶν, πρὸς τὴν εὐκταίαν αὐτοῦ θεᾶν ἐπειγομένων· εὐφροσύνης δὲ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι μεστὰι, και εὐχαριστίαι πρὸς τὸν Κύριον ἀναφερόμεναι πανταχοῦ " Ἀπολ. κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν, 7.

3 Sozomen, II.2.

sacerdotal regulation, and having returned to his See without the previous consent of any Council. The majority of the Council members, composed of ninety-seven Eusebian bishops, approved the accusations, condemned Athanasius anew, and strengthened their decision in diplomatic way by pretending to the Emperor that they found no fault with the decrees of the Nicene Council.¹

This time, Athanasius found himself unprotected by any official support. The new attack against him, obviously, was launched under the blessings of Constantius. According to the new Eusebian plans, Athanasius would be ejected and Gregorius, an Arian, would be appointed to the Alexandrian See.

The execution of these plans was assigned to Philagrius, the prefect of Egypt, who entered Alexandria with military force and compelled the Christian people there to accept Gregorius as their new bishop.²

Gregorius, who had been consecrated in Antioch, took the Episcopal See, while Athanasius, fearing the violence of his opponents, quit Egypt and went to Rome. This happened in the Lenten season of 339 A.D.

1 Sozomen, III.5.

2 Athanasius, Ἐπιστολὴ Ἐγκύκλιος 3; gives us a vivid description of the cruel and impious methods by which the Roman soldiers with the help of the Jews and heathens of the city, imposed their will on the people of Alexandria: "... ἡ μὲν ἐκκλησία καὶ τὸ ἅγιον βαπτιστήριον πυρπολεῖται, εὐθέως δὲ οἰμωγαὶ καὶ ὀλοθυγαὶ καὶ θρῆνος ἦν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν..."

On his arrival in Rome Athanasius was welcomed by Bishop Julius who, although he stood strongly on the side of the Nicene Creed, took up the delicate work of settling the conflict as an arbiter of Christendom. He summoned for this purpose a Council in Rome but the Eusebians did not appear; instead, they met in Antioch, (340 A.D.)¹ Once again they approved Athanasius deposition and dismissed Julius' envoys, handing them an unfriendly letter addressed to the Roman Bishop.²

This reaction on the part of Eusebians did not cancel Julius' Council. After a period of delay, fifty bishops met in Rome (Autumn 340 A.D.) to examine Athanasius' case. The decision was rendered in favor of the Alexandrian Bishop; Julius sent a letter to the Eusebians to make the Council's decisions known. In this letter, which Gwatkin calls, "one of the ablest documents of the entire controversy,"³ the Pope of Rome, in a calm and wise mood, accuses Athanasius' opponents of being proud and boasting and of causing hatred and quarreling by their attitudes.

In the meantime Eusebius, who had been promoted to the See of Constantinople, died. In his person the

1 The Council is known by the name, "Dedication-Council" for the reason that it met on the occasion of the dedication a Church which Constantine had started to build.

2 Portions of this letter are found in Julius' skillful reply, (*Ἀπολογία κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν*, 21.

3 Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism. p. 113.

Arians lost a courageous and clever leader. Yet, the controversy was continuing in mounting intensity. This was partly due to the fact that in their Antiochean Synod, the Arian party renounced Arianism and adopted a new Creed similar in many ways to the Nicene one.¹ This movement gave them an advantage and caused more confusion. At that time, East and West seemed to be in complete separation.

The situation threatened the peace of the Empire so that Constans and Constantius, the two Emperors, agreed that a General Council should meet to restore peace. The place chosen was Sardica. Ninety-six western bishops gathered there under the leadership of Hosius of Cordova.² Athanasius was present, too.

The Eastern bishops, realizing that they were outnumbered by their Western colleagues, withdrew and held a Synod of their own at Phillipopolis. The Sardica Council proceeding with its work, proclaimed Athanasius innocent, condemned several Arian phrases, and wrote a circular letter to the bishops of the Eastern regions.

Following this Council, Constans pressed the execution of the decrees of Sardica. Constantius changed his attitude towards Athanasius and promised him full support and protection. Athanasius was back in Alex-

1 The Creed is exposed by Athanasius " Περὶ Συνόδων " 23.
 2 In all probability the Council met in 344 A.D.

andria, καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία μετὰ πάσης χαρᾶς πεπλήρωτο "1

Athanasius' return to Alexandria was, of course, a new victory for the adherents of the Nicene Creed. An interval of rest followed this event but it did not last very long. Some years later (350 A.D.), the army of Gaul proclaimed Magentius to be the Augustus of the West.² This new development brought Constantius and Magentius, the two rival Emperors, into an armed clash which cost Constantius his life. Magentius remained the Augustus of the West, but his triumph was an ephemeral one. Constantius, of the East, defending the honor of his family, came against Magentius and, in a decisive battle, (351 A.D.) defeated the Western armies until finally Magentius, in a moment of despair, committed suicide.

Constantius, being now the sole master of the East and the West, decided to put an end to the ecclesiastical controversy in his own way. The Arians had converted him to their position and had made him believe that peace would never be restored unless both Athanasius and his opinions were condemned. Thus, the Emperor, forgetting all the good promises he had given Athanasius, started planning the Bishop's annihilation.³

1 Athanasius had previously rejected twice Constantius' proposals to return to his See, ('Απολογία κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν, 51.)

2 Socrates, II.26.

3 "... ὡς ἀπὸ πυρὸς ἀναφθεῖς μετεβάλλετο τὴν γνώμην καὶ οὔτε τῶν ὀρκῶν ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὧν ἔγραψεν ἐπέλαθετο."

A Synod in Milan (355 A.D.)¹ was summoned by the Emperor for the purpose of convincing the bishops of both parties to restore a mutual communion among them and abandon Athanasius. Those who would refuse to sign would be sent into banishment.²

Athanasius received letters from the Emperor to appear before him. The Alexandrian Bishop estimated the conditions as dangerous and stayed in his city. A second message was sent to him and also to the Governors in Egypt to urge Athanasius' departure from Alexandria. The people of the city insisted on keeping Athanasius at home and were ready to support him even by force of arms. Roman legions were ordered to enter the city. Athanasius fled and found refuge among the Egyptian monks.³ This was his third exile (356 A.D.).

The Council which followed at Sirmium, in Italy, marked a new turn to the whole controversy. In this conference, held mostly by Western bishops, a manifesto was drawn up⁴ obviously to conciliate the opposing parties.

1 In this Synod over 300 Western bishops were assembled; the representatives from the East were but a few, "some, it appears, excused themselves from attendance under the plea of illness; others, on account of the length and difficulties of the journey." (Sozomen, IV.10).

2 Among those who refused to sign were Liberius, the successor of Julius, and Hosius of Cordova.

3 Sozomen, IV.10.

4 "Περὶ Συνόδων 26 ff.

The most important difference between this manifesto and the Nicene Creed was the substitution of the term "ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ" for the term "ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ". The second term, "ὁμοούσιος" was the classical watchword adopted by the Nicene Council and meant that the Son was of a like Divine essence with the Father; while the new term, "ὁμοιούσιος" meant that the Son is "like the Father" i.e., not of the same essence as the Father but that the Son's attributes are equally similar to those of the Father's.¹ In effect, the manifesto created a new party in the controversy. This new party was called "Homoion" from the word "Homoios" that was adopted.

Out of this "Homoion" movement, which at that time formed the strongest and the most conservative party, a new sect arose known by the name, "Anomoion" (Unlike.) Its leaders were standing on the Arian doctrine, yet they disagreed with Arius as to the comprehensiveness of the Divine nature. Arius had said that the Divine essence is incomprehensible, while the "ἀνόμοιοι" declared that man can understand it perfectly.

Such was the situation of the religious leadership in the Empire. Confusion and controversy prevailed. Meanwhile new political and military develop-

¹ Sozomen, III.18.

ments of importance began taking place. In Gaul, the Roman legions declared Julian, Constantius' cousin, to be the Caesar of the West. After defeating the barbarians in many places, the new ruler came against Constantius, who prepared his troops to meet the aggressor. (361 A.D.) Even before coming into contact with his rival, Constantius' plans failed because he died (361 A.D.)¹. Thus, the door to Constantinople was open to Julian. He entered the city and was proclaimed Emperor making himself the master of the whole Empire.

Julian actually was not a Christian. He was practising heathenism and nursed in his heart an admiration for the ancient Greek literature and philosophy. Sozomen writes:

"...it is said that he, Julian, openly renounced the faith of Christ so entirely, that he by sacrifices and expiations, which the pagans call renunciatory, and by the blood of animals, purged himself of our baptism."²

It is not strange, therefore, that during his reign Christianity was discouraged; yet, in the ecclesiastical controversy the events turned favorable to the Nicene party. Julian, by reason of prejudice against Constantius, restored again the bishops who

1 Sozomen, V.1.

2 Ibid.

had been banished (356 A.D.). This policy brought Athanasius once more to Alexandria, (362 A.D.).

The Bishop did not stay for a long time at his See,¹ because in the next year the Emperor, after having been informed that Athanasius had converted many pagans to Christianity, ordered him under the severest penalties to quit Alexandria. Athanasius did so going into exile for the fourth time.

Julian ruled the Empire for a short time. During a campaign against the Persians,² he lost his life (363 A.D.) leaving the throne to Jovian, a young officer of the Roman army. Jovian was a Christian and professed the Nicene faith. He manifested the greatest friendship for Athanasius³ whom he met at Antioch to discuss the ecclesiastical problems.⁴ Every one could see that with Jovian as Emperor, the return of the exiled Bishop to Alexandria was only a matter of time. Athanasius came back to his Alexandrian See "with directions to govern the Churches and people of that

-
- 1 During this period a Council was held in Alexandria. Most of the members were returned exiles. The main purpose of this Council was "to anathematize the Arian heresy and confess the faith confessed by the holy Fathers at Nicaea and to anathematize also all those who say that Holy Ghost is a creature and separate from the essence of Christ"(Tom.Antioch.3)
- 2 Julian was the last survivor of the house of Constantine.
- 3 Sozomen, VI.5.
- 4 Sozomen, VI.5.

country, Egypt, as he might think fit."¹

Jovian's reign lasted only eight months. The Emperor died suddenly in 364 A.D. and the troops offered the throne to Valentinian I (364-375 A.D.). The new Emperor felt himself unable to bear the whole burden of the responsibilities and appointed his brother, Valens, (364-378 A.D.) to be the sovereign of the West.

5. The death of Athanasius

In contrast to the noble and tolerable behavior of his brother Valentinian, Valens was a man of weak character, timid and suspicious. He was quickly influenced by the Arian party and disliked both the homoousian and the homoiousian groups. Not long after, Valens ordered his administrators to eject all the bishops who had been exiled by Constantius and restored by Julian. In the list of the exiled, the name of Athanasius was included. In spite of the resistance of the people of Alexandria declaring that Athanasius had not been restored by Julian, the Emperor's orders prevailed and Athanasius was again sent into exile, this to be the last one. After a few years, (May 2, 373 A.D.) the old bishop passed away, "full of years and honors."

6. The Measure of the Man

Praising the personality of Athanasius and the role he played in the Arian controversy, Duchesne says:

1 Ibid.

"L'orthodoxie de Nicée avait trouvé son homme"¹

There is no doubt, indeed, that this extraordinary man offered everything he had to defend the doctrinal Constitution of the Church against the heretical movement of Arius and his party who had tried to drive the Church away from the course of her traditional belief and principles.

In contrast to the machinations and the bad methods used by his opponents, the Alexandrian Bishop fought his battle with integrity and outstanding courage. Athanasius' secret weapons were his rare ethical virtues combined with his intellectual abilities. He demonstrated a wise statemanship, a deep and stable devotion to his faith, and a resolution that made him hope even in the darkest circumstances. On the other hand, his philosophical education, his oratorical skill, and the clearness of his theology gave to him and to his doctrine an effective advantage over his Arian opponents. Athanasius became the hero of the "ἡμερολόγιον". Although his achievements did not seem to be important at the time when the man passed away, yet in the following years they appear as very essential to the cause of the traditional faith. His theological exposition was so complete and satisfactory that, "Eastern Christendom

1 Duchesne: op.cit. 168

has been able to add nothing up to the present day. Even in theory it has hit on no change, merely overloading the idea of Athanasius; but the Western Church also preserved this faith as fundamental."¹

III. ATHANASIUS' THEOLOGY

The root of Athanasius' Theology was the conception of human redemption accomplished through the God-man Jesus Christ. He is the only one who brings men into communion with God and makes them sons of God by adoption.

" Αὐτὸς ἐνηθρώπησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν... καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστὸς ὑπέμεινεν τὴν παρ' ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἀθανασίαν κληρονομήσωμεν " ²

To present and support this fundamental theological thought, Athanasius did not construct a theological system. He was not a theologian but a well-educated pastor who exposed the Scriptures in a vigorous and simple manner.

Here are the highlights of his Theology:

1. On the Trinity

The Trinity cannot be divided. It is one undivided, μονάς, and like in nature. The πρόσωπα of the Holy Trinity possess equal glory and share absolute

¹ Harnack, op.cit., Vol. III, p.144.

² De incarn. 54.

holiness and perfection. The Holy Trinity is composed of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit without including any other person. It consists in nothing made or born. The Trinity only bears and creates; it is the source of everything that exists, spiritual as well as material. The Son and the Holy Spirit are not nominal gods but essential ones; both of them share the substance of the Father.¹

" Τριάς τοίνυν ἅγια καὶ τελεία ἐστίν, ἐν Πατρὶ καὶ ἐν Υἱῷ καὶ ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι θεολογουμένη οὐδὲν ἀλλότριον ἢ ἕξωθεν ἐπιγνύμενον ἔχουσα οὐδὲ ἐκ δημιουργοῦ καὶ γενητοῦ συνισταμένη, ἀλλ ὅλη τοῦ κτίζειν καὶ δημιουργεῖν οὐσα" ²

2. On the God-Head

The Father is the only unbegotten principle of the Trinity. He is the beginning of the Deity and comprises a unity **Μονάς**, in Himself. There are not two beginnings as the Son is derived, begotten from the Father. The Son is not created by the Father as being

1 This teaching about the Trinity attacks Arius' assertions who said that: The persons of the Trinity are separated the one from the other; that they do not share the same divine glory; that the Son's nature is different from the Father's, etc., (De Synod., 14), where a portion of Arius' "Thalia" is included.

2 Epist. ad Serap. 27.

a part of the uncreated nature.¹

" Μονάδα τῆς θεότητος, ἀδιαίρετον καὶ ἄσχιστον
λεχθεῖη μία ἀρχὴ θεότητος, καὶ οὐ δύο ἀρχαὶ
ὅθεν κυρίως καὶ μοναρχία ἐστίν."²

3. On the Son

The Son is co-eternal with the Father. There was no time when the Son did not exist. He is called "Son" because he shares the nature of the Father and together with Him constitutes a Unity. The Son is called in the Scriptures, "Logos" and "Wisdom" because through Him the God-Father expressed his creative power. The Son knows the Father as being a part of His nature. The relationship between The Father and the Son is that of the source and the brook.³

" Λευκότερον φάτος ἀποδεικνύεται... ὅτι οὐκ
ἐστὶ κτίσμα ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, ἀλλ' Υἱὸς ἀλη-
θινὸς καὶ φύσει γνήσιος τοῦ Πατρὸς."⁴

1 These opinions on the God-Head are quite opposite to what Arius said. The latter taught that the Father is incomprehensible by any creature, therefore by the Son too; that only the God-Father is essentially God while the Son and the Holy Spirit are gods of secondary importance, (οἶδαμεν ἓνα Θεόν, μονον, ἀγέννητον, μόνον αἰδίον, μόνον ἀναρχον, μόνον ἀληθινόν (De Syn. 16)

2 Orat. IV.1.

3 Arius conception about the Son was a different one. The Son, he said, has not the same nature with the Father; nor does He constitute a unity with Him. He is not co-eternal with the Father because the Son is γεννητος . (De Synod. 14)

4 Orat.c.Arian., 73.

" Εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, ὁ μόνος ἴδιος καὶ γνήσιος ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ ὧν ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ ἀχώριστον ἔχων πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς Θεότητος... ἀπαύγασμα τε, ὧν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ αἰεὶ ἐστὶ μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς"¹
 " Τῆς δὲ οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς ἴδιον ὧν γέννημα ὁ Υἱὸς εἰκότως καὶ τὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς λέγει ἑαυτοῦ εἶναι." ²

4. On the Holy Spirit

The Holy Spirit is not separated from the substance of the Father and the Son; it shares the same Divine glory and power. There is, therefore, but one God who consists in three divine persons. To reject the Divinity of the Holy Spirit is to reject the whole Trinity.

" τὸ Πνεῦμα ἄλλον μὲν εἶναι τῶν γεννητῶν, ἴδιον δὲ καὶ οὐ ξένον τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐσίας καὶ Θεότητος." ³
 " τῆς αὐτῆς Θεότητος καὶ ἐξουσίας." ⁴
 " οἱ δυσφημοῦντες εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσιν εἰς τὴν Ἁγία Τριάδα βλασφημίαν" ⁵

5. On Human Redemption

Speaking about Human Redemption, Athanasius gives an important place to the thought that Christ is the Redeemer of human nature. Human Redemption

1 Ibid. 41.

2 Ibid.

3 Epist. ad Serapion, 27.

4 De incarn. 9.

5 Epist. ad Serapion, 1. Arius called the Holy Spirit a creature that was superior to the angels only in degree, βαθμῶς not sharing any Divine nature. Athanasius, asks: Is God Trinity or Duality Τριάς ἢ Δυάς ., Epist. ad Serapion, 29.

became possible only because Christ shared Divine nature. If the Redeemer was but a creature, then Redemption of men would be impossible. The death of Christ is the sum of our faith, τό κεφάλαιον τῆς πίστεως.¹ His death on the Cross was an offering προσφορά to God on behalf of sinful mankind. By Christ's resurrection, on the other hand, the believers share the incorruptibility of their resurrected Lord. In sum, "Christ was made man, that we might be divine."²

" οὐκ ἄν ἐθεοποιήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος, εἰ μὴ φύσει ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς καὶ ἴδιος αὐτοῦ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, ὁ γενόμενος σὰρξ. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ γέγονεν ἡ συναφή, ἵνα τὸ κατὰ φύσιν τῆς Θεότητος συνάψῃ τὸν φύσιν ἄνθρωπον καὶ βεβαία γένηται ἡ Σωτηρία καὶ ἡ Θεοποίησις αὐτοῦ",³

" Ἄρτι δὲ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀναστήσαντος τὸ σῶμα οὐκέτι μὲν ὁ θάνατος ἐστὶ φοβερὸς, πάντες δὲ οἱ ἐν Χριστῷ πιστεύοντες... οὐκ ἀπόλλυνται ἀλλὰ καὶ ζῶσι καὶ ἀφθαρτοὶ διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως γίνονται."

6. On the Scriptures

All the Holy documents included in the Scriptures are divinely inspired. Both the Old and the New Testaments are the authentic sacred writings. Any Christian dogma should be drawn out of the Scriptures which are

1 De incarn., 19.

2 Ibid., 54.

3 Orat. II contra Arius, 70.

4 De incarn., 27.

the sufficient witness of the Christian truth. The Scripture is the base of the faith, and its truth is superior to any Creed drawn by any Council.

" Ἀυτάρχεις μὲν εἰσὶν αἱ Ἁγία καὶ θεόπνευστοι
Γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπαγγελίαν " 1
" Ἔστι μὲν πάντων ἰκανωτέρα ἡ Θεία Γραφή " 2

IV. ATHANASIUS AS A CHRISTIAN AUTHOR

1. The quality of his writings.

The many-talented Alexandrian bishop left behind him a series of important Christian writings. Some of these works deal with dogmatic questions, some others offer a unique historical material, while others include polemic and/or apologetic subjects.

Athanasius approaches all these various topics with an extraordinary ability and a superb literary skill. His language is simple and clear; yet his ideas are deep and his arguments powerful. His heretical opponents he answers with sarcasm and irony; yet he proves their errors by using sound reason and the authentic light of the Scriptures.

" Σαφὴς μὲν ἐστὶ τὴν φρασιν, καὶ ἀπέριττος καὶ ἀφελής, δριμύς δὲ καὶ βαθύς, καὶ λίαν τοῖς ἐπιχειρήμασιν εὐτονός " 3

His doctrinal victory over Arianism, although it did not seem to be complete at the time when Atha-

1 Orat. contra Gentes, 1.

2 Epist. de Synod, 6.

3 Migne, op.cit. XXV. p.XXIII

nasius died, yet, after a while, became a fact largely due to the fruitful writing he had done. No doubt then, Athanasius was a successful Christian author whose writings not only defended the faith of the traditional Church through a period of acute crises, but also established the doctrinal foundations of the Eastern Church, which stands by Athanasius' teachings to these days.

Athanasius' Writings¹

A. Apologetic Works

1. Oratio contra Gentes, " Λόγος καθ' Ἑλλήνων "

In this work Athanasius compares polytheism with Christianity; he attacks the first and proves why the second is more superior and reasonable.

2. Oratio de Incarnatione Verbi, " Λόγος περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ Λόγου "

This writing deals with the incarnation of the Divine Logos and presents the Christian faith as the only truthful one against the objections of Jews and Heathens. Both of these books are actually two parts of one work written before the Arian controversy.

B. Dogmatico-polemical Works

1. Orationes IV contra Arianos, " Κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν Λόγοι δ' "

Oratio I is devoted to disprove Arianism by proving the eternal Sonship of Christ. The exposition of this subject is based on a great number of Biblical passages.

In Orationes II, III and IV the writer sets forth a more detailed analysis of the Scriptural

1 See: Bardenhewer, O., Patrology, Freiburg im Breisgau & St. Louis Mo., pp.220-225; Bardy, G., Litterature Grecque Chrétienne, Librairie Blond and Gay, pp.92-97; Kruger, G., Kritische Bemerkungen, Gottingen, 1905; Bright, W., Historical Writings of Saint Athanasius, Oxford, 1881, Introd.

passages related to the Son-Logos in order to strengthen more the dogma of the unbegotten existence of the Son.

2. Letters to Serapion, " Πρὸς Σεραπίωνα Ἐπιστολαί δ' "

In these letters, addressed to Serapion Bishop of Thmnis, the writer advocates the Divine nature of the holy Spirit against those who accepted the divinity of the Son and yet they rejected the consubstantiality of the third person of the Trinity by calling it a creature.

3. De incarnatione dei Verbi, et contra Arianos, " Περὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου "

4. Epistola ad Jovianum, " Πρὸς Ἰωβιανὸν περὶ πίστεως "

5. Expositio fidei, " Ἐκθεσις Πίστεως "

6. Sermo Major de Fide, " Περὶ πίστεως λόγος ὁ μείζων "

7. Interpretatio in Symbolum, " Ἑρμηνεία εἰς τὸ Σύμβολον "

8. De incarnatione dei Verbi, " Περὶ τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου "

9. Κατὰ Ἀπολλιναρίου λόγοι β'

10. Three other Letters are considered as notable.

All of them deal with Christological controversies.

a. To Epictitus Bishop of Corinth,

b. To Adelphius, Bishop and Confessor,

c. To the Philosopher Maximus,

C. Historico-Polemical Writings

1. Ἀπολογητικὸς κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν

Speaking about this work Bright says: "It is the great depository of authentic materials for the Church History of a most momentous period..." It is a documentary writing in which Athanasius gives an exact historical narrative that covers a period of almost fifteen years. In his apology Athanasius includes a complete exposition of his struggles, between the years 336-347 A.D.

2. Πρὸς Βασιλέα Κωνστάντιον Ἀπολογία

In this work Athanasius defends himself before Emperor.

3. Ἐπιστολὴ Ἐγκύκλιος πρὸς τοὺς Ἐπισκόπους Αἰγύπτου

This is a letter which Athanasius addressed to his fellowbishops in his province for the purpose of warning them against accepting a new formula of faith which was about to be circulated among them. He exhorts them to continue rejecting Arianism and hold the Nicene Creed no matter what the consequences might be. It was written about 361 A.D.

4. Ἐπιστολὴ Ἐγκύκλιος

This is another Circular Letter written in 339 A.D. in which Athanasius tells about the shameful behavior of his enemies and makes an appeal to the bishops

of the whole Church to be united against the Eusebian Gregorius.

5. Περὶ τῆς ἐν Νικαία Συνόδου
6. Περὶ Διονυσίου
7. Περὶ Συνόδων
8. Τοῖς ἀπανταχοῦ κατὰ τόπον μονήρη βίον ἀσκοῦσι

In this document the writer exposes the history of Arianism. It was written in 335-357 A.D.

9. Ἑορταστικαὶ Ἐπιστολαί

D. Biographical Material

1. Βίος καὶ Πολιτεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀντωνίου

This is genuine biography composed by Athanasius who was greatly influenced by the ascetic and pious life of Anthony, the founder of the Eastern monasticism.

Secondary Works

1. Ἀπολογία περὶ τῆς φυγῆς αὐτοῦ
2. Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Σεραπίωνα
3. Ὁ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀντιοχεῖς Τόμος
4. Several other fragments.

P A R T B

Key to Abbreviations:

- CQR : Church Quarterly Review
HTR : Harvard Theological Review
JBL : Journal of Biblical Literature
RB : Revue Biblique
TS : Texts and Studies *

* For full titles see in the Bibliography

V. TEXTS AND THEORIES

1. The Neutral Text

The type of text known as "Neutral" was introduced, during the past century, by Westcott and Hort, two prominent scholars whose monumental critical research has ever since been the cornerstone of the modern textual studies.¹

The foundation upon which Westcott and Hort built their theory is the assumption that only the manuscripts, versions, and quotations, dated before the fourth century A.D. have substantial significance for the purposes of the New Testament criticism. The manuscripts of a subsequent age are of little importance because, in their opinion, the material of those manuscripts is discovered to be arbitrarily modified or revised. Thus, with their concern wholly concentrated on the MSS. originated before the fourth century, Westcott and Hort found that their textual material runs in two separate and heterogeneous strains: The "Neutral" and the "Western".² Between these two types of texts,

1 For the complete exposition of this theory see: Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek; New York, 1882 Vol. II.

2 In the "Neutral Text" Westcott & Hort included the two important Codices α and B, indicating that this type of text escaped any intentional revision and is therefore the descendant of the original text; in the "Western" they classified; the Old Latin, the Old Syria and the Codex Bezae (D), - which was estimated to be a copy of a IV century work. To Westcott and Hort the "Western" text is an altered and most freely revised text.

the "Neutral" is by far more valid and superior; its superiority being guaranteed by the great scholar Origen who used it. This is especially true with B, a manuscript that reflects the purest material among all known manuscripts.¹ It presents the shortest text and therefore the most trusted one. Hort explains that the purity of B is due to the vigilant supervision that this text enjoyed on the part of the Alexandrian scholars.²

He says:

"The perpetuation of the purer text may in great measure be laid to the credit of the watchful scholars of Alexandria."³

The following classification of all known MSS. presents the general picture of Westcott and Hort's theory.

According to their view, all MSS. should be divided into four categories:

a. The "Neutral" text represented by ~~⋈~~ and B.

-
- 1 With the only exception of the "Western non-interpolations"; i.e., in cases where the "Western text" omits something which is found in the "Neutral", the Western readings are considered as more accurate. This rule came out of the fact that the revisors of the Western text had a strong tendency to add to this text much extraneous material for clarification or other related purposes.
 - 2 As to the unique superiority of B, we have also an independent supporting evidence in: Weiss, B, Das Neue Testament. Textkritische Untersuchungen und Textherstellung; Leipzig, 1894-1900.
 - 3 Op.cit., Vol. II, p. 549.

- b. The "Alexandrian" Text, i.e. the text appearing mostly in Codex L, in the Boharic version and other allies.
- c. The "Western" Text, which is primarily reflected in D (Codex Bezae), the old Latin and the old Syriac.
- d. The "Syrian"¹ Text, that includes the greater mass of the Greek MSS., with later material very closely related to the "Textus Receptus".

In Westcott and Hort's time and shortly after, the majority of scholars accepted this theory with a great deal of enthusiasm. This happened especially in England where Westcott and Hort's "Neutral" Text was proclaimed as "The True Text", and regarded to be the definite answer to the whole textual problem.

The calm, however, did not last for long. New materials and further study required new approaches to the subject and Westcott and Hort's became ever since the issue of a big and constant controversy.

Salmon writes:²

"...great as it has been my veneration for Hort and my admiration of the good work that he has done, I have never been able to feel that his work was final and I have disliked the severity with which his history of the text has been accepted and even his nomenclature adopted as if now the last word has been said on the subject of New Testament criticism..."

1 This is the name that Westcott & Hort gave to the text called by others "Lucian" (Streeter), or "Byzantine" (Griesbach).

2 Salmon; Some thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. London, 1897.

Scrivener,¹ Burgson and Miller also opposed, in many respects, Westcott and Hort's position, along with a number of other scholars.

Two questions were put:

- I. What is the nature of B and its Neutral allies? Is it an exceptionally pure transmission, as Westcott and Hort hold, or is it a product of editorial revision?
- II. Were B and its Neutral allies actually the prevailing text in Egypt during the early centuries?

Let us try to answer these questions.

I. Anyone who studies Westcott and Hort's textual theory becomes very much impressed by the strong emphasis these famous scholars put on their "Neutral Text". To them, this type of text and particularly Codex B, is the only one that did not suffer any methodical revision or intentional alteration; it is the text that reflects the closest picture of the original manuscripts. As such, the "Neutral" family and its champion B, save some exceptions, should be treated as the most trusted text among all the others.

On this point the conviction of Westcott and Hort is so positive and persistent that one of their

1 Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament; 4th ed. Vol. II, p. 274-312, where the three of them state their arguments.

opponents accused them of superstition and fetichism.

"Le culte d'une idole, (Codex B)" says Prat, "pousse jusque là n'est plus de la superstition, c'est du fetichisme."¹

In spite of such daring attacks, the truth is that the question still remains open whether Westcott and Hort were right in their conclusion about the superior character of the B text. The views of their opponents, although some of them logically supported, do not include the facts which would enable us to reach a positive and objective conception. The textual experts, who in one way or another oppose the Westcott and Hort theory, seem to express their own impressions or reactions without giving us a commonly accepted standard of truth. For that reason, no accurate results could be drawn.

Soden, in his history-making work² tries to prove that the text presented by Westcott and Hort as "Neutral" (not revised), is but an Egyptian recension made by Hesychius.³ This able scholar obviously bases his conclusion on the following historical information given by Jerome in the preface of his letter addressed to Pope Damasus:

1 Prat, F., Recherches de science religieuse, 1914, p. 466.

2 Soden von Hermann, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Berlin, Verlag van Alexander Duncker 1906. Vol. I, p. 894.

3 In all probability this person was an Egyptian Bishop who, as Eusebius informs us, suffered martyrdom around the year 311 A.D. (See Eus. H.E. VIII; 13,7).

"Praetermitto eos codices quos a Luciano et Hesychio nunsupatos paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio: quibus utique nec in toto veteri instrumento post septuaginta interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in novo profuit emendasse: cum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata doceat falsa esse quae addita sunt."

Soden holds that this Hesychian recension embraces not only the Codices \aleph and B, but also several other manuscripts of an Egyptian origin.¹ A different opinion on this matter is expressed by Lagrange² who, speaking about the B text and its relation to Hesychius, disagrees with Soden in two points: First, that the recension of B text was made by Hesychius; secondly, that this recension includes all the texts, as they are indicated by Soden.

He tells us:

"Cette recension, d'après Soden qui lui donne à tort le nom d'Hesychienne (H) nous qui nous croyons comme lui originaire d'Égypte... nous insisterons pour la caractériser sur ses deux chefs, B et \aleph ".³

The fact that the \aleph and B text passed through a revision, - as Lagrange thinks positively it had - does not necessarily mean that this text lost its

¹ He includes: $\delta 1(B)$, $\delta 2(\aleph)$, $\delta 3(C)$, $\delta 6(\Psi)$, $\delta 48(33)$, $26(Z)$, $56(L)$, $76(\Delta)$, $1016(892)$, $\delta 371(1241)$, $376(579)$, and other textual fragments.

² Lagrange, P.M.J., Critique Textuelle II., La Critique Rationnelle, Paris, 1935.

³ Ibid., p.83. Save \aleph and B, Lagrange includes in this recension, called by him "B", a number of other manuscripts such as: W (for Luke I-VIII, 30), C, Ψ , Z, L, Δ ; some cursives; 33, 892, 579, 1241; some perchamints and the Egyptian versions.

superiority over the other texts, if the revision was based on valuable and authentic sources. And this is what Lagrange holds on this point.

He pays a high respect for the B text only because he believes that it came out of a recension made by the competent scholars of Alexandria; accepting that the purpose of such a recension was, as he explains it, "pour reconstruire la base plus ancienne".¹

Generally speaking, it is an unquestioned fact that modern criticism is moving along the line of rejecting Westcott and Hort's views according to which the Neutral text reflects a unrevised text, a text of original purity. Nowadays, it is a unanimous conviction that Codices \aleph and B are the products of a wise and intelligent revision made during the fourth century. As to whether the Egyptian bishop Hesychius is responsible for that revision or not, on this point the opinions differ.²

The division of opinions, however, is not limited on this matter only. The question arose whether the \aleph B text should be regarded as the most excellent one among the other texts. Some critics have no doubt about that;

1 Ibid., p.102.

2 Streeter inclines to believe that B represents the recension of Hesychius; (see Streeter, B.H., The Four Gospels; A study of origins; New York; The MacMillan Co., 1932, p.126); Lake, on the other hand hesitates to give a definite answer (see his article: "De Westcott et Hort au Pere Lagrange et au-dela", in Revue Biblique, Vol. XLVIII, 1939.

yet others tried to prove that the α B text contains a mixed material that reflects omissions, additions, as well as other kinds of influences from other manuscripts. The leader of this party of scholars is Hoskier who, after his research on Codex B, calls our attention to the fact that this manuscript became subject to influences by several versions of a different type of material.

"It seems time to call attention to the lack of basis for Hort's theory, because scholars and writers still speak of a "Neutral Text"... whereas the present writer knows of no such text.

There is ample ground for the opposite view that B had already been influenced by the Syriac and the Latin version, besides the peculiarities visible in the B text many of which are grammatical and some seemingly due to Egyptian surroundings."¹

II. Westcott and Hort do not link up their Neutral Text with any definite geographical locality; they insist, however, that this particular text enjoyed a universal prevalence in Egypt during the early Christian centuries. This subject brings us to our second question: What do we know about the history of the text in Egypt in those days?

In spite of Westcott and Hort's objections, a good number of critical scientists express the belief that the α and B texts came into being for the first

¹ Hoskier, C.H., Codex B and its Allies, London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914.

time in Egypt. Lagrange does not exactly agree on this point by telling us that the sources of \aleph are in effect Egyptian but that this MS. was written in Caesarea.¹

Lake, however, answers:

"all the arguments from history, criticism, paleography and orthography combine to give to the view that Codex \aleph is an Egyptian MS. of the fourth century a probability which cannot be approached by any other theory."²

There seems to be no serious doubt as to the textual relationship between these two manuscripts. Their texts reveal that a close and steady connection exists between them although Hoskier discovered that \aleph and B differ in 3,036 readings.

But Lagrange answers to that:

"En dépit de leurs nombreuses différences de détail Vaticanus and Sinaiticus sont vraiment les représentants d'une tradition."³

The writings of Clement of Alexandria were a source which offered new material in the discussion about the early Egyptian Text. This Church Father was the head of the second century Egyptian Church and the study of his textual quotations therefore would drive the textual scholars to more concrete conclusions.

Barnard,⁴ who accomplished first an efficient critical work on Clement's text passes to us the inform-

1 Op.Cit., p.92.

2 Op.Cit., Preface.

3 Op.Cit., p.101.

4 Barnard, "Clement of Alexandria's Biblical Text:"
T.S. Vol.5, Cambridge University Press., 1979.

ation that the material used by this Father has, without any doubt, a fundamentally "Western" character.

"...we have good grounds for treating the text used by Clement as a branch of the "Western" text....as a text really and geographically Western".¹

Is Clement's text rooted in the textual tradition of Egypt? Streeter answers, "No". He tries to explain this phenomenon in two ways: either that this Father, not being a native of Alexandria, had brought his Western text from Italy where he used it extensively; or, that this type of text was transported to Egypt by Roman Christians coming there on business.² These explanations might be accepted as reasonable, yet a number of scholars oppose these opinions by stating that Clement's Western text is a definite indication that this type of text was in circulation in Egypt at a very early date, an assertion that weakens the theory about the universality of the \aleph and B text in that particular land. Continues Barnard:³

"The strain of text represented in Greek MSS. by \aleph and B, can be traced in Egypt as far back as the middle of the third century, but Clement shews that even in Egypt the earliest evidence give it little support."⁴

1 Ibid., XIII

2 Op.Cit., p.57.

3 Op.Cit., p. XIX

4 Also a strong argumentative discussion is set forth on this matter by Kenyon, F., Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible; The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy., London: 1933.

Such clear-cut conclusions, however, regarding Clement's text, should be based upon undisputed facts and Lagrange¹ seems to be certain that there are no positive facts which could allow us to consider the text of this Alexandrian Father as belonging to the Western family. This critic presents to us a number of characteristic readings to prove that Clement agrees more often with B than with D.

"Que si on compare Clement avec D et avec B," he says, "il est evident qu'il est beaucoup plus proche de B."²

Yet the opinions of Barnard and Lagrange on Clement's text are not as sharply opposite as they seem to be. The nature of this Father's text is such that its classification to the Western or to the Neutral side is, I believe, subject to the personal standards of the man who studies it; the reason being that Clement's readings, although some times reveal a certain textual character, they mostly swing between the Neutral and the Western texts following an independent line. It is up to the critic's personal judgment and taste to determine to which textual area these independent readings are closer.

More light was shed on the History of the Text by the discovery of the fragmental papyri known by the

1 See his interesting article in; op.cit., pp.177 ff.

2 Op.Cit., p. 179.

name, "Chester Beatty Papyri". It is needful, I believe, to give here a brief history and description of these precious findings which are estimated as the most important ancient portion of the New Testament that is available in our days.

The Papyri were discovered at the Fayoum area in Egypt and became the property of Mr. Chester Beatty in 1930. The New Testament material is included in the papyri 45-46-47, all of them edited by Kenyon.¹ P 45 contains certain portions from the four Gospels² and the Acts. Of the 110 sheets which in all probability had composed this Codex, only 30 of them are available to the scientists.

In the third manuscript, P 46, we find several pieces from the Pauline Letters. Only 10 out of approximately 100 sheets are known. The same number of sheets contain portions from the Revelation, P 47. Since the date of these Papyri goes back to the third century, it is understood that their material has become a source of extreme importance for the study of the New Testament

1 Kenyon, G.F., The Chester Beatty Papyri; Descriptions and Texts, London, Emery Walker, 1933.

2 We cite here the Gospels material found in the P 45:
 Mt. XX, 24-32; XXI, 13-19; XXV, 41-XXVI, 3.6-10.19-33.
 Mc. IV, 36-40; V, 15-26.38-VI, 3.16-25.36-50; VII.3-15.
 25-VIII, 1 10-26.34-IX, 6.18-31; XI, 27-33; XII, 1.5-8.
 13-19.24-28.
 Luk. VI, 31-41.45-VII, 17; IX, 26-41.45-X, 1.6-22.26-XI,
 1.6-25.28-46.50-XII, 12.18-37.42-XIII, 1.6-24.29-XIV,
 10.17-33.
 Jo. X, 7-25.31-XI, 10, 18-36, 43-57, (taken from Lagrange).

text that circulated in Egypt around that era.

For the purpose of our thesis, it will be enough to focus our attention only to P⁴⁵ which includes the Gospels sections.

As to its Matthean text, P⁴⁵ presents a mixed material of B and D, with a stronger sympathy to D. Lagrange¹ holds that this text demonstrates a tendency for improvement similar to the latter Antiochian. In Luke and John, a clearer picture is given. Here the text of P⁴⁵ keeps, according to Kenyon, a closer alliance with B and L (that depends on B). The strongest characteristics, however, are exposed in the Markan quotations where the P⁴⁵ shows a preponderant affiliation with W (The Washington Manuscript) as a balancing number of D and B witnesses.

Scholars agree that P⁴⁵, as a whole in the four Gospels, betrays conspicuous attempts of a recension and a trend of its editors to make the text smoother. Vaganay,² suggests that in spite of such corrections the Chester Beatty Papyri is a good witness of the text circulating in Egypt around 230 A.D. when Origen started his revision of the New Testament.

Origen's name is tied up with the history and development of the Egyptian Text. The literary works

1 Op.Cit.,p.160.

2 Vaganay, Leon, Initiation critique textuelle néotestamentaire; Librairie Bloud Gay; pp.100-101.

of this Alexandrian Father show him to be not only a resourceful theologian but an excellent critical scholar as well.

Eusebius tells us¹ that Origen's first five books of his "Commentary of John" were written in Alexandria before his emigration to Caesarea, in 231 A.D. This piece of information is of much importance to the History of the Text because it enables the scholars to pin-point the character of the text that circulated in Egypt and Alexandria at that time. The study of the Markan text contained in Origen's first five books of the "Commentary of John" revealed that this text was drawn from the Neutral sources. A warm discussion however arose as to the character of the text that Origen used in his books written in Caesarea. Streeter believes that after his move to Caesarea this Father changed his textual sources and that he used a text which is "practically identical with the text of family θ ".² From this discovery, Streeter came to the conclusion that the θ text represents the old text of Caesarea which Origen found there. Is such really the case?

"Les maitres d'Harvard, answers Lagrange, avaient objecté a Streeter, que ce n'est pas a Cesarée qu' Origen a changé de texte en faveur de C."³

1 Hist. Eccl., VI.24,1.

2 Op.Cit., p.92. This type of text is figured by Lagrange as "C" and includes: W (in Mark); θ ; 565; Family 1; Family 13; 28; 700.

3 Op.Cit., p.166.

As regards the books XII-XXXII of the same work, it is true that Origen's text sides with Θ ; but, as we are informed, in these works his text rather swings between B and D, betraying the same character that we find in the text of P⁴⁵. This phenomenon makes Lagrange write:

" Il n'y a aucune raison de dire que C, (Streeter Θ) est Césaréen d'origine."¹

Kim² pointed out another mistake in Streeter's theory. In his methodical and detailed exposition of Origen's "Commentary of Matthew", he indicates that the text Origen used for this particular work is much closer to Codices 1 and 1582 than to Θ , or to any other authority.

" In the course of my study of the Gospel text of Origen," writes Kim, " I have discovered that Origen's text of Matthew, as used in his works completed in Caesarea, is remarkably close to the text of Codex 1 and 1582; 1582 is, in fact, a little closer to Origen."³

Lake first introduced the close relationship between Codices 1 and 1582 which are now included in the Caesarean Text. Kim emphasizes this relationship

1 Ibid. Lagrange accepts two possibilities: either that Origen had brought this type of text himself from Alexandria, or that he found it there. He leans to the second, objecting to the first with the argument that "si Origene avait apportait son manuscrit a lui parce qu'il y tenait, il s'en serait toujours servi", (p. 166.)

2 Kim, K.W., The Matthean Text of Origen in his Commentary on Matthew; unpublished Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1946.

3 "Codices 1582, 1739 and Origen " JBL, Vol. LXIX, Part II, June 1950, p. 167.

by expressing the opinion that Codex 1 is a copy of Codex 1582, the latter reflecting a scholarly recension based on Origen's text. So, as the facts prove, we must accept an intimate connection between Origen's Matthean text and Codex 1582.

We have, therefore, found so far that Streeter's thesis on the Origenian text requires a revision at least to the following two points: first, that Origen used a different text as soon as he arrived at Caesarea from Alexandria; secondly, that his gospels text in Caesarea is purely of the Θ type.¹

Coming back to our second major question, we might conclude that the text of P⁴⁵ bears a testimony that besides Westcott and Hort's Neutral text at least one other text of non-Neutral character existed in Egypt circa Origen's time.

Kenyon writes:²

"... it is not possible to maintain that Egypt had preserved an uncorrupted form of text of which B is a characteristic example. For the papyri of earlier date than B, fragmentary as they are, suffice to show that the B text did not prevail universally in Egypt".

The same story is told by two of the Coptic

1 It was found that Origen actually used the Θ type of text only in Mark. The character of the text in the other Gospels appears as follows: Matthew, 1 & 1582; Luke, $\Theta + \aleph B$; John, 1 & 1582 $\aleph B + \Theta$.

2 Kenyon, F., Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible; (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy); 1933, p.82.

versions -- the Sahidic¹ and the Boharic² -- which represent two translations made in Egypt around the third and fourth centuries. Langrange³ believes that these translations were made by two different men each one aiming to create a new work. The Sahidic, according to Hedley⁴, is the oldest Egyptian translation which might be dated in the second century. The text of this version appears somewhat a complicated one, but it generally reflects an admixture of Neutral and Western readings leaning toward the Western more often than the Boharic. This latter, on the other hand, contains a small number of Western readings following, rather closely, the line of the Neutral text.

The valuable evidence that comes out from the Coptic versions is their mixed text that strengthens the theory regarding the existence of a non-Neutral text in Egypt during the early Christian era.

2. The Western Text

Textual Criticism furnishes us with the following three conclusions which throw considerable light

1 Horner, W.G., The Coptic version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect Otherwise called Sahidic and Thebatic; Vol.I., Oxford, 1911.

2 Horner, W.G., The Coptic version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect Otherwise called Mamphitic and Boharic; Oxford, 1898.

3 Op.Cit., p. 319.

4 "The Egyptian Text of the Gospels and Acts;" CQR, CXVIII, 1934, pp.23-29, 116-239.

on the History of the Western type of Text:

- a. This text contains quite a few valuable old readings.

Says Vaganay:¹

"...le text 'occidental' bien que 'sauvage' ... il renferme encore tout un lot de variantes d'un type fruste et savoureux, depris precieux de l'original"

Even Westcott and Hort, who regard the Western Text much inferior to their "Neutral", do not deny the fact that in some particular instances this text offers more correct readings than B itself. According to these scholars' opinion, "the earliest readings which can be fixed chronologically belong to D".² They call these readings, "Non-Western interpolations"³ and give the explanation that in the case when the Western authorities present a reading shorter than its corresponding one found in the Neutral, we must prefer the Western reading as the older and the more accurate. This rule comes out of the strong tendency of the Western Text to add extraneous material for the sake of clearness or for other similar purposes.

- b. The Western Text was known all over the Christian world in the early Christian centuries.

1 Op.Cit., p. 101.

2 Westcott and Hort, op.cit. p. 120.

3 "...pour eviter d'admettre qu'elles étaient en fait des "interpolations" Neutral", (Lake, in his article; op.cit., p. 498).

This is a quite clear indication given by the literary works of the church fathers who lived in the second and third centuries.

"As far as we can judge from extant evidence", writes Westcott and Hort, "it was the most widely spread text of Anti-Nicene times; and sooner or later every version directly or indirectly felt its influence."¹

The Western type of text was circulating in almost every part of the ancient world being used by such Christian writers as Marcion, Irenaeus, Cyprion, Justin, Tertullian. It must, therefore, have been a text that enjoyed high respect among the Christian Churches of the past.

c. In spite of its universal acceptance, textual critics have found that this text should be regarded as a secondary one for the reason that it had suffered more extensive modifications and alterations than any other text.

On this point Westcott and Hort² have this to say:

"The chief and most important characteristic of the Western readings is a love to paraphrase. Words, clauses and even whole sentences were changed, omitted and inserted with astonishing freedom, wherever it seemed that the meaning would be brought out with greater force and definiteness."

1 Op.Cit., p.120.

2 Op.Cit., p.122.

It is a common belief that all of these changes were not the work of one reviser but of many and in different times. A well known explanation for these alterations is the carelessness on the part of the scribes who, for several reasons, failed in reproducing exact copies. In my opinion, however, the most important reason might be that the men who were responsible for the recensions of this text did their best to develop a text which, in their view, would express itself as explicit as possible. We must not forget the acute doctrinal disputes and controversies that rose during the early centuries; a factor which no doubt led these men to freely supplement and modify their text to fit best their doctrinal teachings. "Ce qu'ils voient dans le text", Vaganay¹ says, "c'est avant tout, l'expression de la doctrine vivante de l'église".

The origin of the Western Text has remained an enigma. A number of hypotheses were set forth but none of them has been unanimously accepted. In fact, it is not an easy work to pin-point a definite locality as the birth-place of a text such as the Western which is so old in age and so widely spread in usage. Westcott and Hort suggest that in a great extent it was originated in North-Western Syria or Asia Minor from where "it was

1 Op.Cit., p.84.

carried to Rome, and thence spread in different directions to North Africa and most of the countries of Europe."¹ Lagrange, on the other hand, accepts that the recension of this text took place in Egypt,

" Nous pensons que ce travail est né en Egypt, foyer des études critiques, profanes et sacrées."²

Codex Bezae (D), is introduced by many scholars as the best representative of the Western family. It is a manuscript of the fourth or fifth centuries written, in all probability, in the Western area of Europe. Hort and Lagrange indicate southern Gaul:

" ...le manuscrit D lui-meme," writes Lagrange,³ doit provenir d'un pays ou le latin était non seulement parle, mais dominant... Nous opinons donc le Sud de la Gaul."

A question of radical significance rose about the authorities that compose the Western Text. Westcott and Hort, treated this text as a unity made up by the Old Latin, the Syriac versions and the Codex D. In examining the internal character of these authorities' text, the above-mentioned scholars claim to have found sufficient indications for such a conclusion:

"...of the three great versions, which must date from the earliest centuries, two of their old or unrevised form must be classed as Western, the Latin clearly and almost entirely, the very, imperfectly preserved Syriac more obscurely."⁴

1 Op.Cit., p.108.
 2 Op.Cit., pp.32.42-43.
 3 Op.Cit., p.43.
 4 Op.Cit., p.127.

The unity of these texts, as members of the Western family, is more definitely acceptable by Lagrange, also:

" Nous avons reconnu" says he, "une unite parfaitement claire qui embrasse le manuscrit D, l'ancienne latine et l'ancienne syriaque ..."¹

Fresh approach to this subject, however, has led some notable critics to different persuasion.² Nowadays, it is believed that the Western Text is not a unity at all but three separate families each one representing a particular distinct text, namely: the Italian, the African, and the Syriac.

Kenyon writes:³

"So far as appearances at present go, they seem to point to the conclusion that the so-called Western type of text ought to be broken up into at least three local families, African, Italian and Syriac..."

This new way of facing the Western Text was brought up as a result of the more intensive study of the Codex Bobbiensis (k),⁴ and the discovery of the Syriac Sinaiticus version. Codex k, represents the African Latin text that Cyprian used. Lake⁵ connects it with Rome but he does not go very far in giving

1 Op.Cit., p.72.

2 See especially: Burkitt; op.cit., Introduction.

3 Op.Cit., p.80.

4 First being in Bobbio; now in Tourin. Edited by Burkitt and Turner in JTS. 1904, p.88 ff. II contains but: Mk.VIII, 8-11. 14-16; VIII, 19-XVI, 8; Matt.I, 1-III, 10; IV, 2-XIV, 17; XV, 20-36.

5 In his mentioned article; RB., pp.501-502.

specific indications about its text because, as he explains, the matter has not been fully clarified. He makes, however, the remark that, "le grec qui est a la base de l'Africaine latine n'est pas le meme que le grec sur lequel repose l'Ancienne Syriacque," and he adds:¹

" Les motives de supposer que le Veille Latine l'Ancienne Syriacque et le Codex Bezae representent un text commun...se sont evanouis."

Syriac Sinaiticus, is a palimpsest version discovered by Mrs. Lewis and Gibson in the library of St. Catherine's monastery in 1892. The exact birth-place and date of this version are not known. Lake makes the suggestion that it was originated in Edessa during the second century.²

Burkitt, who first explored the type of its text tells us that we could not classify it in the Western category. The textual morphology of Sy.^s differs a good deal from the Western characteristics, the most conspicuous of which are the long interpolations. According to Burkitt, such inserted material is not found in the Ancient Syriac versions which, on the contrary

1 Op.Cit., p.500.

2 Syriac Sinaiticus and Syriac Cureton (Sy^c), have both preserved the text of the Gospels. Sy^c is a fifth century version discovered in 1842 in a monastery in Egypt. Its characteristic name was given after W. Cureton who published it for the first time, in 1858.

present long omissions, especially in the Sy^s. Lake who accepts Burkitt's views on this matter has to say this:¹

" Manifestement ces deux texts (the Old Latin, of the African type and the Old Syriac), n'ont pas la même origine, ou s'ils l'avaient, ils sont devie tres considerablement de leur archetype."

We could summarize the facts regarding the Western Text thus:

Westcott and Hort were not right in ascribing to this type of text the lowest estimation. Intensive studies, on both old and new material, lead us to the conclusion that the Western family should hold a higher consideration as offering more precious material than it was believed for the reconstruction of the original text of the New Testament.

The question on the text-members of the Western family, on the other hand, should be re-examined on the basis of the conclusions reached by latter scholars. Such a work would better illuminate the History of the Text and give to the Western Text its proper position in modern Textual Criticism.

1 In his article; op.cit., p.501.

3. The Caesarean Text

This is the third type of text found in the Markan quotations included in the works of Origen and Eusebius. The first suggestion about the discovery of this new type of text was made by Griesbach in 1811. He indicated that Origen, beginning with his XI book of the Commentary on John, quit the Neutral text, which he had used in the previous books of the same Commentary, to apply a different type of text. Later studies on this matter verified Griesbach's views and revealed the fact that Origen's new text runs very closely with Codex 1, a conclusion which created Lake's edition, "Codex 1 and its Allies"¹: (118-131-209). Little by little, this new text was emerging in a larger and more concrete shape embracing a number of other good manuscripts, such as: Codices 565, 28, 700, 1582, the Ferrar Group,²: (13-69-124-346-543), Codex 0, the Markan Text of W and the Armenian and Georgian versions.

Origen's shift to that new type of text, which is the same used also by Eusebius, raised the question whether this change was due to the move of Origen to his new home in Caesarea, as Streeter believes, or it actually is a change in the character of the text that Origen was using, as Griesbach explains.

1 Lake, K., TS, Vol. VII., Cambridge, 1902.

2 Lake, K., Family 13 (The Ferrar Group, SD, London, 1941).

A number of scholars, among which Lake, Blake, New, think that Streeter's theory, on this point, is not strong enough for the contention that Origen continued using his Neutral text up to the book X of the Commentary on John, that is, after his residence in Caesarea. Not only that the above-mentioned scholars set forth an hypothesis which is diametrically opposite to Streeter's, i.e., that the Caesarean Text existed in Alexandria and that Origen used it not because he found it in Caesarea but because he brought it from Alexandria. This hypothesis is based on the analysis they made on the Origenian text of Mark. They are very careful, however, to emphasize that this view applies only to the Markan text while the situation in the other Gospels may be different.¹

No matter which type of textual sources Origen brought to his new city, I personally am inclined to believe that when he left Alexandria, this great scholar must have had with him his text, since it is not understandable how a man like Origen, whose life was wholly devoted to textual criticism would leave Alexandria without taking with him his textual sources. While he was still in Alexandria and before his moving to Caesarea, Origen had started working on the Commentary on John and,

1 See the series of their argumentation in: Lake, K., Blake, R., New, S., "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark," HTR, Vol. XXI., October 1926.

therefore, was aware of the fact that he was going to continue writing his Commentary at his new residence. It seems to me unbelievable that with such intention he did not care to carry with him his own text of the Scriptures.

On the history of the origin of the Caesarean Text, scholars give us the following three possibilities:¹

1. That the "Western Text" as the most primitive of all was absorbed by three different local texts: namely, by the Latin European in Italy, by the Caesarean type in Caesarea, and by the Neutral type in Alexandria.

2. That in its first steps, the Caesarean text was an attempt toward an harmonization which resulted in the free form of the Western Text.

3. That the Caesarean Text is based on the two oldest sources — the Neutral and the Western — not in the sense of a compromise between these two texts but that both of them took a considerable part in its formation. This last suggestion is offered by Lagrange.

Soden did not recognize the independent existence of the Caesarean text, having included most of the

¹ Lagrange, *op.cit.*, pp.268 ff.

Caesarean authorities in his I textual family.¹ Yet, the positive results which have been obtained on this matter by competent scholars have established the fact that Soden is wrong and that the Caesarean type of text is as real as its rivals, the Neutral and the Western.

Elaborating further on the subject, Streeter, not only approves Lake's conclusions but also broadens the basis of the Caesarean Text by adding to it other authorities such as, 1424 and 544.²

There is not any doubt that, in the near future, a more intensive study on the Caesarean text as well as the discovery of new textual material will answer many questions about the history of this particular text, which seems to demand a significant place in Textual Criticism.

-
- 1 As it is known, Hermann von Soden introduced in the field of Textual Criticism a revolutionary method not only for changing the traditional symbols of the textual authorities but mainly because he applied a new classification of all known textual witnesses. This scholar divided all the authorities into three major texts: a. The I (Jerusalem) text, b. The H (Hesychian) text, c. the K (Koine) text; which roughly correspond to the Western-Caesarean type, the Egyptian type and the Byzantine type, respectively. (See: Soden, H., op.cit.).
- 2 Streeter, H.B., op.cit. pp.79-109 and especially pp. 572-578. However, the close relationship between these two witnesses and their classification to a common textual family was first pointed out by Soden who made the mistake of considering them as belonging to his I text.

SPECIFIC INTRODUCTION

Among the four textual sources for the textual criticism of the Greek New Testament, patristic quotations appear to be the most enigmatic one. This branch of textual study enables us to find out the birthplace of a certain type of text or texts and also the chronological period in which these texts were in use.

Nevertheless, any critical student who deals with this particular textual witness should not ignore the fact that, before using effectively a patristic quotation, he has to answer first a number of questions:

1. Is the quotation an authentic one?

This question demands great attention on the part of the critic for the reason that scribes in the past changed the original form of the Scriptural quotations of the ecclesiastical Fathers. These changes were made by the scribes either intentionally, by substituting the original Patristic Text with an unfamiliar one, or unintentionally by writing cited patristic verses from memory.

2. If the quotation is authentic, is it also literal and trustworthy?

This question has to do with the author's transcription from his New Testament text. Being primarily con-

cerned to express the "spirit" rather than the "letter" of the quotations used, the authors neglected sometimes to copy faithfully the true text either by writing from memory or by amalgamating parallel gospel verses found in two or more Gospels.

Here I give an example:

Ὅστις βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν / οὔτε ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

The first part of the passage is taken from Mark 3:29, while the other half is the corresponding part found in the passage of Matthew 12:32.

3. Is any part of the quotation taken from
Lectionaries?

By Lectionaries, we mean the extensive sections taken out from the Gospels or the Epistles, which compose special servicebooks used by the church in her public worship. Such collections are better known as **Εὐαγγέλιον** , for those made up from the Gospels, or **Ἀπόστολος** , for those sections taken from the Epistles.

I present here two examples to show the character of this kind of material which was added in several Athanasian quotations:

At the end of the passage in Matthew 10:41, there is the addition: Ἐξαριθμήσομαι αὐτοὺς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄμμον θαλάσσης πληθυνθήσονται.

a lectionary blessing taken from the book of the Psalms. Also, at the end of John 2:14 the addition " ἡμνοῦμεν σε, εὐλογοῦμεν σε, δοξολογοῦμεν σε " is found, a very familiar doxology which has survived up to our days in the liturgical manuals of the Greek Orthodox Church.

It is, therefore, obvious that according to the above three rules, textual students should make the necessary deductions before accepting a patristic quotation as being a part of the genuine patristic text. Here we might say that the work a textual critic does is very similar to that of an archeologist who has first to remove carefully all the dust and foreign bodies accumulated on the relics he has dug out in order to restore their original appearance. On the part of the textual critic, this task is laborious and a delicate one; yet, if it is done successfully, it pays well because, as Lake ¹ says, "after making every allowance of these factors the value of Patristic quotations remains as great as that of MSS. or versions."

To secure the most efficient results of this work, I adopted Burgson's suggestion made for this sort of critical study:

" The exact collation of documents whether ancient or modern with the received text, is the necessary foundation of all scientific criticism" ²

1 Lake Kirsop; The Text of the New Testament, London, Rivingstons, 1949, p.50.

2 Revision Revised. pp. XXIV-V

1. I started by collecting every Gospel quotation found in Athanasius' printed writings as they are included in Migne's Patrology¹ which is the most complete and available patristic source at our disposal. It is, of course, unfortunate that the present textual research is not based on the new edition known as "The Berlin Edition;"² nevertheless, I used the part of this work which is available at present and checked with Migne.

2. All the textual quotations collected for the purpose of this study belong to Athanasius' works which are generally accepted as genuine ones. A list of these works is found in page 45-48 and it was composed according to the sources cited in footnote, in page 45.

3. I put aside all those readings which, although they appear as singular are actually but changes deliberately made by the author or the scribes in order to avoid any discord in connection with the literary mood of their context. Such changes are found especially at the opening words of the quotations where the author adds or omits one or more words, mostly conjunctions, belonging to the body of the quotations so that the literary harmony of

1 Migne, J.P. Patrologiae, Series Graeca, Vol. 25-28

2 Opitz, Hans-Georg; Athanasius Werke, (Kirchenvater-Kommission der Academie der Wissenschaften;) Walter de Cruyter & Co. Berlin und Leipzig, 1935.

the whole text may be secured.

4. As I already mentioned, quite a few quotations are amalgamated with their corresponding readings of the other Gospels. These quotations or readings were collected and isolated.

5. The lectionary material found in some of the selected quotations was also separated. These additional readings were discovered especially at the end of a number of passages.

6. In the process of my work, I did not disregard the stormy theological controversy which was raised in Athanasius' day. Any critic who deals with the ecclesiastical Fathers prior to Athanasius may not consider this factor as an important one. But if we get acquainted with Historical Theology and the significant development the Christian dogma marked in Athanasius' time, we could accept the fact that the dispute known as "The Arian Controversy" might influence this Father's text, at least those passages which bear strict dogmatic meaning.

Hort,¹ writes on this matter:

"It is true that dogmatic preferences to a great extent determined theologians, and probably scribes in their choice between the rival readings already in existence; scientific criticism was virtually unknown, and in its absence the temptation was strong to believe and assert that a reading used by theological opponents had also been invented by them."

¹ Westcott, B.F., Hort, J.F. The New Testament in the Original Greek: New York, Harper and Brothers, Vol. II, 1882.

Here I give two examples which, I think, support this point:

In Mark 1:24 where the passage "Σύ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ" is found, Athanasius' quotation adds, "καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ" a reading with a singular character. Whoever is responsible for this particular addition, his intention was to emphasize more specifically the unique Sonship of Christ, a doctrinal view which is bitterly attacked by Arius.

Also, in Matthew 5:34, the commonly accepted passage — "μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ "

— is modified by the reading, "ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος"

It is clear that in this particular case, the corrector of the passage intended to support the dogma of the Divine nature of Christ by presenting Him as saying that Heaven is His throne while the clear meaning of the accepted reading is that Heaven is God's throne.

In Athanasius' epistle, "Πρὸς Σεραπίωνα " there is a clear suggestion which verifies the tendency of the theological parties to change the text of the Patristic writings.

Athanasius writes:

"....for the majority of men do not consider the faith or the aim of the writer, but either through envy or a spirit of contention, receive what is written as themselves choose according to an opinion which they have previously formed and

and alter it to suit their pleasure." 1

After taking into account the above numbered pre-suppositions, I started collating Athanasius' quotations taken from the Gospels with the "Textus Receptus",² and classified the supporting witnesses. In this stage of my work, I used the critical apparata of Legg,³ Tischendorf,⁴ and Soden.⁵ For more accuracy I checked separately the supporting witnesses of every single variant with the following sources: Codex B; Codex D; The Coridethi Evangelien; Family 1; Codex L; Codex C; Codex Z; Family 13; Manuscript W; Codex Evangelium 604; Sy^c; 892; 22; 28; N; Q; 543; 1241; P⁴⁵; 33; Sy^{s.c}

1

Οἱ γὰρ πολλοὶ οὐ τὴν πίστιν οὐδὲ τὸν σκοπὸν τοῦ γραψαντος σκοποῦσιν, ἀλλ' ἢ διὰ φόβον ἢ δι' ἔριν ἢ προ-ελήθησαν κατὰ διάνοιαν δοξῆς, ὡς εἰάν θελήσωσιν αὐτοὶ δέχονται καὶ μεταποιοῦσι τὰ γραφέντα κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἡδονήν.

- 2 Scrivener, F.H., Novum Testamentum, Textus Stephanici, A.D. 1550.
- 3 Legg, S.C.E., Novum Testamentum Graece, Evangelium Secundum, Matthaeum E Typographeo Clarendoniano, Oxinii, 1940.
Novum Testamentum Graece, Evangelium Secundum Marcum, E Typographeo Clarendoniano Oxinii, 1940.
- 4 Tischendorf, C., Novum Testamentum Graece; Lipsiae, Giesecke und Devrient, 1869; Vol. I.
- 5 Soden, von Hermann, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments; Text und Apparat, Gottingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1913.

The quotations of Athanasius from the gospel of

1. MATTHEW

Chapter 1

1. Βιβλος γεννεσεως Ιησου Χριστου υιου Δαυιδ υιου Αβρααμ (26,1109)
23. Ιδου η παρθενος εν γαστρι εξει και τεξεται υιον και καλεσουσι το ονομα αυτου Εμμανουηλ ο εστι μεθερμηνευομενον Μεθ υμων ο Θεος (26,388. 26,125. 26,1065.25,153)
25. Εως ου ετεκε τον υιον αυτης τον πρωτοτοκον (26,1128 . 26,1157)

Chapter 2

2. Ειδομεν γαρ αυτου τον αστερα εν τη ανατολη (27,1364)
13. Εγερθεις παραλαβε το παιδιον και την μητερα αυτου και φευγε εις Αιγυπτον (25,660. 27,1365)

Chapter 3

- *
4. Η δε τροφη ην ακριδες και μελι αγριον (27,1365)¹
- *
9. Εγειρον τεκνα τω Αβρααμ εκ των λιθων τουτων (27,1157)
- *
11. Αυτος υμας βαπτισει εν πνευματι αγιω (27,1365)
αγιω] αγιω και πυρι (26,1009)

1 An asterisk accompanies every quotation that contains one or more readings which differ from their corresponding ones found in " Textus Receptus "; the quotations without an asterisk are similar to " Textus Receptus "

The first number in parenthesis shows the series number of Migne's volume; the second one indicates the page.

17. Ουτος εστιν ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος (25,481. 26,280)
 26,448. 26,509. 26,520. 26,753. 27,137. 27,152)
 *
 17. Ουτος εστιν ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος εν ω ηυδοκησα
 (25,444. 26,196. 26,461. 26,625)

Chapter 4

- *
 1. Τότε ο Ιησους ανηχθη υπο του Πνευματος εις την ερη-
 μον (26,537)
 3. Ει υιος ει του Θεου (26,301. 27,1368)
 7. Ουκ εκπειρασεις Κυριον τον Θεον σου (26,1016. 25,667)
 *
 10. Υπαγε οπισω μου Σατανα γεγραπται γαρ Κυριον τον Θεον
 σου προσκυνησεις και αυτω μονω λατρευσεις (25,544.)
 26,293. 26,897)
 11. Οι αγγελοι διηκονουν αυτω (26,560)
] διηκονουν αυτω οι αγγελοι (26,780)
 23. Διδασκων εν ταις συναγωγαις αυτων (27,1368)

Chapter 5

3. Μακαριοι οι πτωχοι τω πνευματι (26,285. 27,286. 27,
 453)
 5. Μακαριοι οι πενθουντες οτι αυτοι παρακληθησονται
 (26,1308)
 6. Μακαριοι οι πεινωντες και διψωντες την δικαιοσυνην
 (27,1201. 27,1368)
 7. Μακαριοι οι ελεημονες οτι αυτοι ελεηθησονται (27,809)
 8. Μακαριοι οι καθαροι τη καρδια οτι αυτοι τον Θεον

οφονται (25,8. 26,284. 27,1368)

οτι αυτοι τον Θεον] οτι τον Θεον (27,477)

10. Μακαριοι οι δεδιωγμενοι ενεκεν δικαιοσυνης (25,568)

11. Μακαριοι εστε οταν ονειδισωσιν υμας και διωξωσιν
(27,809)

13. Υμεις εστε το αλας της γης (27,452)

14. Υμεις εστε το φως του κοσμου (27,348. 27,1368)

16^a Ουτως λαμψατω το φως υμων εμπροσθεν των ανθρωπων
(27,1268)

16^b* Οπως ιδωσι τα καλα εργα υμων και δοξασωσι τον πατε-
ρα υμων (27,152)

*
28. Ο εμβλεψας γυναικα προς το επιθυμησαι αυτης ηδη
εμοιχευσεν αυτην εν τη καρδια αυτου (27,1369)

29. Ει δε ο οφθαλμος σου ο δεξιος σκανδαλιζει σε εξελε
αυτον και βαλε απο σου (27,1369)

*
48. Εσεσθε τελειοι ως ο πατηρ υμων ο ουρανιος τελειος
εστιν (26,361)

εσεσθε] γινεσθε (26,1041)

Chapter 6

*
1. Προσεχετε δε την ελεημοσυνην υμων μη ποιειν εμπροσθεν
των ανθρωπων προς το θεαθηναι αυτοις ει δε μη γε
μισθον ουκ εχετε παρα τω πατρι υμων τω εν τοις ου-
ρανοις (27,1369)

*
6. Συ δε οταν προσευχη εισελθε εις το ταμειον σου και
αποκλεισον τας θυρας (25,616)

7. Προσευχομενοι δε μη βαττολογησητε (27,1372)
*
8. Οιδεν ο Θεος ων χρειαν εχετε προ του υμας αιτησαι αυτον (27,1357)
*
9. Οταν δε προσευχεσθε λεγετε Πατερ ημων ο εν τοις ουρανοις (26,81)
9. Πατερ ημων ο εν τοις ουρανοις (25,473. 26,81. 26,996 27,152. 27,1029. 27,1277)
10. Ελθετω η βασιλεια σου (27,129)
11. Τον αρτον ημων τον επιουσιον δος ημιν σημερον (26,1012)
13. Μη εισενεγκης ημας εις πειρασμον αλλα ρυσαι υμας απο του πονηρου (27,1029)
*
19. Μη θησαυριζετε υμιν θησαυρους επι της γης οπου σης και βρωσις αφανιζει και οπου κλεπται διορυσσουσι και κλεπτουσι
*
20. Θησαυριζετε δε υμιν θησαυρους εν ουρανοις οπου σης και βρωσις ουκ αφανιζει και οπου κλεπται ου διορυσσουσιν ουδε κλεπτουσιν (27,1373)
*
22. Ο λυχνος του σωματος σου εστιν ο οφθαλμος σου Ει ο οφθαλμος σου απλους εστιν ολον το σωμα σου φωτεινον εσται εαν δε ο οφθαλμος σου πονηρος εστιν ολον το σωμα σου σκοτεινον εσται (27,1373)
*
25. Μη μεριμνατε τη ψυχη υμων τι φαγητε μηδε τω σωματι υμων τι ενδυσησθε ουχι η ψυχη πλειον εστι της τροφης
*
26. και το σωμα του ενδυματος Εμβλεψατε εις τα πετεινα του ουρανου οτι ου σπειρουσιν ουδε θεριζουσιν ουδε

- * συναγουσιν εις τας αποθηκας και ο Πατηρ υμων ο ουρα-
 27. νιος τρεφει αυτα ουχ υμεις μαλλον διαφερετε αυτων Τις
 * δε εξ υμων μεριμνων δυναται προσθειναι επι την ηλι-
 28. κιαν αυτου πηχυν ενα Και περι ενδυματος τι μεριμνα-
 * τε καταμαθετε τα κρινα του αγρου πως αυξανουσιν ου
 29. κοπιωσιν ουδε νηθουσι Λεγω δε υμιν οτι ουδε ο Σολο-
 * μων εν παση τη δοξη αυτου περιεβαλετο ως εν τουτων
 30. Ει δε τον χορτον του αγρου σημερον οντα και αυριον
 εις κλιβανον βαλλομενον ο Θεος ουτως αμφιεννυσιν
 ου πολλω μαλλον υμας ολιγοπιστοι (26,200)
 *
 31. Μη μεριμνησητε τι φαγητε η τι πιητε η τι ενδυσησθε
 * (27,253)
 *
 34. Μη μεριμνησητε περι της αυριον(26,843)

Chapter 7

- *
 1. Μη κρινετε και ου μη κριθητε εν ω γαρ κριματι κρινε-
 *
 2. τε κριθησεσθε και εν ω μετρω μετρειτε αντιμετριθησε-
 *
 2. τα υμιν(27,1376. 27,1377)
 *
 2. Εν ω γαρ κριματι κρινετε κριθησεσθε και εν ω μετρω
 *
 μετρειτε αντιμετριθησεται υμιν(26,1376)
 *
 3. Τι δε βλεπεις το καρφος το εν τω οφθαλμω του αδελφου
 σου την δε δοκον την εν τω οφθαλμω σου ου κατανοεις
 *
 4. Η πως λεγεις τω αδελφω σου αφες εκβαλω το καρφος εκ
 *
 5. του οφθαλμου σου Υποκριτα εκβαλε πρωτον εκ του οφθαλ-
 μου σου την δοκον και τοτε διαβλεψεις εκβαλειν το
 καρφος εκ του οφθαλμου του αδελφου σου (27,1377)

- *
6. Μη δοτε τα αγια τοις κυσιν μηδε βαλητε τους μαργαρι-
τας υμων εμπροσθεν των χοιρων μηποτε καταπατησωσιν
αυτους τοις ποσιν αυτων και στραφεντες ρηξωσιν υμας
(25,268. 27,380)
7. Αιτειτε και δοθησεται υμιν (3,1184. 27,1205)
11. Ει ουν υμεις πονηροι οντες οιδατε δοματα αγαθα δι-
δοναι τοις τεκνοις υμων ποσω μαλλον ο Πατηρ υμων ο
εν τοις ουρανοις δοσει αγαθα τοις αιτουσιν αυτον
(26,1011)
- *
15. Προσεχετε απο των ψευδοπροφητων οιτινες ερχονται προς
υμας εν ενδυμασι προβατων εσωθεν δε εισι λυκοι αρπαγες
(25,544)
- ενδυμασι προβατων] ενδυμασι προβατου (26,1253)
εσωθεν] ενδοθεν (26,1253)
- *
22. Κυριε ου τω σω ονοματι δαιμονια εξεβαλομεν και τω σω
ονοματι δυναμεις πολλας εποιησαμεν (26,900)
38. Ποταμοι εκ της κοιλιας αυτου ρευσουσιν υδατος ζωντος
(27,408)

Chapter 8

2. Κυριε εαν θελης δυνασαι με καθαρισαι (26,1076)
3. Θελω καθαρισθητι και ευθεως εκαθαρισθη (27,208)
- θελω] λεγω (27,565)
- 26^α Κυριε σωσον ημας απολλυμεθα (27,1129)
- 26^β Και εγενετο γαληνη μεγαλη (27,1129)

- *
31. Ηλθες ωδε προ καιρου απολεσαι ημας (27,912)
ηλθες ωδε] ηλθες (27,284)
απολεσαι] βασανισαι (27,577)

Chapter 9

- *
2. Αφρωνται σου αι αμαρτιαι (26,409. 26,781)
*
15. Οταν απαρθη απ αυτων ο νυμφιος τοτε νηστεουσιν εν
εκειναις ταις ημεραις (26,1292)

Chapter 10

- *
8. Ασθενουντας θεραπευετε δαιμονας εκβαλλετε δωρεαν ελα-
βετε δωρεαν δοτε (26,960)
19* Οταν παραδωσουσιν υμας εις συνεδρια μη μεριμνησητε πως
η τι λαλησητε δοθησεται γαρ υμιν εν εκεινη τη ωρα τι
20. λαλησητε Ου γαρ υμεις εστε οι λαλουντες αλλα το πνευ-
μα του Πατρος υμων το λαλουν εν υμιν
(26,541. 26,544. 26,1008. 27,296)
*
23. Εαν υμας διωκωσιν εις τηνδε την πολιν φυγετε εις την
ετεραν (25,232)
εαν υμας] οταν δε (25,657)
εις τηνδε την πολιν] εν τη πολει ταυτη (25,657)
*
25. Ει τον οικοδεσποτην Βεελζεβουλ επεκαλεσαν (26,664)
*
28. Μη φοβηθητε απο των αποκτεινοντων το σωμα την δε ψυ-
χην αποκτειναι μη δυναμενων φοβηθητε δε μαλλον τον
δυναμενον και ψυχην και σωμα απολεσαι εις γεεννην
(27,505)

28. Μη φοβηθείτε απο των αποκεινοντων το σωμα την δε ψυ-
 χην μη δυναμενων αποκτειναι (26,1144)
- *
 29. Ουχι δυο στρουθια ασσαριου πωλειται και εν εξ αυτων
 ου πεσειται επι την γην ανευ του Πατρος υμων του εν
 τοις ουρανοις (26,200)
- *
 38. Ος ουκ αιρει τον σταυρον και ακολουθει μοι ουκ εστι
 μου αξιος (27,1381)
- *
 40. Ο δεχομενος με δεχεται τον αποστειλαντα με (26,312)
 ο δεχομενος με] ο εμε δεχομενος (26,492)

Chapter 11

25. Εξομολογουμαι σοι Πατερ Κυριε του ουρανου και της γης
 (26,253. 25,13)
- 27^α Παντα μοι παρεδοθη υπο του Πατρος μου (26,400. 25,13)
- *
 27^β Επιγιωσκει τον Πατερα ει μη ο υιος και ω αν ο υιος
 αποκαλυψη (25,576. 26,93. 26,1005)
 επιγιωσκει] γιωσκει (26,194. 26,501. 25,209)
 αποκαλυψη] αποκαλυφαι (25,209. 26,995)
28. Δευτε προς με παντες οι κοπιωντες και πεφορτισμενοι
 καγω αναπαυσω υμας (25,212. 26,144. 26,676. 26,1277
 27,1201. 27,1396)
29. Αρατε τον ζυγον μου εφ υμας και μαθετε απ εμου οτι
 πραυς ειμι και ταπεινος τη καρδια και ευρησετε ανα-
 παυσιν ταις ψυχαις υμων (27,21. 27,25)
 πραυς] πραος (26,365. 27,1381)

- *
30. Ο γαρ ζυγος μου χρηστος και το φορτιον μου ελαφρον
(26,365. 27,1381)

Chapter 12

- *
24. Ουτος ουκ εκβαλλει τα δαιμονια ει μη εν Βεελζεβουλ
τω αρχοντι των δαιμονιων ο δε Κυριος ειδως τας ενθυ-
25. μησεις αυτων ειπεν αυτοις Πασα βασιλεια μερισθεισα
καθ εαυτην ερημουται (26,650)
28. Η δε του Πνευματος βλασφημια (26,649. 26,664)
*
31. Πασα αμαρτια και βλασφημια αφεθησεται υμιν τοις ανθρω-
*
32. ποις ος δ αν ειπη κατα του Πνευματος αγιου ουκ αφεθη-
σεται αυτω ουτε εν τω αιωνι τουτω ουτε εν τω μελλοντι
(26,650)
αγιου Ι του αγιου (26,637. 26,649)
*
40. Καθως γαρ ην Ιωνας εν τη κοιλια του κοιτους τρεις ημε-
ρας και τρεις νυκτας ουτως εσται και ο Υιος του ανθρω-
που εν τη καρδια της γης (26,369)

Chapter 13

16. Υμων δε μακαριοι οι οφθαλμοι οτι βλεπουσι (27,453)
35. Ανοιξω εν παραβολαις το στομα μου (27,349)
41. Αποστελει ο Υιος του ανθρωπου τους αγγελους αυτου
(26,560)
43. Τοτε οι δικαιοι εκλαμψουσιν ως ο ηλιος εν τη βασιλεια
του Πατρος αυτων (26,1009. 27,177)
47. Ομοια εστιν η βασιλεια των ουρανων σαγηνη (27,65)

49. Εξελευσονται οι αγγελοι (26,560)
 51. Συνηκατε ταυτα παντα (27,224)
 54. Ποθεν τουτω η σοφια αυτη (26,664)
 55. Ουχ ουτος εστιν ο του τεκτονος υιος (26,116. 26,659)
 26,660. 27,1116)

Chapter 14

33. Αληθως υιος Θεου ει (27,385)

Chapter 15

- 4.* Τιμα τον πατερα σου και την μητερα σου (25,645)
 13. Πασα φυτεια ην ουκ εφυτευσεν ο Πατηρ μου ο ουρανιος
 εκριζωθησεται (26,752. 26,1032)
 26. Ου καλον εστιν λαβειν τον αρτον των τεκνων και βαλειν
 τοις κυναριοις (27,136)

Chapter 16

13. Τινα με λεγουσιν οι ανθρωποι ειναι (26,404)
 16. Συ ει ο Χριστος ο Υιος του Θεου του ζωντος
 (25,492. 26,184. 26,279. 26,301. 26,621. 27,385)
 18^α Συ ει Πετρος και επι ταυτη τη πετρα οικοδομησω μου την
 εκκλησιαν (27,1236)
 18^β Και πυλαι αδου ου κατισχυσουσιν αυτης (27,1049. 27,1192
 27,1224)
 24. Ει τις θελει οπισω μου ελθειν (25,732. 25,773)

Chapter 17

5. Ουτος εστιν ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος (25,573. 26,33)
26,44. 26,213. 27,1032. 27,1117. 27,1173)
17. Κυριε ελεησον μου τον υιον οτι σεληνιαζεται και κακως
πασχει (27,1388)
19. Εαν εχητε πιστιν ως κοκκον σιναπεως ερειτε τω ορει
τουτω μεταβηθι εντευθεν (26,959)

Chapter 18

3. Εαν μη στραφητε και γενησθε ως τα παιδια ου μη εισελ-
θητε εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων (27,520. 27,1396)
- *
6. Ο ενα των μικρων σκανδαλιζων ελοιτ αν μυλον ονικον
περι τον τραχηλον αυτου κρεμασθηναι και καταποντισθη-
ναι (25,525)

Chapter 19

- *
4. Ουκ ανεγνωτε οτι απ αρχης ο κτισας αρσεν και θηλυ εποι-
ησεν αυτους και ειπεν ενεκεν τουτου καταλειπει ο ανθρω-
πος τον πατερα και την μητερα αυτου και προσκολληθησε-
ται τη γυναικι αυτου και εσονται οι δυο εις σαρκα μιαν
6. ο ουν ο θεος συνεζευξεν ανθρωπος μη χωριζετω (25,99)
ο κτισας] ο κτισας αυτους (26,268)
ο ουν] α ουν (25,665)
συνεζευξεν] εζευξεν (25,666)
- *
21. Ει θελεις τελειος ειναι υπαγε πωλησον παντα τα υπαρχον-
τα σοι καιδος πτωχοις και δευρο ακολουθει μοι και
εξεις θησαυρον εν ουρανοις (26,841)

Chapter 19

27. Ιδου ημεις αφηκαμεν παντα και ηκολουθησαμεν σοι
(25,692. 27,320)
28. Επι δωδεκα θρονους κρινοντες τας δωδεκα φυλας του Ισ-
ραηλ (27,217 . 25,441)

Chapter 20

28. Ο υιος του ανθρωπου ουκ ηλθεν διακονηθηναι αλλα διακο-
νησαι (27,461)
- *
32. Τι θελετε ινα ποιησω υμιν (26,404)

Chapter 21

6. Πορευθεντες δε οι μαθηται εποιησαν καθως συνεταξεν
αυτοις και ηγαγον την ονον και τον παλον και επεθηκαν
επανω αυτων τα ιματια και επεθηκαν τον Ιησουν (26,1312)
- *
38. Δευτε αποκτεινωμεν αυτον (27,253)
- *
43. Οτι αρθησεται αφ υμων η βασιλεια του Θεου (27,549)

Chapter 22

16. Διδασκαλε (27,261)
- *
16. Οιδαμεν οτι την αληθειαν διδασκεις και οτι ου λαμβανεις
προσωπον ανθρωπου(27,173)
29. Πλανασθε μη ειδοτες τας γραφας μηδε την δυναμιν του
Θεου (26,121. 25,560. 26,1177)
- *
30. Εν γαρ τη αναστασει ουτε γαμουσιν ουτε γαμιζονται αλλ
εισι ως αγγελοι (26,293)

Chapter 23

13. Ουαι υμιν Γραμματεις και Φαρισαιοι (27,65)
 *
 37. Ποσακις ηθελησα επισυναγαγειν τα τεκνα σου ον τροπον
 ορνις επισυναγει τα νοσσια αυτης υπο τας πτερυγας
 (27,257. 27,172)

Chapter 24

3. Ειπε ημιν ποτε ταυτα εσται και τι το σημειον της σης
 παρουσιας (26,124)
 *
 15. Οταν ουν ιδητε το βδελυγμα της ερημωσεως το ρηθεν δια
 Δανιηλ του προφητου εστωσ εν τοπω αγιω ο αναγινωσκων
 16* νοητω τοτε οι εν τη Ιουδαια φυγετωσαν επι τα ορη ο
 *
 17. επι του δαματος μη καταβατω αραι τα εκ της οικιας αυ-
 *
 18. του και ο εν τω αγρω μη υποστρεψατω οπισω αραι τα ιμα-
 τισ αυτου (25,657)
 *
 22. Τοτε εαν τις υμιν ειπη Ιδου ωδε ο Χριστος ιδου εκει μη
 πιστευσητε (25,657)
 *
 24. Εγερθησονται ψευδοπροφηται και ψευδοχριστοι και δωσουσι
 σημεια μεγαλα και τερατα ωστε πλανασθαι ει δυνατον και
 τους εκλεκτους ιδου προειρηκα υμιν (25,537. 25,540)
 Ψευδοπροφηται και ψευδοχριστοι] ψευδοχ. και ψευδοπρο-
 φηται (25,545)
 29. Ο ηλιος σκοτισθησεται και η σεληνη ου δωσει το φεγγος
 αυτης (27,324)
 31.* Αποστελει ο Υιος του ανθρωπου τους αγγελους αυτου (25,780)
 39. Ουκ εγνωσαν εως ηλθεν ο κατακλυσμος (26,420)

Chapter 25

11. Ουκ οίδα υμας (27,332. 27,860)
*
20. Κυριε πεντε ταλαντα μοι παρεδωκας ιδε αλλα πεντε τα-
λαντα εκερδισα (27,1152)
21. Ευ δουλε αγαθε και πιστε (27,472. 27,1152. 25,441)
*
27. Εδει σε βαλειν τα δηναρια μου τοις τραπεζιταις ινα
ελθων παρ εκεινων απαιτησω (25,525)
34. Δευτε οι ευλογημενοι του Πατρος μου κληρονομησατε την
ητοιμασμενην υμιν βασιλειαν απο καταβολης κοσμου
(26,308. 26,1441. 27,273. 27,665. 27,909. 27,1008
27,1240. 27,1257)
- *
35. Επεινων και εδωκατε μοι φαγειν εδιψων και εποτισατε με.
*
40. Εφ. οσον γαρ εποιησατε ενι των μικρων τουτων εμοι εποιη-
σατε (25,765. 27,196)
41. Πορευεσθε απ εμου οι κατηραμενοι (27,64. 27,409. 27,441
27,549)

Chapter 26

15. Τι θελετε μοι δουναι καγω υμιν παραδωσω αυτον (27,197)
26. Το σωμα μου (26,524)
*
27. Πιετε εξ αυτου παντες τουτο μου εστι το αιμα της και-
νης διαθηκης το υπερ υμων εκχυνομενον (26,1289)
38. Περιλυπος εστιν η ψυχη μου εως θανατου (26,1277)
*
39. Πατερ ει δυνατον παρελθετω το ποτηριον τουτο (26,377
26,396)
*
45. Καθευδετε το λοιπον και αναπαυεσθε ιδου γαρ ηγγικεν η
ωρα και ο Υιος του ανθρωπου παραδιδοται εις χειρας
αμαρτωλων (26,669. 25,661)

49. Χαιρε Ραββι (27,253. 27,1137)

Chapter 27

25. Το αιμα αυτου εφ ημας και επι τα τεκνα ημων (27,397)

42. Καταβατω νυν απο του σταυρου και πιστευσομεν αυτω
(26,660)

46. Θεε μου Θεε μου ινα τι με εγκατελειπες (26,380. 26,985)

54. * Αληθως ουτος ο Υιος του Θεου εστι (25,484)

63. Μετα τρεις ημερας εγειρομαι (27,669)

Chapter 28

18. Εδοθη μοι πασα εξουσια (26,377. 26,476)

*
19. Πορευθεντες μαθητευσατε παντα τα εθνη βαπτιζοντες αυ-
τους εις το ονομα του Πατρος και του Υιου και του αγιου
Πνευματος (25,225. 26,517. 26,544. 26,560. 26,256,25,723)
βαπτιζοντες] βαπτιζετε (26,337)

του Πατρος και του Υιου και του Αγιου Πνευματος] Πατρος
και Υιου και Αγιου Πνευματος (26,84)

19. Μαθητευσατε παντα τα εθνη βαπτιζοντες αυτους εις το
ονομα του Πατρος και του Υιου και του Αγιου Πνευματος
(26,544. 26,560. 26,596. 26,617. 26,653. 26,644. 26,724
26,1277. 27,313. 27,229. 27,349)

*
20. Ιδου μεθ υμων ειμι πασας τας ημερας εως της συντελειας
του αιωνος (27,320)

Quotations from Athanasius' Pseudepigrapha

MATTHEW

Chapter 4

9. Ταυτα γαρ σοι παντα δωσω εαν πεσων προσκυνησεις μοι
(28,1089)

Chapter 5

17. Μη νομισητε γαρ φησιν οτι ηλθον καταλυσαι τον νομον η
τους προφητας ουκ ηλθον καταλυσαι αλλα πληρωσαι
(28,977)
25. Ισθι ευνοων τω αντιδικω σου εως ου εν τη οδω μετ αυτου
(28,717)
39. Εαν τις σε ραπιση εις την δεξιαν σιαγονα στρεψον αυτω
και την αλλην (28,569)

Chapter 6

12. Αφες ημιν ως και ημεις αφιεμεν τοις οφειλεταις ημων
(28,646)

Chapter 7

14. Στενη η πυλη και τεθλιμμενη η οδος η απαγουσα εις την
ζωην και ολιγοι εισιν οι ευρισκοντες αυτην (28,808)
24. Ανθρωπος τις ωκοδομησε την οικιαν αυτου επι την πετραν
(28,712)

Chapter 8

28. Και ελθοντι αυτω εις το περαν εις την χωραν των

Γερασινων υπηντησαν αυτω δυο δαιμονιζομενοι εκ των
μνημειων εξερχομενοι χαλεποι λιαν (28,1027)

Chapter 10

16. Ιδου αποστελλω υμας ως προβατα εν μεσω λυκων (28,41)

16^β Γινεσθε φρονιμοι ως οι οφεις και ακεραιοι ως αι πε-
ριστεραι (28,257)

37. Ο αγαπων πατερα η μητερα υπερ εμε ουκ εστι μου αξιος
(28,1424)

Chapter 11

23. Και συ Καπερναουμ εαν εως του ουρανου υψωθης αλλ εως
αδου καταβιβασθηση (28,1185)

Chapter 12

2. Ουκ εξεστι τουτο ποιειν εν Σαββατω (28,144)

3. Ουδε ανεγνωτε ο εποιησε Δαβιδ οτι επεινασεν αυτος και

4. οι μετ αυτου πως εισηλθεν εις τον οικον του Θεου και
τους αρτους της προθεσεως ελαβεν και εφαγεν ο ουκ
εξεστιν ποιειν ει μη μονοις τοις ιερευσιν (28,153)

7. Ει εγνωκατε τι εστιν ελεον θελω και ου θυσιαν (28,136)

35. Ο γαρ αγαθος ανθρωπος εκ του αγαθου θησαυρου προφερει
το αγαθον (28,165)

Chapter 13

44. Ομοια εστιν η βασιλεια των ουρανων θησαυρω κεκρυμμενω
εν αγρω ον ευρων ανθρωπος εχαρη ειτα υπαγει και πωλει

παντα οσα εχει και αγοραζει τον αγρον εκεινον (28,441)

Chapter 14

19. Και αναβλεψας εις τους ουρανους ευλογησε τους αρτους
(28,703)

Chapter 16

13. Ηρωτα ο Ιησους τους μαθητας αυτου λεγων Τινα με λεγου-
14. σιν οι ανθρωποι ειναι τον υιον του ανθρωπου Αποκριθεν-
τες δε οι αποστολοι ειπαν οι μεν Ηλιαν οι δε Ιερεμιαν
15. η ενα των προφητων αποκριθεις δε ο Πητρος ειπεν Συ ει
ο Υιος του Θεου του ζωντος (28,968)

Chapter 17

27. Ειπε ο Κυριος προς τον Πητρον απελθε εις την θαλασσαν
και βαλε αγκιστρον και τον αναβαντα πρωτον ιχθυν αρων
και ανοιξας το στομα αυτου ευρησεις στατηρα τουτου
δος αντι εμου και σου (28,713)

Chapter 18

18. Οτι ο εαν δησητε επι της γης εσται δεδεμενον εν τοις
ουρανοις και ο εαν λυσητε επι της γης εσται λελυμενον
εν τοις ουρανοις (28,184)
19. Εαν δυο υμων συμφωνησωσιν επι της γης επι παντος πραγ-
ματος ου εαν αιτησονται γενησεται αυτοις (28,717)
20. Οπου δυο η τρεις εισι συνηγμενοι εν τω ονοματι μου
εκει ειμι εν μεσω αυτων (28,261)

23. Ωμοιωθη η βασιλεια των ουρανων ανθρωπω βασιλει οστις ηθελησε συναραι λογον μετα των δουλων αυτου (28,712)

Chapter 20

18. Ιδου αναβαινομεν εις Ιεροσολυμα και ο Υιος του ανθρωπου παραδοθησεται εις τας χειρας των πρεσβυτερων και
19. των γραμματεων και παραδοσουσιν αυτον τοις εθνεσι και κατακρινουσιν αυτον θανατω (28,485)

Chapter 21

2. Πορευθεντες εις την κατεναντι κομην ευρησεται πωλον δεδεμενον λυσαντες αγαγετε μοι (28,173)
7. Και πορευομενου αυτου υπεστρωσαν τα ιματια αυτων εν
8. τη οδω οι δε οχλοι οι προαγοντες αυτον και ακολουθουντες εκραζον λεγοντες Ωσαννα τω Υιω Δαβιδ ευλογημενος ο ερχομενος εν ονοματι Κυριου (28,1041)
13. Εκβαλετε ταυτα εντευθεν ο γαρ οικος μου οικος προσευχης κληθησεται ο οικος φησιν του Πατρος μου και οικος μου (28,64)
28. Ανθρωπος τις ειχε δυο τεκνα και ειπε τω ενι απελθε εις
29. τον αμπελωνα και ειπεν ουχ υπαγω και απηλθε και προσελθων ειπεν και τω ετερω και ειπεν υπαγω και ουκ απηλθεν (28,712)

Chapter 22

21. Αποδοτε τα Καισαρος Καισαρι και τα του Θεου τω Θεω(25,745)
42. Πως ουν Δαβιδ εν Πνευματι αγιω Κυριον αυτον καλει
(28,32)

Chapter 23

14. Ουαι υμιν γραμματεις και φαρισαιοι υποκριται οτι ηρα-
τε την κλειδα της βασιλειας των ουρανων και ουτε υμεις
εισερχεσθε ουτε δε τους βουλομενους εισελθειν συγχω-
ρειτε (28,1016)
32. Πληρωσατε το μετρον των πατερων υμων (28,1012)
35. Αμην λεγω επελευσονται αι ανομιαι των πατερων υμων εφ
υμας απο του αιματος Αβελ του δικαιου εως του αιματος
Ζαχαριου του υιου Βαραχιου ον εφονευσατε μεταξυ του
ναου και του θυσιαστηριου (28,636)

Chapter 24

2. Αμην λεγω υμιν ου μη μεινη λιθος επι λιθον επ αυτων ος
ου μη καταλυθη (28,685)
4. Βλεπετε μη τις υμας πλανηση πολλοι γαρ ελευσονται επι
5. τω ονοματι μου λεγοντες εγω ειμι ο Χριστος και πολλους
6. πλανησουσι Μελλησετε δε ακουειν πολεμους και ακοας πο-
7. λεμων ορατε μη θροεισθε δει γαρ ταυτα γενεσθαι αλλ ου-
πω το τελος εγερθησεται γαρ εθνος επι εθνος και βασι-
λεια επι βασιλειαν και εσονται λιμοι και λοιμοι και
8. σεισμοι κατα τοπους Ταυτα δε παντα αρχαι ωδινων τοτε
9. παραδουσιν υμας εις θλιψεις και αποκτενουσιν υμας και
10. εσεσθε μισουμενοι υπο παντων δια το ονομα μου και το-
τε σκανδαλισθησονται πολλοι και αλληλους παραδουσιν
11. και μισησουσιν αλληλους και πολλοι ψευδοπροφηται εγερ-
θησονται και πλανησουσι πολλους και δια το πληθυνθηναι

12. την ανομιαν ψυγησεται η αγαπη των πολλων ο δε υπομεινας
 13. εις τελος ουτος σωθησεται Και κηρυχθησεται το ευαγγε-
 14. λιον της βασιλειας εν ολω τω κοσμω εις μαρτυριον πασιν
 τοις εθνεσι και τοτε ηξει το τελος (28,472)
27. Ωσπερ γαρ η αστραπη εξερχεται απο ανατολων και φαινε-
 28. ται εως δυσμων ουτως εσται και η παρουσια του Υιου του
 29. ανθρωπου Οπου δε αν η το πτωμα εκει συναχθησονται οι
 αετοι ευθεως δε μετα την θλιψιν των ημερων εκεινων ο
 ηλιος σκοτισθησεται και η σεληνη ου δωσει το φεγγος
 αυτης και οι αστερες του ουρανου πεσουνται και αι δυ-
 30. ναμεις του ουρανου σαλευθησονται και τοτε φανησεται το
 σημειον του Υιου του ανθρωπου εν τω ουρανω (28,420)
34. Αμην λεγω υμιν οτι ου μη παρελθη η γενεα αυτη εως αν
 35. παντα ταυτα γενηται Ο ουρανος και η γη παρελευσεται
 36. οι δε λογοι μου ου μη παρελθωσι Περι δε της ημερας η
 της ωρας ουδεις οιδεν ουτε οι αγγελοι των ουρανων ει-
 μη ο Πατηρ μονος (28,472)

Chapter 26

35. Εαν δεη με συν σοι αποθανειν (28,1052)
 68. Προφητευσον ημιν Χριστε τις ο παισας σε (28,1295)

Chapter 27

33. Και ελθοντες εις τοπον λεγομενον Γολγοθα ο εστι κρανιου
 34. τοπος λεγομενος εδωκαν αυτω οινον ποιειν μετα χολης
 35. μεμιγμενον και γευσαμενος ουκ ηθελε ποιειν Σταυρωσαν-
 τες δε αυτον διεμερισαντο τα ιματια αυτου βαλλοντες

τες κληρον ινα πληρωθη το ρηθεν υπο του προφητου διε-
μερισαντο τα ιματια μου εαυτοις και επι τον ιματισμον
36. μου εβαλον κληρον Και καθημενοι ετηρουν αυτον εκει
(28,185)

Chapter 28

6. Ουκ εστιν ωδε ον ζητειτε ανεστη εκ των νεκρων ωσπερ ει-
7. ρηκε δευτε ιδετε τον τοπον οπου εκειτο Ιδου προαγει
υμας εις την Γαλιλαιαν εκει αυτον οψεσθε (28,1041)

2. THE MARKAN TEXT

Athanasius' text from Mark does not present any particular interest. His quotations from that Gospel are very limited in number and therefore not sufficient to explain the character of the text used.

In total, I collected 15 quotations which contain 13 variants. Generally, these variants are supported by witnesses of a mixed textual type.

(Look for the Markan quotations and collation in pp. 177- 185)

The quotations of Athanasius from the gospel of

3. LUKEChapter 1

2. Καθως παρεδωκαν ημιν οι απ αρχης αυτοπται και υπηρεται
γενομενοι του λογου (26,216)
20. Και ιδου εση σιωπων και μη δυναμενος λαλησαι αχρι ης
ημερας γενηται ταυτα ανθ ων ουκ επιστευσας τοις λογοις
μου οιτινες πληρωθησονται εις τον καιρον αυτον (27,1391)
27. Προς παρθενον μεμνηστευμενην ανδρι (26,1057)
- *
28. Χαιρε κεχαριταμενη ο Κυριος μετα σου 27,16
29. Νυν απολυεις τον δουλον σου Κυριε κατα το ρημα σου εν
ειρηνη (27,1397)
33. Και της βασιλειας αυτου ουκ εσται τελος (26,1020)
34. Πνευμα αγιον επελευσεται επι σε και δυναμις Κυριου επι-
σκιασει σοι (26,557. 27,373)
35. Διο και το γεννωμενον αγιον κληθησεται (27,1392)
38. Ιδου η δουλη του Κυριου γενοιτο μοι κατα το ρημα σου
(27,1392)
46. Μεγαλυνει η ψυχη μου τον Κυριον (27,1392)
48. Οτι επεβλεψεν επι την ταπεινωσιν της δουλης αυτου ιδου
γαρ απο του νυν μακαριουσι με πασαι αι γενεαι (27,1393)

Chapter 2

10. Μη φοβεισθε (26,896)
- *
11. Οτι ετεχθη ημιν σημερον Χριστος Κυριος εν πολει Δαυιδ
(27,385)

14. Δοξα εν υψιστοις Θεω και επι γης ειρηνη (27,385)
 27,416. 27,461. 27,1132. 27,1332)
- *
 22. Και οτε επλησθησαν αι ημεραι του καθαρισμου αυτων κατα τον νομον Μουσεως ανηγαγον αυτον εις Ιεροσολυμα παρασ-
 τησαι τω Κυριω καθως γεγραπται εν νομω Κυρου (27,1393)
23. Οτι παν αρσεν διανοιγον μητραν αγιον τω Κυριω κληθη-
 σεται και του δουναι θυσιαν κατα το ειρημενον εν νο-
 μω Κυριου ζευγος τρυγονων η δυο νεοσσους περιστερων
 (27,1393)
30. Οτι ειδον οι οφθαλμοι μου το σωτηριον σου (27,244)
 27,420)
- *
 52. Και Ιησους προεκοπτε σοφια και ηλικια και χαριτι παρα Θεω και ανθρωποις (26,429. 26,433. 27,1393)

Chapter 3

21. Εγενετο δε εν τω βαπτισθηναι απαντα τον λαον και Ιησου βαπτισθεντος και προσευχομενου ανεωχθηναι τον ουρανον και καταβηναι το Πνευμα το αγιον σωματικω ει-
 δει περιστεραν επ αυτον (26,537)
- *
 23. Ην δε Ιησους αρχομενος ωσει ετων τριακοντα ων υιος ως ενομιζετο Ιωσηφ (26,1288)

Chapter 4

- *
 1. Ιησους δε πληρης Πνευματος ων υπεστρεψεν απο του Ιορδα-
 νου (26,537)
- *
 21. Σημερον πεπληρωται η προφητεια αυτη εν τοις ωσιν υμων
 (27,372)

30. Δια μεσου αυτων επορευετο (25,664)
 *
 33. Και εν τη συναγωγη ην ανθρωπος εχων πνευμα δαιμονιου ακαθαρτου και ανεκραξε φωνη μεγαλη λεγων Εα τι ημιν και σοι Ιησου Ναζαρηνε ηλθες απολεσαι ημας οιδαμεν σε τις ει ο αγιος του Θεου (27,1397)
 *
 41. Συ ει ο Υιος του Θεου (26,881)

Chapter 6

- *
 36. Γινεσθε οικτιρμονες ως ο Πατηρ υμων ο εν τοις ουρανοις οικτιρμων εστι (26,361)

Chapter 7

14. Νεανισκε σοι λεγω εγερθητι (27,208. 27,565)

Chapter 8

50. Ο δε Ιησους ακουσας απεκριθη αυτω μη φοβου μονον πιστευε (27,1400)

Chapter 9

57. Εγενετο δε πορευομενων αυτων εν τη οδω ειπε προς αυτον ακολουθησω σοι οπου αν απερχη Κυριε και ειπεν αυτω ο Ιησους αι αλωπεκες φωλεους εχουσιν και τα πετεινα του ουρανου κατασκηνωσεις ο δε Υιος του ανθρωπου ουκ εχει που την κεφαλην κλινη (27,1400)
 *
 62. Ουδεις επιβαλων την χειρα επ αροτρον και στραφεις εις τα οπισω ευθετος εστιν εν τη βασιλεια των ουρανων (26,872)

Chapter 10

- *
18. Εθεωρουν τον Σαταναν ως αστραπην πεσοντα εκ του ου-
ρανου (26,407)
- *
19. Ιδου δεδωκα υμιν εξουσιαν πατειν επανω οφρων και σκορ-
πιων και επι πασαν την δυναμιν του εχθρου (26,889)
- *
20. Χαιρετε οτι τα ονοματα υμων εγγραφη εν τοις ουρανοις
(27,377)
- *
22. Παντα μοι παρεδωθη υπο του Πατρος μου και ουδεις επι-
γινωσκει τον Πατερα ει μη ο Υιος και ω εαν θελη ο Υιος
αποκαλυψαι (26,377)

Chapter 11

9. Αιτειτε και δοθησεται υμιν (26,913)
- *
13. Ει ουν υμεις πονηροι οντες οιδατε δοματα αγαθα διδοναι
τοις τεκνοις υμων ποσω μαλλον ο Πατηρ υμων ο εν τοις
ουρανοις δωσει Πνευμα αγιον τοις αιτουσιν αυτον
(26,1012)
- *
19. Ει εν Βεελζεβουλ εγω εκβαλλω τα δαιμονια οι υιοι υμων
εν τινι εκβαλλουσι δια τουτο αυτοι υμων κριται εσονται
ει δε εν Πνευματι Θεου εγω εκβαλλω τα δαιμονια αρα
εφθασεν εφ υμας η Βασιλεια του Θεου (26,544. 26,669)
εκβαλλουσι] εκβαλουσι (27,213)
27. Μακαρια η κοιλια η βαστασα σε και μαστοι ους εθηλασας
(27,1393)
- *
46. Υμιν ουαι τοις νομικοις (27,65)

52. Ηρατε την κλειδα της γνωσεως (27,1389)

Chapter 12

- *
9. Ο αρνησαμενος αυτον εμπροσθεν των ανθρωπων απαρνηθησε-
ται εμπροσθεν των αγγελων του Θεου (27,1384)
- *
20. Αφρον ταυτη τη νυκτι ζητουσι σου την ψυχην α δε ητοι-
μασας τινι εσται (25,664)
- *
27. Κατανοησατε τα κρινα του αγρου πως αυξανουσι (26,1280)
- *
30. Και υμεις μη ζητειτε τι φαγητε η τι πιητε και μη μετεω-
ριζεσθε ταυτα γαρ παντα τα εθνη του κοσμου επιζητει
*
31. υμων δε ο Πατηρ οιδεν οτι χρηζετε τουτων απαντων πλην
ζητειτε πρωτον την βασιλειαν αυτου και ταυτα παντα
προστεθησεται υμιν (26,909)
- *
49. Πυρ ηλθον βαλειν επι την γην (27,232)

Chapter 13

21. Τινι ομοιωσω την βασιλειαν του Θεου ομοια εστι ζυμη ην
λαβουσα γυνη ενεκρυψεν εις αλευρου σατα τρια εως ου
ζυμωθη ολον (27,1401)
32. Ειπατε τη αλωπεκι ταυτη (26,361)
- *
34. Ποσακις ηθελησα επισυναγαγειν τα τεκνα σου (27,449)
- 34^β Ουκ ηθελησατε (27,449)

Chapter 14

- *
26. Εαν μη τις μιση πατερα η μητερα (27,1381)

Chapter 15

21. Πατερ ημαρτον εις τον ουρανον και ενωπιον σου
(27,761)

Chapter 16

- *
25. Απελαβες τα αγαθα εν τη ζωη σου νυν δε ωδε οδυνασαι
(27,1397)

Chapter 17

- *
10. Οταν παντα κατορθωσητε λεγετε δουλοι αχρειοι εσμεν
(27,509)
*
21. Η βασιλεια των ουρανων εντος υμων εστιν (26,873)

Chapter 21

- *
8. Βλεπετε μη τις υμας πλανηση πολλοι γαρ ελευσονται επι
τω ονοματι μου λεγοντες εγω ειμι και ο καιρος ηγγικεν
και πολλους πλανησουσι μη ουν πορευθητε οπισω αυτων
(25,540)
19. Εν τη υπομονη υμων κτησασθε τας ψυχας υμων (27,189)

Chapter 22

29. Υμεις δε εστε οι διαμεμενηκοτες μετ εμου εν τοις πει-
ρασμοις μου καγω διατιθεμαι υμιν καθως διεθετο μοι
ο Πατηρ μου την βασιλειαν ινα εσθιητε και πινητε επι
της τραπεζης μου εν τη βασιλεια μου (26,1440)

Chapter 23

34. Πατερ αφες αυτοις ου γαρ οιδασι τι ποιουσιν (27,1116)
*
42. Αμην αμην λεγω σοι σημερον μετ εμου εση εν τω παρα-
δεισω (27,117)
43. Λεγω σοι σημερον μετ εμου εση εν τω παραδεισω
(27,117. 27,749)
- *
46. Πατερ εις χειρας σου παρατιθημι το πνευμα μου
(26,992)

Chapter 24

39. Πνευμα σαρκα και οστεα ουκ εχει καθως εμε θεωρειτε
εχοντα (26,521)
40. Και ταυτα ειπων επεδειξεν αυτοις τας χειρας και τους
ποδας (26,1061)

Quotations from Athanasius' Pseudepigrapha

LUKE

Chapter 1

11. Ωφθη δε αυτω αγγελος Κυριου εστως εκ δεξιων του θυσιασ-
12. τηριου του θυμιαματος Και ιδων Ζαχαριας εταραχθη και
13. φοβος επεπεσεν επ αυτον Ειπε δε αυτω ο αγγελος Μη φοβου Ζαχαρια διοτι εισηκουσθη η δεησις σου και ιδου Ελισαβεν η συγγενης σου γεννησει υιον σοι και καλεσεις
14. το ονομα αυτου Ιωαννην Και εσται χαρα σοι και αγαλλι- σις και παντι τω λαω σου (28,909)
26. Εν δε τω μηνι τω εκτω της συλληψεως Ελισαβεν απεσταλη ο αγγελος Γαβριηλ υπο του Θεου εις πολιν της Γαλιλαιας
27. η ονομα Ναζαρετ προς παρθενον μεμνηστευμενην ανδρι ω ονομα Ιωσηφ και το ονομα της παρθενου Μαριαμ και εισελ-
28. θων ο αγγελος προς αυτην ειπεν χαιρε κεχαριτωμενη ο
29. κυριος μετα σου ευλογημενη συ εν γυναιξιν Η δε ιδου- σα διεταραχθη επι τω λογω αυτου και διελογιζετο ποταπος
30. ειη ο ασπασμος ουτος Και ειπεν αυτη ο αγγελος Μη φοβου
31. Μαριαμ ευρες γαρ χαριν παρα του Θεου Και ιδου συλληψη
32. εν γαστρι και τεξη υιον και καλεσης το ονομα αυτου Ιη- σουν Ουτος εσται μεγας και υιος ανθρωπου κληθησεται και
33. δωσει αυτω Κυριος ο Θεος τον θρονον Δαβιδ του πατρος αυτου και βασιλευσει επι τον οικον Ιακωβ εις τους αιω-
34. νας και της βασιλειας αυτου ουκ εσται τελος ειπε δε Μα-
35. ριαμ προς τον αγγελον Πως εσται μοι τουτο επει ανδρα ου

γινώσκω και αποκριθεις ο αγγελος ειπεν αυτη Πνευμα
 αγιον επελευσεται και δυναμις υψιστου επισκιασει σοι
 (28,961)

Chapter 2

1. Εν ταις ημεραις εκειναις εξηλθε δογμα παρα Καισαρος Αυ-
2. γουστου απογραφεσθαι πασαν την οικουμενην αυτη η απογρα-
3. φη πρωτη εγενετο ηγεμονευοντος της Συριας Κυρηνιου Και
4. επορευοντο παντες απογραφεσθαι εις την εαυτου πολιν Επο-
- ρευθη δε και Ιωσηφ εκ της Γαλιλαιας εκ πολεως Ναζαρετ
- εις την Ιουδαιαν εις πολιν Δαβιδ ητις καλειται Βηθλεεμ
5. δια το ειναι αυτον εξ οικου και πατριας Δαβιδ απογρα-
- φεσθαι συν Μαριαμ τη μεμνηστευμενη αυτω γυναικι ουση
- εγκυω (28,945)
8. Ποιμενες ησαν εν τη χωρα τη αυτη αγραυλουντες και φυλασ-
9. σοντες φυλακας επι την ποιμνην αυτων και ιδου αγγελος
- Κυριου επεστη αυτοις και δοξα Κυριου περιελαμψεν αυτους
10. και εφοβηθησαν φοβον μεγαν Και ειπεν ο αγγελος αυτοις
- Μη φοβεισθε ιδου γαρ ευαγγελιζομαι υμιν χαραν μεγαλην
- ητις εσται παντι τω λαω οτι ετεχθη υμιν σημερον Σωτηρ
11. ος εστι Χριστος Κυριος εν πολει Δαυιδ (28,965)
22. Ανηγαγον εις Ιεροσολυμα παραστησαι τω Κυριω καθως γε-
- γραπται εν νομω Κυριου (28,973)
26. Ου μη αποθανης πριν αν ιδης τον Χριστον (28,68)

27. Και εν τω εισαγειν τους γονεις το παιδιον Ιησουν του ποιησαι κατα το ειθισμενον του νομου περι αυτου και αυτος εδεξατο αυτο εις τας αγκαλας αυτου (28,985)
36. Και ην Αννα προφητις θυγατηρ Φανουηλ εκ φυλης Ασηρ αυτη προβεβηκυια εν ημεραις πολλαις ζησασα μετ ανδρος
37. ετη επτα απο της παρθενιας αυτης και αυτη χηρα ως ετων ογδοηκοντα τεσσαρων η ουκ αφιστατο απο του ιερου νηστειαις και δεησεσι λατρευουσα νυκτα και ημεραν Και αυτη τη ωρα επιστασα ανθωμολογειτο τω Κυριω και ελαλη περι αυτου πασι τοις προσδεχομενοις λυτρωσιν εν Ιερουσαλημ (28,997)
48. Τεκνον τι εποιησας ημιν ουτως Ιδου εγω και ο πατηρ σου
49. εζητουμεν σε ο δε ειπε τι οτι εζητειτε με Ουκ ηδειτε οτι εν τω οικω του Πατρος μου δει με ειναι και κατηλθεν εις Ναζαρετ και ην υποτασσομενος αυτοις (28,1248)

Chapter 6

9. Εξεστιν αγαθοποιησαι εν Σαββατω η κακοποιησαι ψυχην σωσαι η απολεσαι (28,165)
20. Οτι υμων εστι η βασιλεια των ουρανων (28,20)

Chapter 8

27. Εξελθοντι δε αυτω εν τη γη υπηνητησεν ανηρ τις εκ της πολεως ος ειχε δαιμονια εκ χρονων ικανων (28,1028)

Chapter 12

10. Ος αν βλασφημηση εις το πνευμα (28,397)
32. Μη φοβου το μικρον ποιμνιον οτι ηυδοκησεν ο Πατηρ υμων
δουναι υμιν την βασιλειαν των ουρανων πωλησατε τα υπαρ-
χοντα υμων και δοτε ελεημοσυνην και εξετε βαλαντια μη
παλαιουμενα θησαυρον ανεκλειπτον εν τοις ουρανοις
(28,1417)

Chapter 13

4. Τι γαρ οι δεκα και οκτω εφ ους ο πυργος του Σιλωαμ
επεσεν αμαρτωλοτεροι ησαν παρα παντας τους κατοικουν-
τας εν Ιερουσαλημ ουχι λεγω υμιν (28,640)
29. Ηξουσιν απο ανατολων και δυσμων και ανακλιθησονται
(28,397)
31. Εξελθε οτι Ηρωδης βουλεται σε ανελειν (28,397)

Chapter 15

32. Ο υιος μου ουτος ο νεωτερος απολωως ην και ευρεθη
νεκρος ην και ανεζησεν (28,1044)

Chapter 16

9. Ποιησατε υμιν φιλους εκ του μαμωνα της αδικιας (28,652)
16. Ο νομος και οι προφηται μεχρις Ιωαννου (28,513)
23. Αναβλεψας δε τοις οφθαλμοις αυτου ο πλουσιος ορα τον Λα-
ζαρον εν τοις κολποις του Αβρααμ (28,708)

Chapter 17

7. Τις εχων δουλον αροτριωντα ουκ εισελθοντι απο του αγρου
επιταττει (28,397)

Chapter 19

10. Ηλθον ζητησαι το απολωλος (28,513)

Chapter 21

33. Ο ουρανος και η γη παρελευσεται οι δε λογοι μου ου μη
παρελθωσιν (28,685)

Chapter 22

36. Ο εχων ιματιον πωλησατω αυτο και αγορασατω μαχαιραν
(28,721)

42. Μη το εμον θελημα γενεσθω αλλα το σον (28,680)

The quotations of Athanasius from the gospel of

4. JOHN

Chapter 1

1. Εν αρχη ην ο λογος και ο λογος ην προς τον Θεον και Θεος ην ο λογος (25,84. 25,453. 25,481. 25,568. 25,576. 26,33. 26,96. 26,148. 26,164. 26,260. 26,270 26,385. 26,468. 26,508. 26,513. 26,556. 26,660. 26,676 26,721. 26,780. 26,989. 27,496)
3. Παντα δι αυτου εγενετο
(25,212. 25,448. 25,481. 26,129. 26,157. 26,385. 26,652 26,780. 26,104. 26,1109. 26,1137. 26,1005. 26,1280 27,16. 27,805)
8. Ουκ ην εκεινος το φως αλλ ινα μαρτυρηση περι του φωτος
(26,496)
9. Ην το φως το αληθινον ο φωτιζει παντα ανθρωπον ερχομε-
νον εις τον κοσμον (26,101. 26,573. 26,780)
10. Εν τω κοσμω ην και ο κοσμος δι αυτου εγενετο και ο κοσ-
μος αυτον ουκ εγνω (27,653)
12. Οσοι δε ελαβον αυτον εδωκεν αυτοις εξουσιαν τεκνα Θεου
γενεσθαι (25,443. 26,101. 26,363. 26,576. 26,996.
27,317)
- *
13. Ουκ εξ αιματων ουδε εκ θεληματος σαρκος αλλα εκ Θεου
εγεννηθησαν (27,140)
14. Ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο
(25,449. 26,229. 26,385. 26,513. 26,660. 26,385. 26,388

26,392. 26,433. 26,513. 25,577. 26,64. 26,148. 26,241
 26,248. 26,516. 26,1109. 26,1112. 27,16. 27,805.
 27,1068. 27,1173. 27,1385)

14^β Και εσκηνωσεν εν ημιν

(26,260. 26,656)

15. Και εθεασαμεθα την δοξαν αυτου δοξαν ως μονογενους παρα
 του Πατρος πληρης χαριτος και αληθειας

(25,441. 26,777. 26,385)

16. Εκ του πληρωματος αυτου ημεις παντες ελαβομεν (26,760)

17. Ο νομος δια Μωυσεως εδοθη η δε χαρις και η αληθεια δια

Ιησου Χριστου εγενετο (27,208)

η δε χαρις] η χαρις (26,140)

] om. και η αληθεια (25,496)

18. Ο μονογενης υιος ο ων εις τον κολπον του Πατρος

(25,448. 26,280. 26,496. 25,504. 26,508. 27,656)

τον κολπον] τοις κολποις (27,656)

Chapter 2

4. Ουπω ηκει η ωρα μου

(25,661. 26,412)

19. Λυσατε τον ναον τουτον και εν τρισιν ημεραις εγερω

αυτον (26,520. 26,998. 26,1001. 26,1160. 26,1261)

Chapter 3

2^α Ραββι

(27,261)

2^β Οιδαμεν οτι απο Θεου εληλυθας (27,261)

6. Το γεγεννημενον εκ της σαρκος σαρξ εστι και το γεγεννημενον εκ του Πνευματος πνευμα εστι
(26,1005. 26,1012)
8. Το πνευμα οπου θελει πνει και την φωνην αυτου ακουεις αλλ ουκ οιδας ποθεν ερχεται και που υπαγει Ουτως εστι πας ο γεγεννημενος εκ του πνευματος
(26,1005. 27,525)
- *
16. Ουτω γαρ ηγαπησεν ο Θεος τον κοσμον Ωστε τον υιον αυτου τον μονογενη εδωκεν ινα πας ο πιστευων επ αυτον μη απο-
*
17. ληται αλλ εχει ζωην αιωνιον Ου γαρ απεστειλεν ο Θεος τον υιον εις τον κοσμον ινα κρινη τον κοσμον αλλ ινα σωθη ο κοσμος δι αυτου ο πιστευων εις αυτον ου κρινεται
*
18. ο δε μη πιστευων ηδη κεκριται οτι μη πεπιστευκεν εις
*
19. το ονομα του μονογενους υιου του Θεου Αυτη δε εστιν η κρισις οτι το φως εληλυθεν εις τον κοσμον και ηγαπησαν οι ανθρωποι μαλλον το σκοτος η το φως ην γαρ αυτων πονηρα τα εργα (26,493)
30. Εκεινον δε αυξανειν εμε δε ελαττουσθαι
(27,473)

Chapter 4

13. Πας ο πινων εκ του υδατος τουτου διψηση παλιν ος δ ανπιη εκ του υδατος ου εγω δωσω αυτω ου μη διψηση εις τον αιωνα αλλα το υδωρ ο εγω δωσω αυτω γενησεται εν αυτω πηγη υδατος αλλομενου εις ζωην αιωνιον (26,1000)
*
Πας ο πινων] ο πινων (27,449)

- *
21. Πιστευε μοι γυναι οτι ερχεται ωρα και νυν εστιν οτε
οι αληθινοι προσκυνηται προσκυνησουσι τω Πατρι εν
Πνευματι και αληθεια και γαρ ο Πατηρ τοιουτους ζητει
τους προσκυνουντας αυτον (26,608)
22. Πνευμα ο Θεος και τους προσκυνουντας αυτον εν Πνευματι
και αληθεια δει προσκυνειν (26,608)

Chapter 5

14. Υγιης γεγονας μηκειτι αμαρτανε (27,1400)
17. Ο Πατηρ μου εως αρτι εργαζεται καγω εργαζομαι
(25,577. 26,189. 26,721)
- *
26. Ωσπερ ο Πατηρ ζωνν εχει εν εαυτω ουτως και τω υιω δε-
δωκε ζωνν εχειν εν εαυτω (26,401)
- *
27. Καθως εδωκεν αυτον κρισιν ποιειν οτι υιος ανθρωπου
εστι (26,1281)
- *
30. Ου δυναμαι εγω ποιειν απ εμαυτου ουδεν αλλα καθως ακουω
κρινω (26,400)
- *
36. Τα εργα α δεδωκε μοι ο Πατηρ ινα τελειωσω αυτα αυτα τα
εργα α ποιω μαρτυρει περι εμου (26,288)
- *
37. Ο πεμψας με Πατηρ εκεινος μεμαρτυρηκε περι εμου ουτε
φωνην αυτου ποποτε ακηκοατε ουτε ειδος αυτου εωρακατε
και τον λογον αυτου ουκ εχετε εν υμιν μενοντα οτι ον
απεστειλεν εκεινος τουτω υμεις ου πιστευετε (26,356)
- *
39. Ερευνατε τας γραφας οτι αυται εισιν αι μαρτυρουσαι
περι εμου (26,385)

Chapter 6

6. Αυτος γαρ ηδη τι εμελλε ποιειν
(26,404)
- *
30. Τι συ ποιεις περι σεαυτου σημειον (26,660)
38. Καταβεβηκα εκ του ουρανου ουχ ινα ποιω το θελημα το
εμον αλλα το θελημα του πεμφαντος με (26,261. 26,721)
- *
40. Τουτο εστι το θελημα του πεμφαντος με ινα παν ο δεδω-
κε μοι μη απολεσω εξ αυτου αλλα αναστησω αυτο τη εσχα-
τη ημερα (27,192)
- *
42. Ουχ ουτος εστιν ο υιος του Ιωσηφ ου ημεις οιδαμεν τον
πατερα και την μητερα (26,381)
- *
46. Ουχ οτι τον πατερα τις εωρακεν ει μη ο ων παρα του
Πατρος (26,193)
47. Ο πιστευων εις εμε εχει ζωην αιωνιον (27,1196)
* Πατρος] Θεου (25,453)
51. Ο αρτος δε ον εγω δωσω η σαρξ μου εστιν υπερ της του
κοσμου ζωης (26,1012)
- 51^β Εγω ειμι ο αρτος ο ζων ο εκ του ουρανου καταβας
(26,1012)
62. Τουτο υμας σκανδαλιζει εαν ουν θεωρητε τον υιον του
63. ανθρωπου αναβαινοντα οπου ην το προτερον Το Πνευμα
64* εστι το ζωοποιουν η σαρξ ουκ ωφελει ουδεν Τα ρηματα
α εγω λελαληκα υμιν πνευμα εστι και ζωη
(26,665. 26,1008)

Chapter 7

- *
15. Πως ουτος οιδε γραμματα μη μεμαθηκως (26,660)

19. Τι με ζητείτε αποκτειναι (26,620)
20. Δαιμονιον εχεις τις σε ζητει αποκτειναι (27,195)
27,208)
30. Και ουδεις επεβαλεν επ αυτον την χειρα οτι ουπω ελη-
λυθη η ωρα αυτου (25,661)
37. * Ει τις διψα ερχεσθω προς με και πινετω (27,61)
39. Τουτο δε ειπε περι του Πνευματος ου εμελλον λαμβανειν
οι πιστευοντες εις αυτον (26,997)
40. Τουτο Αβρααμ ουκ εποιησε (25,484)
Chapter 8
12. Εγω ειμι το φως του κοσμου
(26,1277. 26,780. 27,1260)
31. Εαν υμεις μεινητε εν τω λογω τω εμω (26,1008)
33. * Σπερμα Αβρααμ εσμεν (27,905. 27,957)
35. * Ο δε δουλος ου μενει εν τη οικια εις τον αιωνα ο δε
36. υιος μενει εις τον αιωνα εαν ουν ο υιος υμας ελευθερω-
ση οντως ελευθεροι εσεσθε (26,301)
40. Ανθρωπον ος την αληθειαν υμιν λελαληκα
(2,620. 2,657. 2,1088. 26,1284)
41. Ημεις εκ πορνειας ου γεγεννημεθα (27,1116)
57. Πεντηκοντα ετη ουπω εχεις και Αβρααμ εωρακας (26,664)
58. Πριν Αβρααμ γενεσθαι εγω ειμι
(26,40. 26,260. 26,381. 26,497. 27,385)

Chapter 9

29. Τουτον δε ουκ οίδαμεν ποθεν εστι (27,96)
32. Εκ του αιωνος ουκ ηκουσθη οτι ηνοιξε τις οφθαλμους τυφλου γεγεννημενου ει μη ουτος παρα Θεου ουκ ηδυνατο ποιειν ουδεν (26,664)
ηνοιξε] ηνεωξε (25,164)

Chapter 10

- *
10. Εγω ηλθον ινα ζωην εχωσι και περισσοτερον εχωσι (27,208)
14. Εγω ειμι ο ποιμην ο καλος (26,1001)
- *
18. Ουδεις αιρει την ψυχην μου απ εμου απ εμαυτου αυτην τιθημι εξουσιαν εχω θειναι αυτην και εξουσιαν εχω λαβειν αυτην (26,1265)
21. Ταυτα τα ρηματα ουκ εστι δαιμονιζομενου μη δαιμονιον δυναται τυφλων οφθαλμους ανοιγειν (26,665)
30. Εγω και ο Πατηρ εν εσμεν
(25,449, 25,473. 25,520. 25,568. 26,19. 26,81. 26,333
26,489. 26,217. 26,261. 26,329. 26,341. 26,612. 26,625
26,657. 26,773. 26,777. 26,289. 26,1040. 26,1044.
26,1156. 26,1285. 26,357. 26,457. 26,440. 26,465
26,473. 26,480. 26,504. 26,521)
- *
30^β Εβαστασαν λιθους οι Ιουδαιοι ινα λιθασωσιν αυτον απε-
*
31. κριθη αυτοις ο Ιησους πολλα εργα καλα εδειξα υμιν εκ του Πατρος δια ποιον αυτων εργων εμε λιθαζετε απεκρι-
*
32. θησαν αυτω οι Ιουδαιοι Περι καλου εργου ου λιθαζομεν σε αλλα περι βλασφημιας και οτι συ ανθρωπος ων ποιεις

- *
 34. σεαυτον Θεον απεκριθη αυτοις ο Ιησους Ουκ εστι γεγραμ-
 *
 35. μενον εν τω νομω υμων οτι εγω ειπα θεοι εστε Ει εκει-
 νους ειπε θεους προς ους ο λογος του Θεου εγενετο και
 *
 36. ου δυναται λυθηναι η Γραφη ον ο Θεος ηγιασε και απεσ-
 *
 37. τειλεν εις τον κοσμον υμεις λεγετε οτι βλασφημεις
 *
 38. οτι ειπον υιος Θεου ειμι Ει ουν ποιων τα εργα του
 Πατρος μη πιστευετε μοι ει δε ποιω καν εμοι μη πισ-
 τευητε_ τοις εργασις πιστευσατε ινα γνωστε και γινωσκητε
 οτι εν εμοι ο Πατηρ καγω εν τω Πατρι (26,477)

Chapter 11

43. Λαζαρε δευρο εξω (26,1277)
 47. Τι ποιουμεν οτι ουτος ο ανθρωπος πολλα σημεια ποιει
 (25,425)

Chapter 12

27. Νυν η ψυχη μου τεταρακται και τι ειπω Πατερ σωσον με
 εκ της ωρας ταυτης (26,337. 26,380. 26,436, 26,444)
 28. Νυν ο αρχων του κοσμου τουτου εκβληθησεται εξω
 (27,365)
 *
 31. Νυν η κρισις εστι του κοσμου τουτου ο αρχων του κοσμου
 τουτου εκβληθησεται εξω (27,324)
 36. Εως το φως εχετε πιστευετε εις το φως ινα υιοι φωτος
 γενησθε (26,493. 26,495)
 *
 40. Δια τουτο ουκ ηδυναντο πιστευειν οι Ιουδαιοι εις τον
 Ιησουν οτι ειπεν ο Ησαιας οτι ετυφλωσεν αυτων τους
 οφθαλμους και επωρωσεν αυτων την καρδιαν μηποτε ιδωσι
 τοις οφθαλμοις και τη καρδια νοησωσι και επιστρεψωσι
 και ιασωμαι αυτους (26.1000)

- *
46. Εγώ φως εις τον κοσμον εληλυθα ινα πας ο πιστευων εις
εμε εν τη σκοτια μη μεινη (26,261. 26,492. 26,495)
27,124)
- *
47. Εαν τις μου ακουσει των λογων και μη φυλαξη εγω ου κρι-
νω αυτον ου γαρ ηλθον ινα κρινω τον κοσμον αλλ ινα σωσω
τον κοσμον ο λογος δε ον ακουει εκεινος κρινει αυτον
εν τη εσχατη ημερα οτι εγω προς τον πατερα πορευομαι
(26,492)

Chapter 13

12. Εγώ ειμι το φως του κοσμου (26,261)
- *
13. Ουχ υμεις λεγετε με ο Κυριος και ο διδασκαλος και κα-
λως λεγετε Ειμι γαρ (26,37)
- *
21. Ταυτα ειπων ο Ιησους εταραχθη τω πνευματι και εμαρτυ-
ρησε και ειπεν Αμην αμην λεγω υμιν εις εξ υμων παραδω-
σει με (26,377)
31. Νυν εδοξασθη ο υιος του ανθρωπου (27,1385)

Chapter 14

- *
2. Πολλαι μοναι παρα τω Πατρι (27,576)
9. Ο εωρακως εμε εωρακε τον Πατερα
(26,81. 26,230. 26,329. 26,465. 26,489. 26,496. 26,29
26,36. 26,140. 26,181. 26,773. 26,777. 26,989. 26,1040
26,1044. 26,1285. 27,129. 26,497. 26,501. 26,504.
26,612. 26,625. 25,520)

10. Εγω εν τω Πατρι και ο Πατηρ εν εμοι
 (26,81. 26,217. 26,261. 26,266. 26,321. 26,328. 26,333
 26,343. 26,357. 26,404. 26,464. 26,473. 26,481. 26,576
 26,601. 26,616. 26,625. 26,641. 26,656. 26,1285 . 25,481)
- *
 12. Αμην αμην λεγω υμιν ο πιστευων εις εμε τα εργα α εγω
 ποιω κακεινος ποιησει και μειζονα τουτωνποιησει οτι
 εγω προς τον Πατερα πορευομαι και οτι αν αιτησητε εν τω
 ονοματι μου τουτο ποιησω ινα δοξασθη ο Πατηρ εν τω υιω
 (26,496)
- *
 28^α Ει αγαπατε με εχαρητε αν οτι ειπον πορευομαι προς τον
 Πατερα (26,37)
- 28^β Οτι ο Πατηρ μου μειζων μου εστι
 (26,335. 26,336. 26,500. 26,741. 26,1269)
- *
 30. Ερχεται ο αρχων του κοσμου τουτου και εν εμοι ευρισκει
 ουδεν (26,541)

Chapter 15

1. Εγω ειμι η αμπελος
 (26,1277. 26,1269)
20. Ει εμε εδιωξαν και υμας διωξουσιν
 (25,496)
23. Ο εμε μισων και τον Πατερα μου μισει
 (27,81)
- *
 26. Οταν ελθη ο παρακλητος ον εγω πεμψω υμιν παρα του Πατρος
 το Πνευμα της αληθειας ο παρα του Πατρος εκπορευεται
 εκεινος μαρτυρησει περι εμου (26,541)

Chapter 16

- *
7. Εάν εγω απελθω αποστελω τον παρακλητον
(26,580)
- *
12. Ετι πολλα εχω υμιν λεγειν αλλ ουπω δυνασθε χωρειν
οταν δε ελθη το αγιον Πνευμα διδαξει υμας (26,652)
- *
13. Ου λαλησει παρ εαυτου ο παρακλητος αλλ οσα ακουσει λα-
λησει οτι εκ του εμου ληψεται και αναγγελει υμιν
(26,625.)
15. Παντα οσα εχει ο Πατηρ εμα εστι
(26,197. 26,609. 26,329. 26,400. 26,616.26,780)
25. Ταυτα εν παροιμιας λελαληκα υμιν αλλ ερχεται ωρα οτι
ουκετι εν παροιμιας λαλησω υμιν αλλα παρησια
(26,241)
- *
27. Εγω εκ του Πατρος εξηλθον και ηκω
(27,352)
33. Εγω νενικηκα τον κοσμον (26,121. 27,529)

Chapter 17

1. Πατερ εληλυθεν η ωρα δοξασον σου τον υιον
(25,664. 26,405. 26,413)
3. Ινα γινωσκωσι σε τον μονον αληθινον Θεον και ον απεστει-
λας Ιησουν Χριστον (26,320. 26,337. 26,1024)
4. Εγω σε εδοξασα επι της γης το εργον τετελειωσα ο δε-
δωκας μοι ινα ποιησω (26,228. 26,580)
5. Τη δοξη η ειχον προ του τον κοσμον ειναι παρα σοι
(26,408)

- *
6. Εφανερώσα το ονομα σου τοις ανθρωποις
(27,725)
7. Παντα οσα δεδωκας μοι δεδωκα αυτοις
(26,477)
- *
11. Πατερ αγιε τηρησον αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου ο δεδωκας
μοι ινα ωσιν εν καθως και ημεις (26,357)
17. Αγιασον αυτους εν τη αληθεια σου ο λογος ο σος αληθεια
εστιν (26,364)
- *
19. Υπερ αυτων αγιαζω εμαυτον ινα ωσιν αυτοι ηγιασμενοι εν
αληθεια (26,1004)
- *
20. Ου περι τουτων δε ερωτω μονον αλλα και περι των πιστευ-
*
21. οντων δια του λογου αυτων εις εμε ινα παντες εν ωσιν
*
22. ινα ο κοσμος πιστευση οτι συ με απεστειλες καγω την
*
23. δοξαν ην δεδωκας μοι δεδωκα αυτοις και συ εν εμοι ινα
ωσι τετελειωμενοι εις εν και ινα γινωσκει ο κοσμος οτι
συ με απεστειλας (26,357)

Chapter 18

5. Εγω ειμι
(26,292. 26,437)
37. Εγω εις τουτο γεγεννημαι και εις τουτο εληλυθα εις τον
κοσμον ινα μαρτυρησω τη αληθεια (26,261)

Chapter 19

- *
15. Αιρε αιρε σταυρωσον αυτον
(27,121)

15^a Αρον αρον σταυρωσον αυτον

(27,724)

15^b Ουκ εχομεν βασιλεα ειμι Καισαρα

(26,27. 26,236 . 25,729)

Chapter 20

17^a Μη μου απτου ουπω αναβεβηκα προς τον Πατερα μου

(26,1101)

17^b* Πορευομαι προς τον Πατερα μου και Πατερα υμων και Θεον

μου και Θεον υμων (26,741)

19. Δια τον φοβον των Ιουδαιων(25,657)

22. Λαβετε πνευμα αγιον

(26,109. 26,112. 26,116. 26,241. 26,560. 26,576. 26,541

26,625. 26,997. 27,765. 27,1188)

28. Ο Κυριος μου και ο Θεος μου

(26,197. 26,989. 26,1017. 26,1065. 26,1088. 27,660)

Quotations from Athanasius' Pseudepigrapha

JOHN

Chapter 1

45. Ον εγραψε Μωσης και οι προφηται ευρηκαμεν
(28,1344)

Chapter 2

16. Εκβαλετε ταυτα εντευθεν και μη ποιειτε τον οικον του πατρος μου οικον εμποριου (28,64)
21. Λυσατε τον ναον τουτον και εν τρισιν ημεραις εγερω αυτον αυτος δε ελεγε περι του ναου του σωματος αυτου
(28,45)

Chapter 3

5. Αμην λεγω εαν μη τις γεννηθη δι υδατος και πνευματος ου μη εισελθη εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων (26,660)
13. Ουδεις γαρ αναβεβηκεν εις τον ουρανον ει μη ε εκ του ουρανου καταβας ο υιος του ανθρωπου ο ων εν τω ουρανω
(28,1097)
14. Και καθως Μωσης υψωσε τον οφιν εν τη ερημω ουτως δει υψωθειναι τον υιον του ανθρωπου (28,72)

Chapter 4

6. Ιησους δε κεκοπιακως εκ της οδοιποριας εκαθεζετο
(28,449)

14. Ιδε υγιης γεγονας μηκειτι αμαρτανε ινα μη χειρον σοι
τι γενηται (28,192)
29. Και εκπορευσονται οι τα αγαθα πραξαντες εις αναστασιν
ζωης οι δε τα φαυλα πραξαντες εις αναστασιν κρισεως
(28,573)
43. Εγω ηλθον εν τω ονοματι του Πατρος μου και ουκ εδεξασ-
θε με εαν αλλος ελθη εις το ονομα εαυτου εκεινον δε-
ξησθε (28,64)
46. Ει επιστευετε Μωση επιστευετε αν εμοι οτι Μωσης περι-
εμου ελαλησε (28,513)

Chapter 6

38. Ουκ ηλθον ποιησαι το θελημα το εμον (28,57)
44. Ουδεις δυναται προς με ελθειν εαν μη ο Πατηρ μου ο ου-
ρανιος ελκυση αυτον (28,58)
54. Ο μη τραγων μου την σαρκα και πινων μου το αιμα ουκ
εχει ζωην αιωνιον (28,76)
62. Τουτο υμας σκανδαλιζει εαν ουν θεωρειτε τον υιον του
ανθρωπου αναβαινοντα οπου ην το προτερον το πνευμα
εστιν το ζωοποιουν η σαρξ ουκ αφελει ουδεν τα ρημα-
τα α εγω λελαληκα υμιν πνευμα εστι και ζωη (28,372)
69. Ρηματα ζωης αιωνιου εχεις προς τινα απελευσομεθα
(28,401)

Chapter 8

14. Καν εγω μαρτυρω περι εμαυτου η μαρτυρια μου αληθης
εστιν οτι οίδα ποθεν ερχομαι και που υπαγω (28,104)
16. Ουκ ειμι μονος οτι ο πεμψας με Πατηρ μετ εμου εστι
(28,101)
21. Εγω υπαγω οπου υμεις ου δυνασθε ελθειν (28,401)
40. Τι με ζητειτε αποκτειναι ανθρωπον ος την αληθειαν υμιν
λελαληκα (28,516)

Chapter 9

16. Ουκ εστιν ουτος ο ανθρωπος εκ του Θεου οτι το Σαββατον
ου τηρει (28,164)
22. Ταυτα δε ελεγον οι γονεις του αναβλεψαντος οτι εφοβουν-
το τους Ιουδαιους ηδη γαρ συνετεθειντο οι Ιουδαιοι
ινα τις αυτον ομολογηση Χριστον αποσυναγωγος γενηται
(28,1016)
25. Ει αμαρτωλος εστιν ουκ οίδα εν οίδα οτι τυφλος ων αρτι
βλεπω (28,1017)
27. Τι παλιν θελετε ακουειν μη και υμεις θελετε μαθηται
αυτου γενεσθαι (28,1017)
28. Συ ει μαθητης εκεινου ημεις γαρ του Μωυσεως εσμεν μα-
θηται (28,1020)

Chapter 10

1. Αμην αμην λεγω υμιν ο μη εισερχομενος δια της θυρας εις
την αυλην των προβατων αλλα αναβαινων αλλαγοθεν κλεπτης

εστι και ληστης (28,1020)

9. Αμην αμην λεγω υμιν εγω ειμι η θυρα των προβατων δι
εμου εαν τις εισελθη και εξελθη νομην ευρησει
(28,1020)
11. Ο καλος ο ποιμην την ψυχην τιθησιν υπερ των προβατων
εγω ειμι ο καλος ο ποιμην (28,521)
29. Ο πατηρ ος δεδακε μοι μειζων παντων εστι και ουδεις δυ-
ναται αρπασαι εκ της χειρος του Πατρος μου Εγω και ο
Πατηρ εν εσμεν (28,1324)

Chapter 12

37. Πολλα σημεια ποιησαντος του Ιησου εμπροσθεν αυτων ουκ
επιστευσαν εις αυτον οι Ιουδαιοι ινα πληρωθη το ειρη-
μενον δια Ησαιου Κυριε τις επιστευσεν τη ακοη ημων και
ο βραχιων Κυριου τινι απεκαλυφθη (28,65)

Chapter 13

4. Τοτε εβαλε υδωρ εις τον νιπτηρα και αποτιθεται τα ιμα-
τια και λεντιον περιζωννυται και νιπτει των μαθητων
τους ποδας ενδυεται τα ιματια αυτου (28,1020)
33. Τεκνια μου ετι μικρον μεθ υμων και πορευομαι προς τον
πεμψαντα με (28,474)

Chapter 14

15. Εαν αγαπατε με τας εντολας μου τηρησατε καγω αναβαινω
προς τον πατερα μου και παρακαλεσω αυτον και αλλον πα-
ρακλητον πεμψει υμιν το πνευμα της αληθειας (28,49)

Chapter 17

3. Αυτη εστιν η αιωνιος ζωη ινα γινωσκωσι σε τον μονον αληθινον Θεον και ον απεστειλας Ιησουν Χριστον (28,464)
17. Πατερ αγιασον αυτους εν τη αληθεια σου (28,485)
25. Πατερ αγιε ο κοσμος σε ουκ εγ̄νω̄ εγω̄ δε̄ σε εγνων (28,48)

Chapter 19

23. Οι ουν στρατιωται οτε εσταυρωσαν τον Ιησουν ελαβον τα ιματια αυτου και εποιησαν τεσσαρα μερη εκαστω στρατιωτη μερος τον δε χιτωνα επει ην αρραφος εκ των ανω υφαντος δι ολου ειπον προς αλληλους μη σχισωμεν αυτον αλλα λαχωμεν περι αυτου τινος εσται ινα η Γραφη πληρωθη Διεμερισαντο τα ιματια μου εαυτοις και επι τον ιματισμον μου εβαλον κληρον (28,204)

S i g l i a :

Αθ.	Athanasius
Αμβρ.	Ambrosius
Αυγ.	Augustine
Βασ.	Basil
Διδ.	Didymus
Επιφ.	Epiphanius
Ευσ.	Eusebius
Θεοφ.	Theophilus
Ιπ.	Hippolitus
Ιουσ.	Iustinus
Ιλ.	Hilarius
Κυπρ.	Cyprian
Κλ.	Clement
Κυρ.	Cyrillus
Μεθ.	Methodius
Τα.	Tatian
Τερτ.	Tertullian
Χρυσ.	Chrysostom
Ωρ.	Origen

VII. COLLATION

The Athanasian readings and their supporting witnesses
against Textus Receptus

Supporting Witnesses of the Readings of Athanasius

1. MATTHEWChapter 3

4. τροφη αυτου ην] τροφη ην
Aθ.κ B C D W 1. 118. 209. 1582. Vg^(1 MS)
9. εκ των λιθων τουτων τεκνα τω Αβρααμ]
τεκνα τω Αβρααμ εκ των λιθων τουτων Aθ. Cop.^{sa.bo}
11. και πυρι] om. Aθ. E Ω 28. 59. 241. 245. 349. 470
517. 692. Ωρ. Θεοφ. Sy^{s m}
17. ευδοκησα] ηυδοκησα Aθ.κ* C L P W Σ 183. 184. 243.
251. 471. Ιπ. Ωρ. Επιφ. Ευσ.

Chapter 4

1. εις την ερημον υπο του πνευματος] υπο του πνευματος
εις την ερημον Aθ.κ K 21. 157. 349. 399. 517. 954.
1424. 1675. Sy^{s.c} Arm. Aeth. Geo^(letA) Ta.
10. υπαγε] add. οπισω μου Aθ. C² D E L M Z Γ Ω 209. 346
543.² 28. 33. 71. 157. 248. 349
482. 1241. 517. 692. 892.² Ιουσ.
Sy^{s.c} Arm. Aeth. Cop.^{sa.bo(2 MSS)}
b l d h

Chapter 5

16. υμων τα καλα εργα] τα καλα υμων εργα
Aθ. 28. 246. 482. 483. 1093. 1355. Ωρ.
28. πας ο βλεπων] ο εμβλεψας Aθ. Κ 28. 117. 157. 243. 477
1093. 1606. Κλ. Ωρ. Ευσ. Βασ.
Κυρ. Ιουσ.
48. εσεσθε ουν] ομ. ουν Aθ. Ευσ. Ωρ. Geo.
- ωσπερ] ως Aθ. № В F L Z Σ 1. 118. 209. 1582. 13.
124. 33. 543. 346. 1241. 349. 517. 485.
700. 892. 1424. 1675. Ωρ. Κλ. Χρυσ. Ευσ.
- ο εν τοις ουρανοις] ο ουρανιος
Aθ. № В D^b E^{*} F L U W Z Σ 1. 118.
209. 1582. 13. 69. 124. 346. 543.
28. 33. 157. 892. 1241. 1424. Ωρ.
Ιουσ. Αυγ. Κυπρ. Τερτ. a f ff¹ g²
l m.

Chapter 6

1. προσεχετε] add. δε Aθ. № L Z Θ Σ 1. 118. 209. 1582.
33. 157. 247. 349. 544. 892. 1241
1424. Cop^{bo} Aeth. Geo. g¹
6. ταμειον] ταμειον Aθ. № В E L Σ 59. 241. 1093. 1241
184. 1579. 245. 440. 273. 1396.
655. Ωρ. Cop^{sa.bo}

- θυρας σου] om. σου Aθ. K 471 b c h ff
19. Θησαυριζετε] θησαυριζητε Aθ. 209
20. εν ουρανω] εν ουρανοις Aθ. 243. Ωρ.
22. σωματος] add. σου Aθ. Αυγ. Ωρ. Aeth. Vg^(pl) a b c g¹ h q
οφθαλμος] ad. σου Aθ. B 372 Αυγ. Ωρ. Ιλ. Aeth. Vg.
Ta. a b c ff¹ g² l
- εαν ουν] om. ουν Aθ. № 252. 273. 485. a c ff¹ q h f
25. και τι Aθ. № Σ 1. 22.* 1582. 4. 174. 372. 660. 892. 1170
ποιητε
om. Ωρ. Κλ. Ιουσ. Αυγ. Χρυσ. Ιλ. a b ff¹ k l m Sy^s
Sy^{s.c} Cop^{sa.bo} (pl)
26. εις αποθηκας] εις τας αποθηκας Aθ. №^c L 346. 16. 470
482. Ta.
28. αυξανει] αυξανουσιν Aθ. №² B Θ 1. 22. 118. 209. 1582
33. 273. 660. Αυγ. Ιλ. Χρυσ. a b k
- κοπια] κοπιωσιν Aθ. №(B) Θ 1. 22. 118. 209. 1582. (33)
Αυγ. Ιλ. a b c d f ff¹ k q h l
- νηθει] νηθουσι Aθ. № B (Θ) 1. 22. 118. 209. 1582
33. Αυγ. Ιλ. a b c d f ff¹ k l m q
31. μη ουν] om. ουν Aθ. 484 Κυπρ. Cop^{sa.bo}(3 MSS) Geo.²
μεριμνησητε λεγοντες] om. λεγοντες Aθ. Ιουσ. Επιφ. Μεθ.

φαγαμεν] φαγητε Αθ. Ιουσ.

πιαμεν] πιητε Αθ. Ιουσ.

περιβαλαμεθα] ενδυσησθε Αθ. Ιουσ.

34. μη ουν] ομ. ουν Αθ. Cορ^{bo} a b

Chapter 7

1. ινα μη] και ου μη Αθ. 28. 240. 244. 998. 999. 1093
1555.

3. την εν ... δοκον] δοκον την εν Αθ. κ Φ Ν Σ 544. 1200 Ανγ.

4. ερεις] λεγεις Αθ. κ* Θ 700. 1360. Vg. Arm. Geo.² b c
f ε² h k

απο του] εκ του Αθ. κ Β Λ Ν Σ 1. 118. 209. 1582. 13.
124. 346. 21. 28. 33. 372. 399. 235
713. 892. 945. 1241. 1424.

και ιδου η δοκος εν τω οφθαλμω σου] ομ. Αθ. 13. 118^{**}

5. την δοκον εκ του οφθαλμου σου] εκ του οφθαλμου σου
την δοκον Αθ. κ Β C

6. δωτε] δοτε Αθ. Μ S 1. 28. 118. 209. 13. 543. 1241

το αγιον] τα αγια Αθ. 118. 209. 157. 243. 245. 1689
Επιφ. Ωρ. Χρυσ.

μαργαριτας υμων] om. υμων Aθ. Κλ. Ωρ. Cop^{bo} Sy^{s.c}

εν τοις] om. εν Aθ. 1. 22. 118. 209. 1582. 33. 71.
660. 1606. Κλ. Ωρ.

15. προσεχετε δε] om. δε Aθ. Ⓝ Β Ω 237. 240. 273. 435.
544. 565. 1093. Ιουσ. Ευσ. Χρυσ.
Επιφ. Ιλ. Τα. Cop^{sa} Vg. Sy^c Arm.
Aeth. a b c ff^l g^l h l m q

21. κυριε κυριε] om. κυριε Aθ. 700

22. κυριε κυριε] om. κυριε Aθ. 238. 506. 700. 1093. 1675

Chapter 8

31. βασανισαι] απολεσαι Aθ. Ⓝ* 713*

Chapter 9

5. αφωνται σοι] αφωνται σου Aθ. Ⓝ Β C D E F G K L M V
W X Θ Φ Ω 71. 157. 240.
471. 485. 692. 697. 700.
892. k

15. ελευσονται] om. Aθ. Ⓝ*

νηστευσουσιν] add. εν εκειναις ταις ημεραις

Aθ. D Βασ. Ωρ. a b c d g^l h q Vg.

Chapter 10

8. λεπρους καθαριζετε] om. Aθ. v_g^(1 MS)
 νεκρους εγειρετε] om. Aθ. C³L X Y Γ Θ Π Ε Φ Γ Η Κ Μ
 U S V Ω Σ 28. 118. 209. 124
 59. 251. 482. 485. 700. 1402
 1293. 1278. Ευσ. Βασ. Χρυσ.
 Τα. Arm. Geo. Cop^{sa}.
- δαιμονια] δαιμονας Aθ. Ευσ
19. οταν δε] om. δε Aθ. Sy^s
 παραδιδωσιν] παραδωσουσιν Aθ. D G L N W X Σ 13. 69.
 346. 543. 33. 157. 230. 251
 349. 485. 517. 1354. 1424.
 Ωρ. Χρυσ. Vg. a b c d l h q
23. οταν] εαν Aθ. 1170. Ωρ. Αυγ.
 οταν δε] om. δε Aθ. 478. Κλ. Ωρ. Αυγ. Sy^s Geo.²
 αλλην] ετεραν Aθ. κ B W 1. 22. 118. 209. 1582. 33.
 543. 892. 1424. q k
25. εκαλεσαν] επεκαλεσαν Aθ. κ^c B C W X Γ Δ Π Φ Ε Φ Γ Η
 Κ Μ S V Ω Υ 13. 69. 346. 543.
 33. 157. 565. 892. 28. 485. 788
 826. 828. 980. Κυρ.

28. μη δυναμενων αποκτειναι] αποκτειναι μη δυναμενων
Αθ. 349. 659
29. του πατρος υμων] add. του εν ουρανοις Αθ. 99. 241. 257
Ωρ. Κυρ. Αeth. Cop^{bo}
38. λαμβανει] αιρει Αθ. Κλ. Ωρ. Τα.
οπισω μου] μοι Αθ. Κλ. Ωρ. Τα.
40. εμε δεχομενος] δεχομενος με Αθ. 238. Ωρ. α

Chapter 11

27. εαν] αν Αθ. D 33. 124. 990. 1010. 1170. 1293. Κλ.
Ιουσ.Είρ. Ωρ.
- αποκαλυψαι] αποκαλυψη Αθ. Κλ. Ιουσ.Είρ. Ωρ. Τερτ.
Διδ. Κυρ.
30. πραιοσ] πραιοσ Αθ. κ Β C D 713. Κλ. Ωρ. Βασ. Κυρ.

Chapter 12

25. Καθ εαυτης] καθ εαυτην Αθ. X 1. 118. 209. 28. 33. 59.
174. 213. 443. 477. 485. 517.
713. 1012. 1391. 1424. Χρυσ.
31. υμιν] add. οτι Αθ. 28. 243. 1293. 1515. κ η

31. τοις ανθρωποις | αυτοις Aθ. 71. 267. 544. 692. 1194.
1396. Χρυσ. Διδ. Aeth. Vg^(1 MS)
32. τουτω | νυν Aθ. E F G L M S U V Γ Ω 118. 209. 700.
71. 251. 253. 254. 472. 482. 485. 692.
Βασ. Επιφ.
40. εσται | add. και Aθ. D E L W Σ Φ 245. 267. 270. 440.
473. 482. 485. 544. 1293. 692. 945.
12. 93. 1424. 1485. 655. 1396. 1207.
1574. 1170. Ευσ. Κυρ. Κυπ. Χρυσ. Ωρ.
a b c d ff² f g¹ h k q Aeth. Sy^c Cop^{bo}

Chapter 15

26. εστι καλον | καλον εστι Aθ. 229. 270. 472. 473. 478.
482. 544. 726. 1200. 1207.
1355. 1375. 1365. Geo.

Chapter 18

6. επι τον | περι τον Aθ. * B L Z Σ Δ 28. 33. 157. 482.
544. 713. 892. 1241. 1093. 1295.
1391. 1396. 1574. Ωρ. Βασ. Κυρ.

Chapter 19

4. ποιησας | κτισας Aθ. Β Θ 1. 1582. 22. 124. 33. 59.
660. 700. Ωρ. Μεθ. Arm. Aeth. Cop^{sa.bo}

- ο ποιησας απ αρχης | απ αρχης ο κτισας Aθ. 69
5. μητερα | add. αυτου Aθ. W Γ Λ 69. 544. 566. 1187. 1241
2145. Ωρ. Τα. Cop^{sa.bo} Sy^{s.c} Aeth.
21. σου παντα | om. παντα Aθ. Θ D 13. 69. 124. 346. 1.
118. 209. Eip. Sy^{s.c} Cop^{sa} a b c d
- ουρανω | ουρανοις Aθ. κ B C D Γ 230. 1012. 1194.
1295. 1355. 1391. 1396. 1402. 2145
Χρυσ. Ιλ. Κυρ. Cop^{sa} d e g¹ Vg^(3 MSS)

Chapter 20

32. θελετε | add. ινα Aθ. κ L Z 106. 565. 892. 1223.
1293. 1391. 238. 1245. Ωρ. Κυρ. e d
f g¹ h l q a b Arm. Sy^c Vg.

Chapter 21

6. και ποιησαντες | εποιησαν Aθ. D Vg. Sy^c Cop^{sa} Aeth. Geo.
προσεταξεν | συνεταξεν Aθ. B C D 33. 700. 372. 1604
48. a b c d l m q h

Chapter 22

16. ανθρωπων | ανθρωπου Aθ. G Θ 1. 22. 118. 209. 1582.
28. 157. 565. 700. 1424. Ευσ.
Χρυσ. Ωρ. Cop^{sa} Sy^s Geo. Aeth. Arm.

30. εγκυμιζονται | γυμιζονται Aθ. *B (D)L 1. 22. 118.
 209. 262. 349. 372. 477.
 517. 566. 659. 660. 692.
 697. 788. 892. 954. 1010.
 1588. 1675. 1185. 1279. 1293
 1424. 1473. 1573. 1579. Κλ.
 Ωρ.

του Θεου εν ουρανω | om. Aθ. B (D)Θ 543. Ωρ. Αμβ. Arm.
 Geo. Cop^{sa} a b c d e f ff² h q r

Chapter 23

37. επισυναγει ορνις | ορνις επισυναγει Aθ. *B D K L Θ Φ 1.
 118. 209. 1582. 13. 69. 124.
 346. 543. 33. 700. 892. 1295.
 1604. Κλ. Ωρ. Ευσ. Βασ. Κυρ.
 Vg. Sy^s Cop^{sa.bo} Geo.¹

εαυτης | αυτης Aθ. *B D M W Δ Σ Φ 4. 33. 262. 273.
 291. 544. 892. 1424. 2145. Κλ. Ωρ. Κυρ.
 Ευσ.

Chapter 24

15. εστος | εστως Aθ. B² D E K M S U Γ Θ Ω 1. 118. 209.
 13. 69. 543. 28. 157. 700. 1241. 1424. Ευσ.

17. καταβαινετω] καταβατω Aθ. κ Β D L Z Θ Σ 124. 33. 157
 443. 517. 700. 713. 892. 945.
 954. 999. 1279. 1295. 1396.
 1402. 1424. 1604. 1675. Ωρ. Χρυσ.

τι] τα Aθ. κ Β L W Z Γ Δ Π Σ Φ Ε F G H K M S U V Ω
 22. 13. 69. 124. 346. 543. 157. 892. 700. 1241
 Ωρ. Χρυσ. Cop^{sa.bo}

23. ωδε] εκει Aθ. D 1010. 1293. Cop^{bo} Arm. d f ff¹ Vg^(pl)

24. πλανησαι] πλανασθαι Aθ. L Z Θ 1. 22. 118. 209. 1582
 33. 157. Ωρ. Κυρ.

Chapter 25

20. επ αυτοις] om. Aθ. κ Β D L Θ 565. 124. 102. 127. 33.
 71. 700. 892* Ωρ. Αμβ. Vg. Cop^{bo} Aeth. Arm.

27. ουν] om. Aθ. Κλ. Ωρ. Κυρ. Arm. Geo.

35. επεινασα] επεινων Aθ. Ωρ.

εδιψησα] εδιψων Aθ. Ωρ.

40. των αδελφων μου] om. Aθ. Β* 16. 1424. Κλ. Κυρ. ff¹

Chapter 26

28. τουτο γαρ εστι το αιμα μου | τουτο μου εστι το αιμα
Αθ. Ωρ.

το | om. Αθ. * B D L Δ Z Θ 28. 33. 544. a b c d k h l m

39. πατερ μου | om. μου Αθ. L Δ Σ 1. 22. 118. 209. 1582
892. Ιουσ. Ωρ. Ιλ. Κυπρ. Vg. Geo.^B

δυνατον εστιν | om. εστιν Αθ. 990. 1402. 1515. Ωρ.
Ευσ. Κυπρ.Είρ. Βασ. Χρυσ.

απ εμου | om. Αθ. Ωρ.

41. το μεν | om. μεν Αθ. Κλ.

45. ιδου | add. γαρ Αθ. B E Θ 47. 238. 482 . Sy^s Cop^{bo} Arm.

Chapter 28

19. πορευθεντες ουν | om. ουν Αθ. * A Γ Ε F G H K M S U V
Ω 22. 28. 69. 124. 543. 59.
71. 157. 241. 245. 349. 472.
482. 485. 517. 692. 697. 700.
Επιφ.Είρ. Ευσ. Ωρ. Κυπρ. Cop^{bo}

βαπτιζοντες | βαπτιζετε Αθ. Κλ.

20. αμην αμην | om. αμην Αθ. * A B D 1. 22. 33. 700. 102.
1582. 240. 244. Ωρ. Κλ. Vg. Cop^{sa}
Cop^{bo} Aeth. Arm. d e ff^l h q g^l

Supporting Witnesses of the Readings of Athanasius

2. LUKEChapter 1

28. ευλογημενη συ εν γυναιξιν | om. Aθ. κ B L Ω 1. 131.
1582 . 700. Cop^{sa.bo} Arm.

Chapter 2

11. υμιν | ημιν Aθ. 579. 700. 1355. 1675.

ος εστι | om. Aθ. 118. Ωρ.

22. Μωσεως | Μουσεως Aθ. κ B D K R V X Δ Π Ξ Θ W Ω 13.
22. 124. 69. 346. 543. 1241. 28. 33.
892.

52. και | ο Aθ. κ A W 472. 566. 892. 1071. 1194. Ωρ.

ηλικια και σοφια | σοφια και ηλικια Aθ. κ B A Θ C X Γ Δ
Λ Π Ν Ωρ. Κυρ. Επιφ.
Αυγ. Vg. f g¹

Chapter 3

23. και αυτος | om. Aθ. D Επιφ. Εἰρ. Cop^{bo}

ο Ιησους | om. ο Aθ. κ B D L U X 33. 700. 1241.

ωσει ετων τριακοντα αρχομενος] αρχομενος ωσει ετων τρ.

Aθ. * B L X W 1. 33. 118.

131. 1582. 131. 209. 700.

1241. Επιφ. Vg. b c e g¹ l

ων ως ενομιζετο υιος] ων υιος ως ενομιζετο

Aθ. * B L W 1. 118. 131. 209.

1582. 892. 1241. Ωρ. Ευσ. Επιφ. a

Chapter 4

1. πνευματος αγιου πληρης] πληρης πνευματος αγιου Aθ. F Sy^{s.c}

21. οτι] om. Aθ. W D 544. Ωρ. Τα. Sy^s

33. οιδα] οιδαμεν Aθ. Ψ 892. Arm.

41. οτι] om. Aθ. 1424. 1223. Sy^s Τα. q f a b c e ff g¹

ο Χριστος] om. Aθ. * B C D F W L R X E 33. 130. 220.

700. 1241. Ωρ. Τερτ. Vg. Cop^{bo} Arm. Sy^{s.c}

Chapter 6

36. γινεσθε ουν] om. ουν Aθ. * B D L E 1. 118. 209.

1582. 157. 700. Κλ. Κυρ. Τερτ.

Κυπρ. Aeth. Arm. Cop^{bo} a b c e

f l q

καθως] ως Αθ. 700. Γουσ. Ωρ. Κλ. Διδ. Χρυσ.

και] om. Αθ. κ Β Λ Ε Δ W 1. 118. 209. 131. 1582.
262. 1241. 700. 477. 1071. 1187. Κλ. Χρυσ.
Τερτ. Cop^{bo} Aeth. Sy^s c d

ο πατηρ υμων] add. ο εν τοις ουρανοις Αθ. Χρυσ.

Chapter 9

62. αυτου] om. Αθ. Β 1. 209. 131. 245. 1582. 998. Ξρ.
Ωρ. Βασ. Κυρ. Τερτ. Arm. a b l q

βλεπων] στραφεις Αθ. 4. 7. 36. 38. 892. Ωρ. Χρυσ. Κυρ.

εις την βασιλειαν] τη βασιλεια Αθ. κ Β Λ Ε 1. 1582.
131. 33. 700. 1241. Κλ. Ωρ. Κυρ. Ιλ.
Vg. Arm. a b c e f g^l l m

του Θεου] των ουρανων Αθ. Εΐρ. Κυρ.

Chapter 10

18. εκ του ουρανου πεσοντα] πεσοντα εκ του ουρανου
Αθ. 472. Ωρ. Κλ. Βασ. Επιφ.

19. διδαμι] δεδωκα Αθ. κ Β C L Φ Δ X W 1. 1542. 213. 700.
1241. Ωρ. Βασ. Κυρ. Επιφ. Ιλ. Vg. Arm.
Aeth. b c e f g^l l q

του πατειν] om. του Αθ. Ωρ. Ευσ. Βασ. Κυρ. Επιφ.

20. μαλλον] om. Aθ. * A B C D E G H K L M S U V W Γ Δ Λ
 Π Θ Ν Ω 543. 22. 892. 33. 700. Eυσ.
 Βασ. Ωρ. Vg. Cop^{bo} Sy^{s.c} Arm. Aeth.

22. παρεδοθη μοι] μοι παρεδοθη Aθ. * A B C D L W X Γ Δ Λ
 Ξ(Θ) Ν Ω 13. 69. 124. 346. 543. 1241.
 22. 28. 700. 33.

γινωσκει] επιγινωσκει Aθ. C F H Δ 33. 579. 700. 565.
 544. 124. 1194. 1071. 291. 1555

τις εστιν ο υιος] τον υιον Aθ. 544. 1604. Sy^s

τις εστιν ο Πατηρ] τον Πατερα Aθ. Sy^s b 1

Chapter 11

13. υπαρχοντες] οντες Aθ. * D K M X Π Α 22. 2193. 945.
 477. 213. 157. 229. 1354. 1555. 440.
 1229. 1047. 472. 1038. Επιφ. Κυρ.

δοματα αγαθα] αγαθα δοματα Aθ. Κλ. Vg. a b c d e f g

ο Πατηρ] add. υμων Aθ. C U 346. 1424. 7. 1071. 157.
 1012. Επιφ. Κυρ. Τα. Arm. Aeth. Cop^{sa}
 b c l q ff² f r

19. εκβαλλουσι] εκβαλουσι Aθ. M R X Λ Θ Ν 892. 700.

20. κριται υμων αυτοι] αυτοι υμων κριται Aθ. B D 579. 700 a c

Θεου] add. εγω Αθ. κ Β C L R W Ψ Δ 13. 33. 69.
124. 346. 157. 1071. 1241. 1604.
1396. Βασ. Sy^{s.c} c l q r

46. τοις νομικοις ουαι] ουαι τοις νομικοις Αθ. D Sy^s Sy^{s.c}

Chapter 12

9. ενωπιον] εμπροσθεν Αθ. A D Θ K Q Π 348. 892. 1574.
443. 291. 1346. 270. 229. 1354.
1355. 1

ενωπιον²] εμπροσθεν² Αθ. D Κλ.

20. αφρων] αφρον Αθ. K M S U V Π X A E F G H Ω 22. 21.
700. 892. 124. 213. 1574. 713. 566.
1241. 1047.

27. τα κρινα] add. του αγρου Αθ. X 213. 1424. Sy^s Sy^{s.c} a b

αυξανει] αυξανουσι Αθ. F 579

30. τουτων] add. απαντων Αθ. X Θ N 13. 69. 124. 346. 28.
131. 213. 1346. 472. Κλ. Arm.
Aeth. a b f

31. ζητειτε] add. πρωτον Αθ. 13. 28. 69. 124. 131. 346.
543. 1241. Vg. Arm.

του Θεου] αυτου Αθ. κ Β D L Cop^{bo} Aeth. a c Cop^{sa}

49. εις] επι Αθ. * A B K L M T U Θ X Π W N 1. 118. 131.
700. 209. 1582. 13. 69. 124. 346. 543. 33.
892. 1241. Κλ. Ωρ. Μεθ.

Chapter 13

34. επισυναξαι] επισυναγαγειν Αθ. 28. 892. 579. 1194.
1047. Χρυσ.

Chapter 14

26. εαυτου] om. Αθ. 579. Ωρ. ε

Chapter 16

25. απελαβες συ] om. συ Αθ. * B D G H L Π N 13. 69.
346. 543. Βασ. Χρυσ. Ωρ. Κυπρ.

αγαθα σου] om. σου Αθ. E 13. 69. 124. 346. Ωρ. a b

οδε] ωδε Αθ. * B A C D W Θ E F G H K M N U V S Ω
13. 22. 346. 543. 700.

Chapter 17

10. τα διαταχθεντα υμιν] om. Αθ. * ^a 700. Κυπρ. a b e ff

οτι δουλοι] om. οτι Αθ. A X N 1. 118. 131. 209.
1582. Βασ. Κυπρ. Vg. a b c d f

21. του Θεου] των ουρανων Αθ. Ωρ.

Chapter 21

8. οτι] om. Αθ. κ Β L X 1241. Τερτ. Aeth.
33. παρελευσονται] παρελευσεται Αθ. C K Π W A Θ 1. 118.
209. 1582. 127. 131. 1241. 892. 1360.
1223. 477. 2145. 713. 1375. 1355. 1093. a e

Chapter 23

42. αμην] add. αμην Αθ. Χρυσ. Κυρ. Αμβρ. Sy^s Sy^{s.c}
46. παραθησομαι] παρατιθημι Αθ. D R M 1. 118. 131. 209.
1582. 892. 544. 659. 7. 213.
1012. 291. 1375. 726. 1047.
472. 716. 661. 22. Βασ. Επιφ.

The quotations from Athanasius from the Gospel of

3. JOHN

Chapter 1

13. ουδε εκ θεληματος ανδρος] om. Aθ. B 17* Χρυσ. Ευσ.

17. Μωσεως] Μουσεως Aθ. κ B C K L S X Δ Π Θ W 33 Ωρ.

η] add. δε Aθ. W a b c d f ff¹ l h q

Chapter 3

16. εις αυτον] εκ αυτον Aθ. T^b Ψ

17. αυτου] om. Aθ. κ B L T^b W 1. 22. 118. 209. 262. 565.
1582. Κυρ.

19. πονηρα αυτων] αυτων πονηρα Aθ. κ A B G K L T^b U Λ Π
Ψ Θ W 1. 22. 118. 13. 69. 124. 346. 543.
892. 157. 33. 1582. 565. Χρυσ. Κυρ. Vg. c d f

Chapter 4

13. πας ο πινων] om. πας Aθ. Ωρ. Ευσ. Sy^{s.c}

14. ο] add. εγω Aθ. κ D M N T^b W Θ 13. 22. 33. 69. 124.
346. 1241. 1293. 1574. 372. 1093. 661.
Ωρ. Διδ. Arm. Sy^c Vg. a b c f ff² g

21. γυναι πιστευε μοι] πιστευε μοι γυναι Aθ. * B C L W Ψ
E F G H 253. 259. 892. 1241. Ωρ. Χρυσ.
Κυρ. Cop^{sa} Aeth. b g q

πιστευσον] πιστευε Aθ. * B C^{*}D L W E F G H 1. 22. 1241
118. 209. 13. 69. 346. 543. 565. 477
1293. 1071. 1321. 138. Ωρ. Χρυσ. Ιλ.
Κυρ. Cop^{sa}

Chapter 5

26. εχει ζωην] ζωην εχει Aθ. * 569. Ευσ. Επιφ. Διδ.

εδωκε και τω υιω] και τω υιω εδωκε Aθ. * B L Ευσ. Ιλ.
Κυρ. Επιφ. Τερτ. Aeth. b l

27. και κρισιν] om. και Aθ. *^c A B L Δ Ψ Σ Ν Φ Ε F G H W
33. 241. 397. 579. Ωρ. Διδ. Τα.
Vg. Cop^{bo} Arm. Sy^c b c d e ff²

30. ουδεν] ad. αλλα Aθ. 1071. Τα. Sy^{s.c} q f

36. εδωκε] δεδωκε Aθ. * B L Γ W N 1. 118. 209. 13. 69. 346.
892. 33. 157. 131. 28. 543. 1582. 2193. Κυρ.

εγω] om. Aθ. * A B W D L Ψ Δ Σ Ν Φ Ε F G H 1. 22. 33.
565. 892. 7. 1241. 1010. 213. 1582. Τα. Κυρ. Ιλ.
Arm. Aeth. Cop^{bo} c b

37. αυτος] εκεινος Aθ. * B L W 213. a ff²

ακηκοατε ποποτε] ποποτε ακηκοατε Αθ. Ν Α Β Δ Κ Λ Η W
 Ν 13. 69. 124. 346. 1241. 33. 1582.
 Vg. Sy^o Arm. a b c d e f q

μενοντα εν υμιν] εν υμιν μενοντα Αθ. Ν Β Λ W Ν 1. 118. 1582
 209. 13. 124. 346. 1241. 33. Κυρ. Ιλ.
 Aeth. Vg. b c f ff²

39. εκειναι] αυται Αθ. W Κυρ.

Chapter 6

30. τι ουν] ου. ουν Αθ. Σ Λ Ε F G H X^b 33. 1424. 1188. 71.
 1194. 213. 1574. 713. 397. 314. 430.
 Κυρ. Τα. Cop.^{sa.bo} Arm. Aeth.

ποιεις συ] συ ποιεις Αθ. Δ Σ Ν Φ 185 a c d e

40. τουτο δε] ου. δε Αθ. T 713. 892. Arm.

42. Ιησους] ου. Αθ. Μ Ν 1. 118. 209. 1582. 131. 157. 713.
 1223. 472. 476. 700. 1170. 565. 1241. 983.
 1424. 983. 230. 267. 543. 892. Ευσ. Χρυσ.
 b c g

ουτος] ου. Αθ. Β C D L T W 1. 22. 118. 209. 28. 157.
 543. 565. 892. 1241. 1582. Χρυσ. Κυρ. Cop.^{sa}
 Cop.^{bo} Arm. Aeth. a ff² q

46. Θεου] Πατρος Αθ. Ν 1293

51. ην εγω δασω] om. Aθ. κ B C D L T W 33. 157. Χρυσ.
Κυρ. Τερτ. Vg. Arm. Aeth. a b c m l q
64. λαλω] λελαληκα Aθ. κ B C D K L T U Π Θ N W 13. 69.
124. 346. 1241. Ωρ. Ευσ. Διδ. Κυρ.
Χρυσ. Τερτ. Vg. Sy^s Cop^{bo} Sy^{s.c} Arm.

Chapter 7

15. γραμματα οιδε] οιδε γραμματα Aθ. E F G H X 118. 209.
430. 565. 544. 2193. 1223. 2145. Χρυσ.
39. ειπε] ελεγε Aθ. * Χρυσ. Κυρ. Ιλ. Διδ. c l m q ff²

Chapter 8

35. ο] add. δε Aθ. D T Ψ 118. 209. 249. Κυπρ. Τα. Vg.
Cop^{sa.bo} Arm. Aeth.
36. εαν ουν] om. ουν Aθ. E F G H 13. 69. 124. 1241. a e
ff² l Cop^{sa}

Chapter 10

10. περισσον] περισσοτερον Aθ. X^b Γ 69. 157. 213. 579.
1010. 1321.
18. παλιν] om. Aθ. 64. 80. 225. 1241. Ευσ. Χρυσ. Ιλ. e ff²

30. εβαστασαν ουν] ομ. ουν Aθ. * B L Θ W 33. Αυγ.
Arm. Cop^{sa} ff² g
- παλιν] ομ. Aθ. D Θ 28. 124. 346. Cop^{bo} Arm. a b c d f g
32. καλα εργα] εργα καλα Aθ. * A K Λ Π Θ 1. 118. 209. 1582
33. 106. 157. 254. 565. 1241. a c
e f l
- πατρος μου] ομ. μου Aθ. * B D Θ Ιλ. Sy^{s.c} e
- λιθαζετε με] εμε λιθαζετε Aθ. * B L Θ 33. 1241.Vg. a b
33. λεγοντες] ομ. Aθ. * A B K L M W X Π 13. 69. 346. 33.
38. πιστευσητε] γινωσκητε Aθ. B L X Θ 1. 118. 209. 32. 33.
565. Arm. Aeth. Cop^{sa.bo}
- εν αυτω] εν τω Πατρι Aθ. * B D L X 33. 157. Ωρ. Ευσ.
Ιλ. Arm. Aeth. Cop^{sa.bo} a c e g

Chapter 12

31. νυν] add. η Aθ. Λ²
40. πεπωρωκεν] επωρωσεν Aθ. A B * K X L 13. 69. 124. 346.
543. Ευσ. Διδ.
- νοησωσι τη καρδια] τη καρδια νοησωσι Aθ. * A 544. 1223.
1355. g ff²

επιστραφωσι] επιστρεψωσι Aθ. W L K M X Π Θ 13. 69. 124.
346. 543. 1223. 1293. 1321.
Ευσ. Διδ.

47. πιστευση] φυλαξη Aθ. κ A B D K L X Π W(Θ) 1. 13. 33. 69.
118. 209. 543. 157. 249. 346. 565. 1582
1241. Vg. Cop^{sa.bo} Sy^{s.c} Arm. a b c g l

Chapter 13

13. ο διδασκαλος και ο Κυριος] ο Κυριος και ο Διδασκαλος
Aθ. C E F G H M Λ S V Ω 13. 28.
33. 69. 346. 543. 106. 128. 157.
892. 1241. 71. 185. 477. 1216.
213. 1321. 1354. 440. 4. 472.
2193. Διδ. Χρυσ. Κυρ.

Chapter 14

12. πατερα μου] om. μου Aθ. κ A B D L Q X Π Θ 1. 22. 33.
42. 69. 157. 258. 1582. Χρυσ. Κυρ.
Vg. Cop^{bo} Arm. Aeth.

28. πατηρ μου] om. μου Aθ. κ^c A B D L X N 1. 33. 64. 157.
565. 1582. Χρυσ. Κυρ. Ειρ. Ωρ.
Τερτ. Κυπρ. Ιλ. Aeth. Vg. b c e
ff^l g l

30. ερχεται γαρ] om. γαρ Aθ. 69. Arm.

ο του κοσμου τουτου αρχων] ο αρχων του κοσμου τουτου

Aθ. E F G H 124. 118. 209.

137. 579. 137. 1582. 1. 13.

346. 543. 565. Ωρ. Βασ. Κυρ.

Сор^{sa.bo} Vξ.

Chapter 15

26. οταν δε] om. δε Aθ. * B Δ B 579. Διδ. Χρυσ. Επιφ.

Ιλ. Сор^{bo} e l m

Chapter 16

7. εαν δε] om. δε Aθ. 69. 1355

εγω] add. Aθ. A Γ Δ Λ Π C E F G H Ω 13. 33. 543. 346.

118. 209. 700. 1241. 1424. 579. 157. Κλ.

Χρυσ. Διδ. Κυρ. Βασ. Arm. Aeth. Sy^{s.c} a b

c e f q

12. λεγειν υμιν] υμιν λεγειν Aθ. * B L Y 33. 118. 209.

Κυρ. Τερτ. Ιλ. Αυγ. b c e f

ff² ξ l m

αρτι] om. Aθ. * *

13. οσα αν] ομ. αν Αθ. \aleph B D^{*} L 1. 33. 61. 1582. Ωρ.
Επιφ. Κυρ.
- ακουση] ακουσει Αθ. B D E^{*} H Y Θ 1. 435. 1582. Ωρ.
Ευσ. Κυρ. Επιφ. Vg. g
23. υμιν οτι] ομ. οτι Αθ. B C D L Y 42. Ωρ. Κυρ. Vg.
Sy^{s.c} b d e f ff² g q
- οσα] εαν τι Αθ. D Y^{*} Θ 33. 265. 270. 482. 1093.
850. 1820. 2193. 2145. Ωρ. Κυρ. Cop^{bo}
Vg. a b c d f g l
27. Θεου] Πατρος Αθ. \aleph^c B C^{*} D L X 77. 249. 1321. Cop^{sa.bo}
και ηγω] add. Αθ. X 13. 69. 124. 346. 213. Επιφ. Χρυσ.

Chapter 17

6. σου το ονομα] το ονομα σου Αθ. D N Vg. ff²
11. ους] ο Αθ. D^{*} X U 7. 157. 661.
- ημεις] και ημεις Αθ. B M S U Y Π² Θ 69. 579. 1010.
713. 291. 1093. Vg. Arm.
19. αυτων εγω] ομ. εγω Αθ. \aleph A W 71. 248. 579. 700.
788. 1093. Διδ. Χρυσ. Cop^{sa} Aeth.
- και αυτοι ωσιν] ωσι και αυτοι Αθ. \aleph A B C^{*} D K L X Y
Π W N Θ 1. 118. 1582. 13. 69. 124. 346.
543. 33. 1241. Διδ. Κυρ. Vg. Cop^{bo} Arm.

20. πιστευσοντων] πιστευοντων Αθ. 8 A B C D L X Y Γ Δ Λ
 N Π Θ 13. 69. 124. 346. 543. 22. 33.
 700. 1241. Βασ. Χρυσ. Κυρ. Cop^{bo} Arm.
 Aeth. b

22. και εγω] καγω Αθ. 8 B C^{*} D L X U W 1. 249. 33. 1582.
 Κλ. Ευσ. Χρυσ. Κυρ.

23. ημεις] και ημεις Αθ. 998. Vg. Cop^{sa} a b f

Chapter 19

15. αρον αρον] αιρε αιρε Αθ. Ωρ.

Chapter 20

17. αναβαινω] πορευομαι Αθ. Ωρ. Ευσ. Κυρ.

A TABULAR PRESENTATION

Of the witnesses of the text of Athanasius

MATTHEW

Ωp	48	Θ	17	13	12
κ	32	(Θ).....	1	Ιουσ.....	12
κ ^c	2	28	17	W	11
κ ²	1	392	17	69	11
B	29	892 ²	1	543	11
B ²	1	700	17	543 ²	1
(B).....	1	Σ	16	c	11
209	24	157	16	Vg	11
L	23	157 ²	1	Vg(pl)..	2
33	23	h	16	Vg(1 MSS) ₃	
(33).....	1	1424	15	Vg(3 MSS) ₁	
118	23	Aeth	15	Z	10
l	22	ā	15	K	10
D	21	22	14	M	10
D ^b	1	Arm	14	Αὐγ	10
(D).....	2	Χρυσ	14	Ω	10
a	19	Εὐσ	14	346	10
b	19	E	13	544	10
Cop ^{bo}	18	124	13	1241	10
Κλ.....	18	Κυρ	13	ff ¹	10
1582	18	q	13	k	10
Cop ^{sa}	17				

F	9	485	6	N	3
Γ	9	1293	6	Π	3
Ta	9	Επιφ	6	102	2
f	9	Κυπρ	6	230	2
G	8	Sy ^s	6	240	2
σ	8	Sy ^c	6	243	2
σ ²	1	71	5+3	399	2
σ ³	1	692	5	470	2
349	8	482	5	440	2
517	8	Είρ	5	473	2
Βασ	8	X	5	482	2+1
Geo	8	59	4	485	2+2
Geo ²	3	245	4	660	2
Geo ^B	1	273	4	692	2
Geo(1etA) ₁		1170	4	713	2
g ¹	8	1396	4	566	2
Sy ^{s.c}	8	ff ²	4	945	2
S	7	e	4	954	2
1093	7	241	3	999	2
Ιλ.	7	243	3	1010	2
m	7	251	3	1187	2
V	6	372	3	1355	2
U	6	660	3	1194	2
Φ	6	713	3	1391	2
Δ	6	ε ²	3	1574	2
565	6				

1675	2+3	990	2	247	1
2145	2	1012	2	291	1
Υ	2	1402	2	213	1
Τερτ	2	1391	2	235	1
Αμβρ	2	1515	2	237	1
Διδ.	2	1579	2	252	1
4	2	2145	2	257	1
12	2	16	1	349	1
21	2	47	1	372	1
59	2	48	1	435	1
174	2	93	1	434	1
184	2	99	1	506	1
240	2	106	1	517	1
238	2	117	1	544	1
270	2	127	1	566	1
267	2	183	1	692	1
443	2	251	1	713	1
471	2	246	1	726	1
472	2	253	1	826	1
478	2	248	1	828	1
655	2	254	1	954	1
659	2	262	1	980	1
697	2	273	1	998	1
738	2	245	1	1010	1
990	2	241	1	1064	1

1185	1	1689	1	1402.....	1
1200	1	1241	1	1473	1
1207	1	1293	1	1485	1
1279	1	1354	1	1555	1
1295	1	1360	1	1588	1
1223	1	1365	1		
1604	1	1375	1		
1606	1	1355	1		

A TABULAR PRESENTATION
of the witnesses of the text of Athanasius

LUKE

*	21	33	10	M	7
⌘ ^a	1	346	10	22	7
B	21	Επιφ	10	543	7
Ωρ	19	N	9	Sy ^{s.c}	7
700	19	Π	9	Сор ^{bo}	7
D	16	Βασ	9	Χρυσ	7
L	15	13	9	Ω	6
a	14	209	9	F	6
b	14	118	9	U	6
1241	14	124	9	Ξ	6
W	14	Θ	9	579	6
X	14	(Θ)	1	q	6
892	13	f	9	R	5
(892)	1	l	9	H	5
131	12	Vg.	9	Λ	5
Arm	11	Δ	8	28	5
l	11	K	8	213	5
1582	11	69	8	472	5
A	10	Aeth	8	1071	5
C	10	Sy ^s	8	Τερτ	5

g ¹	5	555	2	348	1
E	4	713	2	440	1
G	4	1012	2	270	1
V	4	1346	2	566	1
157	4	1354	2	659	1
544	4	1574	2	661	1
Κυρρ	4	1604	2	716	1
Сop ^{sa}	4	Ιλ	2	726	1
Ψ	3	c	2	945	1
Εῶσ	3	ff	2	1033	1
S	3	4	2	998	1
1047	3	21	1	1093	1
1194	3	36	1	1187	1
477	3	38	1	1223	1
1355	3	127	1	1229	1
1424	3	130	1	1360	1
Γ	3	229	1	1396	1
Εῖρ	3	220	1	1375	1
Ta	3	245	1	1555	1
7.....	3	262	1	1675	1
d	3	291	1	2145	1
291	2	443	1	2193	1

A TABULAR PRESENTATION
of the witnesses of Athanasius' text

JOHN

B	36	Cop ^{bo}	17	X	11
Ⓜ	35	Ωρ	17	X ^b ...	2
Ⓜ ^c	3	118	16	G	11
L	33	a	16	H	11
Kυρ	23	A	15	E	11
33	27	Aeth	15	Iλ	11
D	25	157	14	l	11
W	24	Cop ^{sa}	14	g	11
69	20	c	13	F	10
Χρυσ	20	N	13	K	10
Arm	20	124	13	22	8
Vg	20	209	13	892	8
b	20	543	13	d	8
c	19	565	13	579	7
l	18	e	13	Sy ^{s.c}	7
13	18	f	13	Y	7
346	18	ff ²	13	Δ	6
1241	18	Εϋσ	13	Ψ	6
e	17	Π	12	Μ	6
(θ)....	1	Π ²	1	213	6
1582	17	Διδ	12	Επιφ.....	6

U	5	1424	3	17*	1
Λ	5	Σ	3	32	1
Λ ²	1	7	2	61	1
T	5	42	2	80	1
Τερτ.....	5	64	2	77	1
Ta	5	106	2	128	1
2193	5	131	2	138	1
.....		137	2	225	1
T ^b	4	135	2	230	1
Γ	4	397	2	241	1
713	4	430	2	248	1
28	4	477	2	249	1
1093	4	472	2	262	1
1223	4	544	2	253	1
1293	4	1071	2	258	1
1321	4	1355	2	259	1
700	4	1574	2	265	1
Sy ^c	4	2145	2	267	1
m	4	Κυπρ	2	270	1
S	3	Κλ	2	291	1
Βασ.....	3	Αδγ	2	314	1
Φ	3	Ω	2	372	1
71	3	V	1	435	1
249	3	Q	1	440	1
1010	3	4	1	476	1

482	1	983	1	1194	1
569	1	993	1	1216	1
661	1	1170	1	1354	1
850	1	1188	1	1820	1

The quotations of Athanasius from the gospel of
MARK

Chapter 2

- 11.* Εγειραι αρον τον κραββατον σου και υπαγε εις τον οικον σου (26,781)

Chapter 3

17. Βοαναργες ο εστιν υιοι βροντης
(26,566)
- 29.* Ος δ αν βλασφημησει εις το Πνευμα το αγιον ουκ εχει αφεσιν αλλ ενοχος εστιν αιωνιου αμαρτιας οτι ελεγον πνευμα ακαθαρτον εχει (26,664)

Chapter 5

- 7.* Τι σοι και ημιν Υιε του Θεου Δεομαι σου μη με βασανισης
(25,152)

Chapter 6

- 38.* Ποσους εχετε αρτους
(26,404)

Chapter 10

- 6.* Απ αρχης δε ο κτισας αρσεν και θηλυ εποιησεν αυτους
(26,224)

18. Τι με λεγεις αγαθον ουδεις αγαθος ει μη εις ο Θεος
(26,985. 26,995)
- 21.* Ει θελεις τελειος ειναι υπαγε πωλησον σου παντα οσα
εχεις καιδος πτωχοις και εξειςθησαυρον εν ουρανω
και λαβων τον σταυρον σου ακολουθει μοι
(26,993)

Chapter 11

- 28.* Εν ποια εξουσια ταυτα ποιεις και τις σοι εδωκε την
εξουσιαν ταυτην
(27,93)

Chapter 12

- 29.* Ακουε Ισραηλ Κυριος ο Θεος σου Κυριος εις εστι (26,336)
ο Θεος σου] ο Θεος (25,13)
σου Κυριος] ομ.Κυριος(25,13)

Chapter 13

- 13.* Ο υπομεινας εις τελος ουτος σωθησεται
(26,1297. 27,1203)
- 32.* Περι δε της ημερας η της ωρας εκεινης ουδεις οιδεν
ουδε οι αγγελοι ουδε ο Υιος (26,380)

η της ωρας] και της ωρας (26,412)
 ουδε οι αγγελοι] om. (26,420. 26,985)
 της ημερας] add. της εσχατης (26,985)

Chapter 14

- 33.* Ηρξατο λυπεισθαι και αδημονειν (27,133)
 37.* Ουτως ουκ ισχυσατε μιαν ωραν γρηγορεισαι (27,1397)

Chapter 15

- 34.* Ελωι Ελωι λιμασαβαχθανι ο εστι Θεε μου Θεε μου ινα
 τι με εγκατελειπες (26,436)
 Ινα τι με εγκατελειπες (26,440. 26,441)

Quotations from Athanasius' Pseudepigrapha

MARK

Chapter 1

1. Αρχη του ευαγγελιου Ιησου Χριστου του Υιου του Θεου
(28,968)
8. Εγω μεν βαπτιζω υμας εν υδατι εις μετανοιαν ερχεται
δε ο ισχυροτερος μου ος υμας βαπτισει εν πνευματι αγιω
και πυρι
(28,1245)
40. Προσηλθεν αυτω λεπρος γονυπετων και λεγων Κυριε εαν
θελεις δυνασαι με καθαρισαι
(28,57)

Chapter 3

22. Εν Βεελζεβουλ εκβαλλει τα δαιμονια
(28,392)
26. Ει ο Σατανας τον Σαταναν εκβαλλει η βασιλεια αυτου
ουχ ισταται
(28,677)

Chapter 4

30. Τινι ομοιωσω την βασιλειαν του Θεου η εν ποια παραβολη παραβαλωμαι αυτην
(28,344)

Chapter 8

34. Ει τις θελει οπισω μου ελθειν
(28,392)

Chapter 9

40. Ο μη ων μετ εμου κατ εμου εστι
(28,392)
47. Ο σκωληξ αυτων ου τελευτησει ουδε το πυρ σβεννυται
(28,392)

Chapter 11

2. Απελθατε εις την κατεναντι κομην και ευρησετε ανθρωπον κεραμιον υδατος βασταζοντα
(28,712)

Chapter 13

16. Ο εν τω αγρω μη επιστραφη εις τα οπισω
(28,1425)
32. Ουδε ο Υιος οιδε την ημεραν εκεινην
(28,473)

Chapter 14

30. Πριν αλεκτορα φωνησαι τρις απαρνηση με
(28,705)

Supporting witnesses of the Readings of Athanasius

MARK

Chapter 2

11. και αρον] om. και Aθ. * B C D L Θ Γ 28. 33. 69.
 124. 346. 565. 543. 700. 517. 571.
 892. 1071. Cop^{sa} Cop^{bo} Geo. Arm.
 Sy^{pesh.} Vg^(pler.et WW) a b e f ff l q

Chapter 3

29. βλασφημηση] βλασφημηση Aθ. H 13. 126
 εις τον αιωνα] om. Aθ. D W Θ 1. 209. 22. 28. 565.
 700. 788. Κυπρ. Sy^s a b e ff² q
 κρισεως] αμαρτιας Aθ. C^{*uid} W D 13. 69. 124. 826. 828.
 788. 893. 346. 543. Αυγ. Κυπρ. Sy^s Arm.
 Cop^{bo} Vg^(pler.et WW) b e d ff l q

Chapter 5

7. του υψιστου] om. Aθ. Cop^{bo}
 τον θεον] om. Aθ. Cop^{bo} (1 MS)

Chapter 6

38. ποσους αρτους εχετε] ποσους εχετε αρτους Aθ. B L Δ Θ Geo²

Chapter 10

6. αυτους ο Θεος] om. ο Θεος Aθ. * B C L Δ 579. 1342. Cop^{sa.bo}
21. ει θελεις τελειος ειναι] add. Aθ. K M N W Y Θ Π Σ 13.
69. 124. 826. 828. 788. 983. 346.
543. 28. 72. 122. 229. 238. 253.
300. 472. 482. 565. 1241. 1071.
184. Cop^{sa.bo} Aeth. Sy^{hl} Geo²

τοις πτωχοις] om. τοις Aθ. A B N W X Y Γ Δ Σ Ψ Ε Φ
G H M U S V Ω 118. 22. 13.
69. 124. 346. 826. 828. 788.
983. 543. 1241. 157. 579. 700.
1071. Κλ.

δευρο] om. Aθ. 28

Chapter 11

28. εξουσιαν ταυτην εδωκεν] εδωκεν την εξουσιαν ταυτην
Aθ. * B C L M² Δ Θ Ψ 124. 33. 71.
80. 115. 330. 472. 474. 517.
565. 579. 892. 1071. 1342. Cop^{sa.bo}
Vg. Geo. Arm. a b c f l r^{1.2}

Chapter 12

29. ημων] σου Aθ. Ψ 27^{**} 565. 282. Κυπρ. Ιλ. Cop^{sa.bo} Vg. Aeth.

Chapter 13

13. δε | om. Aθ. Sy^{s.resh.}(1 MSS)
32. οι εν τω ουρανω | om. Aθ. κ D K L U Θ Σ 0116. 28. 124.
127. 299. 472. 474. 485. 565.
700. 892. 1071.Vg. Cop^{oo} Geo.Aeth.Arm.

Chapter 14

33. εκθαμβεισθαι | λυπεισθαι Aθ. (118)
37. ισχυσας | ισχυσατε Aθ.D Θ 1. 118. 131. 209. 1582. 13.
69. 346. 543. 124. 826. 828. 788.
983. 7. 59. 565. 251. 260. b ff ε²
k Vg (1 MS)

Chapter 15

34. εις τι | ινα τι Aθ. 237. 349. 713. 1241. 1424. Eus.

The picture presented by the witnesses which support the Matthean text of Athanasius is clear about the type of text used by this Father in his quotations from that Gospel.

Looking at the tabulated results we find $\Omega\text{p}^{\text{N}}\text{B}$ holding the numerical preponderance over all the other textual witnesses, a fact which means that Athanasius' text of Matthew is "Neutral" in character.

Ωp 48 or 45%

N 31 or 28%

B..... 29 or 27%

The major Western authorities, on the other hand, occupy in the list a lower position than their Neutral rivals.

D 21 or 19%

Vg 11 or 11%

K λ 18 or 17%

In Luke, as in Matthew, the Neutral authorities prevail by far over the western ones. Although Origen comes down this time taking his place after B, the major Neutral witnesses N B appear even stronger than in Matthew, considering the number of the collated readings.

N 21 or 36%

B..... 21 or 36%

Ωp 19 or 32%

The Western witnesses, in Luke, hold a place a little higher than these in Matthew but they do not affect the Neutral type of the text.

D 16 or 27%
 Vg 9 or 16%
 KA 9 or 16%

In the Athanasian text of John the Neutral elements are overwhelmingly stronger surpassing by far those in the previous Gospels-text. I give a clearer picture of that fact by citing in the order of frequency the number and percentage of the major authorities.

B 36 or 47%
 K 35 or 46%
 Ωρ 17 or 23%

In comparison with Matthew and Luke, the major Western authorities hold in this particular Gospel-text their highest place but still they do not overshadow the Neutral character of the text used.

D 21 or 27%
 Vg 20 or 26%
 KA 2 or 3%

The general picture, of the four Gospels combined, shows that the closest witness to Athanasius' Gospels-text is B; Origen follows.

VIII. Explanation and evaluation
of the Gospels - text of Athanasius

In the "Specific Introduction" I mentioned the difficulties any critical student faces in undertaking the task to explore the Biblical text used by the early ecclesiastical fathers. Such difficulties, however, are not limited only to technical matters, such as, the carelessness of the copyists to produce exact copies, the amalgamation of corresponding readings among the Gospels, etc. In order to give the most satisfactory explanation of a certain patristic text, more causes should be taken into account; namely, the historical events which were developing in the era of the father whose text we study, the geographical location of his birth and activities, his travels and the theological field that interested him most. By this I mean that most of the ecclesiastical fathers, especially the Alexandrians, built their Christian teachings on a philosophical basis showing a constant tendency to pair the 'spirit' of the text with a certain philosophical system; such was not the case with Athanasius; he drew his teachings strictly and directly from the 'letter' of the text. He was not a Christian philosopher but a pastor who fixed his attention only upon what the Bible has to say. No doubt, therefore, Athanasius must have been very careful in presenting his textual readings in their best and authoritative form.

Coming back now to the additional causes which might have influenced the Gospels-text of Athanasius we would say that the leading part this father took in " the Arian Controversy " is not irrelevant to the evaluation of his text.

Arianism, is recorded in Church History as the first and the most dangerous blow against the traditional doctrine of the early Church. It was a heresy and, as such, it was to be fought exclusively with the traditional doctrinal testimony of the Biblical text, because the Bible is the only source of the Christian doctrine. As the leader of the anti-Arian party and, "the defender of the sound doctrine of the Church", Athanasius must have done his best to present this doctrine as authentic and genuine as possible, and there was no other way to be effective on that except by using those textual readings which appear to him the most authoritative ones.

And we have every reason to believe that Athanasius had at his disposal the most valid readings. He was born and educated in Alexandria, the home of scientific scholarship and no doubt he had in his possession the precious inheritance of the work of Origen , the most able critical scholar of the early Church.

We should not also forget that, in those days, Alexandria, because of its geographical location, was the connecting

link between the Eastern and the Western Christian world, a fact that strengthens the possibility that a variety of local texts from many parts of the Christendom had been in circulation in that city, from a very early period. There, we could find the "Western" type of text, which, as we already mentioned, had been the most widely spread text during the course of the second and the third centuries. The "Neutral" sources, of course, existed there also. The same must be true of the Palestinian type of text. A number of ecclesiastical personalities of the East had received their education in Alexandria and there is every reason to believe that, because of these educational relations between Palestine and Egypt, the Palestinian sources must have been known in Alexandria. This was the textual environment in which Athanasius found himself; an environment of textual variety made up of several texts coming from different local groups of churches.

This variety of texts was one of the main reasons which led competent scholars to textual revisions and editions. And there was not any other city to take this initiative on this matter than Alexandria with its famous institutions and its able scholars.

The second reason, equally important, for the making of the recensions, was the appearance of the first big sectarian movements. It is known that such sects were, according to the conception of the traditional Church, serious threats against the correct interpretation of the divine

revelation and dogma as had been given by God Himself in the sacred documents. The leaders of this sectarian movements did very often not hesitate to mutilate or change the Biblical text to make it fit in with their heretical teachings. Marcion is one of the examples that verifies that fact. This man, who was the founder and the leader of his own religious sect, saw as important, for the benefit of his views, to form a New Testament canon according to his own judgment, not only by rejecting certain books, which were accepted by the official Church as canonical, but also by mutilating his selected documents for the purpose of altering the meaning of their text. We could, therefore, assume that, under such circumstances, the reaction of the official Church must have been no other than that of editing a fresh edition of the New Testament text in a form that appeared to her the most trustworthy.

These recensions, however, which were very probably created from the second through the fourth centuries, did not solve the textual problem. This is clearly indicated in the works of the early Church fathers who do not seem to show an exclusive preference to any particular form of text. In the textual variants seen in Clement of Alexandria, for instance, his preference is rather confined to the "Western" type of text, although he used a number of readings supported by "Neutral" sources; while Athanasius leans primarily to the "Neutral" sources.

Von Soden therefore is right on this point, since his H-Text includes all the major Neutral authorities which support Athanasius. I checked Athanasius' readings, which von Soden presents as characteristic of his H-Text, and found them to be correct.¹

Lake follows von Soden and the others who agree on this point, although he confesses that he has not himself examined the question.

Here is what he states:²

" In the fourth century the Neutral text was used by Athanasius. This statement we take on trust from von Soden and others, who have examined the question; we do not ourselves know from actual study whether it is true, still less whether it is possible to determine the type of Athanasius' text as that found in B or in ~~K~~ or in L Δ ; the statement is commonly made that the Athanasian text is in the main that of B.... Was he using the same type of manuscript throughout? The situation discovered in the case of Origen's quotations may well be found repeated with Athanasius. We will assume, however, for the moment that the quotations of Athanasius, when studied in detail, will confirm the accepted view that he always used a Neutral text of the B-type, and that he did so because it was the text used in Alexandria."

The view which the facts do not allow us to accept is Streeter's who, speaking on the Athanasian gospels-text, indicates that it generally agrees with the type of text found in the Boharic and the Sahidic versions.

¹ Except one: Matth. 25:21, Athanasius uses the reading "eu" rather than "ευς", as Soden claims.

² "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark", HTR, Vol., XXI., 1928, p. 329-330.

" [There is a] general coincidence between the quotations of the gospels by... Athanasius... with the type of text found in the Coptic (i.e Egyptian) versions." ¹

This conclusion is unsuccessful. We might, of course, say that the Coptic versions (especially the Boharic), contain a substantial amount of Neutral readings; yet, as supporting witnesses of Athanasius' text, these versions are not found in any noticeable place in our list.

A more uncertain, if not a mistaken opinion on Athanasius' gospel text, is expressed by Hort. This able scholar, although he does not make any particular reference to Athanasius' text, speaks generally about the Greek Fathers of the fourth century by characterizing their text as " more or less chaotic."

"... mixture prevails everywhere in the fourth century. Almost all its texts, so far as they can be seen through the quotations of the Fathers, are more or less chaotic." ²

We do not know on what criteria Hort based his speculation regarding the text used by the Greek Fathers of the fourth century. Presumably, his views encompass the Patristic quotations taken from the whole New Testament; but even in this case, the facts make his assumption look suspicious. Once Athanasius' gospels-text proves to be strongly supported by Neutral authorities it would be more reasonable to assume that this Father continued using the same type of text for the rest of the New Testament quotations, than to

¹ op. cit., p.53

² op. cit., p. 139

include Athanasius' text among the others which are " more or less chaotic." As a matter of fact, a Dissertation on the gospels-text of Didymus, just completed at Boston University, shows that this Father used also textual sources of the Neutral type. Here, once more, Hort's conclusion is contradicted.

Therefore, contrary to Hort's conclusion, we have every reason to believe that the text of at least two of the fourth century Greek Fathers, reflects a dominant number of readings which belong to the very same textual family which Hort himself evaluated as the most trustworthy.

I have already mentioned (p.81), that I have checked the gospels-quotations of Athanasius in Migne with those found in Opitz's "Athanasius Werke." This later work is incomplete (only nine parts are available thus far). In the process of my checking I spotted the following variations in the identical parts of the writings of Athanasius:

Matthew 24:15-18

(Migne 25,657) εστος | εστος (Op. Part 4,76)

Matthew 26:45

(Migne 25,661) το λοιπον | om. το (Op. Part 4,77)

John 2:4

(Migne 25,661) ημει | ηλθεν (Op. Part 4,77)

John 14:9

(Migne 25,520) ο εωρακως εμε | ο εμε εωρακως (Op. Part 4,55)

Considering the total amount of the quotations (around 60), the number of the variants, between the two editions, as seen above, is relatively very small.

Whenever the Berlin Edition appears in complete form, I hope to make a comparison of the two editions. There will be some variants, but I am of the opinion that there will be no appreciable difference between the general nature of Athanasius' text in the Migne edition and that of the Berlin edition.

IX. CONCLUSION

I hope that my present study has accomplished its purpose satisfactorily by having verified the opinion of textual critics of the past about the Neutral character of the Athanasian Gospels-text.

To fulfil their delicate task, students of the New Testament text still have, of course, a long way to go. Further textual studies made by competent scholars, since Westcott and Hort, and the discovery of new material have proved the fact that W.H's theory was only the beginning rather than the end, as it was at first believed. Nevertheless, the scholars of today as well as those of the future must carry their task with impartiality and consciousness, if there is to be any hope to achieve their purpose. This point is a significant one. The re-establishment of the original text of the New Testament, a delicate and complicated task as it is, requires full objectiveness and honesty on the part of textual critics and it is my conviction, that in some instances, the misleading conclusions offered by some of the scholars in the past were due to their moral weakness rather than to their ignorance, to their dogmatic or anti-dogmatic prejudices. Unless textual critics are inspired by the love for truth Textual Criticism will never reach its final goal.

Nor have we to accept the wide spread opinion that Textual Criticism is aiming only at the destruction of the traditional faith. Any critic, who deserves this title, destroys when he has to do so and constructs when he has to do so. He should be inflexible about facts without making any retreat whatsoever, no matter how serious how serious the consequences might be.

Let us hope that the textual scholars of the present and of the coming generations will carry their work along this basic principle for there is no alternative to make Textual Criticism both more successful and interesting.

X. BIBLIOGRAPHY

PART I

- Athanasius, Saint, The life of Saint Antony, transl. by R. Meyer, the Neuman Press, Westmister, 1950.
- _____, Letters concerning the Holy Spirit, transl. by C.R.B. Shapland, Philosophical Library, New York, 1951.
- Bardenhewer, O., Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur, Freiburg im Breisgau Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1914.
- _____, Patrology, transl. by Thomas Shahan, Freiburg im Breisgau & St. Louis, Mo., 1908.
- Bardy, G., Litterature Grecque Chretienne, Paris, Librairie Blond & Gay, n.d.
- Barnes, W. Emery, Athanasius, in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.
- Bright, W., Historical Writings of Saint Athanasius, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1881.
- Burn, A. E., Facsimiles of the Creeds, London, Harrison & Sons, 1909.
- Gureton, William, The Festal Letters of Athanasius, London, James Maden & Co., 1848.
- Duchesne, L., Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise, edited by E De Boccard, Paris, 1910.
- Gwatkin, H. M., Arian Controversy, New York, Longmans, 1889.
- _____, Whitney, J.P., The Cambridge Medieval History, New York, MacMillan Co., 1936.
- _____, Studies of Arianism, Cambridge, Deighton, Bell & Co. 1882.
- Harnack, A., History of Dogma, transl. by Neil Buchanan, Little Brown & Co., Boston, 1896-98.
- Kidd, B.J., A History of the Church, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1922.
- Loofs, Friedrich, Dogmengeschichte, Verlag von Max Niemeyer, 1906.

Socrates, History, The Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers, transl. by Zenos, New York, The Christian Literature Co. 1890.

Sozomen, History, The Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers, New York, The Christian Literature Co. 1890.

Stulcken, A., Athanasiana, Leipzig, 1899.

PART II

1. Handbooks

Kenyon, F., Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible, London, published for the British Academy, 1933.

_____, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, London, MacMillan & Co., 1926.

Lagrange, P. M., Critique Textuelle II., La critique Rationnelle, Paris, 1935.

Lake, Kirsopp, The Text of the New Testament, 6th edition, London, Rivingtons, 1949.

Merrill M. Parvis- Wikgren P. A., New Testament Manuscripts, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Streeter, B. H., The Four Gospels, A study of Origin, New York, The MacMillan Co., 1925

Vaganay, Leon, Initiation a la Critique Textuelle Neotestamentaire, Librairie Bloud et Gay, (n.d).

Westcott, B. T.- Hort, F. J., The New Testament in the Original Greek, New York, Harper & Bros., 1882.

2. Texts- Collations- Facsimiles

Abbot, K. T., The Codex Rescriptus Dublinensis, London, Longman Green & Co., 1880.

- Beerman, G.- Gaspar, R. G., Die Koridethi Evangelien, Leipzig, 1913.
- Burkitt, F. C., Evangelion Da- Mepharreshe, Cambridge, 1904.
- Cronin, H. S., Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus (N), Texts and Studies, Cambridge University Press, Vol. V., 1889
- Cureton, W., Remains of a very ancient recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, London, John Murray, 1858.
- Ferrar, H. W., A Collation of four important manuscripts of the Gospels, by Abbot, London, MacMillan & Co., 1877.
- Grenfell, P. B., Hunt, S. A., The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, London, 1898.
- Horner, W. G., The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern otherwise called Sahidic and Thebatic, Oxford, University Press, 1911.
- _____, The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect, Oxford, University Press, 1898.
- Hoskier, C. H., Codex B and its Allies, London, Bernard Quaritch, 1914.
- _____, Codex Evangelium 604, London, David Nutt, 1890.
- Huck, Albert, A Synopsis of the first three Gospels, Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1936.
- Kenyon, G. F., The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, II., The Gospels and Acts, London, Emery W. Led, 1933.
- Lake, Kirsopp, Codex 1 of the Gospels and its Allies, Texts and Studies, Cambridge at the University Press, Vol. 7; 1902.
- Lake K.-New Silva, Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts, Harvard Theological Studies, Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1933.
- Lake K.- Blake R. P.- New S., The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark, The Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, Vol. 21., No. 4 1928.
- Lake, H., and Kirsopp, Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911.

Lake, H., and Kirsopp, Family 13 (The Ferrar group), The text according to Mark with a collation of Codex 28 of the Gospels, London, Christophers, 1941.

Migne, Accurante, Patrologiae, Vols. 25-28, Parisiis, 1837.

Opitz-Geor. Hans, Athanasius Werke, (Kirchenvatter-Kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften) nine parts, Berlin & Leipzig, 1935.

Sanders, A. H., The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, New York, The MacMillan Co., 1918.

_____, The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection, New York, The MacMillan Co., 1912.

Scrivener, F. H., Novum Testamentum, Textus Stephanici, A.D., 1550.

Soden, H. Von, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Text und Apparat, Gottingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1913.

Tischendorf, C., Novum Testamentum Vaticanum, Leipzig, Giesecke & Devrient, 1867.

_____, Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus, sine fragmenta novi Testamenti, Lipsiae.

_____, Monumenta Sacra Inedita, Lipsiae, 1846.

_____, Novum Testamentum Graece, Lipsiae, 1869.

Tregelles, P. S., The Greek New Testament, London, S. Bagster Sons, 1857-1879.

3. Articles- Unpublished Essays

Barnard, M. P., "The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria," Texts and Studies, Cambridge, The University Press, Vol. 5., 1899.

Hedley, P. L., "The Egyptian Texts of the Gospels and Acts", Church Quarterly Review, London, by the Society for promoting Christian knowledge, Vol. CXVII., 1934.

Kim, Kwang, W., "Codices 1582, 1739 and Origen", Journal of Biblical Literature, Philadelphia Pa., Published by the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, Vol. LXIX, Part II, June 1950, p. 167-175.

_____, "The Matthean Text of Origen in his Commentary on Matthew, Unpublished Dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1946.

Lake, K.- New S., "De Westcott et Hort au pere Lagrange et au dela", Revue Biblique, Publiee par L'ecole pratique d'etudes Bibliques, Paris, Librairie Victor Lecoffre, Vol. XLVIII, 1939.

Sanders, A. H., "An early Papyrus Fragment of the Gospel of Matthew in the Michigan Collection", Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, Vol. XIX., July 1926.

_____, "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts", Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, Vol., XXVII., April 1933.

Tasker, R. V. G., "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of Luke", Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, Vol. XXIX., 1936.

_____, "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of John, Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, Vol. XXX., 1937.

Usher, P., "The Egyptian Texts of the Gospels", Church Quarterly Review, London, Published by The Society for promoting Christian knowledge, Vol. CXVII., Oct. 1933- Jan. 1934.

THE GOSPELS-TEXT OF ATHANASIUS

Abstract of a Dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

BOSTON UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL

by

Gerassimos Zervopoulos

Diploma, Supreme School of Political Science, Greece, 1947

Department : Biblical Literature

Field of Specialization : New Testament

Major Instructor: Professor

1955

1. Purpose

The subject of this Dissertation belongs to the general field of the Patristic studies; specifically, it is connected with the contribution of the Patristic quotations to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.

The main purpose of this study focuses on the investigation of the text of the four Gospels as used by Athanasius.

Textual critics of the New Testament, in the past one hundred years, have merely said that Athanasius used the so-called "Neutral Text", but the evidence for such a statement has not yet been given. It is therefore important for us to discover whether this Father actually used the "Neutral Text" or any other type of text.

2. Method

I have collected every Gospel quotation found in Athanasius' printed writings as they appear in the Migne edition; then, I have collated them against the Textus Receptus and then analysed the textual variants.

Before starting the collation process I took out all of the additional material, such as, conjunctions, lectio-nary phrases etc., attached to the Athanasian quotations.

For the witnesses which support Athanasius' readings, I have consulted the critical apparatuses of Legg, Tischendorf and von Soden. For accuracy, I have also checked separately the supporting witnesses of every single variant with a number of textual sources. I have also checked Athanasius' Gospel-quotations in Migne with those found in Opitz's "Athanasius Werke". This later work is incomplete (only nine parts are available thus far). Out of around 60 Gospel-quotations I compared, between these two editions, I spotted only 4 variants.

I have written a brief account on Athanasius' life and theology because I believe that these factors created some particular conditions which are relevant to the purpose of my study.

3. Results

The following is the result of counting the total variants of Athanasius and their supporting witnesses:

Matthew, Variants: 105

Origen 48 or 45%

Aleph 31 or 28%

B 29 or 27%

.....

D 21 or 19%

Other minor witnesses

Luke, Variants: 59

Aleph	21	or	36%
B	21	or	36%
Origen	19	or	32%

.....

D	16	or	27%
---	----	----	-----

Other minor witnesses

John, Variants: 74

B	36	or	47%
Aleph	35	or	46%
Origen	17	or	23%

.....

D	21	or	27%
---	----	----	-----

Other minor witnesses

The text of Athanasius from Mark does not present any particular interest. His quotations from that Gospel are very limited and therefore not sufficient to explain the character of the text used.

Keeping in mind the activities and teachings of Athanasius we must look at his quotations from the Gospel of John if we wish to obtain the best picture of the text used by this Father. We know that Athanasius was involved in a hard and significant struggle the outcome of which might have had decisive consequences to the doctrine of the traditional faith. His principal aim was to defend the most basic

teaching of Orthodox Christianity; namely, the divine nature and essence of Jesus Christ against the heretical views of Arius and his followers. And there was not other most authoritative source to support Athanasius on this matter than the Gospel of John; this is the document that exposes more than any other the motto of Athanasius' theology: "He (the Christ) became man in order to make us gods." We have therefore every reason to believe that the readings from this Gospel, which formulated the dogma he was fighting for, should have been selected by this Father as carefully and critically as possible. Judging Athanasius' Gospel-text from that angle, and I think it is the proper one, we discover that the text used was overwhelmingly "Neutral".

4. Conclusion

I hope that this study has accomplished its purpose satisfactorily by having verified the opinion of those textual critics of the past who predicted the Neutral character of the Athanasian Gospels-text.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Gerassimos Zervopoulos, the fourth son of Anthony and Pagona, was born in Corfu Greece, in January 1920. He received his elementary and secondary (High School) education in his native town, from 1926 until 1937. In 1938 he went to Athens, Greece, to register in the Supreme School of Political Science and received his Diploma from that School in 1948. During the same period he attended the Greek Bible Institute for 3 years. Mr. Zervopoulos came to the United States with a scholarship granted to him by the Gordon Divinity School in which he attended classes from 1949 until 1951. In the same year, he registered in the Boston University Graduate School as a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the field of Biblical Literature (New Testament). The Doctorate was conferred to him in June 1955.

